

2. The executive was careful to stimulate and facilitate initiative on the part of the layman and exercise great care not to stifle this initiative. No effort was made to manipulate the leadership. At the proper time, questions were raised which started a chain reaction in the minds of the lay leadership. This resulted in meetings, obtaining of information, and discussion which brought about the desired change. The executive was the enabler who assisted individuals and groups in the community to understand the problems and to participate in the solution of the problems.
3. The executive served as a fact finder and helped the leadership to articulate their thinking and to focus properly on their course of action.
4. The executive was careful not to put himself in the position where these matters became his problem. At all times they were discussed in terms of what was best for the community.
5. The executive never depended upon one situation or one item to affect the thinking of the lay leadership. All possible resources were brought to bear in a given situation and there was always multiple factors at play in guiding the thinking of persons involved.

The professional is the catalyst between the layman and the problem un-

der consideration. There should exist a two-way communication system between the layman and the professional. The layman contributes his understanding of community need and community reaction, the professional must channel this sense of need in the proper direction at the proper time toward the desired goal. The professional should not assume the role of deciding what is good for the community and then try to manipulate certain key people to go along with his thinking and use them as a "battering ram" to achieve his objectives. The average layman is a mature, intelligent individual who can make sound decisions given adequate data. It is important that he be treated on that level.

In this paper, an effort was made to show the validity of some principles in the community organization process. No attempt was made to become involved in a comprehensive discussion.

It is hoped that this paper would stimulate the development of case material in the community organization process. Like many community executives, the author was originally trained as a case worker, and it was very difficult for him to grasp the real meaning of the community organization process without having case material comparable to the material available to a trainee in the field of case work. Professionals have a responsibility to develop a body of case materials illustrating the community organization process which can be used to teach, refine, improve, and develop sound methods in community organization.

DISCUSSION OF MR. STONE'S PAPER

By BERNARD DUBIN
Jewish Federation,
Camden, N. J.

MR. Stone speaks of the paucity of case material in the field of community organization. Actually, the problem is deeper—there is lacking an organized medium for stimulating creative thinking and the development of the science of Jewish community organization. The practitioner in the field of Jewish community organization is left, in large measure, on his own resources in developing his skill. And, though courses of study in schools of social work are available, in the general field of administration and community organization, there is no such medium today for teaching Jewish community organization. Within our experience, the field of Jewish community organization has taken on a new meaning to such a degree that general courses are not adequate. The Jewish Conference in the last two years, through its programming, is attempting to fill the gap.

Thus, we are constantly on the alert for new ideas, experiences and developments in other communities to advance our objectives in building an organized Jewish community. Actually, at the core of our problem is a need to define and understand certain basics:

1. What is the function of the Jewish community organization?
2. What are its objectives?
3. What is the function of the Executive of the Jewish community organization vis a vis the community,

the Board and Executives of the functional agencies?

It seems to me that testing any principle has to be in relationship to our function and the structure of our community organization. At this point, I might indicate, my beginning too, in social work was the field of case work. I feel that some of the principles applicable in case work are equally fundamental concepts in community organization. Surely, they apply to group work. I feel we would do well to examine the common principles in all areas of social work.

Mr. Stone, in discussing his actual experiences in Toledo, has described the developments in fields of group work, case work and the care of the aged, and finally his own role in each of these situations. To produce the changes he felt desirable for the welfare of the community, various methods were used. He calls them trial balloons, talking to influential people, surveys, etc. Yet, if we examine each closely in terms of its objective, we discern a common thread—namely, to develop a fuller *understanding* in the community in order to condition the attitude of its membership so that they could accept, as basic in their own conviction, the validity of social change. Actually, the processes utilized by Mr. Stone were primarily *methods*. The objective was to develop the quality of understanding needed for change.

Isn't that similar to what we try to do in case work and also in group work with our clients? In case work we hope to help the client achieve some insight to his problems to enable him to change. In group work we hope for group understanding to help them make the proper decision and move forward. In community organization, we have in many respects the composite of these two processes. First, dealing with the individual, such as our President, or Board member, hoping he will assume a leadership role; and, secondly, our relations with Committees, our Boards or Community Councils or Community-wide meetings, looking to the group to gain this needed understanding or insight to be more effective in their respective roles.

Thus, I would like to separate from what is the function of the Executive, the processes we utilize to discharge that responsibility. Secondly, what is the unique contribution of the Director in these areas.

First, we must be ever mindful that our community organization is the result of voluntary association. Participation in it depends upon the choice made by each individual. If we measure participation financially, then, of course, during the last five or six years world events kindled in heretofore unprecedented numbers the desire and need to identify with the Jewish community and participate in its common undertakings.

The challenge we face is to utilize in the community organization, its services and planning, this heightened interest by significant numbers. I recognize this problem varies from community to community, depending upon the scope of the community organization, the direction it is taking, the objectives it has established for itself as the Jewish com-

munity organization to serve the entire Jewish community in its common needs.

We should remember that social agencies locally, and Jewish group movements nationally, antedated professional social work. Social convictions, individual drive and satisfaction motivated individual participation. Thus, a philosophy of organization took root. A *raison d'etre* became fixed and a methodology took form. If, in Toledo there was no family agency for whatever the reason, and some problems became so apparent in the community that it moved the leadership to take steps to meet this problem, the Center, as the only communal agency, added a family case work agency as well. In Camden, the Federation came before any functional agencies. To the merchant that is good business. He sells hardware and when his customers seek shoes because there is no shoe shop in town, it is logical for him to develop a shoe department. Sound merchandising principles come later. Specialization, in whatever field, is a later development, based upon our experience.

We, as professionals, bring a unique quality to the community—unique in the sense that it comes to us through training and experience and with it we acquire an expertness. This is the contribution we make to the community organization process.

Admittedly, in 1951, this is not as readily recognized by all as is the specialization of lawyers or physicians. Nevertheless, in the last decade, we have made considerable strides in that direction. The contribution we make to this process of community organization, among others, is one of clarification of, and conviction about social values, communal responsibilities, servicing our Jewish communal needs as Jews in a Jewish

community. This is our core that we hold to with conviction and is what *we* bring to the process. The problem arises for us—how do we galvanize the community in relationship to this? How do we get them to accept the validity of programs which need to be established to provide the most effective services as we know them? How do we get them to accept the desirable organization to carry out this goal? That was the problem Mr. Stone faced in each of his problems.

We are aware that each person with whom we deal, in an effort to help him develop his understanding to the level we feel necessary, comes to us with differing experiences, backgrounds and vested interests. Thus, the person who, through the years, pioneered and struggled in Toledo to build the Home for the Aged and maintain it outside of the central community organization looks with suspicion on the motivations of the community organizer who seeks to help, though uninvited, in the development of the program of the home in keeping with current demonstrated concepts of the most constructive program for care of the aged. On the other hand, in Toledo, as is obvious from Mr. Stone's papers, the Center leadership, having a longer experience with the central community organization and probably confident of its motivation, is much more ready to participate in communal planning.

Thus, Mr. Stone has to evaluate his methodology in relationship to the background, experiences and attitudes of the individual or group with whom he is dealing. Again, if we are clear on the contribution we expect the professional to make, which is in part the enunciation of social values and communal responsibilities, we can then select the process we anticipate will produce the change in

attitude or understanding we hope to achieve.

Trips to other institutions, self-surveys, surveys by outside experts, gathering material on the experiences of other communities, the utilization of the enlightened and convinced communal leader to convince others, are all important media and need be used with discretion. But, they are only media and should clearly be identified as a tool to achieve our objective.

At this point, another problem poses itself. The processes Mr. Stone described reaches a limited number, albeit they reach the person responsible for making the decision. I would like us to give greater attention to the question, how do we reach the large numbers? If I may be permitted to use the simile of the pebble tossed in the pond, and the size of the ripples it creates as they move into outer circles, I can more readily illustrate my point.

The community organizer is like a pebble. Those in close contact with him and the community structure, as we reach outward—the President, the Executive Committee, Board of Directors, special committees of volunteers in various other capacities—are affected in their thinking and action through this association. Admittedly, the conclusion drawn by the individual may differ from those of the goals set forth in principles in community organization. This too is wholesome. The important thing is to develop a disciplined method of handling differences. The further we get from the Center, where the pebble hit the water, the less sharp is the impact until on the periphery we get a casual and indifferent reaction. One of our problems is this area. It is on this perimeter that the large numbers of the Jewish community find themselves. Though we

DISCUSSION OF MR. STONE'S PAPER

have learned how to reach them in greater degree in recent years, this still presents itself as one of our greatest challenges.

In developing our communal programs, we must be ever mindful of the principle Mr. Stone sets forth, namely, gearing the process of community organization to the level of the community's acceptance. Obviously, this varies with each situation—who is involved, the depth of his conviction, his resistance to change and finally and all important, the quality of leadership.

In discussing Mr. Stone's paper, I have tried to delineate the various forces which are operative in producing the social change and processes we deem

desirable for the healthy growth of Jewish community organization. We need to define the function of each person and what we expect from ourselves as the professional as well as the layman in this process, because it is a most complex one.

We need give more thought to the precise objective of the Jewish community, the forces which hold it together and the areas in which the central structure should operate, the role played by the individual and the methods we can employ to reach him. I look forward to the Jewish Conference devoting itself more and more to this subject so that we can develop the kind of case material and literature necessary for the practitioner.

MINUTES OF ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

HELD TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1951, 1:30 P.M.

AT THE HOTEL TRAYMORE,

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

IN the absence of President Charles Zunser, 1st Vice-President Martin M. Cohn called the meeting to order and presided.

Louis H. Sobel moved the adoption of a resolution expressing the sorrow of the Conference membership over the untimely death of Joseph E. Kapell in a railroad accident enroute to the Conference. The motion was adopted by a standing vote in silence.

President Zunser's Wire

Martin Cohn expressed regret that illness prevented Charles Zunser from attending, and read the following telegram from Mr. Zunser:

"Please convey to officers, members and delegates my profound good wishes for a fruitful and successful Conference. I believe that within the limitations of time and space your Program Committee went to great pains to provide a wide coverage of the most essential problems of concern to Jewish social workers. But a successful Conference must have not only good and timely prepared papers but depends in large measure upon time and opportunity for free discussion from floor. I take natural pride in the fact that the three-year work for the Self-Study is finally being brought to an end in this administration and

praise is due to its special committee for doing so good a job. The Membership Committee this year was particularly active and I was glad to help by making a flying trip to most of the large Jewish population centers, thanks to the interest of Dr. Maurice Hexter who made this possible and who was also responsible for a campaign to increase lay membership in New York. Commendation is also due to the Pension Study Committee, the Committee on Nominations, the Editorial Board of the *QUARTERLY*, the Board of Consultants in furthering publication negotiations with YIVO on the Anniversary Volume. Eli Cohen made an excellent resourceful Secretary. I regret my not being with you at this time of all Conferences but my discharge from hospital Thursday and doctor's orders for strict convalescence make my absence from the Traymore imperative. Greetings and good wishes to all of you."

Registration

Eli Cohen, Secretary, reported that 875 persons had registered up to 1:30 P.M. today.

Treasurer's Report

In the Treasurer's absence, Eli Cohen gave the following report: