

## IMPLICATIONS OF THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES \*

by MARTHA K. SELIG

*Federation of Jewish Philanthropies,  
New York, N. Y.*

**V**OLUNTARY social work has experienced radical changes in the past few decades which have influenced markedly the nature and scope of its activities. One of the most potent factors in this development has been the phenomenal growth in the responsibility which government—local, state and federal—has assumed for social welfare programs. The constantly increasing financial contributions to voluntary agencies by government marks a new era in the evolution of our work. Many of us welcome the idea of change. Others are skeptical; still others are fearful. Which attitude do the facts favor?

When social security legislation was introduced a quarter of a century ago there were many who raised alarmed cries of "Welfare State." Today, government responsibility for welfare is an accepted part of the fabric of our country and our voluntary agencies are stronger than ever. Some 24 billion dollars will be spent this year by government, for the most part in publicly operated programs, public welfare, Social Security, and the like. But of that 24 billion, hundreds of millions of dollars will be given to voluntary agencies throughout the country. This is a very

small percentage of the total that government spends for welfare programs and a small percentage of the total expenditures of the voluntary agencies. But the extent of government participation is steadily broadening to all functional fields, though not uniformly so. Even now a substantial portion of the cost of some services is covered by government dollars; in other areas the contribution is minimal. To all voluntary agencies, however, these funds hold a promise and a challenge.

Today, the cost of care is rising rapidly; emotional, social and medical problems are multiplying in every community; long waiting lists are growing even longer. In view of these facts, the availability of public funds seems most attractive. It is natural, therefore, that we should be deeply concerned with the challenges that confront our voluntary agencies in their acceptance of government funds and that we should want to explore all of the possible consequences and implications of such a relationship. No one of us wishes to see public funds unused because of unwarranted fears and anxieties, when they might benefit our operations and our clients. Yet we wonder whether the apparent immediate advantages may be overwhelmed by long term disadvantages to our Jewish welfare services.

\* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 31, 1959.

Our agencies have grown out of the needs of our Jewish people and have been supported by the Jewish community. They have been rooted in a long history and heritage and nourished on traditional ethics and values. Before we tie ourselves closer to government, we want to know whether the future of sectarian philanthropy is at stake, whether the essential character of our Jewish agencies will change the more we become involved with government financing. Will government dollars mean government domination? Will our private efforts be weakened when we rely more heavily on government aid? When should government take over some of our obligations and which shall they be? What effects will increased government funds have on the relationship between the federations and the member agencies and how will this influence communal planning in the Jewish community?

These questions are valid, but they are not new. We have asked them of ourselves with each step along the road our agencies travelled with government through the years. I am sure that they were asked by the governing boards of the first voluntary children's orphanages that accepted public grants back in the 1800's. Certainly they were raised constantly during the past quarter of the century, when we witnessed the great changes in voluntary philanthropy that came about as the direct result of government's involvement with welfare programs, as we saw federal, state, and municipal governments contribute to the cost of services provided by the voluntary agencies and assume responsibility for many of the functions which had been administered by private philanthropy. Yet we survived these changes healthily, and were freed to program for essential community needs that had been unfulfilled up to then. But will this continue to hold true?

Perhaps we can find the answers by looking at the record, though the experience of the agencies varies throughout the country and from field to field. Some of our agencies have plunged right in to obtain government funds; others have been content just to go wading and still others refused even to get their feet wet. Past and present experience, of course, can only serve as a guide. While our answers cannot be final, the body of experience upon which we can draw can help each of us to decide what road to take, or if we should take the trip at all.

First let us clarify what kind of government participation prompts our concern. Is it the direct financial contributions to our work, or the indirect contributions? Surely few of us quarrel with the very generous contributions government makes indirectly in the tax exemptions we receive as non-profit organizations and through the tax reductions our contributors receive for charitable support. Nor do we question the social security grants which are reflected in the fees received from clients. Specifically, then, what we are concerned with are direct cash grants made by government bodies for construction, for purchase of service, for research.

### **Extent and Effect of Government Cash Grants—to Medical Institutions**

General hospitals and other medical service institutions have had the most extensive experience with government funds. Of approximately ninety medical and paramedical institutions under Jewish auspices (general hospitals, psychiatric hospitals, hospitals for chronically ill, convalescent homes, rehabilitation centers), 59 reported their experience.<sup>1</sup> Of these, 48 received some

<sup>1</sup> 1958 Year Book of Jewish Social Services, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York, N. Y.

form of public assistance, ranging from 3 to 50% of the operating budget.

Government has historically purchased services from voluntary hospitals through per diem payments for medically indigent patients. Though these rates have increased through the years, they have not kept pace with actual costs. Hospitals receive more money today but the total sum represents a smaller percentage of the cost of operating the hospitals than it did years ago. In large measure, the substantial income from insurance plans relieved both voluntary hospitals and government of the onus of meeting spiralling costs. A sizeable increase in government contribution came about in New York a year ago, when for the first time hospitals there were paid for out-patient services to welfare recipients (only about 20% of the out-patient load). This new development achieved through the initiative of all the voluntary hospitals in calling upon the city to implement an existing law, will mean a further increase in government dollars.

In addition to payment for service, government contributions for research, teaching, and fellowships have provided extra sources of income for our hospitals for many years.

Still another dimension to the financial participation of government was added when the Hill-Burton Act was passed in 1946. This Act provided capital funds for medical facilities which would be "available to the general public, without discrimination on account of race, creed or color." In the thirteen years since the inception of the Hill-Burton Act, some 4,000 projects have been undertaken, of which sectarian organizations sponsored 555. Only 23 of these projects were undertaken by Jewish organizations! May we not ask whether our Jewish hospitals and other institutions eligible for grants

have taken full advantage of the intent of this Act?

The hospitals which have used government funds report their experiences rewarding in every respect. In contrast to some misgivings in anticipation, government domination and interference were not experienced and hospitals continued to operate without infringement on their autonomy. In many instances, government grants served as further stimuli for fund-raising, for the addition of new or expanded resources to the community's services actually inspired greater community support. Furthermore, the non-sectarian stipulation did not bring in its train any shift in intake policy, for medical institutions under Jewish auspices have traditionally served the total community. Although patients represent all races and religions, our Jewish hospitals, nevertheless, have preserved their essential Jewish character. Kosher food is served in all orthodox hospitals, Jewish symbolism prevails, and Jewish chapels remain open.

#### To Institutions for Aged and Chronically Ill

Here the development of a financial relationship with government has been slower. It is not possible to state with any degree of accuracy the number of homes benefiting from government funds or the percentages of income attributed to public sources because of the lack of uniform definition and reporting. Some homes report Old Age Assistance and Social Security as public subsidy; others report such funds as clients' fees. Some homes are classified as hospitals; others as convalescent homes. It is estimated, however, that there are about 72 homes for the aged. Sixty reported their experiences and only 17 of them report any public subsidy.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

Where government does participate, the contributions may represent a direct grant for research or a special project, or may be in the form of per capita payment for service. In the case of the latter plan, the local government agency will add to the clients' resources the difference required to meet the agreed per diem rate. In some homes, the rate varies with the nature of the service rendered; in others a flat rate is paid. As in the hospitals, we have witnessed an increase in per diem rates, but these are still considerably below costs.

In New York City, public funds are available not only for institutional care, but for placement of aged persons in foster homes. The advantages of such a program are obvious, both emotionally for the client who prefers to remain in the community, and financially for the community, for the cost is so much less than institutional care.

Several homes for the aged have also benefited from Hill-Burton Funds. To receive them and meet the non-sectarian stipulation, some institutions had to change their by-laws; others their charters. Naturally, this caused concern. Historically, Jewish homes for the aged have been geared to the religious and cultural needs of the residents. Experience here shows, however, that the Jewish character of these institutions has remained unchanged despite the commitment to a non-sectarian policy. This is no doubt due to the fact that aged people tend toward their own group identification, and the Jewish atmosphere of the institutions attracts persons of the same cultural and religious persuasions. The fact that the Hill-Burton Act permits voluntary self-referrals reduces further the impact of the non-sectarian stipulation.

For many homes for the aged, the experience with government has been most constructive. The cushion of public funds has made it possible to admit

people according to their need for service without reference to their ability to pay. It also has stimulated higher standards; it has made possible enriched and, exceedingly important, expanded programs to reduce the waiting lists. In all cases where government purchased service for the aged and chronically ill, Jewish homes have experienced no interference in their internal management and no loss of their autonomy.

Until recently, even where funds were available, many Jewish homes refused this assistance. However, today, with the increasing number of aged who need care and with the rising cost of care, there is extraordinary pressure for new and expanded facilities and more communities are beginning to avail themselves of this help.

#### To Child Placement Agencies

In the child placement field, government has for some time accepted financial responsibility. Twelve out of seventeen children's agencies now receive funds and a number of family service agencies operating children's services also receive payments for this type of care.<sup>3</sup> The average income from public sources is about 33% of the operating budget. Though the nature of the payments has changed, and per diem rates have increased with the years, income from public sources here, too, does not adequately reflect rising costs.

A new formula has recently been introduced in New York City. This formula more closely approximates per diem rate to cost of care, and provides about 90% reimbursement to voluntary child care agencies. Through this plan, government provided an incentive to low standard agencies to improve the quality of their services and encouraged high standard agencies to maintain their level

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

of operation and expand their programs.

Certain stipulations with respect to accounting procedures and professional standards and qualifications (these were determined cooperatively between public representatives and voluntary agency personnel) were part of this new agreement, but none of the private agencies felt that they were inhibiting in any respect to present or prospective programs. The agencies continue to operate in their accustomed manner, without infringement on their autonomy despite the fact that the public agency may soon be considered the senior partner fiscally.

Public grants, which open new vistas of service to children, are also available to our placement agencies for research, experimentation, and demonstration programs. In regard to the non-sectarian stipulation which accompanies some of these grants, the picture is somewhat confused. There are states which make public funds contingent upon a policy of no discrimination; yet the law in these same states provides that wherever "practicable" a child should be placed in a home of his own religion. Obviously, government recognizes the role of the agency in *loco parentis*. In practice, this has meant an interpretation that is consonant with sectarian auspices.

As services become more specialized, however, as treatment units are developed, we find that there is insistence that children of other faiths be served as a pre-requisite to receiving public funds. Perhaps this is due to government's recognition of these treatment centers as hospital facilities; we are not certain. But in those of our agencies which accept non-Jewish children, Jewish mores, customs and milieu are upheld. Respect, of course, is given to the basic religious needs of children of other faiths, but this does not alter the specific character of the agency. This follows the Biblical precept, "and if a stranger shall sojourn among you . . . ye shall

have one statute both for the stranger and for him that is born in the land."<sup>4</sup>

Here, too, despite the availability of public funds for child placement, some Jewish agencies still will not accept such financial aid, even though it would mean expanding existing services or creating much needed new programs.

#### To Family Service and Child Guidance Agencies

Here government is only now beginning to be helpful. Out of a total of 96 agencies, 74 replied to a questionnaire and 10 of them indicated that they receive such help.<sup>5</sup> These few agencies reported a meager contribution, an average of less than 5% of the budget. Since family agencies often provide services which touch upon other functional fields, aged, child placement or adoption, and for which they receive public funds included in this figure, it is obvious the direct contribution for casework and counseling is considerably less.

Grants in this field are made for specific programs, for research or for general expansion of services. Some of the contracts call for very rigid control with respect to policy, selection of clients, and financial accountability. They specify not only the nature of the service, but the geographical area to be served and the specific clients to be referred (Youth Board in New York City), with the result that a large number of referrals may be non-Jewish and atypical of the clientele of the agency. I would say, parenthetically, that this may not have unalloyed results, for the understanding of these cultural differences may well result in modifications in methods and procedures which will

<sup>4</sup> Bible: Numbers, 9:14.

<sup>5</sup> A questionnaire was circulated by Dr. Herbert Aptekar, Executive Director of the Jewish Community Services of Long Island, in connection with his discussion of this paper.

influence the work with our own clients.

To some extent the rigid stipulations in a few of the present agreements may be due to the very newness of the program. It is understandable that any administrator of a new and experimental project would wish to establish as many criteria as possible in order to be assured that the operation of the program would be consonant with the purpose. Once the program has gone through a reasonable period of experience, I am inclined to believe that greater flexibility will be permitted, as it is in the other fields. I would venture to say that a more flexible interpretation might have been evolved even at the beginning had the participating agencies taken a more active role in formulating the program.

There is no definitive philosophy on the part of government in this field and the voluntary agencies have had only a beginning experience. Nevertheless, the trend toward increasing contributions in this field is clear. More grants are made for special services like homemaker, psychiatry, and rehabilitation, but family services and child guidance still remain a major philanthropic responsibility. Wherever these funds have been available, however, their usefulness in furthering the services of the family agencies has been unchallenged.

#### To Community Centers and Camps

In the community center and camping fields, public funds are conspicuously absent, despite the burgeoning need for programs for youth and aged. Save for some few community centers receiving funds for special "G.I." programs, or for day care centers operated within the center building, only New York has reported some experience and this has been extremely limited.<sup>6</sup> A few agencies there

<sup>6</sup> Questionnaire circulated to some 200 agencies by Mr. Harold Arian, Administrative Secre-

have contracts with the Youth Board (a State authorized agency for the prevention of delinquency) which pays for the services of group workers, or with the Community Mental Health Board which provides funds for a guidance clinic. Both contracts stipulate non-sectarian intake. Where a center was dedicated to a Jewish-oriented program, some difficulties were apparent. In a few instances the open-door policy resulted in so radical a change in the membership, that the centers cancelled their contracts to preserve their character. This experience, however, does not necessarily indicate that public funds cannot be used constructively by our community centers. Rather, it posed the question as to whether these Jewish community centers were appropriately located to perform their primary function of serving a predominantly Jewish neighborhood. There is at present a committee of center workers in New York actively engaged in clarifying these questions with government officials.

#### To Vocational Guidance and Placement Agencies

The contribution of public funds is a comparatively recent innovation for vocational guidance and placement agencies. Where such funds are available, agencies receive fees for service for selected clientele, such as the handicapped, the aged, and the veterans, or grants for special projects.

About 50% of the agencies qualifying for public funds are already receiving them,<sup>7</sup> with others exploring means of obtaining these resources. The experience has been positive and has stimu-

tary of the New York Metropolitan Section of the Jewish Welfare Board, in connection with his discussion of this paper.

<sup>7</sup> Questionnaire circulated by Mr. Roland Baxt, Executive Director of the Federation Employment & Guidance Services, in connection with his discussion of this paper.

lated the growth and development of many of the agencies. While acceptance of funds has meant a non-sectarian intake policy, this has posed no special problem, for the character of the agencies remained intact.

This then is the experience of our agencies and the present practice of government.

#### Maintaining the Jewish Character of Agencies

Despite the obvious advantages, only about 100 of our agencies receive such funds, and more than half are hospitals. Some local governments do not make such funds available, but even where such resources could be had, agencies still hesitate to seek them out. Has the phrase "without discrimination to race, color or creed," which generally accompanies these grants, influenced the decision to remain apart? Are we justified in permitting our anxieties to deny to our clients more and better service? Let us look at this a bit and perhaps we can feel more comfortable when we study the nature of government's attitude and our own traditional obligations.

Experience has shown that maintaining the Jewish character of our agencies need not be in conflict with making our services available to a portion of the larger community. Actually, we are aided in this objective by the liberal interpretation by public officials who hold that the receipt of public funds need not conflict with the maintenance of sectarian service. As a matter of fact, Mr. Charles Schottland, former Commissioner of Social Security, stated only last year,<sup>8</sup> that while no one could give a definitive answer, it was his belief that "government never intended

<sup>8</sup> Charles A. Schottland, "Use of Public Funds by Jewish Agencies," presented at the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Washington, D. C., November, 1958.

to deny use of funds to agencies serving the general community purpose even though they concentrated on service to a specific religious group."

The law has been helpful, too, in a somewhat different fashion. A Supreme Court ruling advanced that "government is obligated to assume financial responsibility for the general welfare benefits to which all citizens are entitled without regard to religious belief."<sup>9</sup> This interpretation is possible because the emphasis is on help to the *individual* irrespective of the auspices under which the help is given. It works hand and glove with the principle of self-determination, whereby the client is guaranteed the freedom of choice and the agency retains the privilege of selecting those clients who could benefit not only from the technical skills but from the sectarian milieu to which the agency is committed by history and tradition. Thus far, in practice, government has respected the need for different sectarian milieu else why would they allocate funds to organizations clearly identified in name and purpose as sectarian services?

Those who fear that this practice may weaken the tenet of separation of state and church should find some comfort in the knowledge that government makes a very careful distinction between aid to religion and welfare benefits. It unequivocally differentiates between religious education for which it assumes no responsibility, and welfare benefits which it is prepared to finance. The position is succinctly summarized in a recent review of the legal aspects of this problem, prepared at the request of one of the voluntary organizations, "In the few instances where the Supreme Court has spoken on the issue of governmental

<sup>9</sup> *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 67 S.Ct. 504, 91 L.Ed. 711, 168 A.L.R. 1392 (1947). Quoted in a review of legal opinions on grants to voluntary agencies (unpublished).

aid to religion the majority has generally indicated a liberal attitude so long as the aid in question is not primarily associated with education, but can be construed as a general welfare benefit."<sup>10</sup> The report adds, however, that "these decisions have involved a sharply-divided Court reflecting fundamental division of thought which reappear in state regulations and legislative delegates. There has been no opinion rendered by the current Court membership. The attitude of New York State is outstandingly liberal in this regard, indicating that it would cooperate in any distribution of funds under the proposed plan; but it would be unrealistic not to anticipate immense pressure against the proposals in Congress from legislators of states where the doctrine of the separation of church and state is more strictly construed, as well as from strongly-opinioned citizen groups." And we would be equally naive if we did not anticipate efforts on the part of some groups to expand the definition of the term "welfare" to include religious observances and religious education.

Up to now our experience has been constructive. We must, however, be alert to any change of attitude that challenges our right to maintain our institutions. It is incumbent upon us to review constantly our relationship with government in the light of our commitment to the Jewish community. We must actively promote the continued liberal interpretation of the welfare laws to guarantee the principle of cultural pluralism and self-determination, while respecting the separation of church and state.

It is not immodest to say that our Jewish agencies have made a major contribution to the general community's welfare even as they have emphasized

<sup>10</sup> Review of Legal Opinions on Grants to Voluntary Agencies. (Unpublished.)

primarily service to the Jewish community. We can continue to remain Jewish agencies and retain our tradition even as we reach out to help others. I remind you of the Talmudic precept, "One should support the poor of the gentiles with the poor of Israel; one should visit the sick of the gentiles with the sick of Israel; and one should bury the dead of the gentiles as one does with the dead of Israel for the sake of ways of peace."<sup>11</sup> Opening our doors to the community is not new; it has always been part of our tradition.

I venture to suggest that our relationship with government need not influence adversely our Jewish values. While Jewish social service must have generic concepts, philosophies and values, it cannot be seen or defined in isolation of the milieu in which it operates. Jewish social work in America must, in practice, be different from Jewish social work in other countries, while at the same time preserving the basic tenets. The survival of Jewish social service does not depend, in my judgment, on the extent of isolation. We have lived through the centuries in association with many civilizations and survived with the basic core of values intact—because we had inner convictions and strove to maintain them. If we have anything to fear, it is our lack of conviction and undefined direction. The commitment of the leaders of our Jewish agencies, agency workers, executives, boards, to *Jewish* communal service can influence the direction in which we move and the use of these funds. I suggest that we need not fear government participation, for this is consonant with our democratic society.

#### Effect of Government Aid on Federation-Agency Relations

We have not fully resolved another important question—the effect of public

<sup>11</sup> *Talmud*: Gitlin, 61a.

funds on the relationship between federations and their constituent agencies. At best, relations between federations and the constituent agencies present a challenge to both. "Domination," "control," "autonomy," "institutional identification," are terms familiar to all of us, though the definition may differ with the seats we occupy. One of the factors that has strengthened, in every instance, the bond between federations and their agencies has been the federations' responsibility to raise and distribute funds, the reliance of the agencies on these resources and their obligation to participate with the federations in joint programming. When the budgets of the agencies reflect an increasingly larger percentage of contribution from public sources and a decreasing percentage of income from federations, a new component has been added. The dual alliance has become a triple entente. We must not close our eyes to the real possibility that the relationship of the agencies to federations may become more attenuated, particularly with respect to the programs for which federations have no financial responsibility.

This may also materially affect program planning, particularly as government funds are used to finance new projects. If public resources are withdrawn, the federation generally is pressed to become the residual legatee of this burden and to assume continued responsibility for these projects. Because the nature and extent of many of these programs may have been determined by the ingenuity and contacts of the executive or the particular preference of the local government, they may not always reflect the most urgent need. Priority for the philanthropic dollar may, therefore, be determined not by careful planning, but by prior commitments. To avoid this, programs financed by public funds in voluntary agencies would necessarily have to be subject to consultation with

and approval of the federations prior to any commitment. Conferences before the fact have been helpful in regulating the nature and extent of these programs.

The uneven development of government financial responsibility for various aspects of social services poses another difficult problem for the central planning agency. In order to maintain a balance of service among the various functional fields, it is necessary that the federations or welfare funds evaluate the financial requirements of a service not alone in relation to community need, but in relation to income from other sources, including governmental bodies. It follows, therefore, that as there is an increase in governmental contributions, the voluntary philanthropic dollar is freed for other requirements, and should be re-deployed. Without this freedom of re-deployment there would inevitably be an over-development in some functional areas and a serious under-development in others. Only with this flexibility is it possible to enlarge services receiving public funds, if this is indicated, and to expand critical areas where no public funds are available.

This position will not always meet with the full approval of the agencies. In their understandable desire to achieve higher quality and to expand in peripheral areas where the need is obvious, agencies naturally wish to retain the increased receipts from public sources with no reduction in the grant from federations. However, if one of the basic convictions for the existence of voluntary philanthropic organizations is that they accept responsibility for welfare functions not adequately covered by government, and another, that they undertake new and unexplored programs and techniques, then it is essential that there be greater flexibility in the distribution of philanthropic funds.

The advantages of central voluntary fund-raising have been demonstrated

throughout the history of our federations. Should not the same principles be applied to public funds—now that these are becoming an increasingly important source of income for our agencies? I believe it is timely to explore the possibility of government making grants (payments for service and new projects) directly to the central planning body of the community. Thus we can be assured of the appropriate distribution of all available funds, public and private, for general communal purposes and orderly development of adequate communal facilities.

The need to clarify this relationship is greater today than ever before. Otherwise, the federations, while raising more money and allocating increasing sums to constituent agencies, may find themselves in the anomalous position of being junior partners, fiscally speaking.

#### Tasks and Questions for the Future

There are other questions. We do not know how much government money we can accept and still retain our voluntary character or whether the amount of money received from government is a crucial factor at all. We have not yet clarified which of the social welfare programs are more advantageously operated under government auspices, or which economic segments of the population can best be served by government or by voluntary agencies, or whether this is a crucial factor.

All of these questions have obviously not been answered. But do we need definitive answers to *every* question *now*, before we embark on cooperative programs with government or enlarge the present ones? I do not think so. Time has often, in the past, answered questions that once seemed insoluble. Experience up to now warrants our confidence that we can deal with these problems even as we experiment with new relationships.

It is inevitable that the greater role of government in social welfare should mean some change in the nature and function of the voluntary agencies. In such a changing world, voluntary agencies, as every viable structure, must either move forward or backward. If our Jewish agencies are to continue to be an integral and vital part of social welfare in this country, they must grow and move forward, for only in this way will they find greater strength. The fear of change can only lead to stagnation.

From what we have seen, the advantages of government funds are obvious. Increased government assistance appears to provide the greatest opportunity for our agencies to keep pace with new knowledge and techniques, and to provide the facilities required for the health and welfare problems that are multiplying faster than our philanthropic resources can absorb. Government contributions have made it possible for us to offer our valuable services to an increasing number of people in our communities. They furnish us with our only opportunity to make effective inroads on our waiting lists. They provide the major source for the enrichment or expansion of existing services and give our agencies the means to accelerate their experimental projects. They have, in some instances, even altered the function of voluntary agencies from one of demonstration to one of broad, sustained communal service.

Experience further indicates that government grants provide leverage for philanthropic funds and prime the pump for increased voluntary support. Less dramatic, perhaps, but no less important, is the motivation government provides for elevating standards and sounder community planning.

Government knows, just as we do, that the cost would be enormously more expensive if it alone were to approximate

the services and facilities of our agencies. It has shown its interest in preserving private philanthropy as an expression of our system of private enterprise and subsidize our work as it does other areas when it is in the national interest. It has freed the philanthropic dollar for responsibilities unique to the voluntary sectarian agency. It has permitted us to retain the Jewish character of our agencies and has not intruded on their operation or autonomy.

I am deeply convinced that our Jewish agencies have an obligation to seek government aid where it is available, and to press for increased grants. For today with a rise in family breakdown and increasing problems of youth and aged, the percentage of government funds which directly affect our community health and welfare programs is actually lower than it was in 1950.

It is our further obligation to take an active role in educating government in the value of preventive services as a sound communal investment. Despite the increase in government grants, there is still greater emphasis on emergency and critical situations than on prevention. Government is willing to pay a voluntary agency for the placement of a child after the home has been disrupted, but it is not yet prepared to finance the services necessary to keep the home intact. It is prepared to pay for an aged person in an institution, but makes no contribution to home care programs—though there is beginning to be a breakthrough. Many government sponsored programs are for the most part expedient, developed as "fingers-in-the-dike" measures to meet emergency community problems.

It is our further obligation to stimu-

late and encourage the development of appropriate publicly operated services and to press for adequate funds to assure the maintenance of high professional standards in all public welfare programs. Government must be encouraged to budget for welfare needs, both in the voluntary and public sectors, with the same vision and generosity it would budget for defense. In furthering this development we must also constantly question ourselves. We should be mindful that the lure of additional funds and the prestige or larger operations do not propel us into programs which violate our obligation to the Jewish community and weaken sound community planning. We must remain ever vigilant in maintaining the primacy of Jewish federations and welfare funds in planning and promulgating Jewish communal services.

The optimum relationship between private and government agencies cannot be attained by a *laissez-faire* attitude on the part of the voluntary agencies. It calls for an active bilateral relationship in the formulation of all policy and program. This could be achieved only if the voluntary agencies were freed of the inhibiting anxieties. Individual agencies can be encouraged in this effort if our federations take and state a courageous policy.

The very nature of our sensitive relationship with government is one of change. In a sense every new step we take with governmental financial assistance is a pioneering venture and depends on self-reliance and mutual respect for ultimate achievement in the public interest. I have no doubt that our agencies have an abundance of these resources.

## FUND RAISING AS A SOCIAL WORK PROCESS \*

by ROBERT I. HILLER

United Jewish Federation  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

AND

MEYER SCHWARTZ

Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

### Fund Raising as an Entity and as the Campaign

FUND raising in this paper is defined in the context of a federated fund raising body in the Jewish community, known variously as a Jewish Welfare Fund or a Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. It is a contributors and agency controlled organization whose principal duties are acquiring and spreading information on welfare needs, coordinating the work and reviewing budgets for the participating agencies, campaigning for contributions to meet the federated body's accepted share of these budgets, and disbursing these funds to the agencies. The funds are raised by volunteers, with the assistance of professionals. The funds raised by the Jewish community are disbursed to local, national, and overseas agencies. In this definition *the campaigning for contributions is inextricably wound up with interpretation, coordination, social planning, budgeting, and allocation.*

In this paper *fund raising is conceived, in the sense of the campaign for contributions, as described in Building The*

*Successful Campaign*,<sup>1</sup> because it is about this that questions are raised.

### Significance of the Topic

Fund raising has a functional significance for the Jewish community in America today. The campaign for funds, itself, has become, intended or not, the means by which millions of Americans visibly identify themselves as Jewish, as belonging to an entity known as the "Jewish community." It is no exaggeration to postulate that an overwhelming number of individuals use their campaign participation as solicitors and contributors to express their "Jewishness," and were the campaign for welfare funds to be absent these individuals might not seek their identification in other activity. In truth, they might even be lost to the Jewish community.

In the campaign for welfare funds on behalf of fellow Jews, individuals can identify themselves as Jewish regardless of divergent ideologies and different ethnic, cultural, and social backgrounds. The campaign has become one great expressive Jewish Common Denominator, making for the existence and continuation of the American Jewish community.

\* A condensation of paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 29, 1959.

<sup>1</sup> Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York, 1958.