

FAMILY CASE WORK IN THE SMALL COMMUNITY

that the application of function and structure by the family agency must be related not only to the actual client; but also to the total Jewish community. As our connection to the total community becomes stronger, we are able to move forward. The basis is how we see our-

selves as professional people with the aim of greater service to our potential clientele. We have not lost our professional integrity but are working toward a wider application of professional service through our flexibility and willingness to meet challenges that confront us.

THE LOCAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM*

By **HARRY I. BARRON**

Executive Director, The Jewish Community Council of Cleveland, Ohio

THERE are today approximately twenty-five cities in which community relations programs are carried on as a day-to-day professional job by a specialized agency or as part of a central communal agency. More and more cities are establishing such programs under professional direction, and there is every indication that this field will continue to grow and become a permanent part of Jewish communal work in America.

In the middle '30s, when the first of these local programs were undertaken, the primary task was to combat the rising tide of anti-Semitic activity, much of which was fomented and nurtured by Nazi Germany. Such guidance and instruction as they received came mostly from the national Jewish agencies seeking to protect the rights of Jews. They were labeled "defense" or "civic protective" or "anti-defamation" agencies, and in fact, much of their efforts was of that nature: handling instances of personal assault against Jews; anti-Semitic rumors; vandalism against Jewish institutions; and investigating and counteracting organized anti-Semitic movements and demagogues.

In carrying on this work they had to forge their own tools, develop new ap-

proaches, devise techniques. There were no guides or standards. For the most part they operated by rule of thumb. Nor was there much opportunity for stock-taking, for critical self-analysis. A major conflagration threatened to wipe out American Jewry. It was all they could do to set up simple fire-fighting apparatus and battle the flames wherever they appeared.

It takes both time and experience to learn that there are many ways to fight a fire; that careful study must be made to determine the best fire-extinguishing methods; that firemen must be trained; that it is not merely the occupants of a burning building who have an interest in putting out the blaze—neighbors also have a stake in it; and that the community must be educated how to share in the responsibility for preventing fires.

I am sure it is not necessary to elaborate on this analogy. As local communities became more familiar with the work, as the immediate pressures were lifted, when the war against Nazi Germany drove many of the native hate groups underground, there was opportunity, through interchange of experiences and ideas, to get a better perspective of the whole problem. This searching for greater understanding was stimulated by a sense of inadequacy and impotence in the face of winning in-

* Presented at the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare, Baltimore, Md., June 3, 1947.

numerable skirmishes yet finding the tide of anti-Semitism rising ever higher. There was an insistent groping for more accurate answers to perplexing questions; scrutinizing basic assumptions and approaches. The field became acutely aware of its limitations and uncertainties which served as an incentive to push ahead in all directions for more definitive knowledge and for more effective measures.

In this self-appraisal it was generally agreed that there would continue to be need for combatting organized hate movements and demagogues, exposing them, and keeping their poison confined. The investigative activities and publicity programs had developed very creditably. These were things which we could do adequately.

But it became clear that these were far from comprising a satisfactory program. Case work on individual incidents, dealing solely with superficial symptoms of anti-Semitism, could never come to grips with the basic problem. It would be necessary to do something more fundamental.

It became clear too that there were many limitations to the public relations approach which we borrowed from the field of advertising. We could not continue to view the work as akin to advertising. Creating favorable attitudes in the general population toward the Jew was not the same as selling the public on a certain brand of merchandise. There was more to this work than merely doing a public relations job for the Jewish people.

Further, there was agreement that anti-Semitism is not a Jewish problem; it is not Jews who create it, and it is not Jews who can eliminate it. It is a community problem, a problem for society as a whole to deal with. At the same time it was painfully evident that

the larger community would do very little about it on its own initiative. It would have to be motivated and prodded. That we could do.

And beyond all this, there was the realization that the fight on anti-Semitism must go hand-in-hand with the attack against other group hate movements; that it could not be viewed as a separate and distinct phenomenon. Increasingly, research studies were revealing that anti-Semitism is part of a whole constellation of reaction, and its solution would have to be closely related to the other elements in that constellation.

Our inquiry into some of the roots of anti-Jewish prejudice revealed a variety of elements which gave us better insight into the dynamics of the problem. Let me briefly mention only a few:

First of all, the Jews have remained a distinctive identifiable, different group, throughout the centuries. We know that there is a primitive fear, suspicion and mistrust of the different and the strange. It is easy to direct hostility against that which is considered different. Moreover, the Jews are not only different; they are the descendants of those who, according to Christian teaching, were responsible for the killing of Christ. Much of Christian religious teachings still emphasize this theme and that which says that the Jews were rejected by God and doomed to eternal suffering. These teachings through the years have left their mark on the impressionable minds of the young, becoming the means whereby anti-Jewish prejudice can be stirred into virulent hate under certain conditions.

Through psychological research we know of the syndrome of repression, frustration and aggression. Organized society demands that many aggressive impulses of the individual be repressed.

Such repression frequently produces frustrations which, in turn, often result in aggressions in other directions. We know that our highly industrialized civilization provides all too many frustrations in the life of the average person. The result is large-scale aggression in the form of anti-social actions of all sorts. Anti-Semitism has served as a very convenient outlet for the expression of repressed and frustrated impulses. The fact that prejudice against the Jew has been socially acceptable for centuries makes it even easier. Add to this the stereotype of the Jew as weak and powerless, and you have a natural prey for the bully and the frustrated aggressor.

In times of social, economic and political stress, when people are thrown into a disturbed, fear-stricken state of insecurity and anxiety, they are unable to see clearly the cause of their troubles. At such times they are confused and eagerly project their anxiety and hostility onto others. The Jews have frequently provided that scapegoat. This mechanism has been stimulated by crafty demagogues who have found that anti-Semitism can be employed most effectively to advance their personal ambitions. In crises, people become ready victims of propaganda that satisfy their psychological and emotional needs. And when such devices are used on a mass scale, anti-Semitism becomes a vital element in the plans of hate merchants by sowing suspicion and distrust and thus destroying social cohesion. This divide-and-conquer technique has been an integral part of the strategy of reaction to overthrow democratic traditions and institutions.

Sketchy and superficial though this picture may be, it points out the complex nature of the problem, and makes clear that no single or simple solution

can quickly remove either the results of anti-Semitism or its causes. A local therapeutic program will have to be many-faceted and reach into many places simultaneously if it is to make any appreciable progress.

Perhaps the most important single recent development has been that of shaping our activities in terms of the larger community—a community organization approach. The whole focus of the local program now becomes the community, and the very name of our field, "Community Relations", reflects this change in thinking. We have set out on a path that leads into every nook and corner of our cities, to work with all segments of the population, to enlist the potential of every existing community resource. Promoting positive group relations has now become an art which calls for assistance from many disciplines and related fields: law, education, psychology, psychiatry, sociology, social work in its many branches, advertising, political science, and many others. Moreover, it must make active allies and partners of the practitioners of these and other professions. Individuals and groups cutting across every class must be brought into as many aspects of the work as possible.

The democratic ideal of freedom, equality, and the common good, form the cornerstone of the American way of life. Yet we know that there is a wide gap between these ideals and everyday reality. It is generally agreed that whatever ills there may be in democracy can be cured only by more democracy. Democracy must actually *work* for its benefits to be enjoyed by the people. Mere words, mouthing of patriotic vows, can never take the place of democratic action. Healthy group relations can be achieved only as democracy operates maximally. It is, therefore, of the first importance to convince people of this

THE LOCAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM

truth and of their stake in making democracy a reality. That is what our local agencies have been trying to do.

We have been trying to "sell" the idea that America can prosper only as it lives up to its democratic professions; that its strength lies in the contributions of the rich and varied cultural groups that compose it; that any attempt to deny rights and privileges to certain groups, to set one against another, must inevitably weaken and destroy the entire nation, including the destroyers. Through the use of whatever mass communications media are available—radio, newspapers, magazines, films—wherever the individual turns, the attempt is to reach him with a message that will have impact on his thinking and emotions. This is the diffused mass approach, through which it is hoped some individuals will be reached, particularly if the message is repeated interestingly and frequently.

Just to get one such program under way constitutes a task of major proportions. So often it involves breaking down resistances and fears among editors, publishers, and columnists, radio station owners and managers, motion picture producers and distributors. It requires considerable education and interpretation to convince them that they must share in this job of community relations. And all this after we have made sure that what we have prepared for them to use is of high quality and really does what we want it to.

This broadside use of mass communications media, while it has many uses also has real limitations. It must be pitched at a level that assumes to attract the so-called "average" man. The difficulties inherent in this are very obvious. We now believe that we can make a deeper impression if we are able to reach individuals through their

specialized class or interest groupings. Different segments like labor, veterans, women, businessmen, youth, church groups, nationality groups, each have special orientation, interests, and even language patterns. By associating our message with their special interests, there is greater likelihood of its being understood and accepted. Here we try to develop the self-interest approach as motivation—to show each group how its own interests and well-being are bound up with the advancement of democracy and the development of healthy inter-group relationships. As in all other phases of our program, this must be done frequently, in a variety of forms, and vividly presented.

There is yet another advantage in this special group approach. By having the subject receive the attention of the group as a group, it provides the opportunity for inter-personal reaction and participation, rather than mere passive reading or listening. Learning as well as attitudinal influences are much greater under such conditions. The exchange of ideas, the stimulation of thinking in group discussions, the influence of group leaders and group action in setting standards and patterns, all have value and make this approach to special classes or groups particularly useful. The local community relations agency therefore devotes considerable effort to reach such groups, aiming always at relating our message to the group's immediate self-interest. To gain entry to these groups requires natural contacts with social group workers, ministers, labor union leaders and other persons strategically situated. Often it means winning over such key leaders before the approach to the particular group can be made.

We are beginning to emerge from the stage of exhortation, preachments and

THE LOCAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM

moral appeals. Trying to convert our neighbors on that basis has hardly been productive. Most people have not responded to such appeals—have not been really moved to act upon them. These very people, however, can and do act when their self-interests are endangered; when the things they hold dear are threatened. Our job is to discover those interests and tie them up with our specific goals. When we can arouse individuals and groups to see group relations in this perspective, and to get them to carry their responsibility in helping to promote healthy inter-relationships, we shall have begun to make some progress.

Acting on the conviction that group relations should, insofar as possible, be considered by the community as a whole, many local community relations agencies have helped stimulate the creation of central community-wide organizations to take the leadership in dealing with these problems. In some cities these bodies have become official departments of the city government, carrying the prestige and sanction of such status. In others they have served as coordinating instruments for joint planning and assignment of specialized functions to individual agencies. In still other communities, less cohesive structures have been created, composed of a great variety of local organizations, allowing full autonomy to each group while cooperation is obtained for immediate common projects. There are strengths and limitations in each of these devices which we need not enter into now. Important here is merely to point out that it has been possible to develop community-wide machinery which involves large sections of the population and does for community relations what has already become accepted procedure in problems of education, health, crime, recrea-

tion, etc. It is certainly in the interest of Jewish community relations agencies to encourage, strengthen and cooperate fully with such bodies.

Research studies have revealed that patterns of prejudice frequently become fixed in children at an early age. The role of the school, therefore, is of great importance in the local community relations program. We believe that the public school, as a special guardian of democracy, must assume as a major responsibility the development in the younger generation of an understanding and appreciation for the rich and diverse cultural groups that have contributed to the greatness of America and for the development of democratic behavior through friendly interaction with each other regardless of race, religion, ancestry, folkways or economic class. The job of educating for democratic human relations requires that members of various cultural groups acquire an understanding of each other, an appreciation of the intrinsic values of each other's cultural background, and a willingness to accept and cooperate with each other in building a common American civilization.

The acceptance of this philosophy and its incorporation into the program of the school, integrated into every phase of school life, is not easily accomplished. In the first place, there must be public support created for it. Boards of Education move slowly on such matters. Many school administrators are suspicious of a program that is new and provocative. Some entertain prejudices themselves and question the objectives of intercultural education. There is a reluctance to move into the newer fields. The *status quo* is too comfortable. It is evident, therefore, that the local community relations agency, in

concert with others, must help develop an awareness and desire in the community for this important program. That, too, is a community organization job.

And even when the school administration is prepared to launch such a program, there are problems and tasks for the local community relations agency. Teachers must be trained not merely in the use of educational techniques and methods of intercultural education. They also require basic orientation in the whole field of group relations, social attitudes, treatment of prejudice, and related subjects which most teacher-training institutions have not yet incorporated in their curricula. Local community relations agencies must, therefore, help to provide opportunities for teachers to secure such training at special workshops and institutes, with the view that ultimately the schools themselves will accept this as their basic responsibility. Until such time, the enlightened sections of the community must do whatever possible to demonstrate the value of such a program. They must also make such financial provisions that will enable the project to take root and gain increasing numbers of adherents.

Today there is fairly general agreement that social action and legislation must occupy an important place in the local agency program. This in itself is a significant sign of progress, for it wasn't so very long ago that there was considerable question on this score. Our activity in this field falls broadly into two areas: (1) those measures which seek to reinforce the principles of equal rights for all citizens regardless of race, creed, color or ancestry; and (2) those measures which seek the improvement of general conditions having an im-

portant influence on insecurity, frustrations and social tensions that in crises loose violent group antagonisms.

In the first of these, our Jewish community relations agencies have taken a leading role, on the basis that we are concerned with protecting the rights of all groups, not merely those of Jews. Accordingly, we have supported measures combatting discrimination in employment, education and housing; outlawing anonymous hate literature, discriminatory practices by amusement parks, swimming pools, hotels, restaurants and other enterprises. We act on the conviction that such causes should be championed by the total community rather than by the minority first affected.

We have done much less in the second area. Legislative measures relating to adequate housing, health care, full employment, recreation, minimum wages, slum clearance, etc., have rarely received the active support of the local community relations agency even though in the minds of most professional workers these issues are very closely related to the social climate that affects group relations. I shall have more to say about this a little later on.

But while they have not done much about legislation in these areas, most local agencies have participated in other related kinds of social action. They have worked on local civic betterment programs—community movements for recreation, slum clearance, attacking the external factors contributing to juvenile delinquency, etc.

In these activities the interest of the local agency is not merely in the particular law or social measure, important though it may be. Beyond that is the recognition of the therapeutic value that such concerted community action has. These efforts are a very important part of the whole community education pro-

gram that we are interested in. The very working together of different groups and their memberships toward a common purpose, sharing in all phases of the activity, has infinitely greater value than countless artificial devices for good will. These are the natural avenues through which irrelevant factors of race, religion or national origin become submerged in the common goal; the learning process of striving together for the same objectives. It is the kind of activity which solidifies relationships and demonstrates the unity that is possible in cooperative effort.

We also recognize that part of the value in social action and legislation is the educational process which makes it possible to acquaint large numbers of people with the issues. Enactment of a law is only part of the job. If it were a question of getting a law passed quietly, behind the scenes, or of conducting a public education campaign, there can be no question but that the latter has the greater value. For we have learned that there must be public acceptance of a measure if it is to accomplish its purpose. Our interest in such legislation is in its educational rather than its punitive features. Moreover, even after enactment we know that the community education process must go on so that the law itself will be an instrument of education. Thus, many of the local community relations agencies attempt to carry on activities aimed at keeping the public informed and interested in the workings of the enacted law. Sometimes it has been necessary to mobilize community action to see that the law is administered in the manner intended. All of these activities have values which the community relations agency seeks to employ.

Thus far I have dealt with the local programs that relate to the community-

at-large. That is only part of the job as we see it today. Equally important is the relation to the Jewish community itself. I pointed out before that the roots of anti-Semitism—the causes—are in the maladjustments of society which breed warped personalities, aggressions, and scapegoatism against minority groups. The solution, therefore, must be the responsibility of the total community—of society as a whole.

At the same time, the effects of anti-Semitism have produced an affliction in the Jewish victims which is recognized today as a serious illness requiring careful treatment. It manifests itself in a great variety of forms, ranging from the one extreme of flight from Jewish identity, to the other extreme of retirement into self-imposed ghettoization—of exclusively Jewish association and activity. Whether the reaction takes the form of self-rejection and the wish to escape one's Jewishness, or of a hypersensitivity in which almost every incident is given a Jewish slant and is fraught with danger, the effect upon the Jewish individual and the Jewish group is unhealthy.

The desire to escape the disabilities, discriminations and frustrations attached to Jewish status, has resulted in a great variety of individual behavior patterns and devices, some of which tend to make for a cringing, self-abasing, apologetic attitude about one's Jewishness. These inferiority feelings produce a general weakening of morale and help convey the image of the Jew as weak and defenseless. In turn, this may call forth latent sadistic and bullying behavior on the part of frustrated non-Jews who see in the Jew a natural target for attack. It is understandable, therefore, that Jewish community relations agencies should be interested in counteracting this soul-sick state among Jews and helping them

to develop an inner strength through self-acceptance and positive satisfactions from their Jewishness.

This can be done only through the intensive and concerted action of a number of agencies within the Jewish community. It requires close coordination and joint planning among case workers, group workers, rabbis, Jewish educators, and community relations personnel. Every instrument in the Jewish community having an impact on the individual must incorporate in its work those therapeutic elements which will help meet this problem. It is necessary to give the Jewish individual a clear understanding of the forces that make for prejudice and anti-Semitism; to divest him of his hypersensitivity and anxieties; to teach him how to cope with anti-Semitic incidents that arise; to accept realistically the existing situation as a first step in adjustment; to provide knowledge concerning Jewish culture that will enrich his life; to make available to him those values in Judaism that give it meaning and significance as a way of life for today; to give him some of the compensations and satisfactions which will make his Jewishness serve as it did for his ancestors, as inner strength and armor against his persecutors.

It can be truthfully said that not even the merest beginnings have been made in such a coordinated therapeutic program. Each of our specialized agencies, dealing with some particular aspect of Jewish adjustment, operates independently within its own limited sphere, with relatively little effort to pool its thinking and planning with the others. If we are really to have an impact on the Jewish individual, to move him in these directions, our disjointed efforts will have to be reshaped, strengthened and coordinated.

The child's experiences in his club at the Jewish Center must be related to and augment the lessons of the Hebrew school; the moral and ethical teachings of the synagogue must reflect themselves in the official actions of Jewish organizations; the Jewish person receiving intensive case work treatment involving his self-acceptance as a Jew must find positive outlets through Jewish group living as part of the supportive therapy; the discovery of Jewish employers discriminating or engaging in unethical practices at variance with Jewish precepts, must result in suasion by the Jewish community to abandon such practices. Jewish social and fraternal organizations should be helped in their programming so that their members are exposed to and participate in discussions on all phases of Jewish life and adjustment. Thus they can secure not only an understanding of the problems, but can intelligently help shape community thinking and policies. On a hundred fronts there is need for collaboration and coordination. The community relations agency must give this its closest attention if we are to make any progress in overcoming the infection of inferiority, insecurity, self-rejection and self-hate. We must help free our people from their abnormal—almost hysterical—preoccupation with anti-Semitism.

And beyond all this, there is great need for giving our people a sense of balance between their inner Jewish life and their participation and integration in the general American milieu. Our efforts to provide satisfying experiences in Jewish living must not result in withdrawal from the life of the general community. They need the enriching contacts of both. This is not easily achieved. There is sharp competition for the individual's attention. The more time and

energy he gives to one the less he will have for the other. The means must be found whereby activity in the Jewish community can also be related to the larger community interests.

Programs of Jewish membership organizations should be infused with activities that have broad community implications as well as Jewish significance, so that both ends can be achieved. The discussion of general problems by Jewish groups is most desirable. The consideration of social measures and participation with non-Jewish groups in social action is to be encouraged. Pointing up the Jewish traditions that support the particular action may be helpful motivation. Jewish individuals, moreover, must be assisted to assume their responsibilities as citizens in the full gamut of civic endeavors. Such natural integration and participation in constructive social programs is the very best kind of device to break down the misconceptions and stereotypes of social isolation and clanishness, while at the same time developing wholesome relationships that cut across the barriers of race and religion. The Jewish community relations agency, in concert with other forces in the community, must help in this process by encouraging our people to participate in Parent Teachers groups, in neighborhood councils, in civic organizations, in all endeavors to promote the common welfare.

Earlier I mentioned that we had not been very successful thus far in getting Jewish groups to act on certain social measures having only indirect bearing on group relations but having a very real effect on the general health of our society and thus on our problems. These issues are usually of a controversial nature, involving fundamental social, economic and political philoso-

phies. While most professionals are agreed that many of these measures should receive the active support of the Jewish community since they are consistent with Jewish ethical and religious precepts and do have some effect on our welfare, it has rarely been possible to obtain the united action of the Jewish community on these issues. The reason is not difficult to find.

The Jewish group, like other ethnic, cultural or religious groups, is composed of individuals cutting across many social classes. On economic and political issues there is no homogeneity of viewpoint. The widest kind of divergences exist within the Jewish group on such matters. It would be very difficult to get agreement that would satisfy all elements. Moreover, there is considerable disagreement whether it is desirable or strategic that the Jewish group as a group take a position on such issues. It is contended by some that such action would inevitably divide the Jewish community and render it impotent to deal with the many problems which directly affect it. Since the Jewish community is a voluntary association, so the argument runs, it is a relatively simple matter for persons to withdraw should it take a stand at variance with their own views, especially if the issue is not clearly of a Jewish nature.

Those taking the opposite view are becoming increasingly articulate, but it is doubtful whether community relations agencies can expect any significant change on this score for some time to come. Meanwhile, it would be desirable to have all Jewish communal facilities provide opportunities for disseminating information and encouraging discussion of public issues so that as many Jewish persons as possible might become adequately informed and be helped to arrive at conclusions based on knowledge and

reason. Jewish centers, synagogues and temples, clubs, fraternal and social organizations, should be induced to encourage their memberships to study public issues and participate as citizens in the achievement of social reforms. Some of the more homogeneous Jewish groups can even agree on a particular course of social action and take a position as a Jewish group.

It is ironic that so little has been done with the Jewish community in our programs, especially when we consider that the awareness of the need for such local programs was one of the contributing factors in the establishment in many cities of central representative Jewish community structures to deal with the so-called larger group problems. The threat of anti-Semitism helped crystallize the realization that the Jewish community as such has certain problems which it must meet in a new way. The problem of anti-Semitism affects every Jew—the entire Jewish community—and can be dealt with effectively only by a united Jewish community. Policy decisions in this field must be the product of the best thinking, of all points of view, and must have the authority and weight of the total community behind them if unified community action is to be achieved.

It was no accident, therefore, that the need to defend itself against anti-Semitism hastened the development of democratic, representative central Jewish bodies in many communities, and that community relations work became a function of such bodies in a significant number of cities. This has made it possible for community relations work to be closely related to other major Jewish group problems and programs. It has enabled the utilization of the broad representative base — the mass base — which the central community organization has as a sounding board to deter-

mine community thinking; to keep the community informed on issues and major developments; and to secure active participation from the grass roots on specific programs. It has removed this work from a handful of self-appointed leaders, who, by virtue of personal contacts or social position assumed to act in behalf of the Jewish community on these problems. It has posited the principle that the responsibility for directing this work rests with the organized Jewish community, and its total manpower and resources must be available for the job.

Nevertheless, there is as yet insufficient involvement of the Jewish community in this work. There is still the temptation to yield to the old pattern—of the “top drawer” secret approach—a reluctance to keep the community really informed or to permit it to formulate policy. The professional workers are too prone to keep things tightly in their own hands. This is one field where a studied effort must be made to increase the participation of the lay community, and where the professional must encourage such assistance. Most professionals are themselves not specially trained for this work and can profit from ideas, opinions, suggestions and activity of intelligent laymen.

It is only too clear to those in this field of work that it is in its very infancy. Despite the different approaches and programs that are carried on, there is little that has developed as a result of systematic research or controlled experimentation. What little research is now being carried on is still too far removed from the day-to-day operations of the local community. Testing methods, evaluating techniques have not yet become an integral part of the local program. As a result, progress must continue to be slow and we shall fail

to learn from our errors and from our successes. The professional workers are haunted by hundreds of unanswered questions relating to every phase of the job. There is an earnest groping for answers, a relentless scrutiny and self-criticism of techniques, ideas and programs. This is good. But it is not enough. Basic knowledge is needed, gleaned from painstaking scientific research. For the most part the professionals have neither the time nor the training to carry on such research. Nor does it seem likely that local agencies will be able to maintain their own research staffs. It would seem desirable, therefore, that close working relationships be established between the local community relations agencies and the colleges in their localities, as well as with individual social scientists and psychiatrists so that significant research activity of mutual interest can be directed at some of the problems in this complex field. In addition, it is assumed that the local agencies will seek the help of the research departments of the national defense agencies wherever that is possible.

I have not tried to paint a roseate picture of the local community relations field. As can be seen there are wide gaps and uneven progress. Real obstacles beset the work on every hand. Yet there is reason to be hopeful. Those in the field fully realize the need for flexibility, open-mindedness, and careful experimentation. Local communities are not wedded to a single line of attack. It is no longer one type of approach to the exclusion of others. Rather there are numerous approaches and devices employed simultaneously, directed at a variety of targets. While it is not as yet known under what precise circumstances each has its optimum value, there is continuous use of such approaches as: education through the dis-

semination of information as well as through arousing emotions; disclosing foci of discrimination; exposing vendors of bigotry and bias; encouraging the working together on common problems and breaking down the barriers between groups so they can get to know each other and live together on a friendly basis; employing the forces of social control in a vigorous defense of basic liberties and human rights; withstanding social reaction; advancing democracy through closing the gap between profession and practice. In all of these and others every tool of communication and motivation is being tried. It is generally agreed that the program cannot be confined either to the overt expression of group hatred, or to the attitudes which underlie its expression. Action programs are directed at both: making people less receptive to group hatred, and gradually changing the conditions which incite group hatred.

These are obviously tasks which the local Jewish community relations agencies cannot tackle alone. They are tasks that will tax the ingenuity and resourcefulness of everyone who values human freedom. In our Jewish communal family, we invite the assistance, the maturity, and experience of our older siblings, the case workers, the group workers, the Jewish educators and rabbis, who we hope will take their place beside us to give guidance as well as to seek out ways in which they in their own spheres of work can help advance these goals which should be as close to them as to those who work exclusively in the field of community relations. We shall all profit from such cooperative endeavors for we all have a very direct stake in the outcome. In this work we are really laboring for ourselves—to build a free society in which all of us can live in dignity, in security, and in peace.