munity as normally functioning individuals.

The implications of all this are that, on the whole, many of our values and of our diagnoses are based not on the real potentialities of human beings but on traditions and concepts which are not necessarily relevant today. Even such seemingly positive concepts as feeble-mindedness and psychosis are based not on the inherent real potentialities of the individual but upon the social philosophy which one may have and which determines one's attitude toward "worthwhileness" or "employability." The implications of this are particularly significant for the placement worker, for it seems to me that when he fully realizes their importance and potentialities, the term "unemployable" will begin to have a totally different meaning to him. He will then begin to see the "unemployables" as people who with a certain amount of help, can discover within themselves potentialities heretofore altogether unsuspected, though society, at the moment, has no use for these potentialities. Once having become aware of them, however, the placement worker cannot continue to accept in silence the term "unemployable" but must of necessity do all in his power to interpret the "unemployables" to society in terms of these new concepts.

Thus the placement worker must develop a social philosophy which will enable him to see in just perspective a society which so ruthlessly rejects its "surplus population." He will then no longer be able to accept the answer which he so frequently gives the case worker today—"My job is to meet the specifications of the employer and these people do not meet them."

To repeat once more, the case worker is a realist and he does not expect the placement worker alone to change the ugly realities of today, but unless he succeeds in developing such a social philosophy, his usefulness to the case worker and to his clients will be greatly limited. His role may even be reduced to the one so nobly defined by ex-President Hoover in his recent address to the Young Republicans, when he said, "I hear that new opportunities for youth are gone . . . It is very sad, but did it ever occur to you that all the people who live in these houses and all who run this complicated machinery are going to die? Just as sure as death, the job is yours and there are opportunities in every inch of it."

CAMP LIFE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE YEAR ROUND RECREATIONAL PROGRAM

By Louis H. Blumenthal

Jewish Community Center, San Francisco, Calif.

CAMPING, in the main, has been an isolated experience, with no well-defined relationship to the year round experience of the camper. Camping has been added to the program of the group work center (hereinafter referred to as the center), but not integrated with it. Only very recently have there been evidences of efforts to synthesize the two.

In the past, camp and the center have been separated by the "escape" concept of camping. Camp was viewed as an escape from the city, from its year round routines, its oppressive summer heat and its uncomfortable congestion. It was an escape into the great outdoors, into freedom of action and into new activity. The contrast between city and country gave content to the significance of the camping movement.

The difference in environment and in activity gives to camp its appeal and potential social power. These are important and necessary differences. However, they did tend, until recently, to create a gap between camp and center which was not conducive to an integration of the two.

An awareness of the integral relationship between camp and center emerged with the growing stress upon the child-centered as against the activity-centered program. There was the increasing emphasis of the social sciences upon the unity of the personality as requiring unity of experience for sound emotional growth. The demands and practices in the home, the school, the center and the camp, often in conflict, were pulling the child in different directions. Some sort of harmon-

ious relationship among the various agencies dealing with the child was called for.

Common ground between camp and center was being established by the increasing overlapping of personnel; in the professional exploration of both fields in terms of objectives, standards of practice, leadership and record keeping, in the gradual convergence of much of the philosophy, principles and concepts of both; and in the increasing tendency for camps to be set up, not as independent units, but as departments of group work agencies.

With this tendency for the two fields to come together, how can their integration be made effective? For the purposes of this paper, this process of integration will be described in terms of working principles only. These principles, it will be seen, all converge on one concept, that of continuity; continuity in the quality of the child's participation, in the kind of activity, in the kind of group associations, in the quality of leadership and in the nature of individual guidance. Lastly, there is the continuity of the work of the center and camp with that of the home and the school. In other words, the principles call for an uninterrupted and consistent flow of experiences for the child over the entire year, so that the gains made in one place by way of interests. friends, attitudes and habits can be conserved and progressively advanced in other spheres of the child's activity.

In the first place, the quality of participation should be such as to lead to the development of desirable habits, of ways of doing things, of attitudes, of continuing interest in the activity. In the conduct of an activity, this calls for the following emphases: that the child learn to enjoy the activity for itself, rather than for external awards; that he secure satisfaction out of achievement; that he be given opportunities for advancing in a skill progressively scaled to his increasing capacity; that he learn cheerfully to accept the challenge of the new and the difficult. The center and camp, working in unison toward achieving these objectives, will tend to reinforce the habits and interests gained in either place.

Secondly, camp-center integration calls for an amount of continuity in the kind of activity in their respective programs. The theory has taken hold that the camp program should be markedly different from the city program. As has been already indicated, there is much in this theory that is sound. On the other hand, practice of this theory provides for no continuity of play interests and cuts the child off from the city environment in which he must find most of his play life. On a realistic basis, it would seem that a balance needs to be struck between complete change and complete duplication of experiences as far as camp and center are concerned. This means new experience, of course, but also repetition and reinterpretation of old experience. It means outdoor sports such as hiking, fishing, boating, which, for many children, only camp can provide. It also means city sports and crafts, in which children may not be skilled because of lack of practice or opportunity in the city. In many instances, camp may represent the only or most strategic time for training in city skills. Camp needs to look to the city.

In the same way, the center needs to

look to the camp. With no continuity operating, the camper, on his return to the city, leaves behind the skills and interests gained, to many of which he was just getting "warmed up". The activities of the camp season, instead of representing the beginnings of new horizons, are stored away in the album of happy memories which are poor substitutes for continuing experience.

At this point, the differences between camp and center must be faced. Swimming in a lake with the outdoor setting of sky, forest and hills is not the same as swimming in an indoor pool amid moist walls and reverberating noises. "Camp Spirit", generated out of togetherness of living in a self-contained miniature society, is different from "Center Spirit" among members who are together intermittently and for short periods. The joy and thrill of the outdoors are not likely to be found in a day camp pitched on a playground.

It is evident that camp life cannot be duplicated in the city. However, something of its spirit and its activities can be introduced. In the city opportunities can be provided for the implementing of such camp objectives as the love for the outdoors, the exploration of the environment, the appreciation of natural phenomena. The camp habits of observation and inquiry can be given further practice. This continuation of camp experience can take the form of day, week-end and overnight camping, snow camps and short-term camps over holiday periods; trips to points of interest in and out of the city; picnics; trips for the study of stars, birds, flowers, rocks; boating, hiking and fishing. All these may not be possible because of local conditions. They emphasize, however, an out-of-building type of program.

Third, camp and center can be brought together into a unified relationship when they both provide opportunities for continuing group and personal associations. On the one hand, camp can organize its groups on the basis of city friendships, club units, or school and neighborhood affiliations. On the other hand, the center can build its clubs and groups around cabin and other units of camp in which a we-relationship among the children has been developed. This basis of group organization while subject to other factors such as age, mental and emotional maturity, and mutual acceptability, tends to promote year round friendships and group associations.

It is these associations which are most meaningful to the child, perhaps the most meaningful in his total experience. The group can condition for the child the quality of his participation in activity. Group acceptance is a stimulant to readiness for new experience with the group. Satisfactions, socially shared, take on added zest. Where the group has become a cohesive one, as Dimock has pointed out in "Rediscovering the Adolescent", children have more friendships, a greater number of interests, a common interest of persons, more frequent contacts, a greater psychological unity, and a more stable membership; the activities are spontaneous and vital as against the formal activity in a non-cohesive group.

Fourth, camp and center can reinforce each other when there is continuity of leadership. This does not necessarily mean that the persons act as leaders in both camp and center. Though desirable, it is not always possible to any great extent. The emphasis is rather on the extension of the same philosophy of leadership, by which the counselor at camp and the club leader at the center will be

guided. For example, leader-dominated programs in the city tend to make more difficult the development of group determined programs in camp. This disparity in leadership practice with its conflicts does not make for healthy growth of the child. He is torn between two ways of responding. These different responses to divergent methods of leadership were indicated in the experiments of Dr. Kurt Lewin at the University of Iowa Child Welfare Station, where a number of boys were divided into two groups. "One was a democratic group with an adult leader who let the youngsters decide how to work; the other, autocratic with a leader who gave orders and criticisms without reasons. The children in the democracy were more cooperative, friendly and matter-of-fact with each other. Children in the autocracy quickly became apathetic. hostile to each other, domineering. In the autocracy, the group ganged up on one child, treated him so badly that he dropped out of the club. Thereupon the club began to bully another scapegoat."

Continuity of the same quality of leadership can be furthered by the presence at camp of at least one center staff member whose responsibility it should be to unify practices in leadership. As the connecting link between camp and center, he can unite both in all the aspects of their functioning into an harmonious whole.

Lastly, camp and center can become integrally related by having in common some basic individual guidance system, and by the exchange of social and other data concerning the children. In the first place, there needs to be clarified to both counselor and club leader, a philosophy and psychology of guidance, if there is to be a consistency of practice in camp and center. Under a club leader, a child may be outgoing and cooperative, while

the same child under a counselor may be retiring and disinterested. In such a situation, counselor and club leader need to get together at least by way of common guidance concepts. In the second place, health, personality and social data of children should be pooled. The records at camp should be geared into those at the center and vice versa. Camp records can be of special value to the center because of the wealth of data available. At camp, the child's personality is revealed with a detail not possible in the center, because of the closeness of living together, the long hours of association, and the greater need to understand the child because of the intimacy of the contacts. The camp records can yield much diagnostic material for the club leader. Finally, consistency in individual guidance over the year calls for a correlation of those individual objectives set up for the child at camp with those set up for him at the center.

As so far described, this dovetailing of camp with center represents part, and only a small part, of an integrated approach to the child. Besides camp and center, there is the further impact upon him by the school, the neighborhood, and especially, the home. Teachers, neighbors, and above all, parents play their parts in conditioning the child's behavior, attitudes, and interests. The extent to which these influences are mutually helpful or opposing is an interesting question.

If these forces in the child's life are to be mutually helpful and are to reinforce each other, it is clear that they need to be brought into an harmonious relationship by means of some consistent and unified plan; at least to the extent that is humanly possible. What agency should take the initiative in this work of unification? Should it be the center? It would seem that the task is a serious and large one, and that the obligation to perform it is with the home or with the school. Theirs is the prior responsibility. Where home and school are not ready, willing, or able to effect this coordination of the parts of the child's experience, the challenge falls in the lap of the center. The history of the center is a record of the acceptance of similar challenges. In fact, its very being has grown out of meeting new social needs that have arisen in a changing society. Certain advantages lie with the center in this task. Its methods are informal, and its approach is flexible. It is bound by no legal or traditional requirements as is the case with the school. Above all, its primary interest is not with a curriculum of studies, but with persons.

Of course, all that has been suggested in this plan for integration is much easier said than done. One even hesitates to advance these proposals, some of which are far reaching, in the light of the limitations of the center's resources in terms of finances, staff, facilities, techniques and methods.

Therein lies the challenge for the intensive collaboration of social agencies in a planned cooperative approach which will tend to insure the progressive ongoing development of the child. The integration of camp-center practices might well be the first step.

THE JEWISH EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN CAMP

By SAMUEL D. GERSHOVITZ

Jewish Community Association, Toronto, Canada

TUST as there has been a growing J awareness among all educational groups of the efficacy of the camp as a social and cultural impregnation area, so there has been an increased sensitivity among Jewish educators, center workers and others concerned with the future of the American Jewish community to the possibilities for the development of a synthesis of Jewish cultural life through a carefully conceived Jewish educational program in camp. During these last ten years, too, the cataclysmic and convulsive changes in the lives of European Jewry have had their inevitable repercussions on the thinking of the Jewish community on this continent. These changes have tended to emphasize the necessity for the orientation of the Jewish individual to the permanent and lasting values inherent in the cultural heritage in the way of life called Judaism. This concern, if not consciously expressed previously, at least has been hovering on the brink of common realization, as is evidenced by frequent public utterances of the individuals heretofore referred and in the actuality of the programming within the various types of camps sponsored by them.

Three main types of camps can be said to have recognized this need of the Jewish masses and grasped the opportunity offered them by the camp environment to institute a Jewish educational program. These three are:

- a) the private camp;
- b) the organizational or semi-public camp; and
- c) the ideological camp, such as those sponsored by the Workmen's Circle, the

Jewish National Workers Alliance, Hashomair Hatzoir, Hashomair Hadati, and Young Judea. Of the three, it is to be expected that the private camps' Jewish educational program is the least embracing and least effective in answering the real purpose of its inclusion in the camp setting. It is too often dictated by the exigencies of the day-simply added to the general camp program as a sop to the demands of the paying parents, unplanned, poorly correlated with the rest of the camp program, and presented by a staff ill prepared and too little in sympathy with it. There are, of course, exceptions among the private camps, where owners are aware of their communal responsibilities and take them seriously. In these few camps there are provided that proper motivation and stimulation which give the Jewish educational program significance, meaning and enjoyment to the campers. However, even in these exceptional cases, the dollar motive may obscure and demoralize the proper presentation and development of the program to such a degree that it is emasculated and its real values lost.

It is in the latter two types of camps, the organizational and ideological, that the Jewish educational program has really flowered and its true functions become dynamics in the life of the camp and the campers. The reason for this state of things must be obvious. Both types of camps are intimately related to the communal life of the community through their sponsoring organizations. Campers have been, in most cases, at least partially conditioned to this type of program. The