

THE URBAN CRISIS AND ITS EFFECT UPON JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES *

by BERTRAM H. GOLD

Executive Vice-President, American Jewish Committee, New York

THERE is a great temptation when speaking of the urban crisis and its relation to Jewish communal services, either to indulge in grandiose rhetoric, and thus avoid coming to grips with the issue, or to obfuscate by becoming highly scholarly and academic. I hope I succeed in doing neither. I would like instead, to deal with this problem of the city, and our relationship to it, quite simply and with a full recognition that most of us are puzzled, confused and even "hung up" on what our role, as Jews and a Jewish community should be, in its solution.

This need for a new Jewish communal "look" at the urban crisis has become more forcefully and consciously articulated in recent months. The report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders and the tragic assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. galvanized all America, for a brief moment at least. These events, together with our reaction to the destruction of so many Jewish-owned shops in black slum areas immediately following the assassination made us aware, in a new and almost existential way, of the need for Jewish communal response to this dual sickness that plagues our nation—the sickness of a deteriorating city and the blind rage of

an oppressed minority no longer content to live with poverty and prejudice.

Certainly the human condition of those entrapped in the congested slums of our cities should not require much documentation here. And yet so often, even to the most sophisticated, the true nature of the crisis remains unperceived or certainly "unfelt" until we come face to face with the realities. There were no slums in Jackson, Mississippi for its mayor, until he saw the slums for himself, and smelled and touched the sour agony that pervades slum living.

The crisis we face is just not visible to the comfortable suburban dweller except as violence or the threat of violence erupts to shake his complacency. And so—because we intellectually ignore some of the facts and because we each have our own emotional blocks, we find it easy to project—why can't they better themselves? Why can't they get jobs? There are plenty of jobs for those that want them! Why don't they use some self-effort, just as we did?

The truth of the matter is that the crisis of the cities cannot be understood unless one is able to understand its vast magnitude on the one hand and to identify with each of its individual victims on the other. It is estimated that in one decade—between 1960 and 1970—10,000,000 rural residents will have moved to the cities. The vast majority of

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Detroit, Michigan, June 10, 1968.

these new city dwellers are the poverty-stricken, the unskilled, and the uneducated. Less than 60 years ago 81 percent of all blacks lived in the rural areas of the south. In 1960, which is the last statistic we have, 73 percent of all blacks in this country were living in cities, mostly in the north—a complete statistical reversal in 50 years. Just compare the amount of planning and of resources that went into the resettling of those (less than 10 percent of this 10,000,000) who immigrated into Israel after World War II, with the complete lack of planning and care that has gone into this tremendous population move in our own country these last 10 years.

And the gap between America's white and non-white steadily grows wider. In 1950 one out of six Negro migrants failed to find jobs in Northern cities. By 1960 the figure had doubled to two out of six. More than 600,000 people are now receiving welfare benefits in New York City—approximately 200,000 more than were receiving subsistence in 1941, the peak of the welfare load of the great depression. Although the proportion of poor families has dropped considerably in the past two decades, more than one-half of the black families in America still have incomes of less than \$5,000 per annum and one in four subsists on less than \$3,000. And even though the *Fortune* magazine survey of January, 1968 shows that three out of four Negroes feel their condition has improved, the Watts and Detroit studies indicate quite clearly that rising expectations, combined with unmet promises, result in frustrations which lead to riots. De Toqueville phrased it well, "Patiently endured so long as it seemed beyond redress, a grievance comes to appear intolerable once the possibility of removing it crosses men's minds. For the mere fact that certain abuses have been remedied draws attention to the others and they now appear more galling; people may suffer

less, but their sensibility is exacerbated."

With this backdrop we need to examine some of the problems that give us cause for concern—the use of black power and separatism; black anti-Semitism; the condition of Jews in the Negro slum areas; and the role of Jewish communal agencies.

Black Power and Black Separatism

The term "black power" has caused a special reaction amongst the Jews. The word "power" itself is a word to which we have a pronounced dislike because, as a once powerless group, we have in our tradition eschewed the idea of power except as it lay in the hands of God. And yet we are ambiguous about the term black power because the concept behind it, if not the term itself, comes perilously close to some of our own Jewish terminology and aspirations. Take the sentence, "Jewish identity in its simplest terms, means the facilitation of the empowerment of the Jewish people to be and become themselves." This quotation could come directly from the Lewinian thesis of Jewish self-acceptance. This sentence as it was originally written, before I tampered with it, by Nathan Wright, Jr., who was chairman of the Black Power Conference held in Newark in July, 1967, read: "Black power, in its simplest terms, means the facilitation of the empowerment of black people to be and become themselves."

Or take the opening sentence of Floyd B. McKissick's recent article on *Programs for Black Power*. "Hillel, the Jewish philosopher," says McKissick, "has said

'If I am not for myself, who will be for me

If I am only for myself, what am I

If not now, when'

"This quotation" continues McKissick,

“summarizes in a real sense what black power is all about.”

Indeed in the May 17, 1968 issue of the *Reconstructionist* magazine Rabbi Dov Peretz Elkins claims, “that black power is nothing more and nothing less than Negro Zionism.”

The vast range of differing definitions of black power has reminiscent overtones for us. These definitions vary from the mystical, theological definition of Dr. Wright, to the psychological, inner-directed, self-identity, self-image-creating one of Alvin Poussaint; to the political and organizational emphasis given to the term by Cloward and Pliven and Sol Alinsky; to the frightening third world form of ultra nationalism and complete separation definitions of people like Karenga and Lawrence P. Neal.

As one reads the growing black power literature—not the daily rhetoric, but the more theoretically based literature, one is reminded of Chaim Zhitlovsky’s writings on Jewish nationalism, Achad Aham’s emphasis on spiritual Zionism, the many articles on Jewish self-hate and the like.

While Jews have recognized the bond which they have with the concept of black power, our ambivalence toward it stems from those of its attributes which have never characterized our own search for group identity, namely black power’s incipient racism, its appeal to violence, its irrationality, and above all, its rejection of white leadership and even of white co-operative effort.

While no universally accepted black power theory has yet emerged, certain characteristics can be discerned as follows:

1. Black power stresses black initiative, black self-worth, black identity, black pride.

2. Black power seeks the growth and development of black economic and political power.

3. Black power seeks black leadership development.

4. Black power strives for a form of separation, which will permit it to achieve the above goals, and then to enter into coalitions with whites as psychological, and social, and political equals.

To most blacks this separation seems temporary and as a means not of leaving the main stream but as a way of securing entry into it—although there are some who would make the separation permanent. And even those Negro leaders, who while seeking black identity, decry the racist implications of black power, see it as a political fact. Writing in the January, 1968 issue of the *Journal of Negro History*, Kenneth Clark, an avowed opponent of black nationalism, states:

“ ‘Black Power’, in spite of its ambiguity, its ‘no-win’ premise, its programmatic emptiness and its pragmatic futility does have tremendous psychological appeal for the masses of Negroes. Today ‘Black Power’ is a reality in the Negro ghettos of America—increasing in emotional intensity, if not in rational clarity. And we, if we are to be realistic, cannot afford to pretend that it does not exist.”

The separatist aspirations on the part of blacks today has bothered us white Jewish liberals. It seems to be so contrary to our cherished notions about integration. Yet much of these aspirations, particularly those related to goals of group growth are a necessary and inevitable stage which we must be ready to accept, given the circumstances of American life today.

If this is so, it means the development of new strategies for us as a Jewish community on such programs as school decentralization, integration, open housing. It will mean new and different confrontations between blacks and Jews, about which I will have something to say later. At this point it is important for us to

recognize with Margaret Mead that we "need not choose between integration and black power. . ." The development of political black power will inevitably involve separatism, but it must be at black, not white, initiative. If the black community wishes to bound itself, turn in on itself and gather strength to turn again and face the white community, that is its right.

Negro-Jewish Relationships

Black anti-Semitism has been said to be the greatest obstacle to wholehearted and complete Jewish involvement and support for the present phase of the civil rights movement. What are the actual facts about Negro anti-Semitism? Is there Negro anti-Semitism? The answer is yes. Is it increasing? Probably so, although only in proportion to increased anti-white sentiment and even here on a different level.

Based upon what research material is available, including the Anti-Defamation League study made in 1964 and a small sampling study made by the American Jewish Committee in the late fall of 1967, the following impressions have emerged:

1. There is less Negro anti-Semitism than there is anti-white feeling and Jews as a group are more frequently named by blacks as being pro Negro.

2. Negro anti-Semitism would seem to be a function of anti-whiteism, that is, all Negroes who score high on an anti-Semitic index also score high on an anti-white index.

3. There is at the moment a direct relationship between economic position and life style and the amount of Negro anti-Semitism. The lower the income the greater the anti-Semitism. Or put in another way, levels of Negro anti-Semitism decrease as education, income, and life-style increase, although with growing

group conflicts on middle-class levels, this may not continue to be so.

In actuality, Negro anti-Semitism needs to be seen on four different planes. The first is the third world, black militant, pro-Arab, anti-Zionist form of anti-Semitism. This has been clearly articulated by the now infamous SNCC Newsletter which spread a vile anti-Semitic, anti-Israel line, and the New Politics Resolution in the convention held by the New Left last summer in Chicago, on the "Imperialistic Zionist War." Lawrence P. Neal, a Negro black power theorist, writing on the "International Implications of Black Power" states that, "Attempts to internationalize our struggle are dialectically consistent with the thrust of Afro-American history . . . it connects the Afro-American nation to the larger context of the world-wide revolution. . ." He goes on to say that, "an analysis of international realities clearly indicates that Zionist interests are decidedly pro-Western, and that these interests are neo-colonialist in nature and design." However, in the same piece, Neal points out that "The Negro leadership voiced strong support of the Israelis during the conflict. . ."

Whatever evidence we have would seem to indicate that the Negro masses did agree with their leadership's support of Israel. In the American Jewish Committee's study, respondents were asked whether they were familiar with the black nationalist position on the Arab-Israeli conflict. If they replied affirmatively they were asked whether they agreed with it. If they replied that they were not familiar with the position they were given a brief explanation and then asked their views.

Two-thirds of the respondents said that they were not familiar with the black nationalist position and of those who knew or expressed an opinion after being told of the position, only two in ten agreed with it. A similar rejection

was seen of the separatist and violent interpretations of black power. When the respondents were asked to define black power in terms of what it meant to them, the clear majority specified black power as economic or political power, unity, the drive to work together, racial pride rather than shame of race. Only a small percentage referred to black power in separatist, racist, or violent terms.

A second level of Negro anti-Semitism, linked somewhat to black nationalism but possessing a viability of its own, is one in which the Negro intellectual is playing a more open and vocal anti-Semitic role. Nowadays, Negro writers are perhaps the only ones whose works contain pure anti-Semitism, simple, unadulterated, clear and unambiguous. Le-Roi Jones disclaims, "We want . . . dagger poems in the slimy bellies of the owner-Jews," and Harold Cruse, in a book called *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, replete with crude and vicious anti-Semitism, argues that the Jews dominate "the creative and cultural" fields in a country of white Anglo-Saxon dominance.

While such utterances form the intellectual front of the black nationalist movement, they are also part of an undercurrent of anti-Jewish resentment on the part of many white non-Jewish intellectuals against Jewish eminence in the cultural world. This is part of the resentments among the "out" groups, among the writers, intellectuals, and academicians who are not Jewish and, especially among those who do not live in New York, who feel excluded from the "hot center," from the establishment, from wherever great and lively things are going on. But in the case of Negro spokesmen it is more because it is part of the third world left ideology.

A third level of anti-Semitism is that of the lower economic Negro imprisoned in his rat-ridden slum. This is the group

which exhibits a marked degree of Jewish stereotypy which requires closer examination.

It has many times been pointed out that the poor Negroes' principal contact with the white world is through his landlord, his shopkeeper, his caseworker, the teacher and the policeman. In all but the latter instance, in most large metropolitan communities, there is a likelihood these contacts will be with Jews. Even the emerging Negro middle-class in the civil service and in professions located within organizational settings find that it is often a Jew who supervises him. School principals, casework supervisors, and in some instances union leaders, are often Jewish and seem to stand as blocks to black advancement.

It has long been a classic principle first advanced by Marx and Weber that when the economically oppressed see a relationship between their life situation and those who control it, they will be the most intensely hostile towards those whom they perceive as controlling. This hostility is increased with the ambivalence that arises from the very fact that because of the experience of both groups as persecuted minorities, the Jew who has been a major model for the Negro, now seems to stand in his way. Bayard Rustin admonishes us. "Don't think you are so damned exclusive in being targets of Negroes. They are saying worse things about . . . Negro leaders precisely because they love them a little more than they love you. . . I am pointing out to you . . . that the Negro holds the greatest disrespect for those who have made it when he is nothing. I've made it, James Farmer has made it, Martin Luther King . . . made it. But there is nobody who has made it more than the Jews, and nobody started more handicapped. This is something which creates an ambivalence in the Negro community. We love the Jew and we hate him."

Negro anti-Semitism originating in the

black man's striking out against those whom he perceives to be "controlling" him brings us to a fourth and more complex level of Negro-Jewish relationships. There is a rising hostility between Jew and Negro because of increasing conflicts in group interests which have tended to destroy effective Negro-Jewish coalitions. This is today most clearly being seen in the school decentralization issue and the attack upon Jewish school teachers. These conflicts of group interest will be extended to other areas and will increase in intensity; they raise the question as to how narrowly or broadly we view the matter of Jewish group interest. Are we ready to abandon the principle of basing advancement on merit for the principle of advancement to compensate for past wrongs, because the latter serves the greater common good even though the former works to the immediate best interest of the Jewish group? The answer is not an easy one and will not be reached without pain.

One thing is certain. A failure to see the problem realistically, in all of its complexities, leads only to extremist answers and to a rationale for "copping out." Those who, at every point, see only the "narrow" Jewish group interest are finding it easier and easier to abandon the larger effort because such effort is "not good for the Jews." Those universalists who see only "the greater good" and deny the importance of Jewish group interest soon find themselves operating without a Jewish base, and in the final analysis, find themselves "copping out" too, since they are rejected by the very black nationalists whose favor they curry. They become "non-persons"—accepted by neither group.

The selected and limited use of power needs to become a much more conscious and legitimate tool in intergroup relations today. We must, as a Jewish community, be concerned with what is good

for the Jews as well as with what is good for the Negroes. We must honestly examine each issue which produces tension and conflict between us and the black community and make deliberate choices—sometimes in open disagreement with black groups, at other times trading and compromising, and on still other occasions making concessions in order to enter into alliances for a greater good.

If I have spent more time than the limits of this paper warrant on this aspect of Negro-Jewish relationships, it is only because I believe it will be the most compelling and difficult aspect in the days ahead. Certainly the response to the first two levels of Negro anti-Semitism which I discussed are clear and unequivocal. The black nationalist third world-ideology and the increasing black intellectual anti-Semitism needs to be fought openly, vehemently, and with all the resources we can muster, including the assistance of responsible Negro leadership.

This form of Negro anti-Semitism is especially dangerous on several counts. It is given expression by a growing number of highly articulate, charismatic black spokesmen. It appeals to the most volatile elements in the Negro community—elements which are the first to strike out with violence. It gives us special problems because part of "our bag" is our own past identification with the left—and this form of anti-Semitism is associated with the left—and so we find it more difficult to attack the thunder which comes from the left.

Having said all this may I also say, parenthetically, that we are in danger of building our own mythology about black militancy. All black militants are not alike. Not all black militants are third-world nationalists. Not all black militants reject alliance with whites. Not all black militants are anti-Semitic. We have to devise strategies, and some of us are doing just that, for keeping open

lines of communication with these forces. This is a subject for another paper—but it is enough for us to bear in mind the dangers of stereotypy.

Jews in the Slums

I have assiduously avoided using the term "Negro Ghetto." I have done so because I agree with the British journalist Malcolm Muggeridge, who in a letter to the *New York Times* on May 5, 1968, commented that the use of the term ghetto for the Negro slum areas is "a perfect example of . . . the falsification of words to make them serve political ends. By equating Negro slums with a ghetto, on the one hand white racialism—in itself bad enough in all conscience—is associated with the additional horrors of Nazi anti-Semitism. On the other the white bourgeois champion of the Negro can see his wrongs in terms of pogroms and other distant and remote wickednesses, rather than of nearby and present social and economic inequalities."

I suspect that the usage of the term is too well embedded in our language for Muggeridge's letter or my feeble protest to have any effect—so if you want to read Negro "ghetto" where I say Negro slum or some other alternative phrase, you have my permission to do so.

Those Jews who still reside in such largely Negro areas are chiefly aged people, a remnant of a past Jewish neighborhood, who find it difficult to leave for either sentimental or economic reasons. They worry about danger in the streets; they band together for comfort and security; and many of them are recipients of Jewish agency services. In time even these small remnants will probably cease to exist.

A much more perplexing concern to us is the Jewish merchants in the slums. They face danger when violence erupts, and, as well, their very existence conflicts with the increasing desire of

Negroes to control all business in their own areas.

Immediately following the riots after Martin Luther King, Jr's assassination, the American Jewish Committee compiled information from 13 major cities on the status of Jewish business in the Negro slums—the extent of their presence and the effect on them of these riots. While it is true that the information received came from a number of different informants, with different observation skills, and without the availability of refined fact-finding techniques, nonetheless certain facts did emerge:

1. A substantial number of Jewish businesses were damaged or destroyed during the riots. Whether the proportion of Jewish-owned businesses destroyed is larger than other businesses is unknown.

2. Jewish individuals, particularly the elderly, suffered deeply during and following the riots. Here, too, the size of this group is unknown.

3. Jews operating businesses in Negro slum areas are apprehensive about their futures and their safety, and are uncertain whether they plan to remain.

4. The organized Jewish community has become alerted to the problem facing these Jews. An increasing number of Federations are beginning to develop programs to meet their needs as well as programs to benefit Negroes and to contribute toward meeting larger urban issues.

5. The majority of responses on the issue of anti-Semitism as a factor in the vandalism reject the contention that Jews were particular targets. Most feel that Jews were part of the white business community against which the actions were directed.

6. There is a need for objective knowledge on the size of the problem. How many Jewish business men or professionals actually are established in the various Negro slum districts? How

many plan to stay? How many are leaving? Do they need help? We simply do not have the answers.

The need for assistance to the Jewish victims of the riots is perhaps best illustrated by a report from Baltimore, dated May 16, prepared by one of our staff: "When the violence in Baltimore broke, the Federation held open all the Jewish agencies . . . they did not really expect much in the way of requests, but to their surprise the Family Agency had 27 emergency calls. This was for food, money or other advice. A total of approximately \$6,000 has been spent in emergency relief so far for Jewish victims, including payments for apartments . . . A staff person of the Federation . . . worked with the program of assisting business people with advice. A group of five or six business counselors from the Jewish community volunteered their services along with lawyers, tax people and others . . . as a result of this process 87 people are in the pipeline and approximately 43 people have been placed in other jobs. . . The range of problems ran from one individual who had a gross of \$750,000 and 13 employees who was wiped out, to an elderly refugee woman whose husband had previously been murdered in a robbery in her store."

This emerging service on the part of Jewish social agencies across the country has made us conscious more than ever that the issue of Jewish storekeepers and landlords in Negro slum areas cannot be avoided much longer. There are many Jews who are locked in these areas and who, with help, would be eager to leave. A program designed to help Negroes buy these businesses and to be trained to operate them effectively would do much toward the development of Negro economic power. Not that the problem is a simple one. In the long run the economic problem goes far beyond marginal businesses and even of

the employment of indigenous groups in viable businesses. Special economic assistance programs, for both black and white owned businesses, will be required so as to lessen the high cost of conducting businesses in these neighborhoods.

Despite this long range approach, assistance to help the Jewish marginal business man and the owners of "Mom and Pop" stores to leave them is an important short-range program. Not because it will do away with Negro anti-Semitism—it won't—but because on an immediate basis it will help at least those Jews who want to escape from positions of danger and on a longer range basis it will help to provide a more stable Negro community and a basis for an effective alliance with the Negro group.

Jewish Communal Agencies and the Crisis of the Cities

In a report to the Board of Trustees of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland in January, 1968, Henry Zucker repeated a statement he made two years earlier: ". . . the adjustment of our social institutions to this obsolescent condition [in our cities] is a major problem of our times. It requires the attention of every thoughtful member of our society and of social institutions like our Federations . . . We believe that the most important domestic objective of our time is the realization of full equality for the American Negro, and we strive to make it possible for Negro and White persons to live in harmony. I believe that this type of activity will be an increasing concern of our Federation, and that we shall find more and more ways to contribute to the solutions of the great problems of our time."

One can well ask, why was not more done by Jews since that report in 1966, while during the same period of time Protestant and Catholic groups were

putting large amounts of manpower and finances into a solution of the urban crisis? There was probably a number of reasons for our lack of movement. Aside from the black Jews of New York we have no Negro constituency as do Protestants and Catholics, and besides has not our per capita record of liberal concern been markedly superior to those of the "Johnny-come-lately," Christian crusaders? We have been annoyed by what we have at times perceived as a form of blackmail on the part of both white Christians and black power militants. As a result we have either withdrawn or adopted a pragmatic temporizing posture setting a middle-of-the-road course which will keep us never too far from the Christian community to be too different, and never too far in the rear of activity to be singled out for a violent attack by Negro leadership. But above all, we have been blocked in our work for the betterment of the cities because at best Federations and their agencies have seen Jewish involvement in narrow human relations terms as being the responsibility of the community relations agencies only, and at worst as being not the concern of the Jewish community and its agencies at all.

In very recent months we have begun to see major changes take place. Federations and their agencies are beginning to take positive action to allocate resources in dollars and in manpower to this crisis. Federations themselves are, in several instances, assigning staff to spend full time to develop plans and programs to meet the urban crisis. Jewish community centers located in changing neighborhoods are looking at their responsibilities to these neighborhoods with new perspective. Jewish resident and day camps are allocating space to Negroes and are developing Negro and Jewish cultural exchange programs in a proudly sectarian fashion. Jewish hospitals, of course, have always served a

large majority of Negroes in hospital clinics, and even as clinics are disappearing with the advent of Medicare, they are making new and creative efforts to serve their Negro constituency, as witness New York Federation's recent supplemental grant of two and one-half million dollars to its hospitals to prevent the threatened immediate shut down of medical services to the poor.

Vocational agencies have been at work in various Office of Economic Opportunity employment programs, and as far back as July 1964, Irving Greenberg of Newark called on Jewish family and children's agencies to set aside a portion of their existing services for Negro clients and to assign personnel to new agencies being developed to serve Negroes—although not many have heeded his words.

The Contemporary Challenge

All this is encouraging and useful, but it is still marginal and peripheral and will remain so until all Jewish agencies are ready to re-examine their programs, the use of their respective professional disciplines and their particular intake policies and service objectives. Our efforts will remain marginal and peripheral until we are ready to build some new models of action and create new institutional forms.

Until World War II the Jewish Federation model—and by this term I include all constituent agencies of Federation—was essentially built upon a welfare model, which was based upon our "looking after our own." With the growing affluence of the Jewish community and with the greater intervention on the part of government in health and welfare, this model turned imperceptibly at first, but quite definitely more recently, to a group identity- group-survival model. Now I believe we must enter into a third phase in which we

recognize that the Jewish community system and the general community system are interdependent, and that with the increasing attention that we are giving to Jewish knowledge based on tradition we must also give increasing attention to making it relevant to today's society.

This new model will have more clearly to articulate and represent a sense of mission and commitment to Jewish values and to their implementation in meeting the social issues of our time. This model will need to recognize that our actions in the crisis of our cities, as well as in other social crises, must be a true expression and function of our Jewish tradition. Certainly working for social justice is part of our prophetic mission. But it is not enough to declaim our interest in social justice without any knowledge of how and why it is part of our tradition. The act must be an existential Jewish act, extending from our knowledge of, and belief in, our Jewish heritage. And this, I believe, is one of the basic challenges to Jewish education today.

This new model of communal service will need to re-examine its former focus on "process" and social work abstractions. In a period of history when the demands of social change are for "now"—not tomorrow; when we confront basic social issues and power strategems of large social groups—in such a period of history, political-strategic forms of action are much more demanded of us than the solely philanthropic or therapeutic, individual-centered orientation.

This new model will require us to be innovative, devising new structural and institutional forms, and above all, it will require us to take risks even at the expense of failure.

I would like to see created in communities around the country a new institution—a Jewish Urban Planning Council, or Board, or Agency. The title

is not important. What is important is that it bring together leading scholars, social and physical scientists, and enlightened laymen who have special competence in urban affairs; that this new group not be made another committee or part of a community relations approach, but that it be a new and independent entity; that its functions be clearly seen as those of creating, developing, and coordinating urban programs under Jewish auspices and in alliances with non-Jewish groups; that it be permitted to be free-swinging, action-oriented and even, when necessary, anti-establishment.

What are some of the directions for Jewish urban work in the future? Here are but a few:

1. A concentrated educational program within the Jewish community dealing with our responsibilities in the area of urban development is badly needed. It is not good enough in 1968 to permit the national community relations agencies and the local community relations councils and their professional staffs, because of their dedication, to become institutional surrogates for social action in the same fashion as the synagogue and the rabbi have become the institutional substitute for prayer. Individual understanding and commitment are necessary. We need to be concerned about Jewish attitudes towards Negroes and how these can be improved. We need to help individual Jews find avenues for showing that they care. We need to know much more than we do about the actual situation of Jews in the cities and the stake they have in urban programs.

2. We should be in the forefront in creating suburban coalitions—a new movement growing out of suburbia, which recognizes that with the inevitable growth of metro-communities there is an interdependence of the cities and the suburbs. There are very few Jews liv-

ing in Newark. There are even fewer Jews living in Cleveland. Yet the Jews of the Oranges and the Jews of Shaker Heights work in the cities and their lives are inextricably bound to the future of these cities. Suburban responsibility must be seen, not as suburban versus urban, but a part of urban responsibility.

3. We can be especially helpful in the creation of Negro federations and in the creation and growth of Negro agencies. It has been said that the two greatest barriers to solving the problems of the cities are the overabundance of White institutions and the complete lack of Negro institutions. We certainly have the skill and expertise for the creation of self-help institutions of our own and we might very well pass this on to the Negro community with both material as well as ideational resources.

4. We need to extend ourselves in every way that we can in those instances where integration is possible, such as in changing neighborhoods and in our contacts with the Negro middle-class business and professional groups.

5. A great deal of the resistance to change in the city stems from the resistance offered by lower-middle-class white groups, many from different ethnic backgrounds, who fear a loss to themselves in gains made by Negroes. There are 20,000,000 such families living on the fringes of the central city and the very far out cheaper sub-divisions of larger metropolitan areas. These are simple, ordinary people and it does us little good to accuse them of white racism.

There is a great need to identify the problems of this class and to speak creatively to their deepest needs. However we might wish to assert the priority of the most disadvantaged, we can no longer define the major problems of America only in terms of Negroes, or Puerto Ricans, or Mexican Americans.

We need to find superordinate goals, that is, goals large enough to unite and coalesce not only Jew and Negro but white non-urbanites with black urbanites.

Undoubtedly there are many other suggestions for action that can be found. I suspect that our success will be measured by the proliferation of ideas that we can advance in this regard even though we will be able to manage only a few at a time.

Finally, one of our most persistent and most haunting problems is our manpower shortage. A member of my staff, upon graduation from a school of social work last June, wrote a letter, saying in part the following:

"Many of the same questions I had are now focused on the Jewish communal field. Its relevance to social issues like poverty and race relations, its willingness to engage in controversy where necessary, its commitment to the larger society as well as to the Jewish community, and even its very Jewishness—all these are problems as I make job choices. I believe in the Judaic value of social justice—in fact, I see it as tying many things together and making it important to enter Jewish communal service and help people put this value into practice. In doing so, I would have two goals; to achieve a larger measure of social justice than currently exists, and to engender a consciousness of the Jewishness of the value itself, as a help to Jews who wonder about the relevance of their religion for current American life . . .

"What to do—leave the (Jewish) field alone because there are many things I don't like, or get in and reform the system? I favor the latter, but only where there is a potential for reform."

Is there such a potential? I know only this. Young Jews today are becoming alienated from Jewish life for many reasons, but at least two of these

Journal of Jewish Communal Service

reasons are because we have very few authentically Jewish individual or organizational models committed to the larger society and because we have lost almost all of our secular non-religious options. The Jewish community will not meet this challenge by leaving the larger

struggle in a new isolation that will have us concentrate only on programs narrowly defined as being of Jewish concern. We cannot preserve and sustain Jewish values without applying them. Indeed their very application will in the long run preserve them.