

supporting only special phases of the philanthropic work of the community.

One of the problems that faces every thinking Jew is that of anti-Semitism. We must be careful not to give any opportunity to those persons who are over ready to criticize the Jew. Such people would surely be loud in their protests and criticism should the Jewish group withdraw more from the chest than it contributes; and many narrow-minded persons, who, we must admit, make up the majority of all, would find fault if the Jewish group should withdraw a larger amount of the fund than such percentage as its group is to the total population of the community, even though it contributed as much as it withdrew; and, lastly, some would even find fault in case the Jewish group withdrew less than it contributed, if it still withdrew a larger amount than the percentage the Jewish population is of the total population.

A recent survey made in the city of Chicago indicates that the growth of the charity dollar in that city has averaged about three times as great as in a large group of cities where other plans are in operation. From 1918 to 1922, 82 Chicago organizations increased the total income 87 per cent for philanthropic work; while in 47 communities having community chests, the increase was only 20 per cent.

We admit that figures of this kind do not prove anything against a chest, but they do show healthy development in a large non-chest city.

From our study of this question we must come to the conclusion that whether or not a chest is advisable for any community depends primarily upon the social conditions and activities in that particular community, and that no plan or form of organization which will fit every community has yet been developed.

In those communities where the Jewish Federation has not attained or even closely approached its possibilities, both in development and in financial support, it has nothing to gain and much to lose by becoming a part of a chest. But, as stated before, it should become an integral and active part of a welfare league and through such league should contribute to the philanthropic up-building of the community the best it can give.

CHAIRMAN SEMAN: This finishes the discussion of Mr. Shroder's paper. The program committee didn't plan on an informal discussion except to leave it to you to decide upon. Do you wish to discuss this paper, or do you prefer to have the following papers read and then the discussion taken up?

SECRETARY GOLDSMITH: I want to say that the problems presented by the paper following (I have read it in advance), are going to be more or less the same as the problems Mr. Cahn and Mr. Shroder presented. The problems are closely related. It might be better to go through with the formal presentation and then have a general discussion from the floor.

CHAIRMAN SEMAN: I am sorry that Dr. Bernheimer is not here to present his paper personally. I have asked Mr. Maurice J. Sievers, of the Jewish Federation of Toledo, to read the paper. The subject of the paper is, "A Study of the Relation of Jewish Centers to Jewish Federations and Community Chests".

Mr. Sievers read Dr. Bernheimer's paper.

## THE RELATION OF JEWISH CENTERS TO JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND COMMUNITY CHESTS

CHARLES S. BERNHEIMER

There are listed 55 Federations of Jewish Charities in the American Jewish Year Book for 1924-1925. There are 227 cities in the United States and Canada in which a number of social service organizations have united in some kind of Community Chest for mutual support; chiefly for the purpose of securing funds from the public to carry on the work of social service organizations. There are 342 Jewish Centers of various kinds in the United States associated with the Jewish Welfare Board. In addition there are a considerable number not associated with the Board. The relation of these Centers to Jewish Federations and Community Chests is of importance. Any experience which Centers have had with these two types of community organizations and opinions which have developed with reference to the relation of the Centers to these organizations, especially in view of the rapid growth of the Community Chest in recent years, should be of interest and of value in assisting in the determination of action on the part of Centers.

## JEWISH FEDERATIONS

In reviewing the 44 replies received from Jewish Centers in response to a questionnaire, as well as the statistics of 45 additional Centers for which data are at hand, it should be kept in mind that we are dealing with two types of Centers, the Y. M. H. A.'s, Y. W. H. A.'s, and Jewish Centers with a participating membership, and the Settlements and Alliances which have no participating membership.

Of the 89 Jewish Centers 37 are in a Jewish Federation and 26 are not; in 23 cases there is no Federation; and in 3 instances there is no report. Of the 89 Centers, 63 have a participating membership; of those with a participating membership where there is a Federation, 24 are not in a Federation and 19 are in a Federation; of the 19 in a Federation, 14 are in the New York and Brooklyn Federations. Outside of Greater New York, therefore, a considerable number of the Centers with participating memberships that have been listed are not in a Federation. to add the number of this type of organizations to the Federation.

The Centers with no participating membership lend themselves more readily to affiliation with organizations that are regarded as purely philanthropic in character. For instance, in the case of the Y. M. H. A. of Birmingham, Ala., the point is made that the Federation deals only with charities, and recreational centers like the Y. M. H. A. should not be confused with charitable organizations. It is found, as a matter of fact, that wherever there is a Federation, the Settlement-Alliance type of organization is ordinarily included.

The Federation which covers the territories of Manhattan and the Bronx in New York City includes the Y. M. H. A.'s, Y. W. H. A.'s, and other Jewish Centers. Their inclusion is regarded as a *fait accompli* and the representatives of these associations make no argument opposed to it. However, the fact is that as a result of a united campaign for buildings conducted by the Federation \$6,337,000 was subscribed, of which \$5,809,000 was collected, and of this sum the only substantial amount received by a recreational organization was \$160,000 for the Federation Settlement toward the total of \$240,000 which its building cost. The

larger appropriations went to hospitals, orphan asylums and homes for convalescents. The inference is not far to seek as to how Jewish Centers have fared in connection with a building fund in which they have pooled with other organizations.

In Brooklyn, some of the Jewish Centers are included in the Federation and some are not. Three that are in the Federation have replied to the questionnaire. One, the Hebrew Educational Society, is of the Alliance type and the contention of its executive director is that the Federation does not permit of much expansion of program and puts a stop to building plans. The Y. M. H. A. of South Brooklyn claims that increases in the budget have not been granted by the Federation in accordance with the needs of the organization and that plans for erecting a new building have met with continual set-back due to the deficit of the Federation. The Y. M. H. A. and Y. W. H. A. of Borough Park is a little more hopeful, stating that the Brooklyn Federation is at present keenly interested, and that it will undoubtedly take action tending toward assisting in the promotion of a building program, but admits that the sustained interest of participating members is seriously affected.

It should be added, in this connection, that the Jewish Centers in Brooklyn which are not in the Federation are as badly off with reference to their programs and the possibility of building as are those in the Federation, the conclusion from which would be that the elements of retardation may be in the community itself and are not necessarily due to the fact that a Federation has been organized. Under the circumstances, however, a strong Jewish Center may be able to make an appeal in its own behalf which it is prevented from making because of its connection with the Federation.

In St. Louis, the Y. M. H. A. has not joined the Federation because it looms large as a commanding organization in the community and it has been felt that with a growing membership and the prestige of its new building and its broad program the organization will be in a position, certainly at the outset, to command a large maintenance fund independently of an appeal which the Federation would make for communal purposes. It is thought that at the

present time its inclusion would tend to complicate the situation for the Federation.

Considerable depends on the attitude of the community as to whether it is desirous of including an organization of the Y. M. H. A. and Y. W. H. A. type. Both in Philadelphia and Chicago there is no such demand and in St. Louis the Federation is acquiescent in the position which the Y. M. H. A. has assumed. In Brooklyn there has been no endeavor to add the number of this type or organizations to the Federation.

The instances of Brooklyn organizations representing their retardation as due to the Federation and the result in the remainder of Greater New York, especially as to expansion of building programs, are a matter seriously to be considered as a guide to Jewish Centers contemplating entrance into a Federation. There should be a clear understanding as to the ability of the Jewish Center to expand its facilities, which in turn means the expansion of program and the expansion of budget.

If the Federation is dominated by the idea that provision for hospitals and orphan asylums is superior to other needs, a Jewish Center may fare ill, in which case it would be more desirable for the Center to act independently of the Federation.

Where there is a Jewish Federation and the Jewish Center is not a constituent thereof, the main reason for its not participating appears to be the sentiment that the Federation is primarily intended for the philanthropic type of organization and that the community is not desirous of contributing from its fund to the support of a non-philanthropic organization. There may also be the feeling on the part of the Center itself that the personal relationship of the members to the Center is impaired by virtue of the fact that the Center is put into the same class as the organizations which receive a stipend from the community treasury. Where such a sentiment strongly exists in the community, it is not wise for the Center to enter the Federation.

If the Center with a participating membership is to become a constituent of the Federation, it must be made clear that it is to a very considerable extent supported by its membership and that the appeal to a share in the community fund is for such expenditures as are not self-supporting, to

serve a community need which would otherwise have to be met by a contributing membership. This does not mean that the Center should be considered as a club to which the members contribute for their own recreation and social life, and for which they need the support of the community to help them out. It does mean, however, that a Jewish Center with a participating membership does its utmost toward securing members who pay for the upkeep of the Center, consistent, however, with the obligation on the part of the community to assist the Center to preserve its function as a "character building" and community-serving organization, that is building character that will maintain individual and social morale and enable Jews to conserve Jewish consciousness, affiliation, culture and spirituality. From this point of view the Jewish Center should have the right to make an appeal to the community for funds to enable it to provide adequate facilities and for an annual budget adequately to maintain the facilities and promote a community-wide program of activities.

If the Center cannot come to an agreement with the Federation on the several points here presented, it should not enter the Federation. Having entered, and not satisfied, its only redress is an appeal to the community or withdrawal from the Federation. The latter action would not be regarded with favor even by those who would espouse the cause of the Center, because it would tend to affect the morale of the Jewish community. Therefore, the only alternative is a demonstration of the needs of the Center. An illustration in point is the making of a study of the situation with reference to recreation facilities for the Jewish community of Brooklyn for consideration by a sponsoring committee of the Federation.

As some of the same principles and circumstances apply with even greater force to the relationship between Jewish Centers and Community Chests, than to the relationship with Federations, further discussion is extended into the realm of the Community Chest, which involves more vital debate than that relating to the Jewish Federation, inasmuch as most communities have already decided whether or not a Center should form a constituent part of a Federation, whereas the formation of Community Chests and entrance into them are still moot questions.

## COMMUNITY CHESTS

*Jewish Centers in Chests*

Of cities with a population of more than 300,000, 17 are in Chests and 5 are not. These 5 are New York City, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Boston and Washington. Baltimore has a limited financial federation but does not include Catholic or Jewish organizations. Philadelphia, St. Louis and Buffalo Chests likewise do not include Catholic or Jewish organizations.

Of cities having a population from 100,000 to 300,000, 44 are in Chests and 14 are not; of those having a population of from 30,000 to 100,000, 104 contain Chests and 85 do not; of those with a population between 20,000 and 30,000, 25 have Chests and 80 not; and of those with a population of less than 20,000, 28 have Chests and approximately 3,000 have no Chest. The total number of Community Chests is 227.

Of the 89 Jewish Centers of which statistics are presented, 36 report being in Chests, 32 are not in Chests, 20 report that there is no Chest in the respective city, and in one case there is no definite report. It is to be noted that of those reporting no Chest, 14 are of Brooklyn, Manhattan and the Bronx, New York City. Of the 36 organizations where there are Chests, 16 are of the non-participating membership Alliance or Settlement type and 20 are of the membership type. Of the 32 not in Chests, 26 are of the participating membership type and 6 of the other type. This result shows a preponderating number of the former type are not in Chests.

Inasmuch as the relation of Y. W. C. A.'s to Chests is in a number of respects similar to that of Jewish Centers, some of the results of a questionnaire sent in January, 1925, to Chest executives and to Y. W. C. A. general secretaries in Chest cities are here presented. On the basis of 40 returns which are regarded as fairly representative of the larger city associations in Chests, the following data were compiled:

10 out of 26 reports stated that 100% receipts were obtained from the Chest, and the remaining 16 stated that they received something less than their full asking.

28 received more from the Chest during 1924, than in the year before Chest organization; of these 18 had naturally increased claims upon contributors on the score of enlarged and better equipment, larger and better staff, expanded program and increased numbers of individuals attending activities: 7 received less from the Chest than through their own efforts.

31 general secretaries stated that the Chest allows the association to raise money for special projects, though in most cases there are certain requirements to conform to, such as that no appeals can be made publicly, that special appeals must be cleared through the Chest, that only Y. W. C. A. members may be approached. 4 reported that no special appeals can be made.

In 14 cities Chests encouraged special contributions; in 11 cities they are discouraged; and in 15 they are allowed, but neither encouraged or discouraged.

As to the interest in the Y. W. C. A. on the part of members and contributors as affected by the Chest, 14 reported more interest, 8 less interest, 4 stated that the chest made no difference, and 14 were uncertain of the effect.

29 definitely favored the chest, 2 opposed it, and 5 stated that the organization was too new to judge.

*Questions to be Considered*

What are the outstanding questions which must be answered so as to determine the relationship of Jewish Centers to Community Chests?

1. Should sectarian agencies be admitted?
2. Should character-building agencies be admitted?
3. Under what conditions should a Jewish character-building agency be admitted with reference to:
  - (a) Budget
  - (b) Expansion of program
  - (c) Building plans
4. What has been or may be the effect of participating in the Chest with reference to:
  - (a) Sustained interest of participating members.
  - (b) Expansion of membership.

- (c) Development of the Jewish Center movement.
- (d) Morale of the Jewish Community.

*Should Sectarian Agencies be Admitted?*

The first question is adverted to by Mr. William J. Norton, in a pamphlet entitled "Financial Federations":

"Should sectarian agencies be admitted? The general practice is to draw no sectarian lines. Existing Protestant, Catholic, Jewish and non-sectarian social service agencies—that is, social service agencies owned and operated by religious sects or by people belonging to a religious sect—are usually admitted. The Federation ought to assure itself that the work done by the organization is predominantly social service and only incidentally religious. If its work is largely religious and only incidentally social service, its admission should be refused. In some cities special Protestant, Catholic and Jewish committees guide the Federation's dealings with sectarian agencies."

For Detroit, Mr. Fred M. Butzel, Vice-President of the United Jewish Charities of that city, makes the following presentation:

"There is nothing in the law or the practice of the Community Fund which in any sense restricts either religious or national activities on the part of its constituent members. It does not contain frankly religious agencies whose primary purpose is religious services. It does contain the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. H. A., and numerous settlements. It does not take in either the Catholic parochial schools or the Jewish educational institutions. There is no constitutional objection however. There is only the feeling that the time is not ripe and the public opinion is not favorable either on the part of the institutions or on the part of the large giving public."

Miss Cecil B. Wiener, Executive Director of the Buffalo Jewish Federation for Social Service, which has not joined the Chest of that city, presents the following view:

"The men who compose the Community Chest Budget Committee have felt in the past that purely sectarian organizations ought not to be represented in a community budget." \* \* \*

The Executive Director of the Y. M. H. A. of Mt. Vernon, states that the Board of Directors voted to stay out of the Community Chest by a large majority, among the reasons for its action being the following:

"The association should appeal to Jewish sectarian interests and family life. Inasmuch as the association is primarily Jewish in its aim, it was considered inadvisable to enter the Chest because of the consideration that distinctively religious organizations should not be included in the Chest."

These statements and opinions are fairly representative of the opposing views on the subject as to whether a sectarian organization should be included in the Chest.

*Should Character-Forming Organization be Admitted?*

Again we have a statement from Mr. William J. Norton:

"Should philanthropic character-building agencies, such as the Y. M. C. A. and the Boy Scouts, be admitted? Here there is more diversity of practice. Many people honestly believe a Federation should confine its constituent agencies to those doing a strictly charitable work. If one tries to draw from them their interpretation of the work charitable, one finds a confused state of mind. In the main they seem to mean relief-giving agencies, children's aid societies, orphanages, old people's homes, nursing associations, clinics, prisoners' aid societies, protective organizations and settlements. They think the character-forming organization should be paid for by those receiving its benefits, not realizing that every one in the community who has received a modicum of education got it at someone else's expense. Most of the Federations have found it fairly easy to answer these objections and admit character-forming societies, because the supporters of such organizations are numerous, influential, good money-raisers, and generous and dependable givers themselves."

Mr. Philip L. Seman, General Director of the Jewish People's Institute of Chicago, says:

"I am not in favor of a Jewish Community Center as a part of a Jewish Federation and a Community Chest, unless such Chest includes every institution in the community, including the Y. M. H. A. and other educational institutions. Under such circumstances, I do not think it would be wise for a Jewish Community Center or a Y. M. H. A. to stay out. Otherwise, it is the one type institution which makes an effort towards a dignified method of self-support, or the very largest portion of its budget on a self-support basis.

"The membership of a Community Center or Y. M. H. A. would never feel the same if they were to be conscious of the fact that deficits or moneys needed were secured through the central charity pooling fund. They would lose that interest which most of them have, in maintaining an independent spirit, a self-respect, leading towards the goal of 'we want to stand on our own feet, and make an effort to look after our own needs', instead of the paternalistic attitude of 'oh, let George do it—why worry—we pay our dues, let the deficit be looked after by somebody else.'"

On the other hand, Mr. Butzel says:

"The Detroit Y. M. C. A. program is as popular an item as we have in our Community Chest and I am sure that Jewish Community Centers would be just as welcome. At the present time, Detroit is having a drive for five million dollars to build seven Y. M. C. A. buildings and the entire community is back of it."

Similarly, Mr. Tobias Roth, Executive Secretary of the J. Y. M. A. of Rochester, gives expression to the following:

"With reference to the Community Chest of Rochester, and the desirability of a Jewish Center like ours being a member of the Chest, and as a matter of fact any other Jewish organizations that may be in the city joining same, I wish to state that from my own personal observation, and from knowledge which I have secured concerning the condition of most of the Jewish organizations prior to the formation of the Community

Chest. that they are today in a far more progressive state than would have been at all possible had not the Chest come into being."

There is in the statements arguing opposition to the Chest sufficient reason for careful consideration before a Jewish Center shall join the Chest. Where there is in the Community the distinct feeling that the Chests are purely for the philanthropic type of organization, it surely is apparent that it must be educated to the broader point of view of including the character-forming group before that group can at all consider participation in the Chest. Where there is a strong sentiment for such participation, as is reported for Detroit and Rochester, for instance, the Jewish Center should be considered eligible provided there are no other strong reasons against its participation. This reduces the particular question raised as to what the local situation reveals in regard to the sentiment toward the Jewish Center as a character-forming organization.

#### *Budget*

Where the answers to the questionnaire sent to Jewish Centers have been sufficiently responsive, they show, on the whole, that the Chest has aided them by an increased budget. This is brought out particularly in the replies from Louisville, Ky., Detroit, Mich., Gloversville, N. Y., Rochester, N. Y., Portland, Ore., Harrisburg, Pa., and Scranton, Pa. These instances include some fairly large as well as some smaller communities, both as to Jewish as well as general population.

The following is more detailed testimony pro and con:

In Detroit, Mr. Butzel says:

"The Community Chest has made our financing problem very much easier and has enabled us gradually to discard from our board large givers whose social viewpoint was not helpful and whom it was necessary to constantly flatter. The existence of the Community Chest and its very direct effect on the city-conducted social services has led to the building up of public outdoor relief, special schools for defectives, public hospitals, progressive care for delinquents, all on a non-sectarian basis, so that many activities taken care of

by Jewish or other religious groups in other cities seemed to be superfluous in Detroit."

For the Rochester J. Y. M. A., Mr. Roth says:

"As far as our own organization is concerned, there seems to be no doubt but that because of the Community Chest we have been able to expand considerably beyond the extent that we might otherwise have progressed, this being due only because of the very large operating deficit allowed us by the Chest.

"The fact that the Board of Directors or the association executive, or in fact any of the members of the association are not called upon to spend any time towards the raising of funds, makes for the opportunity of more concerted effort in the direction of developing the activities."

In "The Chronicler", the organ of the Y. M. H. A. of Louisville, there appears in the issue for March, 1925, the following:

"What the ultimate effect of the Y. M. H. A.'s joining the Community Chest will be cannot be predicted with a certainty. To date, however, instead of standing on our former policy of financial isolation, as the result of joining forces with the other agencies we have been assured more supplementary income in one year than we have ever raised for the same period on our own and have eliminated all the attendant ills that come with deficit drives. The scope of our work will gradually widen and both increased revenue from internal sources and from supplementary income from the Chest will take care of our growing needs. Our autonomy has not been interfered with in the least and there is gradually being introduced into our work the point of view that we are only a fractional part of the community's social program, which becomes more significant only as we realize our place in the whole unified social and philanthropic program of this city."

Mr. Samuel Goldhamer, Executive Secretary of the Cleveland Federation, has the following to present as to that city:

"The Community Fund, failing to adopt those instru-

mentalities by which the Federations of Jewish Charities have been able to stimulate generous giving, is finding itself unable to cope with the demands made upon it by either the Welfare Federation or the Jewish Federation, and has for the past two years put the Federations to a severe test in throwing back upon them the responsibility of curtailing expenditures. This situation is fast reaching a crisis where the Community Fund itself is put on trial and must either acknowledge failure as it is now organized, or so reorganize its approach to the problems, by the adoption of the experiences of the Jewish Federation, as to make more successful its efforts in the future."

The Buffalo situation is presented by Miss Wiener as follows:

"Our Community Chest went over the top for the first time last year. The men in charge of the Community Fund are very fearful of any increase in their budgets and they have always pared the budgets to the very rind. Some of the agencies that are in the Chest find it exceedingly difficult to get increased amounts for the prosecution of their work and the Budget Committee so dominates their organization that their Board of Directors has only powers of making recommendations but cannot carry into effect the projects of which they approve."

In Newark, N. J., the Chest, newly organized, has failed by a considerable amount to secure the fund agreed upon, as a result of which the original allotment to the Y. M. and Y. W. H. A. amounting to \$53,448 for the current year has been reduced to \$25,789.44, a shortage of \$27,658.56. Other participating agencies, including the Conference of Jewish Charities, have had their original allotments reduced in similar proportions.

Again, the local situation is the determining element. In most cases, it appears to be favorable and in some instances the Chest is hailed as being much more helpful in securing an increased budget than would have been possible if the Center had been independent of the Chest. There are conditions, however, where the Chest is not substantial enough, as is the case in Buffalo and St. Louis; or where a

Chest has been regarded as strong in the past, but where it shows signs of not being able to cope with the demands of the future, as in Cleveland; or where at the outset, it has failed to meet its allotments by a very considerable proportion, thus throwing the problem of securing adequate funds back on the respective organizations, as in Newark. It is to be noted that these instances relate to large communities, both as to their Jewish and general populations.

#### *Expansion of Program*

This need not be dwelt upon at length, except to point out that a Center should be desirous of expanding its program year by year and that it has the right to look forward to increasing, broadening and improving its activities, and thus demand a larger budget, which in the case of Centers with participating memberships may have to be met in part by the Chest and in the case of the other type of Center will have to be met wholly by the Chest.

The situation in Detroit on this point is represented as follows:

"The Community Fund has never discouraged any expansion in the activities provided they did not seem to overlap or throw the entire social program out of balance. In no instance has there ever been an arbitrary veto. Since the Community Fund was established, a Y. W. H. A. building was acquired, a Y. W. H. A. camp established, and an enlargement of the United Jewish Charities building has been made."

The subject has not as yet been sufficiently analyzed to show the extent to which Centers are planning programs so that their needs will be met by the Chest as they progress from year to year.

#### *Building Plans*

The new large Jewish Center buildings have been erected from funds with which the Chest has had nothing to do. This is the case in Philadelphia, Chicago, Kansas City, Newark, Paterson, Perth Amboy and Bethlehem, and in the cities where buildings are under way or definitely planned, including Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Washington, D. C., and Jersey City.

The experience of Centers in New York City, including Manhattan, the Bronx and Brooklyn, with respect to retardation of building plans, in relation to Jewish Federations, is also to be taken into consideration.

The evidence, on the whole, is not conclusive as to the effect of Chests on building plans of Centers.

#### *Sustained Interest of Members*

Where there is testimony on this point, it appears to be indicated that the interest of members is not maintained as effectively with entrance into the Chest as before. This is brought out by Mr. A. S. Magida, Executive Director of the Y. M. H. A. of Scranton, Pa., who is enthusiastic as to the desirability of the Chest, but agrees that the interest of members has fallen off. The Mt. Vernon association did not join the Chest because it was thought that the personal interest of many members would be lost.

The facts and opinions relative to this subject are, however, too sparse to form any conclusive judgment.

#### *Effect on the Jewish Center Movement*

So far as one can judge of the tenor of the replies, those Centers that have joined the Chest do not feel that the movement has been retarded by such participation. Those which are not desirous of joining the Chest have a distinct fear to this effect, which is expressed by Mr. Jacob N. Sokohl, of the Philadelphia Y. M. and Y. W. H. A., as follows:

"The Jewish Center movement has not yet developed a stability throughout the country which makes its requirements a fixed and known quantity. The next ten years will undoubtedly see large buildings in many communities that now have practically no quarters. The Federation's first care is hospitals, orphan asylums, etc. There is no question, therefore, that an association within a Federation has its growth retarded because of the real demands and needs of the other institutions who derive their income from the Federation. In those cities where it has been desirable to have the 'Y' join the Federation, the Y. M. and Y. W. H. A. has already reached an advanced stage of development, at least as far as its facilities are concerned."

This is a matter over which our Centers may well ponder before deciding to join the Chest. The Jewish Center movement is in the full flush of expansion and growth. Our new buildings, our expanding programs, the larger employment of professionally trained executives and workers, the recognition of the services of the national organization, the Jewish Welfare Board, in co-operating with the Centers with which it is affiliated to the end that they shall become virile forces in their respective communities, the response of these communities, not only in financial but in moral support, to Jewish Center enterprises, are all evidences of a movement which has been gathering momentum and strength. The individual Centers may, therefore, with perfect propriety, make demands on our Jewish communities for what they regard as adequate support in the building up of organizations that shall provide for promoting the individual morale and the group consciousness of our Jewish youth. The Jewish Center movement needs to make propaganda in its own behalf. The successes that have been attained point the way to what may be accomplished in communities where the movement is still in a somewhat backward state. No other movement, however laudable, should conflict with the possibilities with which the Jewish Center movement is fraught. A Center may, therefore, best promote its purposes by keeping itself independent, so that it may gather together a substantial body of members, maintain their interest, develop a community-wide program, and secure facilities and support from the group to which it can appeal with most immediate and direct effect.

#### *Jewish Morale*

On the subject of the effect of the Chest on the group consciousness of the Jew, we enter into a field in which little testimony has been brought forward, but which is the most serious of all the considerations to be discussed and determined.

Mr. Goldhamer, of Cleveland, makes this contribution to the subject:

“There is to be considered a breaking down of the Jewish consciousness—the interest which the Federation was able, by its activity and aggressiveness, to build up in the Jewish community. There is recognized

a distinct loss of such Jewish interest since the establishment of the Community Fund and the resultant ease with which the members of the Jewish community have unshouldered the burden of responsibility for the maintenance of their institutions.

“It is doubtful if the gain in the establishment of any bond of sympathy and understanding between those of various creeds would offset the disadvantages and distinct losses traceable in the breaking down of group interest.”

To this statement, that of Mr. Butzel, of Detroit, may serve as a reply:

“A Jewish consciousness is a good thing obviously. A civic consciousness in a municipality is also a good thing. I believe that they can be led to harmonize better in a community where a Chest exists and contacts and mutual dependence are fostered.”

We need not argue at length as to the desirability of Jews entering into civic and communal relationships with other elements of the community, but the question arises whether, after building up our social service organizations on the ground that we have a distinct purpose to subserve in behalf of Jews, we are not entitled to financing those organizations as a distinct group if we feel that our very existence is threatened by a co-operative enterprise in which we become participants. The fact is generally recognized that the several churches and synagogues should not pool their finances. In many instances sectarian organizations are not regarded as proper participants of Community Chests. There is the feeling among some interested in Y. M. C. A.'s that they should represent to a Chest that they form an aggressively Christian movement. May not the Jewish group, surely the Jewish Centers, not only make perfectly clear the Jewish character of their movement, but agree not to join a movement, however laudable in its purpose and however effective with reference to other groups, which may gradually weaken Jewish group consciousness? This is a question which we are compelled to ask ourselves before we make a decision.

*Further Study Required*

It is apparent that much that has been here discussed shows a tentative state of mind, for the reason that, although there are strong leanings in one direction or the other, there is not enough evidence to base a conclusion. Nor perhaps can there be a conclusion that will satisfy all situations. It is evident, however, that the subject warrants the most serious and thoughtful consideration on the part of our Jewish communities and our Jewish Centers in particular. We must go into the matter much more thoroughly.

*The Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A.*

We are not alone in the realization of this fact. The national Y. M. C. A. has gone through the process of endeavoring to ascertain sentiment by means of a limited number of questionnaires and has adopted resolutions of guidance to local associations, but has now arrived at the point where it feels called upon to enter into an examination of Chests more completely. A commission on the study of participation in Chests has been appointed, to report to the National Board of Y. M. C. A.'s in October, 1925. The report is to include a study of Chest cities; the relationship of local associations to the respective Chests; a compilation of financial returns to local associations and general agencies through Chests; a study of the effect upon an association where it has withdrawn from the Chest; information as to the extent to which an association has obtained permission to secure money outside of the Chest appeal; a study of interpretations of Chest committees concerning the freedom of local associations to deal with their own membership in matters of finance; and the development of a standard policy by the Y. M. C. A. to be adopted by local associations in seeking to work out better relationships with Chests.

In earlier years, the National Board of the Y. W. C. A. definitely advised the local associations against joining Chests. In 1922, the Board published a booklet for the use of association finance workers, under the heading "Our Experience with Community Chests", which contained among its conclusions the following:

"The Community Chest movement is in some ways a forward step in the development of the philanthropic

activities of America. It is to be commended for what it has done, but it cannot be considered as final in its present form because of these inherent limitations. It would seem, therefore, as if our association should first clearly understand that they are probably confronted with a phase and not a permanent condition."

The national convention of Y. W. C. A.'s in 1922 adopted the following resolutions which have been made a condition by several associations before entering Chests:

"Resolved: That whenever the following conditions obtain, the Young Women's Christian Association enter the Community Chest movement and pledge its full support and co-operation:

"a. That there be adequate representation on the budget committee and on the governing board.

"b. That the Y. W. C. A. have the right to determine its own administrative policies and methods of work.

"c. That further opportunity for appeal on the part of the Y. W. C. A. be allowed whenever the Community Chest fails to reach its financial goal.

"d. That national and international affiliations and obligations be recognized and that appropriations be made through the Community Chest to enable the association to meet its full share of these financial obligations.

"e. That provision be made from time to time for the raising of necessary funds for extension work, either building or program, through the general budget of the Chest or through a separate campaign; if by means of a separate campaign, that the full support of the Community Chest organization be given to the Y. W. C. A.

"That if in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Y. W. C. A. withdrawal from the Community Chest seems expedient or necessary, they shall be free to exercise their best judgment."

The action and attitude of the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. have been brought into the discussion that their conclusions, as the result of their experience, similar to that of the Jewish Center group, shall assist in guiding Jewish Centers.

*Recommendation*

This entire presentation is a report of progress in the parliamentary sense of the term. It points to the need of a larger knowledge of the situation which confronts our Jewish Centers with reference to Jewish Federations and Community Chests. To this end it recommends further study of facts, views and reactions, so that it shall be possible to formulate some general principles as to conditions in which our Jewish Centers shall enter Federations and Chests, if they agree to participation; these conditions to keep in view not only financial safeguards, not only the autonomy of the Centers with all its implications, but their influence as agencies for the conservation and promotion of Jewish group morale and Jewish group consciousness.

CHAIRMAN SEMAN: Now, the floor is open for general discussion—I beg your pardon, the most important part of the story is yet to come. The formal discussion will be opened by Mr. Samuel Goldsmith, Director of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research, New York City.

## DISCUSSION

SAMUEL A. GOLDSMITH

What I have to say to you today in discussion of Dr. Bernheimer's paper is, of course, said to you in a personal way and not in my official capacity as Director of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research. Some of the things that I shall have to say may surprise some of you, particularly those of you who know of the long affiliation which I had in the past with the movement for the establishment of Y. M. H. A.'s and Jewish Community Centers.

"A fact", Napoleon is said to have said "is like a bayonet". You can do anything you like with it, except sit on it."

I certainly shall not attempt to obscure the facts which Dr. Bernheimer has brought together in his paper. It is proper to admit that there are certain Y. M. H. A.'s and Jewish Community Centers in both Federations and Chests and certain that are not in either.

It is also patent that some Centers have prospered and others have not. Whether the prosperity that has come to some has been due to better leadership, or salesmanship, or a wiser community, or good times, one cannot tell. Cer-

tainly to place the blame on membership in a Federation is quite beside the point, if any analysis at all is made of the trustee-personnel of the Centers and the Federations. Whether one considers the trustee-personnel of the National Jewish Welfare Board or of the local associations, or Centers, one is impressed by the tremendous duplication in persons on the boards of the Centers and of the Federations, or even the Jewish representatives in Community Chests. This is particularly true in New York, which has been singled out by Dr. Bernheimer, where the Y. M. H. A.'s have remarkably able and strong friends in the Federation group. These friends are firmly convinced of the value of recreational and educational activity.

Nor can one disagree with the thesis that a Center must be relatively certain of the financial success of either a Federation or a Community Chest before considering joinder. Those that have joined, have joined for purely local—one is tempted to say arbitrary reasons. Successful Chests have apparently permitted expansion of programs—unsuccessful ones have apparently curtailed programs. Likewise the Federations.

There are certain fundamentals relative to this discussion that Dr. Bernheimer does not present—and to which I should like to draw your attention briefly.

First, it is desirable to indicate some patently false assumptions.

One is the assumption that these constitute the only character building organizations in a Jewish Community program. This is not so. A good family care agency, a good Children's Agency, a good agency dealing with delinquents—these are par excellence character-building agencies, requiring a finer technique—and exacting a greater ingenuity on the part of social workers than do the Centers. They should and do, where the Center is wise and generous, use the Center as one of the means toward the character-building of their wards. Indeed the Center's work for and with those temporarily dependent or borderline-dependent is of greater validity and value than with the ordinary middle-class.

Second—The assumption that Federation or Chest and "Charity" (in the bad sense of that term) are synonymous.

I pass over the fact that Chests have supported Orchestras, Art Galleries, Experimental Schools, and what not, without pauperizing a community. Or that all institutions of higher learning and all our museums, art galleries and opera houses—(and in Europe the State-owned theatres) are philanthropic institutions. Or that those most vehement in denouncing membership in Federations or Chests have gratefully accepted buildings from the Federation groups. These, too, are facts.

What is needed is education by the Centers and the Federations of the obstreperous young (indeed I question the truth of their being obstreperous)—in the fact that a sound Federation and a sound Jewish Community program are synonymous—not the term, Federation, and the opprobrious term, "Charity".

Our Federations are now and are to be important because they do in certain cities and can in all cities represent the thinking and planning of the Jewish Community. The Center surely must come into the Federation picture, but the master-hand that paints the picture must paint it not as the whole picture—but as a necessary detail along with a plan for health—for children—for Jewish education. It cannot even be the entire background—for that is the Jewish multitude, and not a building.

If there is no master-mind—(a group mind or an individual mind) if there is no master hand—then all the community institutions, forms of community expression that they are, suffer, the Center along with the rest. And if the J. W. B. analyzes the situation, they will find this condition as the root of the evil.

Certainly no one dreams of asking a Center or Y. M. H. A. to join an unstable Federation or Chest. Certainly no one should ask it to join if it, on the other hand, doesn't possess the three qualifications that Mr. Shroder has somewhat sketched—namely: (1)—A personnel-professional and lay, that would contribute ideas, leadership and money—that would have influence in the councils of either Federation or Chest. Second—It should not join until it has reached some stability and adequacy as to finances—and third, it should have a definitive program of work, that does not duplicate other work already being adequately done.

These considerations of joiner lead one to a fundamental

disagreement with Dr. Bernheimer in his demand that the Center be assured of increasing funds to meet a constantly expanding program of work. Shall this organization, too, stand in the way—a huge and terrible Polyphemus, rock uplifted—barring the road as lord of the isle, until they remember that Polyphemus after all was but one-eyed—or until some wily Odysseus gouges out that one eye and leaves them sightless?

In the present-day light of the trend toward decreasing programs of work for private agencies, one views such a statement with amazement. These organizations are not going to be exceptions to self-provision of activity by the working-class. They have no immunization to progressive social legislation—to community provisions for better health—to increasing state and municipal provision for recreation and leisure-time activity—or to similar provision for more educational facilities. Nor have they immunity to incursion into their field of organizations who though begin with specialization programs broaden into Community projects. We shall witness probably in the next few years two additional community wide Jewish educational and recreational movements, namely, the synagogue center movement and the Jewish educational institute movement.

I, personally, though I know that sometimes the huge, recent buildings have been erected against the better judgment of some of the thinkers in the community center movement—and out of regard for the desire for monumental structures on the part of local communities—I have viewed with dismay these huge buildings—and the concomitant lack of co-operation and guidance of and to the facilities provided by public funds. Programs such as those provided by the cities of Chicago and Detroit for the use of public school facilities as advocated in Cleveland, will not these affect more of the mass of the Jewish population for recreation and education than a huge building? Have you ever thought that if you took 10% of the cost of a \$1,250,000 building—such as some cities have erected, and devoted it to propaganda for better and more parks, playgrounds, use of school facilities and experimental work in Jewish neighborhoods, how many more persons would be affected and benefited by a Jewish Community Center program? Is there not too great stress on the term *Center* and too little on the *Community*?

We social workers know how buildings have depreciated—how communities move away from them. If electrification of the country through giant power is going to hasten movements of population and somewhat thin out our huge cities, shall we not ask for an expensive, flexible program?

What, after all is the purpose of the Center? To my mind it serves a dual purpose. On the one hand it serves to make of the average middle-class Jew a *humane* being—with all that term implies—culture, self-sufficiency—and provision for a working, fine relationship to the idea of God and man. This for the Jew. To the community, it should exhibit the average Jew as humane and human being—without romanticism of reputation for mere giving—without caricature—just as practical, useful citizen.

And this leads us back to our discussion of relationship of the Center to Community planning. Whether or not it is typical of American culture, I am not certain—but aided by us social workers—our community leaders have tended to make philanthropy almost coincidental with useful life. Masses of Jews rebel at this. They don't want philanthropy in nationalism, they don't want it in industry. But there it is.

One of the real opportunities, if not the only opportunity, that the Jews have for participation in Community life as a whole is, through philanthropic activity, whether among Jews solely or among all the peoples in the community. So come our Jewish community programs, embracing all types of activity led by the same groups of the same persons in all works. Then comes a correlated integrated community program—at least insofar as Jewish groups are concerned. In the planning and the achieving, where there is planning and achieving, the Jewish Center cannot stay out. It has for the Jewish group leadership, in making the Jew humane. When the time comes—after it (the Center) is integrated with the Jewish Community's plans and work, and the whole community plans and achieves—it also cannot remain apart. It is the means of expression of the Jew as human being. And it must have two eyes fixed on the ground before it and on the far horizon of a better community through general public improvement; not Polyphemus-like—one eye blinking in amazement—demanding in a period of lessening private and growing public social work constantly increasing programs and funds.

CHAIRMAN SEMAN: The informal discussion will now take place. We are going to limit informal discussion—that was decided on by the Program Committee—to five minutes, and I think it would be advisable to find out how many intend to discuss in order that we may have a general idea. We may have to cut that, if there are too many to discuss, to three minutes.

MR. A. OSOVSKY (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman and Fellow Workers: I am speaking from experience. For years in Winnipeg we didn't have a federation but we had organized Jewish philanthropic work. Now we have a community chest; we call it a Federated Budget. We have had it for the last three years. At first the representatives of the community chest came to us and wanted us to join with them. We thought it was a splendid thing, a splendid, marvelous thing from every point of view, and we felt we were brothers and there should be a joining of hands, and what was the difference between Jew and non-Jew, etc., etc., in social work. We have joined; for the first year, everything was all right. It was merely a financial federation. And especially it was all right because the Jewish population raised \$12,000 more than it had to take out of the community chest. The second year became harder and harder for the entire population. The entire population did not come up to the budget as assigned, and the Jewish population also fell down. Then the questions began. How many children are in orphanages? How many old folks are there by right, etc.? Isn't there some Jewish education work, etc.? Now, in the third year the questioning has gone on still farther; they are beginning to see that Jewish social work must go by itself. It must stand on its own feet if it will stand at all.

Jewish social work has its particular side, and, as Jewish social workers we know that we know better than anybody else what the real needs are. If we are to join the federation or, as you call it, the community chest, in the long end it will lead either to the assimilation of the Jewish ideal of charity, or it will lead to two different points of view. We in Winnipeg are beginning to see the light, that we will do better alone, outside of the community chest, than in it.

DR. FICHMAN (New Orleans): Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss some of the points raised by the discussion of Mr. Shroder's paper. I, too, come from a community chest town, but I am not going to let this degenerate into the usual experience meeting, because I think it has been well said that these questions have to be applied locally.

We are here for the purpose of discussing general principles, it seems to me, and of answering specific objections and setting up specific objections to the Jewish Federation affiliating with the community chest.

There are several issues that have been raised in the paper and the discussion. One is the whole question of Jewish education.

Isn't there a danger that we social workers are starting on a wrong and on a dangerous journey when we take it for granted that Jewish education is part of our federation work? I have had some leanings that way myself. I am beginning to have some doubts about the thing. I take it that Jewish education must mean religious education. I don't know of any other Jewish education, if it has not a religious trend

how can we so designate it? What is the job of the synagogue and the temple? What is the job of the Jewish religious organizations if that isn't the job? I should say decidedly that a federation that is to any large extent subsidizing Jewish organization must stay out of the chest, just as the Catholic parochial school must, unless we are willing to go further and say that the chest should subsidize all religious work in the community, then they must take care of the churches and synagogues, if that would be the trend.

Most of us would object to a trend like that.

There were several points raised by Mr. Cahn that I think need attention. He says we must look out for anti-semitism that the anti-semites in the country are going to say that the Jews are getting more out of the chest than is coming to them. On the other hand one might say that the same anti-semites might say that these Jews always refuse to play with them that we will sell them merchandise, lend them money and do everything with them except play with them in the field of social endeavor.

The answer is, of course, that the anti-semite doesn't need a club; he has one, and he will use it, and we need not fear, we are going to give him arguments to use against us.

I don't worry much about what the anti-semites in the community will say.

There is another point that Mr. Cahn raised that I think is rather doubtful. He said that the Jewish federation can bring greater pressure to bear on its own people to give to the federation than the community chest can bring to bear upon the same Jew to give to the community chest. I don't know where he gets that logic. I don't know where he gets his reasoning. I do know that the average normal Jew thinks more of what his Gentile brother in the community will think of him, and will respond more to that pressure. That is my experience wherever I have been. He will respond to that pressure more than the pressure within his own group.

Mr. Cahn also raised the argument that in the community chest giving a man will say, "I give to charity in my own way". Again, I don't see the logic of that. Why, if you solicit a man for the community chest, will he give you that answer any more than the same Jew will give it to you when he comes to the federation.

Friends, isn't there a danger that in our whole discussion of the relation of the Jewish federation to the community chest, we are trying to rationalize, as do all people, what may after all contain some elements of prejudice? Isn't there a danger that we are not able to see this thing in the clear, because of a good many fears, some of which may be well substantiated by facts and some of which I am afraid lie only in the realm of prejudice and fear of the union?

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to discuss any of the papers but rather to call attention to one point which I believe the gentleman who discussed the relation of the federation to the community chest omitted, namely, this: I know it to be a fact that for years we have been discussing and we had standing committees who were supposed to report on how to deal with the question of national institutions who have to go outside of their own limited

boundary lines and appealed to the community at large for support for their respective activities. How is the community chest, when it does take in the federation, going to deal with this problem? What kind of a deal is it going to give national institutions? Our President, Dr. Bernstein, pointed out that no outside organization, whether national or international, ought to go out on independent campaigns.

What I would like to hear especially from Mr. Shroder, who has extolled the values of the community chest, and who has so highly and warmly recommended that all federations do join the community chest, is, what is the attitude or what ought the attitude of the community chest to be towards the problem of national and international organizations in which Jews are interested, ought to be interested, and will be positively interested.

CHAIRMAN SEMAN: Since this was not a part of the discussion but merely a question, I will ask Mr. Shroder to answer him, if he will, and others in the room.

MR. SHRODER: The question of financing national and possibly international demands is a question which each community chest has to work out in its own way. Community chest processes and programs have not been standardized to the point that all community chests agree on the same proposition with reference to any detail in connection with its operations. It is too new; the community chest movement in a fairly advanced form is not more than five or six years old. The question is answered in different ways by different community chests.

Cleveland, for instance, includes in its budget a fund for national purposes. There is nothing in its practice which would prevent their including a Jewish national purpose as they include a non-sectarian national purpose.

In Cincinnati we have taken the stand on national organizations, that the local organization itself must judge the value of the national movement to its work and to its organization, and may include up to a limited per cent in its budget its support of national organizations.

After all, you come back to the fundamental underlying whatever theory, whatever practice, is adopted by the community chest, and that is that the group will have to support the chest to the extent that it expects withdrawals from the chest.

If the Jews are going to insist upon material appropriations to national and international Jewish work, they will have to increase their contributions to the chest to the point that the chest can carry that work.

When once you grasp that as fundamental, that the chest is no stronger than the groups and individuals that support it, that it cannot make \$2 out of \$1, that every dollar it gives out must come in, that the community work of each group must be supported by that group (unless its economic status is so low it is unable to support it, and then it becomes a community problem)—when you grasp that idea and are prepared to put in what you want to take out, plus your share of the responsibility for the entire community and national program the community is benefiting from, you will have no difficulty on

the financial score as to how you will be treated by the community chest.

DR. BOGEN: We are apt to confuse two problems, one the value of the community chest as a community effort, the other is the effect of the community chest on the Jewish community plan.

It seems to me it is a little too late now to discuss the value of community planning in general and the value of community chests. It is a thing tried by the Jews first and proved to be successful. That does not mean that things are all right and favorable and useful. War, for instance, in its principle, is a disrupting element. At the same time war may perform a very strong unifying effect on the parties combating.

The question is whether the community chest movement is strengthening or weakening the Jewish community plan, and it seems to me that instead of enjoying complacency and satisfaction in our achievement and especially being so happy about the bright future, it might be well to go back to history and see what happened in the past.

First of all, in order to speak of the influence that community chests may have on Jewish organization in community planning, it is time we should define what our community planning is, and what is the program. I believe the answer is given in the organization of the "Kehillah" in the European countries. That is a well rounded out Jewish community program. It included first of all religious activities. It included philanthropic activities, it included all the educational activities, included protection against the enemy of the Jews. That is a complete Jewish program. It has been tried here, and I don't believe has succeeded, because it was a compulsory organization. But the community must agree on the general program, it must be democratic, represented by democratic people. It must have the resources with which to support the element that participates in this community effort which the federation has. It must definitely decide on one line of program in each line. The time has come when we need now to discuss what is the content of our own program. In other words, if we speak of a community program is there such a thing as a community unified program or plan for the Jews separate from the community problem in general. That problem will be discussed tomorrow morning in the community organization program.

*Adjournment.*

## MONDAY LUNCHEON SESSION

JUNE 8, 1925

CHAIRMAN LURIE: The subject today for discussion—and there will be only informal discussion, we have no formal papers for this meeting—is "Changing Causes of Removal of Children from Their Homes". The chairman of the meeting himself has no prepared paper, but will begin the discussion by outlining briefly the problems involved in the removal of children from their homes. It is a particularly pertinent question for this combined group to discuss, inasmuch as it involves both agencies very pertinently, both types of organizations, those that deal with family welfare problems and those that deal with children outside of their homes. In our discussion today we are considering removal of children from their homes in its broader aspects. We are not confining ourselves to the forcible removal of children by process of law or compulsion, but are using the term to signify also the removal of children by voluntary surrender, and are including in our discussion all of the children who are at the present time receiving assistance from agencies who placed them in some other institution than their natural home.

The problem therefore of the changing standards of removal of children from their homes involves very decidedly the standards of social agencies, standards reached by agencies in the children's field as well as those reached by agencies in the child-caring field. We take as our assumption that the natural home is the traditional institution to care for children.

We are aware in our discussion, or should be, of its various inadequacies, as judged in any practicable or ideal consideration. The removal, therefore, of children from the home, should be considered as a substitute for the particular advantages of the natural or normal home, and I think it is. We have reached the point in social work where we can consider with the removal from their natural home the possibilities of so developing the natural home of the child that removal may not be essential.

I want to outline also briefly in beginning the discussion the changes which have taken place in the attitude towards children who are potentially the types that should be removed or are being removed from their natural surroundings.

I think most of us will remember the stage in social service when children were removed from their homes for almost any reason which the parents saw fit to give, when the community in general had an attitude of *laissez faire* towards the problem of the dependent child or the one that could not be adjusted in his own home. I think many of the workers here can remember the time when very naturally in the process of caring for dependent families, children were removed from homes where the father had deserted the mother, as a regular process of case work, it was felt desirable wherever a mother was deserted to take the children away from her, because of the danger involved in a collusive desertion.