

The Purposes of the Jewish Community Center Movement: An Appraisal of Their Operation

by CARL URBONT

THERE IS much data in the literature of social institutions to show how complicated is the search for a definition of purpose. This search assumes major importance for Jewish institutions facing ever greater challenges because of the complex changes within the Jewish community of contemporary America.

The majority of American Jews are now native-born, and masses of them are college educated. They have access to almost every sphere of American society, are free to enjoy a life of dignity and, in consequence, feel free to choose to retain or to give up their group identity. Thus, paradoxically, it is free society, the very thing Jews everywhere have labored to achieve, that is now challenging their group survival. The ensuing problem facing the Jewish community underlines the need for a reexamination of the vitality of its institutions. Among these the Jewish community center movement holds a strategic position.

The forerunners of the Jewish community center were the first Young Men's Hebrew Associations, established during the second half of the nineteenth century as a counter influence to the Christian missionary work of the Young Men's Christian Association. The movement grew rapidly as it attracted increasing numbers of Jews who had come to the United States from all parts of Europe to escape persecution. They were of very diverse background, Orthodox and Reform, Sephardi and Ashkenazi, traditional and "worldly."

By the beginning of the 20th century, the Y's, settlements, and Jewish neighborhood centers concentrated on the "Americanization" of the newcomers, and tried to protect them, through social action programs, from many injustices suffered by immigrants during the industrial expansion of this country. In a certain sense, these agencies also met the newcomers'

group urge to survive as Jews in their new environment. In New York and Philadelphia, courses were offered in vocational training of unskilled Jews, as well as in the arts, literature, English, and foreign languages. Formal Jewish education programs for young children and adults were also provided.

The trend toward a national organization of Y's was initiated in 1913, and the newly established Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations gave impetus everywhere to the spread of the centers.

During World War I, the Y's, with the aid of the Jewish Welfare Board which came into being in 1917, extended services to Jews in the United States armed forces. The JWB then mobilized Jewish communities throughout the country to develop effective cooperative social and hospitality programs for soldiers and sailors in local Y's. This cooperation was a strong unifying influence and aroused widespread interest in the Jewish community for the continuation of such joint efforts on a permanent basis after the war. In 1921 JWB and the Council of Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations merged and the new agency, the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), set about strengthening the then existing Y's. Under the impact of the depression of the 1930's, they began to refer to themselves as Jewish community centers. They sought to reach into many new areas of community service to meet new needs.

When the enormous dimensions of the tragedy the Jews suffered at the hands of the Nazis became known, a deep sense of responsibility for the perpetuation of Jewish life was felt by large sections of the American Jewish community. The Jewish community centers, too, considered it their primary function "to serve as a reservoir of Jewish life and influence in the community, and more particularly to help bring our youth nearer to Jewish life in sentiment, thought, and action."¹ In recent years, however, certain spokesmen of the movement have sensed a complacency within the community which has weakened the Jewish orientation of the centers. The movement has grown rapidly, serving today more than 700,000 members in some 300 centers throughout the country, with an aggregate annual budget of approximately \$32,500,000 in 1965. Its great potential—the size of its membership and representation in most communities throughout America—make the undeniable absence of a clear direction of purpose in its work disquieting to many of its leaders. A

¹ Louis Kraft, *A Century of the Jewish Community Center* (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1954), p. 20.

movement, especially one within a minority group, that does not shape its own program through its own sense of purpose is bound to drift, and may eventually become engulfed by the values, interests, and events of the majority culture.

This study was undertaken to determine the stated Jewish and general purposes of the center movement today, and to examine the relative expenditure of energies and resources for their implementation in the centers. An attempt was also made to determine the underlying causes for some of the movement's problems, as reflected in the findings, and to touch upon possible remedial action.

BASIC AIMS FOR CENTER MOVEMENT

The following assumptions were established in the study, against which Jewish community center purposes could be tested:

1. It is a Jewish institution;
2. The public, which supports it, considers it primarily an institution of Jewish identification, as well as an instrument for Jewish group survival;
3. Its purposes should therefore promote group cohesiveness among Jews;
4. The character of its present purposes should set it apart as a unique institution in a free society.

These, in broad outline, are also based on the recommendations made by Oscar Janowsky in his famous "Statement of Principles"² which attempted to develop some ground rules for the Jewish community centers, the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations, and other kindred agencies seeking affiliation with JWB.

Its specific guidelines stressed the necessity for injecting Jewish spiritual values into all programs, including recreation, and for stressing individual as well as group needs. Janowsky also saw the center as a means for furthering the democratic way of life, and as an instrument for integration of the individual Jew and the Jewish group into the total American community, without loss of their identity as Jews.

He thus saw the centers serving in the dual role of guardians of Jewish group loyalties and of protagonists of the free society that tends to weaken these very loyalties. The community's growing need for Jew-

² Oscar I. Janowsky, *JWB Survey* (New York, 1948).

ish group identification made it all the more necessary to establish whether, after a lapse of almost 20 years, such purposes were still to be found among the centers' stated aims and, more significantly, among the aims actively implemented today.

Janowsky's major contribution was that his report aroused a preoccupation with the purposes of the center movement.

Over the years, numerous pronouncements have been made about purpose, which were doubtless motivated by the malaise of thoughtful center leaders over problems caused by various changes in the Jewish community: shifts of large segments of the Jewish population to suburban areas and the ensuing disintegration of old ethnocentric Jewish neighborhoods; the reported increase in the incidence of intermarriage among Jews, and the loss of numerous professional center workers to other fields. Expressions of doubt as to whether the "working aims" of the centers were sufficiently focused to cope with these problems became more frequent. Statements on what ought to be the purposes had to be related to the actual state of affairs in the center.

The present study provided no easy answers. But though its limitations are possibly not very much different from those of the Janowsky report of 1948, it has shed some light on the current relationship between center avowals of aims and implementations. In doing so, it has raised and sharpened the edges of many issues which should disturb complacency if, indeed, such complacency exists, about the certainty of a future of the movement as a significant factor in American Jewish life.

METHODOLOGY

The Jewish community centers have exercised wide latitude in the use of such terms as purposes, objectives, aims, methods, goals, principles—a difficulty that had been largely overcome by initial definitions of the terms "purpose" and "aim." Purpose was defined as a philosophical system of ideas which serves as a guide for the behavior of those functioning within the organization. Aims were identified as the component unit parts of a purpose, motivating the organization's leadership to strive toward specifically desired goals.

With these definitions as a basis, the study, concluded in 1964, was conducted in the following phases:

1. An inventory of the current stated aims was compiled from responses to an open-ended questionnaire to executive directors, request-

ing institutional documents containing statements of purpose. This first questionnaire was mailed to 151 representative centers in large, intermediate, and small communities. From the 55 responses and documents received, 66 discrete aims were culled, refined, the frequency with which they were mentioned was noted, and they were then incorporated into an inventory. Brevity of the inventory required the combination of certain like aims: i.e., "knowledge of Jewish history" and "languages," were recorded as *Jewish knowledge*; "spirituality," "spiritual welfare," and "religion," as *Judaism*; "athletics" and "sports," as *physical growth*.

2. These 66 aims were then listed in a second questionnaire and mailed to the executive directors of the original 151 centers. The directors were requested to scale the degree of implementation of the aims in their own center by encircling any one of the following values for each: 1) high degree of implementation; 2) moderate; 3) low; 4) not implemented at all. In a concluding question the participants were also asked to add any aim that might have been inadvertently omitted from the list, and to suggest one or two ideal priority aims that should be operating in their individual center. Responses to the second questionnaire were received from 108 executive directors. (See Appendix A.)

3. A hierarchy, or ranking, of the operating aims in the entire country was developed from the responses to the second questionnaire, starting at the high of rank one, and descending to the lowest rank of 52. The list was arranged in a manner arbitrarily defining the upper half of ranked aims as receiving strong-to-moderate implementation in the country as a whole, and the lower half as getting little or no implementation. The midpoint was rank 24. The analysis that followed was based upon this ranking order. (See Appendix B, Column 1.)

GENERAL AIMS vs. JEWISH AIMS

Before the ranking procedure, the numerical "votes" received from 108 centers reflected a general belief on the part of executive directors that their agencies strongly implemented their stated aims, with high expenditure of staff energy and agency resources. The numerical responses also suggested the existence of an idealistic belief in the practicability of the center movement's aims. However, the grouping of the aims and their ranking according to the strength of their implementation showed some significant revelations, such as the higher ranking value of a general, rather than a Jewish orientation (Appendix B).

General Aims

RECREATION

The most significant finding in the study was that the overwhelming majority of directors (89) voted the aim "to provide recreation for its members" as commanding the greatest degree of staff energies and resources. A close correlation existed between the evaluation of this aim in the country as a whole and in communities of all sizes, although it was ranked first in intermediate and small communities and second in the large communities, including Metropolitan New York. A further analysis revealed that this recreation aim, grouped with two others relating to the use of leisure and "opportunities for deriving fun," averaged the highest ranking of all groupings of aims, both general and Jewish.

There was, however, contradiction between the high degree of implementation of recreational aims and the executive directors' written responses to the concluding question of the second questionnaire. This question, it will be remembered, was designed to invite a narrative value judgment regarding the one or two most important aims in each center. A tabulation of responses to this question (Appendix C) rated these aims in the following order: "Development of the personality," and "personality development of the Jew" were the two of highest priority in all the respondent centers. "Recreation" was ranked here as fifth in order of priority.

There may have been procedural as well as conceptual reasons for this difference in treatment of the recreational aims by the same respondents. Approximately 30 per cent of the executives did not answer the concluding question at all, and those who did respond seemed not to put their best effort forward. It appeared as though many of them scanned at random the list of aims in the questionnaire, in order to find and record "one or two most important aims." Since the eye tended to rest on page two of the questionnaire, where the concluding one was found, only seven aims, or 26 per cent of those listed on page two, were "forgotten." On page one, 20, or 50 per cent of those listed, were "forgotten." One may further speculate that the treatment of the recreational aim in the last question was implicitly a reflection of the subjective feelings of the executives about recreation in the center. While they originally "voted" that this group of aims was the most highly implemented, they seemed to agree that recreational purposes should not have priority

value. They appeared to reveal a subjective devaluation of the recreational aims because they preferred to remember personality development ideals as "most important."

PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

In the responses to the concluding question general personality development was ranked higher than the Jewish aspect of this development, and this tended to confirm the assumptions of such a spokesman for the movement as Sanford Solender,³ that center objectives focus more upon the "total personality" than upon any sectarian aspect of it.

If in the ranking of all 66 aims of the questionnaire recreation had any "competitor" at all, it was the aim related to the "value and dignity of the individual," which emerged at second place in the hierarchy. In the order of 52 ranks into which all the aims were classified, the difference between ranks 1 and 2 was as indistinguishable as two runs due to a single lucky hit at a baseball game. The executives did not agree on which of the two aims was to be ranked first. In the large communities, "the value and dignity of the individual" took precedence over "recreation," 77 respondents ranking it as highly implemented, and 29 as moderately implemented.

It was interesting to note that the more general the language used in phrasing each of the ten personality development aims, the higher their ranking tended to be. Thus, the five higher ranking aims were broad generalizations, such as "value and dignity of the individual"; "opportunities for growth"; "interests of participants"; "further personality development," and "self-expression." The remaining aims, more specific in definition, were placed lower in the hierarchy: "to encourage creativity"; "improve character"; "improve social skills"; "improve physical capabilities," and "promote mental and intellectual growth."

The inference is that the respondents seemed to be less sure about the degree of implementation of aims with more specific meaning than of those phrased more rhetorically, even where these appeared to have the same intent. This suggests a permissive, informal attitude toward program in the centers, as well as a vagueness about objectives. It would be fair to postulate that the center movement's goals would be more concrete if the value attached to implemented aims moved from higher

³ Sanford Solender, "The Place of the Jewish Community Center in Jewish Life: A Formulation of the Position of the Center," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, XXXIV, No. 1, Fall 1957 (New York: National Conference of Jewish Communal Service), 43.

for the specific, to lower for rhetorical generalizations. On the other hand, one can also understand the tendency of the center field to establish the broadest operational policies, thus permitting the inclusion of a wide variety of program preferences.

It should also be mentioned that a negative correlation was found between the averaged judgments of the executive directors respecting all 66 aims, and the frequency with which they were mentioned in the examined center literature. For example, the ten personality aims had high ranks in the judgment of the executives, but they received relatively infrequent attention in the literature. In other words, high frequency of mention in center documents is not to be misconstrued as high priority in practice, nor does low frequency in the literature imply low implementation.

JEWISH IDENTIFICATION

The center movement's high implementation of aims having to do with intergroup and intragroup relations, in combination with those dealing with Jewish personality development, underscores the center's apparent high and continuing degree of sensitivity about accommodating Jews to the American scene. This is equivalent to a throwback to an earlier period in the history of the Jewish community center movement (1880 to 1920), when the YMHA's had geared themselves to the "Americanization" and adjustment needs of the immigrant.⁴ Its emphasis today may be due to the continued influence of earlier decades. Since "Americanization" needs are now academic, there may be an implicit recognition of the desirability of stressing the acculturation process. The higher ranking of intergroup rather than intragroup relations aims indicates a deeper concern about accommodating to the outgroup and to the general culture. What was the intent of the aims dealing with Jewish internal relations?

The intragroup category included specialized Jewish welfare aims whose intent is to meet particular needs of the Jewish community, for the implicit survival of the Jewish group. This category of aims averaged from high to moderate implementation in the movement, and included: "to provide leadership for, and identification with, the Jewish community" (ranks 5 and 6); "to promote the members' self-acceptance as Jews" (rank 9); "to minister to the welfare and social needs of the members" (rank 10); "to provide opportunities for their participation in the Jewish

⁴ Janowsky, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

community" (rank 15); "to develop understanding among the various subcultures of the Jewish community" (rank 24), and "to contribute to the stability of the Jewish family" (rank 20). These objectives suggest the center's desire to condition the individual to identify with the Jewish community. Presumably, if it succeeds along this line, it may then try to work with him toward meeting the welfare needs of the Jewish group. But can the center successfully instill Jewish attitudes and a sense of Jewish identification, considering its latent tendencies toward acculturation, as revealed in this study? Within and outside the center, many Jews today are alienated, lacking Jewish sentiments, knowledge, a sense of tradition, or Jewish aspirations.

Aims Getting Little or No Implementation

In a figurative sense, the aims which fell below rank 24 were considered to be in the lower half of the ranking column. These were understood in terms of a descent to levels of decreasing effectiveness. In the same sense, all aims below rank 40 were assumed to be in the "lowest of the low" category, reflecting relatively no implementation.

Considerable disparity was found to exist between the stated and operating aims. For example, although the formal literature of the agencies attached great importance to aims related to the "democratic ethos of America," they were "demoted" to the lower half of the ranking column wherein the weakness of their implementation was shown. It is likely that the vote of the executives on these aims is a reflection of the fact that Jews today feel quite secure in America and that, therefore, the respondents found it unnecessary to profess their center's dedication to democratic ideals in responding to a questionnaire that was internal to the Jewish group. It seemed to be taken for granted. The formal documents of the centers, on the other hand, stressed such goals as "community betterment" and "democracy," probably because of a concern about the institutional image in the eyes of the outgroup. Another possibility is that such stated aims may have been retained by a conservative institutional leadership that was generally disinclined to change formal documents deriving from a time, at the turn of the century, when "Americanization" programs had been rife in Jewish social agencies.

Almost all the general aims in the lower half of the ranking hierarchy were related to social action, among which were such processes as "community betterment," "enhancement of American culture," "strengthening the democratic process," and "improving world social conditions."

The latter aim fell all the way to the bottom of the "lowest of the low" category. In spite of all that had been said for years by leaders in the field about the important role of the center in social action or public affairs, such aims proved impotent.

"To help its participants relax from tensions" was classified as a recreation-oriented aim in the study, but its rank contrasted strongly with the other three aims mentioned earlier in the recreation group ("recreation," "leisure," "fun"). It was ranked 27, falling into the category of poorly implemented aims. One may conclude that tensions require a therapy approach, and such techniques of social work are not employed to a significant degree in the center movement today.

JEWISH TRADITION

It is surprising to find evidence of interest in Jewish tradition in the Jewish community center movement, where the name of God has rarely been mentioned in agency pronouncements. While some tradition-oriented aims were getting moderate implementation, others emerged weakly—a manifestation of inherent inconsistencies.

Aims ranked by the respondents as getting moderate implementation in the upper half included "*identification* with Jewish ideals"; "*appreciation* of Jewish values," and "*preservation* of the Jewish heritage." The traditional aims grouped in the lower half, getting poor implementation were: "*appreciation* of the Jewish tradition" (rank 25); "*develop* an appreciation for Jewish ethics" (rank 28); "*encourage* practices in accordance with Jewish morality" (rank 29); "*promote* a Jewish way of life" (rank 30); "*stimulate* Jewish thought and ideas" (rank 36).

The quality of language employed for the tradition aims in the higher ranks seems to express a passive tolerance and respect for the Jewish values transmitted from generation to generation. However, the phrasing of the tradition aims in the lower half, characterized by the use of active pragmatic verbs, seems to manifest an intention to perpetuate these values. As the eye scans down the ranks of the "activist" aims, the language phrasing them gathers word-power progressively, from *appreciate* to *develop*, to *encourage*, to *promote*, to *stimulate*. However, in reality, the ranking order of these aims actually operates in inverse proportion to their semantic strength; the stronger the language, the weaker the rank. While these aims reflect the center movement's literal respect for Jewish law, culture, customs, and social and religious institutions,⁵ their

⁵ Max Radin, "Tradition," in R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, XV (New York, 1942), pp. 62-67.

ranking reveals little purposeful activity to perpetuate them. Indeed, if this were otherwise, averaged opinion throughout the country would not have permitted the aim "to impart Jewish knowledge," which is a strategic way of perpetuating tradition, to slip down to the low implementation rank of 37.

The evaluation of some of these aims showed further inconsistencies in the movement. While, for example, "identification with Jewish ideals" (rank 16) seemed to be operating strongly, by contrast, such related aims as "to promote a Jewish way of life" (rank 30); "to promote identification with world Jewish community" (rank 44); "to teach principles of Judaism to center participants" (rank 45), and "to promote closer ties with the State of Israel" (rank 47), were among the lowest ranked. One may speculate that perhaps the center workers are "practice" oriented and are vague about *how* to make tradition a significant part of the lives of their agency memberships.

It is evident from the weak implementation of "activist" aims related to tradition that the teaching of prophetic Judaism, an important part of the Jewish tradition, cannot be conceived as a center purpose; nor is the propagation of the message in the daily *Shema'*, which three times daily enjoins the believing Jew to ". . . teach them [the traditions of the Torah] diligently unto thy children, and . . . speak of them when thou sittest in thy house, when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

The findings do suggest that there is more consciousness of Jewish tradition in centers serving large communities than in those in small communities. For the country as a whole, it may be generalized that there is neither a marked tendency to reject Jewish tradition nor an active program to propagate it.

Certain groups of aims, related to intragroup relations and to community betterment, found themselves at the very bottom of the hierarchy (with averaged ranks of 41 and 45 respectively) and, according to the criteria employed in this study, are evidently not being implemented. Among the particular aims in these groups were further inconsistencies. The center may be a "common meeting ground" (rank 24) for Jews of different ideologies, for example, but that does not mean that "unity" (rank 30) is being fostered among the various Jewish subcultures. While the use of the center as a common meeting ground fosters the creation of a hospitable climate of receptivity for members of all denominations, orientations, beliefs, and non-beliefs, the movement's composite pro-

gram, as seen in this study, reflects little effort in developing unity among the subcultures around some common rallying point or cause.

INGROUP MARRIAGE

In view of the Jewish community's deep anxieties over the growing rate of intermarriage the failure of the center movement to implement the aim "to provide opportunities for ingroup marriage" is surprising. Its rank (43) seems to indicate that the movement provides for a long list of welfare needs of the Jewish group, but not for the one directly related to its biological and cultural survival. The existing disparity becomes even more perplexing in the light of the high-to-moderate implementation (rank 19) of such a related aim as the "social needs of the Jewish community." One might draw the inference that the center field prefers to assume no ideological position with regard to ingroup marriage, and to operate, as do many Jewish agencies, on the neutralist assumption that the biological or cultural survival of the Jews as a group is possible as long as they are left alone in a free society.

This assumption, which follows the thinking of such founders of the contemporary Jewish community as Isaac Mayer Wise and Solomon Schechter, is seriously questioned by Marshall Sklare, who states:

. . . having finally established themselves in such a society, Jews are now coming to realize that their survival is threatened—not by Gentile hostility, but by Jewish indifference. This is what finally makes intermarriage so bitter a dilemma to confront. . . . In short, it casts into doubt American Jewry's dual ideal of full participation in the society and the preservation of Jewish identity. And once the rate of intermarriage is seen to be growing, the contradiction in the basic strategy of American Jewish adjustment is nakedly exposed.⁶

Whether or not the Jewish community center movement can or wishes to do something about this problem today, is not clear. An examination of the attitudes of the movement's power structure and memberships on the subject of ingroup marriage would shed more light on this question.

THE JEWISH PEOPLE

It was confusing to find the aim "to promote identification with the world Jewish community" at the bottom of the lower half, with a rank of 44, while the related aim "to promote a sense of identification with the Jewish People," by contrast, showed strong implementation, with a rank of 13. Although both aims apparently have the same intent, the center

⁶ Marshall Sklare, "Intermarriage and the Jewish Future," *Commentary*, April 1964, p. 52.

movement probably views the latter as being in consonance with an important social-work objective—identification with people, with Jewish people in this instance. The concept of “the Jewish People,” as espoused by Mordecai Kaplan,⁷ views peoplehood, or Jewish spiritual nationalism, as being essentially a state of mind, an act of consciousness, which is indispensable for the continued “identity of the Jewish people.” Kaplan’s definition is cited here only to contrast it with the center movement’s apparent disinclination to commit itself on an internationally constituted *community* of the Jewish People and its probable desire to confine its interest to Jewish people in America. This inference is reinforced by the center movement’s implied tepid attitude toward the World Federation of Jewish Community Centers and YM and YWHA’s, founded by JWB to promote a cooperative and inspirational tie between the American movement and Jewish centers, and youth groups in many countries abroad.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The center field’s attitude toward “closer ties with the State of Israel,” an aim which found itself among the least implemented (ranked 47, sixth from the lowest), does not reflect the positive attitude of most American Jews toward Israel. Marshall Sklare and Benjamin Ringer, in their study of Baltimore, Md., residents in 1948, found that virtually all had endorsed the establishment and United States recognition of Israel.⁸ In 1952 Sklare and Vosk also interviewed 200 Jewish families in Riverton, and their findings supported the earlier study.⁹

In searching for an explanation of the center movement’s obvious lack of interest in promoting some sort of relationship with Israel one might consider the possibility whether a special institutional factor operating within the movement may not make this aim so inoperative.

Institutional Aims

Among the aims ranked in the lower half of the scale were three in the category “Ends Related to the Existence of a Jewish Community

⁷ Jack J. Cohen, “Mordecai M. Kaplan’s Concept of Peoplehood,” in Ira Eisenstein and Eugene Kohn, eds., *Mordecai M. Kaplan, An Evaluation* (New York: Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 1952), p. 37.

⁸ Marshall Sklare and Benjamin Ringer, “A Study of Jewish Attitudes Toward the State of Israel,” in Marshall Sklare, ed., *The Jews, Social Patterns of An American Group* (Glencoe, 1958), p. 440.

⁹ Marshall Sklare and Marc Vosk, *The Riverton Study, How Jews Look at Themselves and Their Neighbors* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1957), p. 20.

Center Movement," which the respondents doubtless associated with the Janowsky *Survey*.¹⁰ These were: "to promote institutional identification with the Jewish community center movement" (rank 34); "to uphold Janowsky's 'Statement of Principles'" (rank 37), and "to achieve primacy of Jewish content in the program" (rank 38). Although many other aims listed in the questionnaire had also been mentioned by Janowsky, these three evidently triggered direct associations with his report. In effect, they almost consistently triggered a negative reaction on the part of the respondents. It may, therefore, be assumed that the Janowsky "Principles," as such, receive little, if any, implementation in the center movement today. Their formal adoption by agencies most likely signifies little more than a desire on the part of center boards to conform, at least outwardly, to JWB's institutional expectations. It is possible that a more vigorous and sustained espousal of the Janowsky "Statement of Principles" by JWB and the National Association of Jewish Center Workers would have moved the centers to give these concepts more adequate implementation.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Despite the admitted limitations of the study and the inherent ambiguity and lack of philosophical precision of the stated purposes, certain conclusions can be drawn from the data. Chief among them are the contradictions inherent in the center movement's avowed purposes, as opposed to its "working" purposes.

The Center as a Movement

To begin with, the movement's lack of emphasis on many center-related aims gives rise to the basic question whether the centers are concerned to any appreciable degree with the propagation of the movement, as such. If the operational budgets of the centers were dependent upon a central national source, their ideology and attitudes would probably come under closer country-wide scrutiny, and this would ensure some degree of institutional direction. But allocations for operating expenses come from local fund-raising resources. And while fund-raising leaders often exercise some indirect, subtle control over the local center, they evidently are not sufficiently center movement oriented to guide the im-

¹⁰ Janowsky, *op. cit.*

plementation of the broader principles that should govern community center work.

What Makes for Jewishness?

The acculturation process in American society, which increasingly numbs the sense of group cohesion of many Jews, tends to intensify their alienation from any Jewish institution seeking to hold them, unless that institution succeeds in evolving more positive values and successful techniques. It has been inferred that the center movement accommodates more to acculturation by emphasizing the easily attainable objectives of recreation, leisure, fun, and personality development, and less to purposes dealing with the survival of the Jews as a group. It has also been inferred that its quest for Jewish group identity may be losing ground, as is its role as a cohesive force within its own ranks and within the Jewish community.

On the surface, the primacy of implemented recreation and leisure aims seems to correlate closely with Solender's view that the center "posits its program on the great values to be derived from the constructive use of what we term people's leisure." But the center field is not strongly committed to Solender's further view of "the use of a portion of this free time for positive purposes related to the Jew and his group."¹¹

The aims have a vague, nonideological base, and are geared to satisfying interests and needs related to pleasure-seeking and "deriving fun from center activities." The activity itself, rather than the institution, becomes the focus of the individual member's attention. The past and the future of the center and the Jewish community are overshadowed by the *here* and *now*, with minimal obligation or commitment to ideology or long-range institutional purposes.

Rabbi Kaplan criticized this very tendency in the Jewish community some 20 years ago:

American Jewish life seethes with activity. Federations, welfare funds, community chests, United Jewish Appeals, hospitals, orphan asylums, homes for the aged, fraternal orders, public relations agencies, . . . make quite a clatter. What permanent significance, if any, do they have? Are all these efforts with their vast expenditure of energy part of the advance or of the retreat of our inner forces?¹²

¹¹ Sanford Solender, *The Unique Functions of the Jewish Community Center* (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1955), p. 4.

¹² Mordecai M. Kaplan, *The Future of the American Jew* (New York, 1948), p. 9.

This criticism is obviously directed to most agencies serving the Jewish community, and, as such, applies also to the center field. While center emphasis on recreation may be a reflection of the fact that Jews feel at home in the general culture of America, it cannot be considered a reflection of the Jewish "inner forces" of which Kaplan speaks.

Vagueness of Purposes

The ambiguous, uncritical use of language in expressing aims also is a failing that is not confined to the center alone. As a matter of fact, one suspects that the center has borrowed its language from the constitutions or publications of kindred organizations. Alfred Jospe points to this very difficulty in his essays on Hillel activities on the college campus:

There is no dearth of definitions of Hillel's purposes. If you ask students, as we have frequently done, what they conceive Hillel's main purpose to be, you get an enormous variety of answers, thoughtful or crude, perceptive or superficial, some phrased beautifully and some put in a way to take you flinch.¹³

The universality of the problem is underlined by the fact that the San Francisco branch of the YMCA in a self study¹⁴ referred to manifold difficulties in defining its purpose. Even the President's Commission on National Goals abundantly documented in a report its struggle in defining goals for the American people in the 1960's.¹⁵

Neutrality

The center movement is also hampered in achieving clarity of purpose because, aside from difficulties in formulation, its basic purposes are, or have become, unclear.

Although the center has been exposed over the years to a profusion of ideologies in the Jewish community, it has not specifically accepted and championed any. Nor has it developed an ideology uniquely its own. As Benjamin Halpern¹⁶ cautioned not so long ago at the Lakewood Con-

¹³ Alfred Jospe, *Judaism on the Campus, Essays on Jewish Education in the University Community* (Washington, D.C.: B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, 1963), pp. 12-13.

¹⁴ Roy Sorenson and Hedley S. Dimock, *Designing Education in Values, A Case Study in Institutional Change* (New York, 1955), pp. 53-54.

¹⁵ The American Assembly of Columbia University Administrators, *Goals for Americans, Programs for Action in the Sixties: A Report of the President's Commission on National Goals* (New York, 1960).

¹⁶ *Future Directions of American Jewish Life and Their Implications for Jewish Community Centers, Proceedings of Conference at Lakewood, New Jersey, January 6 to January 9, 1963* (New York: National Association of Jewish Center Workers and JWB), p. 4.

ference, the center movement needs "a clear articulation of the specific form of Judaism" with which it can "identify itself, which it can defend as its own cause."

Neutral Position of Center Movement

The data of the study indicate that the center's failure to adopt a positive program of its own stems from its inclination to reject any ideology having a seemingly polarized end, survivalist or assimilationist. The movement's weak implementation of Jewish aims was established; but its rejection of assimilationist aims was just as strong. The reaction to an aim that inadvertently won notoriety as a result of a typographical error in the second questionnaire may serve as illustration. It read "To facilitate the adjustment of Jews to American society *with* (should have read *without*) loss of their Jewish identity." In this form, it clearly advocated assimilation. The vast majority of respondent executive directors ranked it very low. In rare instances, only where the respondents took the trouble to change the wording to read "without loss," was it rated as highly or moderately implemented. The centers were less severe, but also negative, in ranking "integration of the Jew into American society" as well as most other intergroup and intercultural aims. While it has been the policy of the movement to welcome non-Jews as members, it would almost appear as though integration, intergroup, and intercultural aims were looked upon as steps toward assimilation and, as such, were overtly rejected as inactive.

Center executives in the smaller communities were more sensitive about relations with the non-Jewish community than were those in Metropolitan New York and other large urban areas. It may be, therefore, that the smaller the community, the greater is its concern about good relations with the non-Jewish community; the larger the concentration of Jews, the greater their sense of security about their image among non-Jews.

The center movement's apparent assumption that Jewish survival is possible by following a dual course of full participation in the majority culture and the simultaneous preservation of Jewish identity is entirely in keeping with its neutralist position. The study suggested, however, that the dual strategy, as presently implemented, is not working to the advantage of the Jewish community. The study also established that the preponderance and diversity of the stated Jewish aims do not necessarily mean that they are more actively implemented than its general aims. It

does suggest, however, a larger variety of concerns for the survival of the Jewish group in America.

The general trend in the country toward the growing dependence of the family on all types of communal agencies for services which formerly were in its own province,¹⁷ seems to indicate that the Jewish family, too, is growing increasingly dependent upon Jewish community agencies, including the center. As the American Jewish family becomes increasingly alienated from its past, it becomes more dependent upon agencies like the center to give it a rational basis for identification with the Jewish group and culture. But Jewish knowledge and Jewish experiences are basic to the development of this sense of identification. If the center field is not offering these today, will it be willing or able to do so tomorrow?

The growing forces for the integration of other minorities in America may also impose increasing pressures on the center movement to place greater stress on intergroup relations. In this event, the center will be particularly vulnerable because it lacks a strong ideological base to preserve its identity as a Jewish institution.

Centrality of Individual and Accommodation

It is consistent with the stated purposes of the center field that most of its major aims were found to be focused upon the individual who is served primarily in groups. This is based on the assumption by the ideologists of the movement that the center group work experience will bring about the kind of changes in the personality and values of the individual that will increase his emotional identification with the Jewish community.¹⁸ This remains to be proved. A further assumption is that the goals of the individual member or of the group are consistent with the goals of the center and with the needs of both the general and Jewish community. This assumption must be subjected to the test of further study. Center ideology was interpreted by Bertram H. Gold at the Lakewood Conference as follows:

Most of us saw the Center's "ideology" not as a simple catch word, but as arising out of the total context of what we stand for and what we believe in; the things we do and the ways in which we do them. Seen in this way, our ideology stems from the dedication to the quest for Jewish identification and justification.

¹⁷ Harold L. Wilensky and Charles Lebeaux, *Industrial Society and Social Welfare* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958), p. 68.

¹⁸ Sanford Solender, "Social Group Work and the Jewish Community Center," in Louis Kraft and Charles S. Bernheimer, eds., *Aspects of the Jewish Community Center* (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1954), pp. 76-77.

It is related to the way in which we help the individual to struggle to find a definition of Judaism that is satisfactory to him.¹⁹

The question arises whether the major responsibility for finding a definition of purposes rests on the institution or on the individual. If the individual is primarily responsible, the institution is relieved of the obligation of presenting an ideology, and anything the individual accepts for himself is presumably acceptable to the center.

Leadership Development

According to the findings, the Jewish community center field has been expending major efforts to develop leadership for the Jewish community, a task of utmost importance for its future. Who are the leaders now being developed, and what are their goals? Are they lay leaders of center boards whose talents, once recognized in local communities, are sought by Jewish federations and national Jewish agencies? Are they staff members of centers, who are receiving on-the-job professional training and experience; or social-work students on supervised field work assignments in centers; or outstanding members of center groups, accepting leadership responsibility for the first time? Is the primary objective of such a program to provide lay and professional leadership only for centers, or also for the rabbinate, for Jewish education, and for the various national Jewish agencies and their fund-raising bodies? In this context, a review of the center training program for lay and professional people seems indicated. Once "trained," what is the nature of their commitment to the Jewish community? How does their leadership compare with that found in other Jewish institutions?

Professionalization and Center Values

With the professionalization of agency staffs, the movement's perception of its purposes undoubtedly underwent many subtle changes, for it entrusted its value system to workers whose training and philosophy are not necessarily rooted in the Jewish community, nor necessarily in keeping with center intentions. Since World War II, these workers have recognized social group work,²⁰ with its emphasis on the individual, the group,

¹⁹ *Future Directions of American Jewish Life and Their Implications for Jewish Community Centers, Proceedings of Conference at Lakewood, New Jersey, January 6 to January 9, 1963, op. cit., p. 161.*

²⁰ It should be made clear that the term "group work" was not included among the aims of the Jewish community center in this study, because it suggested a method rather than a goal. For similar reasons, "adult education," "physical education," and "Jewish education" were also omitted.

and the process of personality development, as their core discipline. As a result one may surmise that they generally have a stronger loyalty to broader social-work aims, as espoused by their national professional organizations, than they do to center purposes.

As Harleigh B. Trecker described it,

Group workers believe that the person is more important than the activity. Group workers believe in the dignity and worth of every human personality. Group workers believe in the infinite capacity of people to grow and change. They recognize that growth comes from within and that growth opportunities must be provided so that these capacities for growth can be realized. Group workers believe, furthermore, that people have the capacity to make wise judgments and when people are given an opportunity to accept responsibility they tend to behave in a responsible manner.²¹

The evolution and implementation of basic center objectives have been left to the chance that somehow the workers' orientation and center objectives would converge at a point in time, or at least follow a parallel course. But the data show that there is little likelihood of an adjustment of differences between the avowed purposes of the agencies and the perceptions of their executive directors. There is reason to speculate that this has been equally true of boards of directors.

The center movement has apparently borrowed heavily from American social work philosophy, especially in the use of noncontroversial generalizations, which tend to demonstrate that agency purposes are in keeping with the objectives of American democracy. But, at the same time, purposes that have been deemed unique to the center movement appear to be growing vaguer, and there is no indication that a drastic change is imminent. An apparent loss of direction has resulted, causing a sense of malaise on the part of numerous center leaders. Herman Stein²² feels that "inherent strains will continue" (and, he hopefully adds, so will "efforts to resolve" them). The center movement, through a unique and particularistic program for the education of its workers, may be able to assure them the Jewish knowledge and active commitment to Jewish ideals, in addition to social-work training, with which they may fulfill expectations. It should be remembered, however, that the implementation of center purposes, as examined in this study, was based upon the perceptions of the executive directors. They do not com-

²¹ Harleigh B. Trecker, *Social Group Work, Principles and Practices* (New York, 1955), pp. 67-68.

²² Herman D. Stein, "Jewish Social Work in the United States, 1654-1954," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 57 (1956), p. 73.

pletely represent the agency's collective will or consensus. Purposes may be strongly influenced by such variables as the recipients of center services, the power structure of the board, turnover in staffs, sources of support, the surrounding community, and the prevailing culture, or any combination of these factors. The study of the attitudes of each of these in relation to the program and purposes of centers would add to our knowledge.

Social Action

Despite the fact that social workers have regarded social action as a deeply rooted responsibility of their profession, the low ranking of social action aims indicates feeble, almost nonexistent, activity of this character. Failure in this sphere may, in part, be ascribed to the fact that the center has come to be associated primarily with recreation. For where people play in their leisure hours, they do not seem to respond to the challenge of causes or social issues requiring the investment of time, energy, commitment, and devotion. And, as an agency dedicated to the democratic process, the center can rarely undertake social action that will be representative of its membership because consensus is difficult to achieve among the varied groups it serves. At best, a consensus is difficult to achieve because of the diverse viewpoints on any one issue among the different groups, subgroups, and individuals within any one center. There are, however, other reasons why social action aims were found to be fairly inoperative. There seems to be doubt in the movement as to which social action is appropriate to the center, what form such action should take, and how to go about it. In addition, there appears to be a general disinclination on the part of the administration, both lay and professional, to permit the center to become embroiled in public controversy. A final aggravating factor probably is the tendency of boards of directors, largely drawn from affluent sectors of society, to maintain a conservative outlook on crucial questions of a social and political nature.

Future of Center Movement

In the light of the composite picture of the operating and non-operating purposes of the contemporary Jewish community center movement which emerged from the study, one may ask those concerned with its mission where they wish to go from here. Perhaps they are content with the *status quo*, with neutrality, with the center's seemingly compromised

objectives that have displaced the earlier goals of Jewish identification. The operating purposes today indicate a more generalized level of operation in the form of recreation and personality development for Jews. The leadership may, on the other hand, come to realize that the vitality of the movement depends on its retreat from neutrality; that its service to the Jewish community depends on a more definitive Jewish program.

It is hoped that the findings presented here will spur the center movement to a reexamination of its goals. The author recognizes that the purposes of social institutions operate in subtle ways, often affected by latent forces of which even their leaders may not be aware, and that it is generally difficult to predict how their stated purposes will operate. It is therefore all the more important for a thriving movement periodically to evaluate its position and to highlight its future course. The center movement's leadership and its following will have to venture out of their safe moorings, and examine their will, or lack of it, to survive as part of the Jewish group. If they wish to survive, the question remains under what conditions they wish to do so.

Whatever the decision, the Jewish community center movement will inevitably face changes. Do those associated with it wish to control the changes? An institution seeking definition, understanding, and control of its situation cannot be satisfied with the kind of neutrality about which Thoreau once mused:

Well, we are safe and strong, for now we sit
Beside a hearth where no dim shadows flit,
Where nothing cheers nor saddens, but a fire
Warms feet and hands—nor does to more aspire:
By whose compact utilitarian heap
The present may sit down and go to sleep.²³

²³ Henry David Thoreau, *Walden and Other Writings* (New York, 1937), p. 229.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Using the scale on the right, please encircle the appropriate number showing the degree to which, in your judgment, each listed aim is actually implemented in your agency.

(Definition of the word "implementation": the extent of effort, energy and resources expended by your staff in attempting to achieve each aim.)

<i>The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:</i>	<i>Degree of Implementation</i>			
	<i>High</i>	<i>Mod- er- ate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Not at All</i>
1. To help its participants relax from tensions	1	2	3	4
2. To uphold the JWB "Statement of Principles" by Oscar I. Janowsky	1	2	3	4
3. To foster the arts of the general community	1	2	3	4
4. To develop an appreciation of the Jewish tradition	1	2	3	4
5. To develop an appreciation of Jewish ethics	1	2	3	4
6. To promote a Jewish way of life	1	2	3	4
7. To promote the welfare of the general community	1	2	3	4
8. To help in education of the general community ..	1	2	3	4
9. To encourage Jewish culture	1	2	3	4
10. To preserve the heritage of America	1	2	3	4
11. To encourage acceptance of differences among in- dividuals and groups	1	2	3	4
12. To teach the principles of Judaism to Center participants	1	2	3	4
13. To advance integration of the Jew into American society	1	2	3	4
14. To provide recreation for its members	1	2	3	4
15. To stimulate identification with Jewish ideals...	1	2	3	4
16. To encourage social action for improvement of social conditions	1	2	3	4
17. To help promote the democratic process in America	1	2	3	4
18. To encourage involvement in local general civic affairs	1	2	3	4
19. To promote opportunities for Jewish group survival	1	2	3	4
20. To encourage membership's identification with the Jewish community	1	2	3	4
21. To preserve the heritage of the Jewish group ...	1	2	3	4
22. To develop the social skills of its participants ..	1	2	3	4
23. To stimulate Jewish thoughts and ideas	1	2	3	4
24. To promote the mental and intellectual growth of its participants	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX A (Cont'd)

<i>The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:</i>	<i>Degree of Implementation</i>			
	<i>High</i>	<i>Mod- er- ate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Not at All</i>
25. To serve as the meeting place of local general organizations	1	2	3	4
26. To encourage creativity of the individual	1	2	3	4
27. To facilitate the personality development of the Jew	1	2	3	4
28. To help improve world social conditions	1	2	3	4
29. To promote a sense of identification with the Jewish People	1	2	3	4
30. To promote the stability of the Jewish family ...	1	2	3	4
31. To promote the proper exercise of American citizenship	1	2	3	4
32. To assist in the improvement of the character of the individual	1	2	3	4
33. To promote closer ties with the State of Israel ..	1	2	3	4
34. To provide opportunities for growth of individual personality	1	2	3	4
35. To encourage self-expression of the individual ...	1	2	3	4
36. To encourage intercultural relations between Jews and other groups	1	2	3	4
37. To promote the purposeful use of one's leisure time	1	2	3	4
38. To impart Jewish knowledge to its participants ..	1	2	3	4
39. To promote the health of the general community.	1	2	3	4
40. To promote the welfare of the Jewish community	1	2	3	4
41. To meet the social needs of the Jewish community	1	2	3	4
42. To provide opportunities for participation in the Jewish community	1	2	3	4
43. To meet the interests of the participants	1	2	3	4
44. To promote identification with the world Jewish community	1	2	3	4
45. To help improve social conditions in the general community	1	2	3	4
46. To develop unity among the sub-cultures of the Jewish community	1	2	3	4
47. To stress the value and dignity of the individual	1	2	3	4
48. To encourage self-development of the Jewish personality	1	2	3	4
49. To foster appreciation of the Jewish group and its culture	1	2	3	4

* The questionnaire was circulated with the item reading as misprinted here. It should have read "without loss."

APPENDIX A (Cont'd)

<i>The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:</i>	<i>Degree of Implementation</i>			
	<i>High</i>	<i>Mod- er- ate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Not at All</i>
50. To facilitate the adjustment of Jews to American Society with loss of their Jewish identity * ..	1	2	3	4
51. To help the individual accept himself as a Jew ..	1	2	3	4
52. To develop leadership for the Jewish community.	1	2	3	4
53. To encourage inter-group relations between Jews and other racial and cultural groups	1	2	3	4
54. To promote an institutional identification with the Jewish Community Center movement	1	2	3	4
55. To provide its participants with opportunities for deriving fun	1	2	3	4
56. To encourage an appreciation of Jewish values...	1	2	3	4
57. To encourage practices in accordance with Jewish morality	1	2	3	4
58. To develop the physical capacities of the individual	1	2	3	4
59. To promote self-fulfillment of the individual Jew and satisfaction with his being a Jew	1	2	3	4
60. To further the development of the personality of the individual	1	2	3	4
61. To achieve the primacy of Jewish content in the program	1	2	3	4
62. To encourage contributions of the Jewish group to American culture	1	2	3	4
63. To raise the cultural level of the general community	1	2	3	4
64. To develop a common meeting ground for Jewish sub-cultures	1	2	3	4
65. To serve as a meeting place for local Jewish organizations	1	2	3	4
66. To provide opportunities for in-group marriage..	1	2	3	4

Concluding Question:

If you had to choose one or two aims representing the most important current purpose(s) of your agency, write the one or two you would choose in the order of their priority.

APPENDIX B

Average ranking of aims from high to low based upon judgment of executive directors.

Question Number	Aim	Ranks of Aims in Communities:					
		All	Large	Metro- poli- tan N.Y.	Com- bined N.Y. Large Cities	Inter- me- di- ate	Small
#14	To provide recreation for its members	1	2	2	1	1	1
#47	To stress the value and dignity of the individual	2	2	1	1	2	6
#34	To provide opportunities for growth of individual's personality	3	1	6	4	3	7
#43	To meet the interests of the participants	3	1	8	8	4	4
#60	To further development of personality of individual..	4	3	2	3	5	8
#52	To develop leadership for the Jewish community	5	8	8	11	4	2
#20	To encourage identification with the Jewish community	6	3	5	8	8	3
#35	To encourage self-expression of the individual	7	6	3	7	6	7
#37	To promote the purposeful use of one's leisure time	8	3	4	6	8	7
#51	To help the individual accept himself as a Jew	9	3	8	5	11	8
#26	To encourage creativity of the individual	10	3	4	6	9	9
#55	To provide its participants opportunities for deriving fun	10	11	6	13	8	9
#32	To assist in improvement of character of individual ..	11	10	6	12	4	11
#27	To facilitate personality development of the Jew	12	8	4	9	11	10
#29	To promote sense of identification with the Jewish People	13	9	5	10	10	10
#11	To encourage acceptance of difference among individuals and groups	14	4	8	10	8	13
#22	To develop the social skills of its participants	15	7	10	13	7	16

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

Question Number	Aim	Ranks of Aims in Communities:					
		All	Large	Metro- poli- tan N.Y.	Com- bined N.Y. and Large Cities	Inter- me- di- ate	Small
#42	To provide opportunities for participation in the Jewish community	15	11	15	21	13	4
#15	To stimulate identification with Jewish ideals	16	11	6	13	12	13
#58	To develop the physical capacities of the individual .	16	5	10	11	11	15
#59	To promote self-fulfillment of the individual Jew and satisfaction with his being a Jew	16	9	7	12	11	15
#40	To promote the welfare of the Jewish community . . .	17	10	12	18	17	7
#49	To foster appreciation of Jewish group and its culture..	18	9	5	10	14	18
#41	To meet the social needs of the Jewish community	19	10	10	16	18	10
#30	To promote the stability of the Jewish family	20	16	7	19	13	14
#24	To promote mental and intellectual growth of participants	20	14	6	17	15	13
# 9	To encourage Jewish culture	20	12	9	17	15	13
#48	To encourage self-development of the Jewish personality	20	13	12	22	13	10
#56	To encourage an appreciation of Jewish values	21	11	8	15	19	13
#19	To promote opportunity for Jewish group survival . . .	22	7	9	11	19	17
#21	To preserve the heritage of the Jewish group	22	9	10	15	17	15
#25	To serve as the meeting place for local Jewish organizations	23	20	20	32	12	5
#64	To develop common meeting ground for Jewish sub-cultures	24	12	18	24	16	10
# 4	To develop an appreciation of the Jewish tradition	25	14	7	18	20	20
#17	To help promote the democratic process in America	26	12	6	14	23	22

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

Question Number	Aim	Ranks of Aims in Communities:					
		All	Large	Metro- poli- tan N.Y.	Com- bined N.Y. and Large Cities	Inter- me- di- ate	Small
# 1	To help its participants relax from tensions	27	11	14	20	22	18
# 5	To develop an appreciation of Jewish ethics	28	22	8	24	22	21
#57	To encourage practices in accordance with Jewish morality	29	15	22	31	21	13
# 6	To promote a Jewish way of life	30	19	24	23	26	16
#46	To develop unity among sub-cultures of Jewish community	30	13	17	25	25	16
# 7	To promote welfare of the general community	31	23	9	26	29	12
#10	To preserve the heritage of America	32	21	11	27	21	23
#25	To serve as the meeting place of local general organizations	33	25	21	38	41	12
#54	To promote an institutional identification with the Jewish Community Center movement	34	27	14	33	24	18
#13	To advance the integration of the Jew into American society	35	17	20	30	23	27
#31	To promote the proper exercise of American citizenship	35	18	13	25	27	27
#23	To stimulate Jewish thoughts and ideas	36	18	17	28	28	24
# 2	To uphold the JWB "Statement of Principles" by Oscar I. Janowsky	37	16	20	29	27	26
#38	To impart Jewish knowledge to its participants	37	20	9	24	30	28
#61	To achieve the primacy of Jewish content in the program	38	19	18	30	30	22
#62	To encourage contributions of the Jewish group to American culture	39	17	14	25	31	29

APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

Question Number	Aim	Ranks of Aims in Communities:					
		All	Large	Metro- poli- tan N.Y.	Com- bined N.Y. and Large Cities	Inter- me- di- ate	Small
# 3	To foster the arts of the general community	40	20	17	30	25	31
#63	To raise the cultural level of the general community . . .	41	30	12	36	29	22
#36	To encourage intercultural relations between Jews and other groups	41	23	21	35	32	19
#53	To encourage inter-group relations between Jews and other racial and cultural groups	42	29	20	39	30	23
#66	To provide opportunities for in-group marriage	43	16	22	31	36	29
#18	To encourage involvement in local general civic affairs.	43	27	19	38	35	22
#44	To promote identification with the world Jewish community	44	24	21	37	38	21
#12	To teach the principles of Judaism to Center participants	45	23	20	34	33	32
#50	To facilitate the adjustment of Jews to American society with loss of their Jewish identity	46	20	23	36	38	23
#33	To promote closer ties with the State of Israel	47	26	17	36	37	25
# 8	To help in the education of the general community . . .	48	32	19	40	34	25
#16	To encourage social action for improvement of social conditions	49	28	16	36	39	30
#45	To help improve social conditions in the general community	50	34	18	41	38	33
#39	To promote the health of the general community	51	31	23	42	40	33
#28	To help improve world social conditions	52	33	25	43	52	34

APPENDIX C

Frequency and ranking of choices of all executive directors in response to concluding question.

<i>Number in Question- naire</i>	<i>Mentioned Aim</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>
#60	To further development of the personality of individual	17	1
#27	To facilitate personality development of the Jew ..	15	2
#20	To encourage membership's identification with the Jewish community	14	3
#46	To develop unity among sub-cultures of the Jewish community	12	4
#14	To provide recreation for its members	9	5
#51	To help individual accept himself as a Jew	8	6
#19	To promote opportunities for Jewish group survival	7	7
#21	To preserve the heritage of the Jewish group	6	8
#41	To meet social needs of the Jewish community	6	8
#52	To develop leadership for the Jewish community ...	6	8
#56	To encourage appreciation of Jewish values	5	9
# 6	To promote a Jewish way of life	4	10
#37	To promote a purposeful use of one's leisure time ..	4	10
#38	To impart Jewish knowledge to its participants	4	10
#58	To develop physical capacities of the individual	4	10
#59	To promote self-fulfillment of the individual Jew and satisfaction with his being a Jew	4	10
#29	To promote a sense of identification with the Jewish People	3	11
#42	To provide opportunities for participation in the Jewish community	3	11
#47	To stress the value and dignity of the individual ...	3	11
# 2	To uphold the JWB "Statement of Principles" of Oscar I. Janowsky	2	12
#43	To meet the interests of the participants	2	12
#49	To foster appreciation of the Jewish group and its culture	2	12
#53	To encourage inter-group relations between Jews and other racial and cultural groups	2	12
#62	To encourage contributions of the Jewish group to American culture	2	12
#64	To develop common meeting ground for Jewish sub-cultures	2	12
#66	To provide opportunities for in-group marriage ...	2	12
# 1	To help its participants relax from tensions	1	13
# 9	To encourage Jewish culture	1	13
#11	To accept differences among individuals and groups.	1	13

APPENDIX C (Cont'd)

<i>Number in Question- naire</i>	<i>Mentioned Aim</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>
#12	To teach the principles of Judaism to Center participants	1	13
#15	To stimulate identification with Jewish ideals	1	13
#16	To encourage social action for improvement of social conditions	1	13
#18	To encourage involvement in local general civic affairs	1	13
#23	To stimulate Jewish thoughts and ideas	1	13
#31	To promote proper exercise of American citizenship.	1	13
#41	To meet social needs of the Jewish community.....	1	13
#61	To achieve the primacy of Jewish content in the program	1	13
#65	To serve as a meeting place of local Jewish organizations	1	13