

PLANNING, ALLOCATIONS, AND FINANCIAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE FEDERATION SYSTEM

GARY A. TOBIN, PH.D.

Director, Maurice and Marilyn Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts

A new organizational structure needs to be created for federations that redefines the relationship between a changing fund-raising system and an outdated planning and allocations system. Human resource development and Jewish continuity must be replaced with the building of Jewish identity and the Jewish growth of individuals. Simply maintaining the system will result in an organization that is unresponsive to community needs and vision.

Major changes have occurred in the organizational and institutional structure of the Jewish community, and the federation system has been at the center of these dramatic changes. Over the years, federations have assumed a variety of functions and activities as part of their institutional agenda, including leadership development, Jewish education, and some direct service functions. Yet, the core of the federation agenda has been annual fund raising through a central umbrella campaign. An allocations process then distributes that money to local agencies, national agencies, and for overseas purposes in Israel and other countries. The organization has been primarily structured to raise most of its money from a relatively select group of major donors.

The language of campaign is now yielding to the phrase "financial resource development," signifying a major adjustment in the federation system. Financial resource development recognizes the expansion of fund-raising activities within the federation system beyond the annual campaign. These include endowments, special campaigns, and the sets of activities that help an annual campaign, such as donor cultivation. The budgeting process has given way to planning and allocations, signifying a more systematic and more carefully assessed method of distributing funds. Planning includes long-range planning, strategic planning,

and other kinds of future-oriented activities that place allocations in a larger context. This systemic approach includes both the scope and the length of time that allocations are being considered—multi-year as well as annual. Although many in the system now recognize the need to integrate financial resource development and allocations, the relationship remains unclear in many federations. The federation system has not yet fully captured the implications of the sea changes that are affecting the internal structure of the system.

BACKGROUND

In some ways the federation system has responded positively to changes in the Jewish community, but has not yet coordinated its own internal evolution. Although some of the changes are dramatic, such as the evolving peace between Israel and its neighbors, the fund-raising system still has time to plan and change and respond. Most changes are long term and gradual. For example, many Jews, especially leaders in Jewish organizations and institutions, have been turning their attention over the past few years to assimilation and the loss of Jewish identity. There are a myriad of responses: denial, confusion, panic, a call to arms for action. But these communal trends have been developing for a long time and are difficult to precisely characterize

and therefore comprehend. The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, which showed an intermarriage rate of approximately 50 percent, set off some communal alarms to address the issue of Jewish continuity. Yet, this study clarified what most individuals already understood intuitively and experientially, with a snapshot of community changes that were already in process. Organizations and institutions are able more easily to respond to an immediate crisis or to a major event, such as a war in Israel, than to gradual shifts in a community's structure and culture. Changes in values and norms that lead to assimilation and transformation in Jewish identity are more difficult to address.

Nevertheless, the Jewish federation system now is responding to the peace process, the growing awareness of an assimilating Jewish community, and the implications of both for fund raising, planning, and allocations. The federation system was forged by generations with unique life experiences that shaped the ideology and structure of the federation movement. For first- and second-generation Jews, the formative experiences were the Holocaust; the economic disaster of the Depression; anti-Semitic barriers in neighborhoods, schools, and employment; and the birth of Israel. For third-, fourth-, and subsequent generations, their life-shaping experiences have been the Six-Day War, the Intifada, and peace, prosperity, open access, and power in America and Israel. Jews have been integral in reshaping societal norms and institutional structures in the United States. Third- and fourth-generation Jews have never known a world without Israel. Periodically threatened with destruction by external forces, Israel has always triumphed.

The macro forces that shape identity and therefore the federation system have been accompanied by major shifts in the demography of the Jewish community, particularly in family structure, mobility, and the accumulation of wealth. Highly educated and well off, the Jewish population is com-

paratively wealthy both in terms of income and accumulated assets. At no time in American Jewish history has fund raising had a more prosperous potential base.

There have been major changes revolving around Jewish identity and behavior. Israel, which has been a keystone in Jewish identity for the past fifty years, now enjoys somewhat lower levels of support among younger Jews. Identification with Judaism within the United States has become more marginal for younger Jews. The multiculturalism and pluralism of the society as a whole have permeated the Jewish community as well. Younger Jews are far less likely to fast on Yom Kippur, are far more likely to have Christmas trees, and are less likely to have their male children ritually circumcised than all previous generations. In contrast, studies also show that some younger Jews are more likely to belong to synagogues, to observe some Jewish rituals, and to engage in some form of Jewish education than previous generations. Therefore, no single characteristic can define Jewish identity and behavior for the entire Jewish population. Some are moving away and some are moving closer, but the drift is generally away.

No one can dispute that rates of intermarriage have been rising over the past two generations. The National Jewish Population Survey indicates intermarriage rates at around 50 percent. As anti-Semitic barriers broke down and Jews became more prosperous, their integration into the general society quickened. With higher levels of normative acceptance for marriage to a non-Jew, and the children of mixed marriages themselves more likely to marry non-Jews, the rates of intermarriage continued to climb. Other data indicate that where a conversion to Judaism takes place, children in these families are more likely to be more Jewish. It is unclear what the long-range effects of intermarriage will be on the Jewish community. Since most marriages do not result in conversion, levels of involvement of mixed-married couples tend to be

lower than those of in-married couples.

Demographic and religious identity changes have been accompanied by structural changes, particularly in Jewish organizations and institutions. Both synagogue membership and attendance are low. Yet, some synagogues are booming, and a certain core of Jews continues to attend on a regular basis. Total dollars given to Jewish philanthropies, including federations, are at an all-time high, although the number of givers is down. The streams of giving have moved from the annual campaign to special campaigns and endowments. Organizational membership has been declining in some mainstream organizations, whereas new institutions, such as family foundations, have emerged in great strength. Younger Jews are more likely to volunteer now for non-Jewish organizations than Jewish organizations, and it is the reverse for their parents and grandparents. Yet, a core of Jewish leaders has developed, even among the younger generations, that is more likely to be as committed as their parents or grandparents.

Therefore, no single set of trends, either in terms of direction or intensity, characterizes the contemporary Jewish community. The sea changes that result from the peace process in Israel and continuing assimilation in the United States are difficult to characterize in such a way that would enable financial resource development and planning to follow some simple set of guidelines. However, it is clear that, for both Israel and the United States, emphasis will be shifting to internal security, rather than concern with external threats.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

For decades, federations have been solidifying themselves as central fund-raising organizations within the Jewish community. They have been quite successful in this endeavor. The federation system constitutes the single largest fund-raising system in Jewish life, raising and distributing hun-

dreds of millions of dollars to both local agencies and to the United Jewish Appeal for distribution to the Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) and the United Israel Appeal (UIA)—dollars designated for Jewish communities around the world and for Israel. This fund-raising umbrella has had the most success with major donors who often contribute \$100,000, \$250,000, a million dollars, or more on an annual basis. Such donors believe that one central fund-raising organization, using a consensus model of decision making, represents a reasonable, safe, and equitable way to make major donations or to serve the greatest number of purposes, institutions, and recipients. Federations have even adopted the phrase that they are the "central address" of the Jewish community, and in the absence of any other central institution, the claim is probably true. The other major institutional force in Jewish life, the synagogue, is split along a variety of ideological and denominational lines. Synagogues do not represent a singular cohesive political or social force in the Jewish community. Other major agencies and organizations, such as Jewish Community Centers, Jewish family service agencies, or others, fall under the umbrella of beneficiary agencies of the federation. In some communities federations are now bringing synagogues under the allocations umbrella, offering synagogues grants for specific programs in Jewish education, family education, or to promote Jewish continuity. The sphere of the federation therefore has been expanding, not shrinking.

Yet, large amounts of money are raised completely outside the federation system, including money for Israeli universities, Hadassah, yeshivahs in Israel, and a whole host of organizations, agencies, and institutions. For example, local agencies have their own fund-raising drives, and the total dollar amounts raised by synagogues through dues and other means exceed the dollar amounts contributed to the annual campaigns in federations. Therefore, the strength of the federation derives from the

fact that it is the *biggest* force in most communities, not a monopolistic force.

It is important to recognize, however, that most of the growth of federations over the past twenty years has occurred outside its annual campaign, through special campaigns and endowment funds. The allocations system therefore has received a major jolt in many communities. The federation system has been developed to raise money on an annual basis to be put into a central budgetary pot. An allocations system has developed where X amounts of the monies are used for administrative purposes, Y amounts of money are sent to the United Jewish Appeal, and Z amounts of money are allocated primarily to local agencies, with some going to national agencies.

The new sources of revenue—endowments and philanthropic funds—often have developed into a separate system. Monies that reside in philanthropic funds and restricted and unrestricted endowment funds are sometimes allocated through a grant process, usually with committees and boards that are separate and often independent to one degree or another from the rest of federation and the committee structure. In many federations, therefore, parallel allocations processes have developed, and depending on the federation, they may or may not be well coordinated. The fastest growing realm of fund raising in the federation system, the endowment movement, has produced a reservoir of funds that may or may not be part of the allocations system. In some federations, the allocations from both the annual campaign and endowments are well coordinated. Some endowments make block grants to the allocations committee. In other federations, the growth of endowment funds has allowed the creation of a parallel universe within the federation system that may or may not intersect effectively. In some federations, the endowment system is almost out of the control of the consensus-oriented model. Agencies may be forced to make dual allocation requests through the annual campaign funds to the

endowment fund. In some communities, agencies cannot make requests of the endowment fund without first clearing them through the planning and allocations process. And in other federations, agencies may go directly to the endowment fund.

The growth of endowment and philanthropic funds is a result partly of changes in tax laws and also donors' desire for greater control over the use of their gifts. Although some major donors are still comfortable with the idea of a central fund-raising organization for the distribution of their gifts, others would like to see their gifts used for particular purposes. The same donors may endorse the idea of the umbrella fund-raising system, but have specific interests in Jewish education, human service needs, Israel, or a wide range of designated missions, goals, and purposes. Philanthropic funds and foundations within the federation system allow the donors to have more participation, influence, and control over their giving *within* the federation system. Therefore, these philanthropic funds and foundations within the federation system allow the donors the best of both worlds. They allow them to be part of an overall fund-raising system that is greater than the sum of the parts, but at the same time facilitates their involvement in their own particular interests. Most donors, especially major donors, are increasingly unwilling to place their money in a central fund over which they have little say about its ultimate distribution.

This phenomenon also has been the impetus for the establishment of major Jewish foundations outside the federation umbrella. Unlike foundations of the past, in many Jewish family foundations today the principal donor is alive and active within his or her own foundation. Major Jewish foundations include Koret, Cummings, Wexner, Bronfman, Crown, and others. There are now thousands of Jewish family foundations in America, and more are being created all the time. Enormous wealth in the Jewish community has been accumulated over the

past two generations, and much of it is finding its way into family foundations. Not unlikely, within a few years the total amounts of money distributed by endowment funds and family foundations will exceed the total dollar amounts allocated through the annual campaigns of federations. In some communities this phenomenon may have already occurred.

Over the next ten years the most important institutional players in the Jewish philanthropic and community structure may be the combination of federation endowment funds and family foundations. The boards, committees, major donors, and professionals within the endowment and family foundation structure may exert more influence on policy and planning decisions and therefore on the future direction of the Jewish community than any other institution or set of institutions. In most communities the individuals who create the endowment funds and the philanthropic funds within the federation also have their own family foundations and are also the largest major donors in the federation's annual campaign. However, in many cases their annual gift has remained static over the years while the other sources of giving have increased. With each passing year the *relative* importance of the annual campaign has decreased for major donors.

Over the years, the largest donors play less and less of a role in the active leadership of the federation. They are less likely to be active on the board or committees within the federation, having already served in leadership positions. They still may play a leadership role by virtue of the size of their annual gift, but they are not as likely to be involved in the volunteer management of the federation, especially the annual campaign. The annual campaign has little emotional appeal for many major donors. It is viewed as an annual tax. Their interest and passion are more likely to be aroused by their role in their own philanthropic or endowment funds or their own family foundations.

THE NEED FOR CHANGE

The primary mission of federation should be to increase the identity of Jews, strengthening their positive conceptions of what it means to be a Jew. This leads to greater participation in Jewish life and richer individual and communal growth. The world as a whole is improved by the special role Jews can play.

The need for change in the federation system is apparent to most professionals and lay leaders. However, discussions usually focus on programmatic areas: what programs can be offered to particular subgroups of Jews to involve them more in Jewish life? Questions abound: "How do we reach teens? How do we induce intermarried couples to belong to synagogues? How do we induce more professionals to contribute to an annual campaign?"

Yet, two critical sets of questions must be asked before programmatic solutions can be addressed adequately. Federations must first explore ideological/conceptual questions. What type of Jewish community is the federation attempting to build? What are the cultural and religious frameworks that we wish to perpetuate and revise? How does contemporary Judaism thrive in postmodern Diaspora communities, and how do they relate to Israel?

A second set of federation inquiries should concern its structure. Assuming that visions of a growing and vibrant Jewish community are found, what organizational and institutional structures are in place or are needed to reach that vision? Do some organizations facilitate change and new directions or prohibit growth? Are there major gaps in the current structure of the Jewish community to achieve desired changes? How does federation fund raising fit into these evolving structures?

Ideological and structural changes can lead to more cohesive approaches to fund raising. Certainly, new programs need to be created, and some have already been instituted. But programs must be modeled,

evaluated, and replicated within the context of reshaping why institutions do what they do (ideology) and the mechanisms to achieve appropriate response and change (structure).

Different questions have to be asked. For example, federations have typically been concerned with such issues as how to involve more individuals in the annual campaign, how to induce more people to serve on boards and committees, what techniques should be used in terms of developing a particular fund-raising message or to obtain more people to solicit, how to train leaders more effectively, how to induce more people to visit Israel, and how to develop priority-setting systems within a planning and allocations system. All of these continue to be vital issues. Even as ideologies and structures change, it is still important for individuals to visit Israel, it is still important to find new leaders and involve them in boards and committees, and it is still important to experiment with new and interesting fund-raising techniques and messages in annual and other campaigns.

These issues, however, need to be supplemented with another set that acknowledge the changing realities of the contemporary Jewish community. Federations must face the lack of commitment of many Jews to any Jewish agency or organization. Federations must seriously address the competition from other non-Jewish philanthropies for the time, attention, and interest of Jewish volunteers and donors. Federations must look at the substance of Jewish life and at those aspects of culture, religiosity, and social structure that affect fund raising.

The baseline assumptions on which the federation system operates need to be assessed and challenged. The federation sits at the center of a variety of organizations and institutions that it funds on the basis of the programs and services that are offered. Federations assume that those programs and services are achieving certain ends, their purposes and goals are being achieved, and that the greater good of the Jewish commu-

nity is being served. Yet, there is very little in the current system that allows for a systematic evaluation of the programs that are provided by Jewish organizations and agencies funded through the umbrella system.

LOOKING FOR NEW LANGUAGE

The ideological underpinning of the emerging Jewish community will require an alternate language. First and foremost, the phrase "Jewish continuity" needs to be abandoned. Continuity is a cheap imitation of survival and reflects a concern with maintaining the status quo. It shows a fear that the strength of the Jewish community is not great enough to sustain itself for generations. The call to maintain Jewish continuity is a reactive ideology born of fear and frustration and is not very forward looking. Jewish federations, if they are going to be on the cutting edge of change, need to be forming commissions of Jewish commitment, growth, and renewal, rather than commissions on Jewish continuity.

Jewish education is another phrase that has become obsolete. It is closely associated with either supplemental or all-day schools for children and youth. Often one hears claims that more Jewish education is the key to maintaining Jewish continuity. This combination of deadly phrases is basically a call for expending more financial resources in the most traditional Jewish education venues in the hope that such investment will solidify the Jewish identity of these children and youth and last into their adult lives. However, it is the transmittal of Jewish tradition and learning, morals and ethics within the current generation and between the generations that is really at issue. Jewish learning is both experiential and cognitive, formal and informal, intellectual and emotional, and it encompasses a whole range of activities, processes, and events. Therefore, Jewish education as a phrase needs to be replaced with Jewish learning and growth in order to capture the complexity of the phenomenon of the lifelong experience of Jewishness.

Membership is another word that needs either abandonment or redefinition. Membership in synagogues, for example, cannot be defined solely as those who pay dues on an annual basis to the synagogue. Membership in the federation cannot be conceptualized as making a large enough gift to be welcome within the peer group of leadership circles. Membership must come to mean an inclusiveness within the totality of the Jewish community that used to come either through birth to a Jewish mother or ritual conversion into the peoplehood of the Jews. If membership is defined by financial criteria alone, the community will continue to decline in numbers.

Financial resource development is a phrase that needs rethinking. It does not capture the need to build upon the central campaign with endowments, special campaigns, and capital campaigns. New language is required to recognize the need to integrate different fund-raising mechanisms within the federation system and to approach the donor in a more holistic fashion. Currently, the once-a-year annual solicitation is often divorced from other aspects of the federation fund-raising system and remains the most difficult task. Financial resource development can be used as a screen to de-emphasize the important role of involving individuals in annual giving. Financial resource development must be amended as a phrase and replaced with the ideology of *tzedakah*. *Tzedakah* includes patterns of behavior, such as helping provide employment, providing a certain moral and ethical framework for human interaction in the exchange of monetary gifts, and putting money in the context of other morals and values as well. The federation needs to be at the forefront of recapturing *tzedakah* as an ideology and not just as a phrase.

Federation itself is a name that should be abandoned. Federation connotes a loose consortium. It does not truly reflect either the purpose, the mission, or the character of the organization. Federation conveys an

amorphous body to most individuals and does not have in its title any reference to fund raising, community building, or any of the other functions of the organization. Furthermore, research has shown that the term "federation," especially among younger Jews, is most closely identified with science fiction films and the television show "Star Trek." The United Jewish Fund, the United Jewish Community Fund, or some variation on this language would be a more appropriate title for the federation.

Human resource development is another term that needs to be abandoned. The Jewish community does not develop human resources in the same way in which livestock is raised. Human resource development de-emphasizes the purpose of the communal endeavor since individuals must be thought of as more than resources, but also as human beings. Human resource development smacks of a desire to invest in individuals in order to use them. This is inappropriate phraseology for the Jewish community. The phrase human resource development should be replaced with human development, so that we are looking at the totality of the person, not at his or her use as a resource.

Last but not least, the language of crisis fund raising, especially in behalf of Israel, needs to be modified. This language was developed at a time before Israel had reached some measure of economic strength and before peace had emerged as a real possibility. The language of crisis fund raising portraying Israel as weak or perhaps defenseless undermines the changing relationship between the Diaspora and Israeli society. A new language, one of mutual respect and cooperation, needs to permeate the Jewish organizational and institutional network, and federations need to take the lead in developing it. Such an ideological change should lead to a different set of structural realities. Philanthropic Zionism must give way to economic development, joint ventures, cultural exchange, and joint program activities between groups of American and Israeli Jews. Rabbi Brian

Lurie, executive director of the United Jewish Appeal, has termed this new relationship a "living bridge," a system where not only dollars but also ideas and human beings move from one culture to another, back and forth in an interactive fashion. Jews should continue to raise money for use in Israel. The subsidy of *aliyah* and the creation of a stronger and more vibrant Jewish society are important. But these donations must be coupled with a greater personal and institutional involvement that connects two communities of strength, rather than two communities of potential weakness.

DEFINING A NEW INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

The internal service delivery system at the local level must also change. There should be nothing sacrosanct about the current constellation of Jewish organizations, agencies, and institutions. Some glaring gaps are obvious in the system. For example, a national Jewish community requires a national Jewish information and referral system. The Jewish community needs to take hold of the reality of high mobility and develop mechanisms to link individuals who move into Jewish communities new to them. A Jewish service corps to recruit and train volunteers for a variety of activities within the Jewish community and for the Jewish community to serve the general community needs to be integrated into Jewish organizational life. The new Jewish Peace Corps helps fill this void. The only way to recapture the volunteer energy of the Jewish community is to have an institutional network that facilitates meaningful interchange among Jews. Currently there is no national retreat center, and few regional retreat centers for that matter, in the Jewish community. Hotels, conference centers, and a variety of venues are used instead of a well-designed and well-administered retreat center for Jewish learning. Currently there are very few institutions that actively promote and encourage conversion to Judaism. Inter-marriage is affecting more and more

Jews, and yet the mechanisms to help non-Jewish spouses and the children of these spouses to formally enter the covenant of Judaism do not exist. Synagogues may or may not play that role, but a consortium of synagogues in conjunction with other organizations and agencies or a new institution entirely may be appropriate to face this major challenge in contemporary Jewish life. Currently a wide variety of organizations, including the Council of Jewish Federations, the Jewish Community Centers Association, and others, serve the purpose of collecting and transmitting information. Universities may also play this role. But there is currently no institution in the Jewish community, no national information exchange center, that facilitates the exchange of research, institutional experiences, and organizational data. A vast reservoir of materials exists in terms of programs, analysis, models of marketing materials, and so on that requires a sophisticated exchange network.

These are just some of the gaps that can be identified in the Jewish communal structure. There are many more. Even where there seems to be adequate services, such as housing or nursing home care for the elderly, it is not clear that such services are delivered in the most efficient manner possible. The current constellation of agencies and organizations were developed to respond to specific needs in the Jewish community at the time of their inception and evolution. Some may be well suited to the 1990s, some need slight reorganization, and some need abandonment. But these structural issues need to be faced head on by the federation system.

The fund-raising system itself also needs some major structural changes. More professionals are required to be engaged in the business of *tzedakah*, a one-on-one teaching interchange and interaction with donors. At the same time, *tzedakah* is a communal enterprise, and the techniques of mass marketing, telemarketing, direct mail, and others need to be used to involve the largest

number of individuals. Restructuring the fund raising with more personal attention and more technical sophistication is only a part of the structural changes that need to take place. An overall approach that integrates the various streams of fund raising within the federation is essential. There is too much disparate activity in the realms of endowment, capital campaign, annual campaign, and special campaigns. It is confusing to the donor and an inefficient use of professional/lay resources within the system. The current system does not attend to the changing reality of how individuals think about their giving and how other organizations and institutions, particularly universities, health care, and cultural arts institutions, are soliciting Jews. A restructuring of the fund-raising system in the direction of a more comprehensive approach is already under consideration at some federations, but it needs to be discussed more fully as an emerging systemic change.

The notion of planning needs to be reassessed entirely. Different federations have engaged in long-range planning, strategic planning, short-range planning, and emergency planning. Some have gone through the process of setting long-range goals, redefining their mission, looking at their strengths and weaknesses, and the various techniques that are used in a variety of planning strategies. These are all good tools and should continue to be used in the system. Furthermore, programs have been devised to develop leaders for the management of the organization. Often, leadership development also implies placing individuals on agency boards and committees and ultimately increasing their gifts to the federation. Leadership development and long-range planning have been the traditional mechanisms to reinvigorate and revitalize the system over time.

Long-range planning, short-range planning, and planning and allocation need to be amended with community planning, which goes far beyond tinkering at the margins. Community planning encompasses

the overall rethinking of the Jewish community in terms of ideology, structure, and programs.

Community planning must reintegrate fund raising, planning, and allocations in new ways. The current planning and allocations process is at best ineffective and, at worst, largely destructive. Committees are required to allocate monies for local purposes largely from the revenue stream of the annual campaign. Although revenues from endowments, capital campaigns, and special campaigns have skyrocketed over the past years, the annual campaigns have been largely flat or declining. Therefore, the allocations process often turns into a fruitless, frustrating, and often angry set of meetings where individuals are charged with divvying up an ever-static or decreasing pie. Agencies are forced to redo their budgets over and over again to demonstrate need. New programs are rarely funded, and most budgets go up or down a few percent. Creativity is lost, and animosity between the agencies and federation builds. The system is almost guaranteed to engender negative responses to new programs and ideas, and certainly to the creation of new organizations and institutions. The current planning and allocations system maintains the status quo, which is neither good for community goodwill nor for institutional and therefore community growth. The system is certainly no mechanism for developing leadership and is as likely to dissuade future involvement as to create it. Most of all, it is an excessive waste of lay and professional resources. The time spent going through the exercise of preparing budgets, reviewing them, and demonstrating crisis or lack of crisis, depending on the committee, misuses valuable human energy that should be spent on creativity and growth.

The current planning and allocations system also creates a false and dangerous tension between the need for local services and providing funds for Israel. As long as allocations take place primarily through the fund-raising stream of the annual cam-

paign, local agencies will receive a lower amount of money raised in the federation system. Major dollars are now being funneled to capital campaigns, special campaigns for Israel, or endowments that may or may not be accessible to the planning and allocations process, depending on the federation. Some individuals are even suggesting that the crisis of continuity in the United States is so severe because of the funding for Israel. If only we had spent those monies locally, they argue, we would not be in this condition. It is an erroneous argument, of course, in that Israel has been the strongest element in the centralized campaign and the monies would not have been available at all for local uses. Furthermore, the strength of the Jewish community over the past fifty years has developed along with Israel. Their identity and growth have been inseparable, and such revisionism distorts the primary role Israel plays in Jewish identity. Yet the current system fosters such discord.

CONCLUSION

Leaders within the Jewish federation need to invent and create a new organizational and institutional reality that redefines the relationship between a changing fund-rais-

ing system and an outdated planning and allocations system. System maintenance will result in an overall lack of community planning and community vision. Leaders must be constantly dreaming a better world and be active participants in building it. Human resource development must be replaced with the building of Jewish identity and the growth of individuals as human beings and Jews. Federations then take on a different set of roles and meanings. If the federation reconnects planning and allocations and fund raising in this new system, individuals will assume leadership roles because they will be involved in the exciting activity of designing and creating the Jewish community of the future.

The revitalization of Jewish organizations, the revitalization of Jewish leadership, and the rededication of the federation system mean the realignment of financial resource development and planning into a new ideology and structure. Once these tasks are under way, appropriate programs will follow. They will reflect the growth of individuals, of institutions, and the community as a whole. Jewish continuity will vanish as a goal, and Jewish growth will emerge as part of the evolving Jewish civilization.