

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

The Session on Community Organization of the National Conference of Jewish Social Service convened at 8:40 P. M., May 14, Mr. Morris D. Waldman of Brooklyn, N. Y., presiding.

THE CHAIRMAN: When I think of a Jewish community I think of the kind of community that I have recently seen abroad in Central European countries. Those are real communities. They are communities because they have a common interest. They have or have had up to recently in all of these countries government sanction. In fact, they have had obligations imposed upon them by the government, so we find in a country like Poland, for example, the "Gmina," a highly developed organization. The "Gmina," I take it, is a corruption of the word "Gemeinde." We find the same sort of community organization in Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia. There, like Germany, the community is referred to as a "Kultus Gemeinde."

In a country like Lithuania the community has more recognition even than in a country like Poland. All of the communities known as "Kehillahs" elect delegates to a national council known as the "Nationalrat," and this national council delegates or elects the Minister for Jewish Affairs in the Lithuanian cabinet.

I know a number of years ago an attempt was made in New York to impose upon that city a Kehillah somewhat along the lines of Kehillahs of Central Europe, with this great distinction, however, that where these communities abroad had a certain political significance and a political relation to other elements in the population, of course in this country there was no idea of constituting the Kehillah as a political entity.

It has been very interesting to watch the development of Jewish communities in the United States, to see how the Jewish community has evolved in all parts of the country. Jewish communal life here first was manifested in the synagogue, later in the charities, and various charitable organizations sprang up in haphazard fashion quite fortu-

itously, and it was only in the course of years that the community spirit grew out of this experience in the establishment of various charitable organizations.

And the Federation has more recently become the representative organization of the community or the real Kehillah. So we find, as was indicated in reports read this afternoon, that federations which originally were established for the purpose of collecting funds for constituent organizations, have very rapidly acquired a community point of view, and now no longer—certainly in the more developed communities—no longer view the community problems through the eyes of the constituent societies but from the point of view of needs of the community, and now regard the different societies merely as instruments which the community employs for the purpose of satisfying those needs.

I have not seen the paper which the speaker of the evening is to present. I don't know what its contents are. Perhaps I have anticipated something in my introductory remarks, however, I didn't intend to make such a long introductory speech and I shall now forthwith call upon Mr. Lowenstein to present not a paper of his own as appears in the program, but which he tells me is the report of the Committee on Community Organization.

MR. SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN: The Program Committee for the Conference of 1923 entrusted to a special committee under the chairmanship of the late Louis H. Levin the preparation of the report on Jewish Communal Organization in America.

Owing to the illness of Mr. Levin, work upon this report was delayed from time to time until at last in the spring of 1923, when it became apparent to Mr. Levin that he would be unable to undertake the preparation of the report, he asked that he be relieved of this responsibility and requested his associates on the committee to proceed without him.

He had, however, prepared a syllabus expressing his thought as to the matters that should be treated in the report. This syllabus was made the basis for discussion and a committee consisting of Dr. Ludwig B. Bernstein, Messrs. Harry L. Glucksman, Samuel Goldhamer, Samuel Goldsmith,

Maurice Hexter, Miss Dorothy Kahn, Hyman Kaplan, Solomon Lowenstein and Miss Frances Taussig, met in New York City for organization and preliminary discussion. Thereafter there were held weekly meetings of the New York members of the committee for further discussion and elaboration, and meetings of the full committee were held in Pittsburgh on April 28th and in Washington on May 12th. The report herewith presented represents the results of these discussions.

The time that the committee had at its disposal was so short that it makes no pretense of either thoroughness or finality. In the opinion of the committee, it should be considered purely a preliminary and tentative approach to the subject.

It is recommended that the incoming Executive Committee be requested to appoint a new committee which should at once undertake the further and fuller consideration of the subject and present a definite final report to the Conference of 1924. It is hoped that as a result of such careful deliberation, a report may be presented which may with some authority express the opinion of the Conference with regard to this important question and be in such form as to justify publication.

As Acting Chairman of the committee I wish to express my sincere thanks to my associates for the time and thought that they have given to this preliminary statement and my appreciation of their helpfulness.

MR. LOWENSTEIN then read the following report:

JEWISH COMMUNAL ORGANIZATION IN AMERICA

It is impossible to discuss Jewish communal organization in America without some brief preliminary reference to Jewish conditions in Europe in order that we may have some conception of the background of the Jewish masses in America which had a predominant influence in their attitude towards the problem of communal organization in this country.

The greater part of the present Jewish population of the cities of the United States has come here from centers of Jewish life with traditions and customs of organization stretching back through long periods. We do not find among them such divisions in Jewish life and thought as met them upon their arrival in America. First and fundamentally, there is no division between congregational activities as such and other parts of the communal organization. The Gemeinde

includes in its authority all Jewish activities, religious or otherwise. Philanthropic matters naturally are an integral part of its life. The community has certain autonomous functions, in some cases including the power of taxation, so that there is no need for special forms of organization for the purpose of raising funds for this or any other purpose.

By the very fact of his birth in the group, every man is a member of the community and recognizes himself as such, with all the appertaining privileges and responsibilities. There is no thought of essential division between civil and religious functions so far as the life of the community itself is concerned. It is a compact group in itself exercising all the functions inherent in any community. Coming from such a close corporation, the immigrant to this country finds himself at once in the midst of a diversified and confusing mass of activities. He is no longer a member of a closely-knit body with a form of organization adaptable to all the communal needs. He finds no community as such, but a number of widespread, loosely or almost disorganized bodies of persons having as their only common factor the item of Jewish birth, with widespread differences, religious, political, social and economic.

In the case of the early Jewish settlers in America, this was not true to anything like the same degree as prevails at present. In the first place, they were easily distinguishable from their neighbors by reason of their alien religion and social customs. They were in a great minority in the population and it was natural that they should associate themselves in common endeavors. Formation into religious congregations was naturally the first step by reason of the individualistic or congregational nature of such religious bodies and because of the prevailing attitude with regard to separation of church and state, involving a similar separation of religious and all other activities, there came about a decentralization of the community life whereby there were dissociated from the religious activities as such all other communal functions, even those quasi-religious, such as philanthropic matters which up to this time had been distinctively congregational activities. The self-respect of the Jew and his recognition of his duty to care for his own needy brethren dictated the establishment of independent charitable agencies in order that the Jewish poor might receive the attention of those familiar with their psychology and in a position to give them the kind of care which would be both sympathetic and intelligent.

Thus we find at a very early period in the Jewish settlement in America the establishment of agencies to meet the primary needs—family welfare societies, orphanages, hospitals and homes for the aged. While the early Sephardic settlers undoubtedly must have met the needs of those of their co-religionists who found themselves under the necessity of appealing for communal support, their number was so few and in general they appear to have been so successful economically that we find very few agencies tracing their origin to this settlement. Most of the organizations with which we are familiar arose among the Jews of German origin. As their number, too, was not great, as we consider our population of to-day, and as they represented a largely homogeneous group, these organizations were for the most

part simply formed and practically entirely under the control and administration of lay workers voluntarily offering their time and attention to the care of these agencies. The demands were not great either in the number of cases presenting themselves for attention nor in the amount of money required for the maintenance of the institutions, and until the period of the first immigrations due to the persecutions in Russia and other parts of Southeastern Europe, these simple forms of organization fairly adequately met the requirements.

With the year 1880, however, a complete change in the situation manifested itself. The repressive Russian edicts of that year set up a great stream of immigration to America as the land of opportunity and freedom, which continued in ever-increasing numbers until the outbreak of the European war and the subsequent restrictive immigration legislation of the United States. Almost overnight, there presented themselves at the doors of the happier American Jewry a great mass of Jews almost as foreign in all their characteristics of life and thought to the American Jewish settlement as to their non-Jewish neighbors. In speech, in customs and religious observances, in economic and industrial training, in social conventions, they presented a series of baffling problems and misunderstandings to the older residents of our country. None the less, the obligation to care for them, to establish them in this country and to meet their needs was willingly accepted.

It was soon apparent that the existing forms of organization were adequate neither in scope nor variety nor funds to assimilate this great new influx. New types of organization and a new technique necessarily followed. The entire plan of communal organization has been colored ever since by the special needs created by this influx. As immediate steps, housing accommodations had to be provided, employment secured, equipment for business and for trades made available and distribution of the immigration effected. Naturally, the largest numbers congregated in the cities of the Eastern sea board, though almost from the beginning the filtration into the interior cities took place and soon spread into every part of the country. Naturally, the problems that arose were most intense in the large cities. Even here there was differentiation by reason of the greater mass of settlement in the ports of arrival and in the great industrial centers of the middle west. Great social changes were inevitable and perplexing problems resulted even in the smaller cities, towns and villages to which our newly arriving brethren found their way.

Where large groups settled in any one community, to a large extent they retained their cohesiveness and persisted in their distinctive habits and ways of thought and life. In the smaller centers, where the necessity for assimilation appeared more urgent and where the power of resistance could not be so strong, there resulted a disintegration of Jewish life and characteristics which is manifest today in the almost complete absorption of considerable numbers.

By reason of the almost inevitable financial poverty of the new immigrants, the philanthropic problems were necessarily the most insistent. Too much cannot be said in praise of the resourcefulness, the zeal and the sacrifice of the ardent workers who up to this time had had as their only problem the simple difficulties of the earlier

residents. Sums which were indeed vast for those days were quickly raised and every effort was made to render kindly and helpful assistance to the newcomers.

It soon became evident, however, that something more was needed than the intermittent kindness of the volunteer worker. It became necessary to place the actual conduct of the work in the hands of persons especially engaged for the task, with the continuing cooperation and valuable support of the volunteers who constituted the Boards of Direction of the various forms of communal enterprise. In the first instance, recourse was usually had to men of professional training in the ministry or other lines of work.

But this too proved insufficient and gradually there came into these positions men and women of special training, devoting themselves exclusively to this work so that today we are able to count in this Conference professional workers in the hundreds developing technique and standards in a diversification of effort undreamed of forty years ago. The actual development of professional social work in America dates back to less than twenty-five years, and we are only today about to discuss the creation of a School for the Training of Jewish Social Workers, though similar schools of a general character have been in existence for over twenty years.

Parallel to this development of the professional social worker ran the organization of new types of agencies to meet the newly developed needs and the expansion of the previously existing agencies supplying the primary wants. Very soon thereafter, the newer arrivals showed that they likewise were cognizant of their own needs; that they were in some instances dissatisfied with the methods that had heretofore been employed, and conscious of gaps in the scheme of social organization which had been met by their own European forms of organization and which were founded upon a sound understanding of Jewish character.

The new immigration was essentially sound and self-respecting. It was not a pauper class but rather a pioneer group driven into exile but determined to take the fullest advantages of the opportunities of their new home. Thus we find the creation of new forms of associations either on a neighborhood geographical foundation or on a conception of more independent forms of helpfulness. The Hebrew Free Loan Society represents a type of organization directly contributed to Jewish communal effort by the Eastern European immigrant, Free Burial Societies, Chevroth of various types, the Hachnosas Orchim are other forms that suggest themselves in this connection.

Of chief importance, however, in the minds of the newcomers were those agencies meeting either their direct religious needs or conditioned by their peculiar religious desires. In addition to the synagogues which grew up almost automatically, the school for religious instruction constituted an important and immediate form of expression. Moreover, the profound convictions in the conduct of orphanages, hospitals, homes for the aged, etc., with regard to the dietary or other religious requirements of the Eastern Jews were such that as soon as their financial condition permitted, they undertook the establishment of such institutions, conducted perhaps not with the same degree

of technical efficiency as the older agencies but more nearly in accord with their own desires.

Moreover, as has been said above, the sudden irruption of such hordes of newcomers naturally created new problems and necessitated new machinery to solve them. As soon as means of self-support had been found, it became necessary to provide agencies whereby the strangers could be equally assimilated to the normal course of American life. Opportunities to learn the language of the country, to prepare their children to enter the proper school classes, to familiarize themselves with the requirements of American life and customs, to teach them the history and principles of the American government, required agencies of Americanization, such as settlements, recreational centers, young men's and young women's Hebrew Associations, etc., etc. Opportunities were provided for new forms of technical and agricultural training, for the dispersion of the immigrants from the ports of arrival to interior cities. New and sinister phenomena appeared in our midst as a result of their sudden introduction into the life of our huge cities as contrasted with their prior homes; the separation of parents and children by reason of the quicker adaptability of the latter and their readiness to learn a new language and to take on the outer aspects of the new civilization, the temptations of our crowded and congested tenement districts—all conspired to bring about conditions of juvenile delinquency hitherto unknown among us. These necessitated the development of entirely new forms of organization.

One result of all these factors was a constantly increasing number of separate agencies or institutions, each making a separate appeal to the community or some portion thereof, and in the great majority of cases where there was no permanent fund accumulated through years of growth, whose income could contribute towards meeting the great additional burden thus imposed; without a sufficient continuous source of income to enable the work to be properly maintained, there was complete disorganization and demoralization of communal effort. Absolutely unnecessary duplicating agencies were created; many important fields of work were overlooked and in the struggle to obtain sufficient funds, a variety of motives, not all of them equally worthy, was appealed to. Funds were raised not only by means of regular membership subscriptions but through all forms of entertainment—bazaars, affairs, lotteries, theatre and card parties, etc., etc., involving a very large percentage of expense for purely organization and administration purposes.

It became apparent that some means must be provided to obviate this wasteful and inefficient method of supporting and conducting communal agencies. Out of this need arose the form of communal organization generally known as Federation. In this purely preliminary study, it is perhaps unnecessary to pursue a detailed examination of the different types of Federated activity devised to meet local conditions in the various parts of the country. In its broadest sense, the Federation form of organization is designed to constitute a coördinated program for communal, philanthropic agencies by supplying a central body for the collection and distribution of funds intended for charitable purposes.

It is characteristic of all Federations that the funds received shall be given solely for the purposes of the organizations constituting the

Federation and for its own administration expenses, without any other attraction than the purely altruistic motive and without any compromise in the form of a provision of entertainment or amusement as a bait.

The collection of funds is in the hands of the Board of Management of the Federation and every form of legitimate solicitation is utilized. The funds thus received are distributed in accordance with the needs of the agencies included in the central body in due proportion to their usefulness and importance in the community. This program is subject to modifications due to antecedent existing conditions, local opinion and numerous other adventitious circumstances, but in every instance, despite all modifications of practice, this is the prevailing ideal. In some instances, this simple fiscal form of Federation has been transcended and the Federation itself possesses functional characteristics, as a result of which it actually operates agencies of various kinds.

In any complete consideration of this subject, careful attention must be paid to the various forms of Federation organization that have developed throughout the country and some attempt made at valuing these various manifestations. At this time it is impossible to go into details and we must content ourselves with some consideration of the broader aspects of the question—to what extent Federation has been successful in organizing the community taken as a whole; what are its essential advantages and defects; whether it is a final form of development or but a step for a more complete and perhaps a more diversified form of communal management.

In the opinion of your committee, it can fairly be claimed that the Federations have been successful in improving the financial methods of our communal agencies, in securing a larger measure of support and a more intelligent, just and efficient distribution of the funds thus realized. It may also be fairly claimed that as a direct result of the Federation movement, there has come about improved standards of the work of the various constituent organizations, amplification of the content of their work and an expansion of the fields of activity.

It cannot be said so surely that the Federations have shown themselves to be resourceful in meeting new needs, in initiative in the establishment of new organizations to solve questions insistently presenting themselves, in enlisting the efforts of existing agencies, nor providing reserve or capital funds for the rehabilitation of antiquated plants or the construction of new institutions. Nor have they been altogether happy in their efforts to secure the hearty coöperation and active participation of all the elements making up the Jewish body politic.

Experience has proved that in practically every instance in which a Federation has been founded upon sound and approved plans, the initial increase in the amount of financial support secured has been great; that with proper organization and intensive effort this sum can be increased annually both to meet the natural loss due to death, business failure, removals and resignations from other causes, and to provide a gradually increasing amount to meet greater costs of living and maintenance, legitimate expansion of activities, raising of standards, etc. In no instance does it appear that as yet the full financial resources of any given community have been realized, and though the rate of growth naturally diminishes from year to year, there does not

appear at the present time sufficient evidence to indicate that in any instance the maximum result has been achieved.

It would be demanding too much to claim that the improvement in standards of work of the various affiliated societies is due exclusively to Federation. The development of a class of professional social workers already referred to undoubtedly has much to do with it, that Federations have helped develop social workers. Contact with non-Jewish agencies, offering in many instances examples of superior method and wider vision has undoubtedly been a direct influence in the development of Jewish work. The increasing interest in social questions and the vast amount of study given them has been shared by Jew and non-Jew alike and has much to do with the improvement of the technique of our various agencies.

But when all due allowance is made for these and other causes, it is undeniably true that by relieving the executive officers and the boards of control of our societies from a disproportionate and in many instances almost exclusive interest in the necessity for raising funds, there has been set free a reservoir of energy for concentration upon the problems of the work itself and thus brought about the marked improvement of which we are all conscious.

Moreover, the Federation movement has, though it must be admitted in varying degrees, unquestionably brought about a broad community spirit as opposed to a narrow institutional point of view, a recognition of the fact that our various forms of philanthropic effort are but individual expressions of different phases of one central communal problem rather than independent, self-sufficient activities.

This broadening concept of the meaning of social work has had the effect of attracting large numbers of young men and women of superior education and ability to active participation in these communal enterprises who would have stood aloof from mere absorption in the detailed administration of any single institution, no matter how worthy in itself.

On the other hand, it is alleged by many that this very factor is instrumental in diverting from the management of these essential agencies men and women who might have given themselves freely to their development and thus reduce the number of individuals joining in communal life. On the whole, however, it would not appear that this contention is justified.

During the period covered by the Federation movement, it can easily be seen after even a cursory examination that even in those agencies which had been well established and had acquired an honorable tradition in pre-Federation days, there has been a broadening of vision and of scope, taking full advantage of all scientific discoveries and applying more humane and intelligent treatment of all classes of dependents. There is today absolutely no comparison in the field of family welfare, medical social service, child care and delinquency with the conditions existing prior to the days of Federation. There is an eager search for new methods and for scientific research. This is a positive achievement of Federation and one for which it cannot be given too much credit.

The great shortcoming of Federation has been that in many instances it has signally failed to organize the community. This is due

to a variety of causes. In the first place, insufficiency of funds has too often restricted the Federation activities to those agencies already existing at the time of its organization and compelled a great hesitancy in admitting new organizations, thus leaving outside the Federation list worthy institutions deserving communal support and compelling them to meet the tremendous competition of a centrally organized body enlisting the financial support of the great bulk of large givers in the community. For purely local reasons, frequently purely personal or institutional, organizations which should be included in the Federation stand aloof, preferring to continue a selfish policy of isolation because of assurance of adequate financial support instead of pooling their interests with those of the community at large and thus bringing about a well rounded program of work.

But the chief cause of failure to create a comprehensive Federation must be sought in the lack of understanding and congeniality between the different national groups within the community itself. Too often the Federation has been merely a Federation of old-line institutions, ignoring completely or partially the new enterprises established by the more recent arrivals. Thus there has been created unnecessarily a lack of unity which is destructive of any true manifestation of communal life.

It is difficult to use any adjectives adequately descriptive of these different elements in the community—Orthodox and Reform, Russian and German, Uptown and Downtown—while all descriptive and expressive of these differentiations, are in no sense complete definitions of the different elements. Yet in a general way, they express to us the variety of interests with which we are concerned.

A recent study by two of the members of this committee of various Federations throughout the country shows that in the majority of instances, the newer groups in the community are either inadequately or not at all represented in the bodies controlling the Federation. We are witnessing on a much larger scale a renewal of the similar differences between the original Sephardic settlers and their immediate German successors. But whereas in the earlier period, these differences were of little importance because of the small numbers involved, today the problem is so huge as to require a coördination and understanding coöperation of every group in the community, if a real organization is to be achieved. This difference manifests itself throughout the entirely communal structure—religious, social, in the larger and smaller senses of the word, economic and otherwise.

The next point of attack in the development of the Federation movement or any other form of community organization must be the harmonizing of these differences and the inclusion of every communal element in the communal organization. Inasmuch as this subject has already been treated in one of the papers presented at an earlier session, we would allude but briefly here to the question of the inclusion in our scheme of Federation organization of those agencies providing religious instruction. To one part of the community, there can be no doubt that they are of as paramount importance as an expression of communal life as any other form of activity comprehended in our Federations; their inclusion has been a source of violent controversy in many cities and in but very few have they received that measure of support which they deserve. Both among their supporters

and their opponents with reference to their inclusion in the scope of Federation, there have been grave doubts as to whether they should be considered of such character as to warrant their inclusion in the group of agencies supported by Federation, but it is the unanimous opinion of this committee that they must be so considered and that every true Federation must make provision for them.

Similarly, in view of the fact that our agencies are dealing with groups of clients to whom the proper observance of dietary and other religious requirements is of supreme importance, it should be axiomatic that our institutions, no matter under what auspices, should be so managed as to respect these conscientious scruples of the persons whose wants they are designed to supply.

On the other hand, there must be a wholehearted recognition by those elements in the community interested in the maintenance of these institutions and practices that they must share in the responsibility for the support of the communal agencies; that they must not unnecessarily duplicate existing organizations and that they must freely support to the limit of their financial ability all forms of communal organization caring for their brethren, for whose benefit they were created.

This implies, of course, a fair representation of these elements in the management of the Federation and its constituent societies. Here, however, we encounter another of the great difficulties of the situation, namely, the securing of properly representative persons to undertake this task. Our communities are of such shifting character, with such frequent changes of personnel owing to, until but recently, the constant new arrivals and their rapid progression in economic prosperity that the representation of today is wholly unrepresentative tomorrow. By reason of their individualistic characteristics, it is becoming more and more difficult to secure a continuity of representation of these groups and no way has as yet been found to overcome this difficulty.

Moreover, there must be a frank recognition of the fact that if all elements of our community are to be represented and to participate in a thoroughgoing fashion in the philanthropic forms of communal expression, with a corresponding share of financial support, they must receive similar recognition in the purely social and recreational forms of organization. If we are to have real communal organization, there can be no place for snobbishness and exclusiveness. In this as in other respects, all Jews are brethren.

This being granted, there remain, however, real questions as to procedure. It is conceded that the more recent additions to our ranks have not by reason of previous training learned the lessons of systematic organization to the same degree as have those who have been longer in touch with American conditions and methods of administration. Frequently, their institutions are not so organized as to make it advisable for them to enter at once without preliminary experience into the larger life of the Federation. In some instances, their premature inclusion in the Federation has been disastrous to both sides and has hindered further development along the same lines.

In this respect the experience of Baltimore and Chicago is extremely illuminating. In both these cities, the Federation as originally constituted represented the Reformed element. Quick to realize the advantages of the Federated scheme of government, the Orthodox

groups soon combined in their own Federations. The two Federations side by side developed contemporaneously and in increasingly harmonious relations until at last the time appeared ripe for an amalgamation which was effected first in Baltimore and not long after in Chicago. The experiment in Baltimore has continued for a sufficient period to justify every hope of those who brought it about, and it is believed that the Chicago experience will be equally happy. Both groups have learned by their failures and successes what constitutes the best form of organization and it appears probable that in both these cities, the great dangers of division in the community have been averted. Such a method would probably be unnecessary and possibly undesirable in smaller communities but cities with large population and many diverse interests might well examine the experiences of these two Federations.

In this connection, we might call attention to the fact already indicated that the problems of different cities necessarily vary in proportion to their size and complexity of groups, and it is therefore recommended to the permanent Committee on Communal Organization that different methods be studied as applicable to cities of different grades.

For the purposes of your committee, it has appeared that the grouping might be somewhat as follows:

Group 1—New York.

Group 2—Chicago, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, San Francisco.

Group 3—Cleveland, Detroit, St. Louis, Boston, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, etc.

Group 4—Indianapolis, Kansas City, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, etc.

Group 5—Unorganized or semi-organized communities of the approximate size of Memphis, Nashville, etc.

Group 6—Small communities with less than 100 Jewish families.

The obverse of the situation indicated above must also be recognized, namely, that by reason of the process of assimilation, there is annually an increasing escape from our ranks and year by year we find ourselves losing for communal purposes an increasing proportion of those men and women who by reason of heredity, tradition and longer established residence, should for many years to come furnish the largest proportion of our active communal workers.

If the present diminution of immigration is to continue permanently, this will constitute an ever increasing weakness in our endeavors thoroughly to organize our Jewish communities.

While not entirely appropriate at this point in the discussion, it should be said that your committee believes that one of the most important functions of the permanent committee which it has recommended for the study of this entire question of organization shall be the deliberate and careful consideration of the probable effects of this immigration policy with reference to the entire field of what now constitutes Jewish Social Service.

It is manifest that under such conditions many of the needs now so pressing would lose much of their force and money and energy set free for the fuller development of the work of the various institutions and possibly the elimination of a number of them and the substitution of newer and more needed forms of work.

It is the definite opinion of your committee that the Federation represents but a stage in our communal development and not the final

form. What that form may be, it is impossible at this time to forecast. Papers have been read at an earlier session with reference to two forms of activity which may indicate phases of this newer development—namely, District Service and Jewish Centers.

The plan of District Service as applied to Jewish work is as yet too new to justify any dogmatic assertion concerning it. In our own small committee, there is divergence of opinion among representatives of the two cities in which the plan has been tried out as to whether it constitutes a new stage in the development or merely a method of technique. In our large centers of population, to which alone it applies, there can be no doubt that the active sharing in communal work by the actual residents of a district would be most stimulating and heartening and that it contains possibilities of evolution that may bring about a complete change in our methods of administering our various kinds of service. It must be remembered, however, that a citywide organization must still be maintained to finance the District Organizations to the extent that they are not self-supporting.

The Jewish Center also offers much hope if it can be made a democratic expression of all the needs of the community in which it is located and endeavor to supply all such wants for family helpfulness, education, both religious and secular, recreation, coöperation with all existing special agencies, etc., which would no doubt do much to impress upon every member of the community his responsibility and his obligation. It is conceivable that such an organization working in coöperation with a general community board, which will outline policies for the entire city, which in turn can be applied locally through such centers, would constitute a form of organization much more immediate and efficient than is at present possible in the highly centralized way in which we endeavor to meet our communal needs.

There is one other present day trend of organization to be considered, one that, however, we approach in an extremely tentative fashion because the data available have not yet been sufficiently studied. They have, however, been collected, and will be available for your permanent committee. We refer to the Community Chest. As is well known to all of you, this plan of entire community organization, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, has spread with great rapidity. Hexter's criticism existed before the war. Originally attempted in order to unify and coördinate the many appeals for various war-time causes, the method proved so efficacious that after the war, at the instigation chiefly of Chambers of Commerce or other civic bodies, the plan has been continued or introduced where not already tried, for purposes of joint collection and distribution of funds intended for all forms of communal social service.

Questions that must be given very serious consideration before arriving at a conclusion in this matter concern themselves with the amount of financial support to be realized from the Jewish community. In places where the Jewish organizations are invited to join Community Chests, is it possible that the amount to be contributed by Jews will be greater or less than would be the sum realized by an independent Jewish Federation. Furthermore, would the amount contributed by Jews be fairly proportionate to their number and wealth in the community and also to the amount that they should receive for the support of their particular institutions, giving due regard to the

obligation of the Jew to contribute to the various non-sectarian activities present in the community. Should the Jewish organization enter such Community Chests as independent units or only after they have attained such complete local organization as will lead them to believe that they are prepared to enter on equal terms into a joint enterprise.

To these and similar questions we hope to receive fuller replies in the next report to be submitted to you.

This presentation has thus far eliminated from consideration groups of activities transcending local organizations which nevertheless are intimately bound up with the problem we have been treating. It is impossible to dissociate from the consideration of this matter the relations between the local organizations and the national societies appealing to the country generally for funds nor to such emergency needs as are illustrated by War Relief, Pogrom Relief, etc.

This question has been treated in a special study on Budgeting of National Institutions prepared at the direction of the Executive Committee by the Bureau of Jewish Social Research, which has also had a place on your program at this Conference, and therefore is at this juncture merely presented as a very important part of the general problem.

Nor has any attempt been made to treat in detail the matter of proposed separate Jewish religious educational Federations, as our attitude towards this proposition has been indicated above.

Similarly, we have entered into no discussion of the proposed Kehillah form of communal organization inasmuch as after several years' trial, it does not appear to have met the needs of American communities and for the present it can be dismissed without detailed consideration.

For purposes of information for your permanent committee, there is attached to this report as an appendix the original syllabus prepared by Mr. Levin.

In conclusion, your committee desires to repeat its earlier statement that this report is to be regarded as entirely preliminary and its recommendation for a permanent committee to function during the entire year preceding the next Conference in the hope that definite conclusions and recommendations may be presented to you at that time.

Respectfully submitted,

SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN, *Chairman*
DR. L. B. BERNSTEIN
H. L. GLUCKSMAN
SAMUEL GOLDHAMER
SAMUEL GOLDSMITH
MAURICE B. HEXTER
MISS DOBOTHY KAHN
HYMAN KAPLAN
MISS FRANCES TAUSSIG

THE CHAIRMAN: As the report of this committee was purely informative, and no recommendations were embodied except that the committee be continued so as to present a