

ysis of this boy's sexual life. A boy so deeply attached to the mother and guilty about his incest drive must have considerable masturbatory guilt and some, either conscious or unconscious, homosexual trends. His projection of homosexuality on to the therapist at one period of treatment was a significant lead which could have been followed.

Another point which impresses me was that the therapist did not bring into the treatment relationship any fundamental discussion of the daily difficulties of this boy in his adjustment to the other people of this institution. It would have been well to point out to the patient how his adjustment in the institution was a repetition of his behavior pattern in the home, how he was identifying staff members with members of his own family, and how this pattern was infantile in character.

The treatment attitude should not be confined to the therapist but should pervade every part of the institution and should be the fundamentals of the attitude of every staff member coming in contact with that child. Classroom and trade school, the daily routine, special recreation and work activities, both on an individual and group basis, should form part of the total community program directed to the treatment of that individual child. This requires adequately trained staff to add positive, constructive activity to daily life, as well as an absence of destructive personalities on the grounds. It is frustrating to attempt treatment of problems through one sphere of the institution's program when in another sphere destructive influences are being exerted. To get down to cases, one cannot treat a homosexual boy who is being seduced by an active homosexual staff member. Treatment is

also delayed when staff members, by virtue of their own instability and lack of understanding, repeat the very errors in handling by the family which brought the child to the institution. I wish, too, to emphasize the importance of a wide recreational program of creative character with sufficient flexibility and variation to enable even the most unadjusted youngster to find himself in some activity.

Above all, the institution must make it possible for social workers to have constant contact with the home as well as the family. The child must be interpreted adequately and truthfully to the family so that their exaggerated feelings and misunderstandings of the child are lessened. In this way their attitudes, at times rejecting, at times over-protective, might be made more wholesome in relation to the child. At all times we must keep in mind that the treatment of the child takes place in terms of the development of mature relationships with the members of his own family. Poor relationships in the institutions or in the classroom may be understood only as reflections and carry-overs from the poor relationships in the family.

Time and time again we have seen children make good institutional adjustments but revert to their earlier patterns immediately on return to the home. This is due to a lack of interpretation and a lack of handling of the institution problems as a reflection of the home problems. Such treatment can be effected only through an intimate tie up between the home and the institution during the period of the child's stay in the institution. Difficulties in the institution may be treated by bringing in the cooperation of the home; difficulties with the home may be treated by bringing in the institution.

Employment Practices and Relationships

EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS IN JEWISH SOCIAL WORK

By MAURICE TAYLOR

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THE areas of disagreement between employer and employee in Jewish social work have noticeably diminished. The survey of employment practices recently published in the Jewish Social Service Quarterly revealed a growing approximation to the standards adopted by this Conference at Detroit. The main difference between the recommended standard and actuality remains on the salary question. It is around this point that the controversy between board, executive and staff has been mainly waged during the past three years.

We are still too close to the whole matter to view it as objectively and dispassionately as its gravity demands. A decade from now we shall be better able to evaluate its pros and cons, and to assay its true place in the development of our profession. By that time the situation will undoubtedly have become more stabilized. The relative positions of private and public social work are as yet in a highly fluid state. It is for that reason that while the objectives of the protective organization may seem clear, the milieu in which they are sought is too shifting to provide a proper foothold for solid accomplishment. The gains of today may be completely wiped out by a change in the political or financial situation of tomorrow.

The main issue before us, to put it baldly, is that of the merits and demerits as well as the possibilities of collective bargaining in Jewish social work. While the problem in Jewish social work is seemingly no different than in the field as a whole,

there are certain aspects which we must consider as related to our own particular sphere. Employment practices and relationships have always been the concern of staffs and boards ever since the professional was introduced into the social work picture. Social work is no different from any other occupation in that whenever there is an employer and an employee there must be a determination of such matters as salaries, hours, vacations, and other conditions of work. Whether for good or evil, prior to the depression these matters were handled in such manner as to become of little or no concern to anyone other than the staffs and agencies involved. An examination of Conference proceedings reveals nothing to the contrary. Our attention was always focussed on the working conditions of our clients. The depression brought salary cuts which served to turn our interest inward to our own problems, sometimes to such a degree that we have run the risk of being accused of forgetting the problems of our clients.

While the onset of the depression was the immediate cause, emphasis was lent to the problem by the growth in our desire to achieve professional status, which brought with it a natural concern with preparation and training for the task and the material compensations that should accompany it. If social work were to be a career rather than a makeshift occupation it demanded a proper type of personnel and, as a natural corollary, adequate conditions surrounding its pursuit in order that the best persons might be attracted to

and kept in it. Sharp reductions in employment standards brought us to a keen realization and consideration of what those standards should be. The crux of the present question exists in the methods of achieving and maintaining them.

The rapid growth of social work before the depression and its achievement of at least a quasi-professional status attracted a large number of persons who had previously gone into other callings. A sharp advance in the requirements for employment brought with it not only a better trained personnel, but also one that could be attracted only by the promise of better conditions if social work were to compete successfully with other professions for satisfactory practitioners. The coming of the depression, however, changed this picture since with it came a lessening of opportunity in other fields. Before public social work entered the picture in any thorough-going way, private agencies were rapidly expanded in size and a dilution took place in the numbers with adequate training. The entrance of government into relief put an entirely different complexion on the personnel problem, creating not only difficulty of mass employment, but complicating it by the use of relief clients as investigators with consequent damage to employment standards of the professionally trained social worker. The rise of the public agency was accompanied by the withdrawal of private agencies into a scope of operations more restricted than ever before and with a greater emphasis on personnel qualifications with, at the same time, less by way of funds to purchase those qualifications. The existence, side by side, of a highly trained and more experienced group with a large inchoate mass of untrained and inexperienced practitioners presented a problem of personnel management in social work such as had

never before been faced by agency administrators. It is not surprising, therefore, that all of this coupled with demands of the so-called "rank and file" group and implemented by a methodology hitherto quite foreign to social work should have brought us to a state of confusion from which some believe we shall never recover. For us as Jewish social workers the question is of burning significance because it is within our own midst that the movement began and it was by our own group spread to other parts of social work, particularly the public field. This Conference, therefore, has a peculiar responsibility for considering the whole question. It would be well were our genius which created it also able finally to solve it.

The essence of a protective organization in social work is disclosed when contrasted with the professional associations in our field, in that its objective is primarily the promotion of the economic welfare of its members. The fact that its membership embraces all employees irrespective of function or occupation except for administrative personnel, precludes it from any professional status. It insists, however, that its concern with wages and working conditions is not necessarily incompatible with a professional interest in the technical performance of the job. Furthermore, its vertical union ideology demarks it from other groups with which it compares itself, namely teaching, acting, engineering, and others. It finds no community of interest with either the executive or board, nor does it see any solution to its problem except through the process of collective bargaining. It views the social worker solely as a wage earner who should use the approach that has been found effective by other groups of employees in protecting his standard of living. It claims as an illusion the improvement in economic

status through an improvement in professional status, and on that ground discounts the value of the A. A. S. W. to its membership. It sees in the executive an ally of the board, one who is either unwilling or unable to represent the true interests of the staff. It seeks direct contact with the board as well as official representation on the governing council of the agency. It holds that social workers should develop a basis of united action with labor in general as part of a movement to bring the control of social work as of other services into the hands of a society controlled by organized workers.

Opposed to the foregoing is the opinion that boards acting merely as representatives of the giving public, while desiring and needing the help and advice of social workers, cannot yield to them any ultimate responsibility. Control by an employee group runs contrary to the nature of voluntary social work. The protective form of employee organization which proposes to use the method of collective bargaining is not applicable to social work which operates on a non-profit basis and its employee problems differ radically from those of industry in general. While employee associations of professional persons are held desirable, the attempt to influence board decisions by the pressure-group method is regarded as particularly undesirable. There is a denial of the assumption of a conflict of interest between the board and staff and a belief that differences can be dissipated if a satisfactory method for joint participation is developed.

In this discussion of employee organization it is necessary to bear in mind that there is by no means one pattern. In general it may be said that there are three types of groups. Almost all staffs of any size have some form of council. Most of

them are of the traditional sort including within their programs questions of both professional and employment practice, but without much, if any, tinge of the protective organization philosophy. For the most part they are represented on the board by the executive, but frequently with staff representation also. This type is found in cities of every size. Generally there is a close personal acquaintance between board and staff which simplifies the problem of contact between them and leads to a more informal avenue of discussion and settlement of problems.

At the other end of the scale are the agencies whose staffs are members of highly organized movements affiliated with the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work. Only five of the Jewish workers' organizations are thus affiliated and they are divided into two groups from the point of view of action taken to meet their demands. The extremists in philosophy and action are those affiliated with agencies in the New York and Brooklyn Federations; the moderate groups whose attitudes and practices are more closely allied with those not affiliated with the National Coordinating Committee are found in Philadelphia, Boston and Detroit. In the latter city, we find the phenomenon of executives being admitted to associate membership with vote.

As far as Jewish social work is concerned, therefore, practically the entire experience upon which we can base our discussion applies to the New York area. This raises the question as to how typical this experience may be considered. Are the conditions and the people in New York, staff, executives, and boards, any different from those in other places which should produce one situation there and a different picture elsewhere? Does the

very size of the problem there and the great numbers of persons involved suggest an explanation? Would the same people act differently if they were located in another city? Is there anything extraneous to the social work situation which is creating the problem? One prevailing opinion couples these organizations with communist activity, involving the use of the communist tactic. It sanctions the organizations, but condemns their leadership as interested not in social work but only in making trouble.

In order to get a picture of the size, development, program and accomplishments of the rank and file movement during the past two years within Jewish social work, a schedule soliciting information was prepared and answers received from four of the five associations. All of these include every grade of employee other than executives except Detroit. A total membership of approximately 878 was reported. In one it was said that about 95% were enrolled; in a second, 67%; in the third, about 25%. No calculation was made in the fourth. An interesting development has taken place in the New York area by the transfer of certain groups to already organized A.F.L. unions. Hospital workers have been transferred to the Hospital Workers' Union. This included both the professional and maintenance workers. The maintenance workers of other institutions in the Federation have been transferred to the Building Service Maintenance Union. An un-stated number of clerical workers belong to the Bookkeepers', Stenographers' and Accountants' Union.

The programs of these organizations during the past two years have included demands for the improvement of working conditions, restoration of salary cuts and salary increases, recognition of the right

to organize, the right to meet with governing bodies to present grievances and demands, equal pay for equal work, orthodox observance of religious holidays, etc. They have also sought to encourage the professional development of workers by advocating attendance at schools for social work, the expense to be borne by the agency. All have had as their goal the further organization of staffs and the welding together of the several associations through the National Coordinating Committee. They have explored the possibility of joining the main stream of organized labor through affiliation with the A.F.L.

An important question that has been raised in connection with demands for better working conditions is "who constitutes the employer"? Is it the Federation or the individual constituent agency? The answer to this, of course, depends on local conditions. In many communities there is no doubt that the Federation is the controlling body; in others, where the individual agencies possess varying degrees of autonomy and are jealous in the preservation of their separate status the question is not easily answered. The issue was of paramount importance in New York, but has not been raised in like degree elsewhere because a clash between staffs and boards has not occurred.

The Association of Federation Workers maintains that the Board of the Federation, by virtue of its fund disbursements to constituent agencies, indirectly constitutes itself the directing body of these agencies and therefore possesses the essential attribute of an employer and must recognize the employer-employee relationship on a collective bargaining basis between themselves and the A. F. W. This point of view the New York Federation refused to accept on the ground that

it could never agree under the terms of its by-laws to deprive the affiliated societies of the right to engage and discharge personnel, to fix their wages, and other working conditions, which prerogative individual institutions carried out irrespective of Federation grants.

It has been pointed out that in private agencies it is often difficult to discover the true "employer" and to direct action against him alone. Action by workers is limited both by its effect in the raising of the agency's budget, and on the needs and rights of the clients. The social worker has much more direct responsibility for the client than the trade unionist has for the consumer. This may be unfortunate for the practitioner, but it is an implied obligation of the job and cannot be ignored.

One program contained the significant objective of promoting "an educational program aimed at . . . the need for greater cooperation between clients of social service agencies and the workers in those agencies". While the exact meaning of this is not developed, this Conference should know whether its implications are the same as those which brought forth the following comment in one of the papers delivered last year at Lake Placid: "The social worker, and especially the practitioner, through the relationship established and the interpretation of content, liberates the client to make his own choices in the governing of his own life by removing emotional blockings. The introduction of any political bias on the part of the therapist makes this free choice impossible. A commitment to any party that calls for proselytizing may make it difficult for the case worker to carry out his professional responsibility in an objective and therapeutic manner. Furthermore, the zeal with which proselytizing is carried on within the agency itself frequently re-

sults in interference with that smooth functioning within an organization that makes for the tranquillity and peace that are requisites for effective case work activity".

In answering the question as to the issue supported by Associations of Federation Workers affecting both the welfare of their members and that of others within and outside of social work, a variety of causes was named. The list given by one is representative of those mentioned by two others and includes the following:

Definitely affecting social work and social workers are:

- Protested dismissal of public relief workers for organizational activity
- Fought lockouts in New York Hospitals
- Endorsed the Frazier-Lundeen Bill
- Opposed curtailment of transient relief
- Opposed withdrawal of Federal relief funds from city and state
- Opposed retrenchment in W.P.A.
- Endorsed Works Projects bill—minimum and maximum salaries, hours, etc.
- In favor of child labor amendment
- Support of adequate housing laws
- Support of American Youth Act
- Demanded liberal immigration in light of situation in Germany
- Opposed retrenchment in staff of public relief agencies
- Opposed discrimination in public relief agencies
- Protested forcing of non-citizens from Emergency Relief Bureau
- Endorsed the use of trade union tactics in social work protective groups.
- Among those not immediately connected with social work or the welfare of social workers were the following:
- Opposed increased appropriations for army and navy in the face of decreased funds for relief

Opposed compulsory militarism in colleges and C.C.C.
 Demanded curtailment of powers of Supreme Court
 Protested alien sedition bill
 Favored civil rights, freedom of the mails, free speech, free press
 Revive Bill of Rights
 Congressional investigation of silicosis
 Protested loyalty oaths
 Demanded freedom of all political prisoners
 Demanded Olympic games be transferred from Germany
 Neutrality Bill
 Formation of Farmer Labor Party
 Protested use of state guards in breaking up strikes.

The fourth confined its support to issues involving the immediate welfare of its own group and took no part in any extra-organizational questions. The same is true of the fifth.

Methods used in support of demands have included stoppage; picketing; pressure through telegrams, letters and petitions; cooperation with organized labor through solicitation of its support and of the public in general, publicity, mass meetings, mass parades and contacts with the State Labor Board and the Rabbinical Committee for Social Justice.

What have been the results of these methods? There is by no means complete agreement. The answer to this question must be considered not only in relation to the material questions of wages and other working conditions, but also as they have affected staff efficiency and morale and the general standing of the Jewish social worker and Jews generally. They must also be viewed in contrast to what workers in other cities have achieved without these methods.

It is claimed by the A. F. W. that not

only have partial salary adjustments been won, but that further cuts have been averted, cuts already made have been rescinded, and contemplated discharges have been forestalled. Recognition has been obtained from one Federation of the A. F. W. as the collective bargaining agency for the employees of the Federation and its agencies. It is also stated that substantial improvement in working conditions has been gained, such as shortened working hours in some agencies, increases in salaries, and lengthened vacation periods. Some minimum salary schedules have been accepted, although increases have not been granted in all cases. It is claimed that the workers in agencies where Workers' Councils were well organized and properly functioning fared better during this period of wage reductions than workers in agencies where no medium existed for collective bargaining. While victory was claimed in the case of the Beth Moses controversy, the lack of success at the Lebanon Hospital has been compensated for by awakening the Jewish community to a realization of what are termed unjustifiable conditions prevailing in philanthropic institutions. It is said that the latter experience has given added emphasis to the membership's faith in demonstration, stoppage and picketing as effective weapons in arousing the community to a realization of the workers' grievances.

Executive opinion is divided on the merit of A. F. W. practices. It ranges from outright endorsement to utter condemnation. There is, of course, no dissenting voice against the right to organize. It is the tactic that is objected to. While the executive does not criticize his own exclusion from the workers' councils he does object to being characterized either as hostile or indifferent to the interests of

the staff. One executive wrote "I am close enough to my own days in the field to feel I am a member of the staff, representing the staff point of view. As far as our own board is concerned, that is the light in which I desire to be considered." Another writes that "the desire to separate the interests of the executive and the staff seems to be based upon a false premise. Social work is a cooperative undertaking—Board, executive and staff—and unless it can function as such, leadership in this field is jeopardized, and development based upon community understanding and support retarded".

The rank and file movement is criticized on the score that its aim is to achieve the control of social work. It is characterized as a class struggle movement with revolutionary aims. Its usefulness is therefore questioned both on the ground of its protection of social work as a profession and on the ground of its safeguarding the best interests of social workers as a class. There is a likelihood of its disintegration should there come a quick demobilization in relief services. In any event, in the long run it will prove to be a weakening rather than a strengthening influence in social work, unless unskilled mass social work has come to stay. The fact that the workers' movement has become in effect a class war is unfortunate in that it has exaggerated the idea of a class distinction between Board, staff, and executive.

While it has been given credit as having had some effect in the improvement of salaries and working conditions, nevertheless those in a position to know the facts are sure it cannot take credit for all the advances that have been made, although it is assumed that it will make such claims. Its value lies in the direction of having created a greater awareness in the governing bodies of social agencies of personnel

problems. Its militant activities, however, are condemned by the same executives who acknowledge the good that has come out of organization. Question is raised as to the interpretative value of picket lines. Such activities are considered to have been ill-advised and to have alienated a great deal of what might have been favorable feeling. Through many of their activities they have succeeded only in making nuisances of themselves and of intensifying anti-Jewish feeling. The reaction of Boards has been definitely unfavorable even where the executive has been in favor of the program. It has resulted in creating an attitude of suspicion where formerly there was no difficulty in arranging joint discussion.

Equally disastrous has been the effect on staff and agency morale. There has been considerable feeling of coercion on the part of many members who were only lukewarm to the idea. Many have joined only because of social pressure and an unwillingness to face isolation. The tactics employed have not had the full endorsement of the entire membership. Others, particularly among the better trained case workers, have had a considerable amount of conflicting emotions about their affiliations with the A. F. W. and their status as professional individuals. They recognize the desirability of organization for certain ends, but are not sure how the methods of the organization itself relate to their individual professional philosophy.

Confusion has been created in the administration of certain agencies through interference with functions which were not the responsibility of the staff. There has developed a habit of challenging which has carried over into matters of professional and administrative concern. The promotion of staff discontent has seriously

interfered with agency morale, and there have been instances of notorious disregard of the commonly accepted rules of procedure and discipline which have interfered with efficient administration and agency routine.

The vertical union philosophy is characterized as a mistake in the field of social work. While it may be sound industrially, there is not enough of a community of interest between social workers, clerical workers, maintenance employees and other categories of workers to give them cohesion. Another opinion is to the effect that the social work group weakens itself in tying up for organization purposes with stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, porters, orderlies, maids, etc., who are notoriously difficult to organize and who in such times as these exist in over abundance among the unemployed. Both from the professional point of view as well as from the selfish interests of the group, a mistake has been made in trying to combine such divergent elements merely because they all happen to be wage earners.

In the discussion of tactics, a vital distinction is drawn between forms of protest in behalf of the interests of clients and labor generally and these in our own behalf. Paul Kellogg, in a symposium in "Social Work Today" states, "There is a whole of a lot of difference between tactics used to better relief and the same tactics used to break down a relief administration as part of a general agitation". "Questions of tactics hang on questions of objective. You phrase yours, 'Whether social workers have a right to organize along trade union lines and to make use of labor tactics.' Make use of them for what?" he asks.

The ultimate resort in trade union practice is the strike which aims at the pocket book of the employer. Obviously, the

same motive in settling controversies, namely to permit a resumption of earning power and profits, does not exist in social work. There are no material interests of the employer affected. There remains, therefore, the hope of stimulating public opinion. How powerful can that be said to be in influencing the board of a social agency for this purpose? There is certainly no buyers' strike to be induced, such as through a boycott. In this instance it is the counterpart of the buyer, namely the client, whose interests will be directly jeopardized. The client, particularly the relief client, does not come to the agency through choice — indeed, the reverse is true.

Social workers face not the help of public opinion, but rather its condemnation. Ewan Clague, in the same symposium, stated: "To act in such a way as to bring upon themselves a charge of narrow selfishness would be extremely short-sighted for the social workers; they must act with their clients and not against them." Those in executive position who have been outspoken in their sympathies for the rank and file have advised caution as to the methods and particularly of the extreme need of having a proper interpretation placed upon them. The use of methods commonly employed by other groups merely because they are traditional in labor conflict is condemned. Bertha Reynolds in the same symposium wrote: "Why . . . use crude methods even if labor has found them effective? As long as the conference method and arbitration of differences are possible, it would surely be as absurd to use the costly language of picketing, demonstrations, stoppages as to use a steam drill to open a walnut." This has peculiar applicability to private social work, and particularly to Jewish social work, because agencies generally are small

and avenues of contact open and informal. No agency or executive that does not extend the freest access to its staff for the presentation of complaints or the discussion of differences is to be defended. Executives would do well not to assume a more reactionary attitude than their boards. There has been much criticism of executives by executives for their ineptness in dealing with these problems, thus serving to permit situations to develop which might have been averted through a more genuine desire to cooperate. On the other hand, the mere perfection of machinery for promoting negotiation counts for far less than good faith and good will. Unfortunately there have been too many charges of lack of these attributes on the part of both sides.

One question that is of the gravest importance to us as Jewish social workers is the effect of all of this on us as Jews. Reference has already been made to certain tactics that have served to intensify anti-Jewish feeling. We would indeed be blind were we not to recognize that the extreme militancy of the past two years has had an effect upon the Jewish group in the profession as a whole. We stand in marked contrast to the private non-sectarian group which has experienced practically none of this. The public field

in certain cities has likewise been the scene of much controversy, and Jewish workers have been quite active in these situations. While we certainly are not to be condemned for fighting for what is just merely because we are Jews (our history as a people is replete with challenges of the injustices and inequities of life), nevertheless it is important that we give sober attention to any special obligations upon us, particularly in these trying times.

One fact which should give pause to these who claim for militancy results in increased wages and better working conditions is the advance that has been made on many other fronts where no such tactics have been employed. Salary cuts were universal; salary restorations likewise have been quite general. Report after report has come to me of action taken by boards restoring cuts and increasing wages without the aid of high pressure methods. The greatest advance anywhere on the salary question took place entirely on the initiative of a board. As good social scientists, before we make any claims as to a cause and effect relationship we must make sure that the same effect we note in various places and at different times comes from the same cause, otherwise our conclusions are valueless. They become nothing more than mere rationalizations.

THE RATIONALE FOR WORKERS' ORGANIZATION

By MOLLIE PEARL

United Jewish Aid Societies, Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE practitioners welcome the opportunity of presenting this paper to the members of the National Conference of Jewish Social Service. The atmosphere in our field, as in the field of social work generally, has been surcharged in recent years with a panicky hysteria that has given rise to confusion and misunder-

standing. The board members of Jewish agencies have been pointing with alarm to the growth of a new phenomenon in the field of social work—the organized rank and file movement.

We wish to clear this atmosphere of confusion and to disentangle ourselves from the stultifying effects of personal at-