

An agency that receives public support can cover at least some of its overhead costs from public dollars. To the extent that this move liberates philanthropic dollars, that money can be redirected into value-added services for Jewish clients.

A third consideration concerns the empirical or sociological relationship between the Jewish community and the general community. Simply stated, Jews are affected by what happens to their neighbors. This is true for the whole diverse spectrum of Jewish communities, even for *Chasidic* groups that consciously cultivate insularity. It follows that it would be imprudent for Jews to be indifferent to the social welfare needs of the community at large, needs that are also present for the most part in the Jewish community. We could treat these needs only as they affect Jewish clients, but doing so would ignore the fact that the quality of life within the Jewish community rises and falls with the quality of life of the general community. When we work to improve the lives of those in the general community through nonsectarian service, we thereby provide a service, albeit indirectly, to our Jewish client.

As a fourth consideration, let us consider the notion of *tikkun olam*. "Healing the world" describes well the activity of the JFS agency that serves both Jews and non-Jews. In addition to being imprudent, it might also be unethical by Jewish standards for a JFS agency to be indifferent to the social welfare needs of the general community. Perhaps the best way

to explore this ethical question is to ask ourselves, Can one be a truly Jewish organization and help only Jews? For me, the answer is no, if without our involvement there are inadequate resources to serve the non-Jewish community.

Finally, a JFS agency can gain considerable strength from being diverse. A diversity of funding sources leaves us less vulnerable to unexpected changes in any one of them. Offering a diversity of programs to a diversity of clients makes us more flexible and thereby better able to adapt to shifts in the environment.

CONCLUSION

There are no easy solutions to the issues that arise when Jewishly affiliated human service providers choose to offer services on a nonsectarian basis. Depending on local conditions, different agencies will have to arrive at different solutions, taking into account such factors as their size, the strength of their philanthropic support, and the character and diversity of the Jewish communities they serve. My intent in this article has been to stress the need for all of us to consider the question of how to balance the tensions between Jewish identity and diversity. The current environment has made this a particularly important question, and as long as we continue to engage it in a thoughtful manner, all of our agencies—and our communities—will be able to learn and profit from the dynamic tension and creative potential.

FEDERATIONS AND JEWISH FAMILY SERVICES A Partnership to Strengthen the Caring Community

CHARLES ZIBBELL

Former Associate Executive Director of the Council of Jewish Federations, Executive Committee Member and Former Vice President, Association of Jewish Family and Children's Agencies, and Board Member, Jewish Family Service, San Diego, California

Jewish Family Service agencies and Federations must explore together their ongoing relationships, their common concerns, and their different roles with the goal of developing new strategies to deal with today's challenging realities. JFS agencies represent the community expression of caring and must be part of the communal planning enterprise and not merely service-delivery mechanisms.

It is inevitable as we move closer to the twenty-first century that thoughtful leaders of the Jewish community should seize this time as an opportunity for extensive stock-taking about the entire Jewish enterprise. The value of a reassessment lies not only in the opportunity to define assets and liabilities and to identify the major issues that we confront, but also in the sorting out of the critical changes that need to be initiated and the continuities that should be maintained. Certainly, by now we have learned how closely inter-related are continuity and change. Indeed, some seasoned observers of the Jewish scene feel strongly that the distinctive know-how of Jewish leaders lies in their recognition that selective change has been the hallmark of Jewish continuity.

The roots of the caring community lie deep in Jewish history. Indeed, the very uncertainties confronting Jewish communities in various historic periods and in different places in the world led to the creation of portable institutions that were critical to the survival of the Jewish people. Mutual support among Jewish communities throughout the world was a practical and effective response, as well as an implementation of ethical imperatives.

Beginning over 100 years ago, the establishment of the Federation-agency system recognized that a social contract, largely implicit, bound both parties. The Federation would conduct the fund-raising campaign and allocate the funds to the agencies, and the agencies would carry out their growing programs of meeting Jewish human needs. As

the system evolved, new needs were identified and incorporated by a process of community planning in which agencies and Federation played partnership roles. With the rise of Nazism, the growth of world-wide anti-Semitism, and political and social upheavals in the European Jewish communities, the Federations and their agencies with their decades of local experience moved into the global arena (Bernstein, 1983).

Today, Federations mobilize about a billion dollars a year through their annual campaigns, endowment fund development, and capital fundraising. Together with their agencies, they leverage hundreds of millions of additional dollars through fees, governmental funds, independent fund raising, and special grants. The "gross Jewish communal product," the total result of these fiscal activities, undergirds a vast Jewish human services enterprise.

Jewish Family Service (JFS) agencies were part of this great mobilization to meet the needs of the twentieth century. As needs grew, staff became professionalized and incorporated into their work the insights of the social and psychological sciences that could improve the outcomes in the families that sought their help (Dolgoff & Feldstein, 1980). Large numbers of immigrants were cared for efficiently and effectively, and found their way into Jewish community life even as they integrated into the American environment. Comprehensive services to the elderly expanded as their numbers and needs grew. Educational and preventive services devel-

oped, and concrete programs emerged for a variety of populations at risk—support for the bereaved and for the single mother, Big Brothers, free loans, and the like. Volunteers were mobilized in the thousands to help in specific tasks and to provide the governance and support for the expanded agencies—now a vibrant, progressive, and responsive part of the community system.

As we stand at the threshold of the new century we are especially conscious of the challenges and problem that lie ahead. Here are some of the major issues we must confront as a community:

- Jewish demographic trends (Kosmin et al., 1991): the aging of the population, declining fertility, growing number of single parents, increasing mobility and dispersal of the population, and emergence of the fourth and fifth generation of American Jews
- Landmark changes in governmental responsibilities for the needy: welfare reform, budget reductions, and devolution of responsibilities from federal to state authority
- Monumental changes in the health care system that affect not only people in need but also the delivery of family services
- Increased rates of intermarriage and diminished identification with the Jewish community
- Worry about the declining public acceptance of federated fund raising in general and particularly the leveling-off in annual Federation campaigns
- Concern over the diminished attractiveness of a more prosperous Israel as a major partner in community campaigns, tied in with the uncertainties of war and peace in the Middle East in a fast-changing political climate

In the face of these challenges it is essential that JFS agencies and Federation leadership—lay and professional, local and national—live up to their responsibilities. They must begin to explore together their ongoing relations, their common and mutual concerns and their

different roles with the goal of developing new strategies to deal with the changing environment. With the background of one hundred years of experience and a clear-eyed perception of the problems looming ahead, this is a valuable exercise that will benefit the entire Jewish community.

The following propositions could serve as the basis for this exploration of some of the basic challenges facing the Jewish community. They are not intended to be dogmatic statements, but rather to serve as discussion-openers that can help set the agenda. The hope is that common ground can be identified and consensus reached on the steps to be taken toward effective solutions.

PROPOSITION I: A CARING COMMUNITY IS A CONTINUING COMMUNITY.

A community that is concerned about the needs of its members and mobilizes resources and programs to meet those needs will elicit commitments that are at the heart of continuity. This is more than a matter of "you take care of me and I'll take care of you." It goes to the essence of the Jewish social ethic—that the heart of the Jewish people's mission is *tikkun olam*, the repair of the world. The communal system was devised to implement in institutional form the principle that "we are our brother's keeper." The Jewish tradition placed heavy emphasis on the deed, namely, "doing" Jewish. That's what our service agencies are all about. This is not to denigrate education and culture, which play the key role in learning. But doing is also learning. Through Jewish "doing" we have brought into being the caring community with its communal agenda. It would be a tragic mistake to identify only Jewish learning activities as the sole means of strengthening Jewish continuity.

PROPOSITION II: THE SOCIAL CONTRACT IN THE FEDERATION/ AGENCY SYSTEM IS OF FUNDAMENTAL IMPORTANCE.

The Federation-agency system developed on

the basis of a social contract—sometimes explicit but often implicit. Like all contracts, it sets forth the distinctive roles, mutual responsibilities, and common goals of the parties involved. Parties to a contract respect each other's autonomy. They have different roles, but one is not subordinate to the other. They feel free to discuss issues and to hammer out solutions that meet the needs of both. Any fundamental changes in the nature of this relationship should be made only after very careful deliberation and with the participation of all parties.

The importance of this contract cannot be overstated. It has established the basis for mutual trust and understanding and has provided guidelines for day-to-day living and working together for the past one hundred years.

PROPOSITION III: FEDERATIONS AND AGENCIES HAVE COMMON GOALS BUT DIFFERENT ROLES.

An effective partnership is built on the recognition that the various partners play different roles that complement one another and strengthen the overall enterprise. The primary role of the Federation is to organize and strengthen the Jewish community, to mobilize human and fiscal resources, and to serve as the central community address for planning and coordination. The JFS agency must focus on strengthening families and individuals. In doing so, it has special links with the social welfare community and crosses over into the fields of health and informal education. As a human service agency, it serves as an important bridge for the Jewish community in finding allies and encouraging collaboration with agencies in the general community. Mutual recognition and acceptance of different roles are essential to the communal partnership.

PROPOSITION IV: THE JEWISH COMMUNITY SHOULD ACT AS THE EXTENDED JEWISH FAMILY.

With the dispersion of Jewish families all over North America and the heightened mobility of the population, the traditional strength of the

Jewish family has been eroded. Increasingly, the generations are separated from one another geographically, and when Jewish families face the same problems as their neighbors—single parenthood, domestic violence, substance addiction and the like—the extended family is not there to offer support. What is called for is a searching look at the potential of the Jewish community to act as a substitute for the extended family when the need arises. This examination would open up consideration of a substantial array of services to strengthen the core family. With the aging of our population, this concept may call for a specialized approach to a comprehensive set of community-based services for the elderly in assisted living.

PROPOSITION V: THE JFS IS THE "911" OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY.

A caring community must be an accessible community. Our families under stress must feel that there is always a listening ear for their concerns and needs. Emergencies are natural occurrences in family life, and the Jewish community must provide for them. But that care should go beyond emergencies. The JFS agency should be designated as the first number to call when a need arises. Trained counselors should be available for advice, services, aid, and action. Making this possible will require a new level of commitment of human and financial resources and a creative approach to program planning and development.

PROPOSITION VI: NEW WAYS OF PLANNING AND FINANCING MUST BE EXPLORED.

The classical formulation was very simple: The agencies carry out the programs, and the Federation provides the financial resources. But life has become more complicated than that. Agency programs have had to expand beyond the resources that Federations could commit; multiple streams of funding, including United Ways, fees for service, public funds, special grants, and independent fund raising have now been tapped. The fiscal

picture has become a complicated mosaic.

Federations themselves have begun to recognize that the annual campaign, as vital as it is, cannot serve as the be-all and end-all of funding. The dramatic increase in endowment funds among Federations bodes well for creative thinking about new approaches. As allocations to agencies have leveled off, the agencies have begun to test the waters of independent fund raising. This activity has set off alarm bells in Federations, which are concerned about the need to protect the annual campaign.

This is an appropriate time to face the issue of multiple campaign activity. It is possible that we can now explore a third source of financing of the Jewish communal enterprise, in addition to annual campaign and endowment funds. Instead of the current helter-skelter approach in many communities, a carefully planned and designed set of activities for agencies to raise funds might prove to be an answer. Federation can offer its expertise to agencies in developing appropriate programs that will strengthen the community's financial capacity. Collaboration rather than competition could avoid the dangers of confusing donors and supporters.

Pressed by fiscal demands, some Federations are considering new budgeting devices as a way out of the financial dilemma. These new approaches raise the basic issue of the social contract. The agencies represent the community expression of caring; they must be part of the communal enterprise, not simply service-delivery mechanisms. If there are changing priorities emerging in Jewish life, they should be addressed through the commu-

nity planning process where changes can be made on a rational and planned basis. This will strengthen the system and not alienate vital segments of the community.

CONCLUSION

Pluralism in Jewish life is our strength and a source of strengthened commitment. There are so many different ways in which our people can express their membership in the Jewish community, and all can lead to constructive involvement. There is no one answer to strength and continuity. Our "father's house" has many rooms, and we can dwell in them together.

In the final analysis, we must enter the twenty-first century with a mobilization of the wisdom and know-how acquired in the twentieth century. The past century has tested the capacity of the Jewish community of North America, and it has measured up to the challenges. We have every confidence that we can move forward toward the fulfillment of the prophet Joel's promise of the future, building the kind of community in which "your old people shall dream dreams and your young people shall see visions."

REFERENCES

- Bernstein, Philip. (1983). *To dwell in unity*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Dolgoff, Ralph, & Feldstein, Donald. (1980). *Understanding social welfare*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kosmin, Barry, et al. (1991). *Highlights of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.

INTERAGENCY AND MULTIDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION A Win-Win Strategy

SALLY WEBER, LCSW

Regional Director, Adult & Children's Counseling Services,
Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles, California

Intra- and interinstitutional collaboration is of great importance in an era of shrinking resources. Social workers and educators bring different and complementary skills to Jewish family education, and a team effort would enhance such programs. The outcome of such a collaborative effort is a strengthening of our agencies, disciplines, and in turn the Jewish family.

The unique challenge to all concerned with the future of American Judaism and of the American Jewish family is how to best join our professional resources to provide a broad menu of creative, welcoming, informative, and helpful services to our community. Our clear mandate for the twenty-first century is to address the ways in which such collaboration can enhance our ability to serve the Jewish community and the Jewish family.

The challenge of how to intensify the Jewish identity, behavior, education, and continuity of children, adults, and families does not involve only one profession or one institution within the Jewish community. It requires all of us. Those now working in the field of Jewish family education have come from many disciplines, including social work, education, communal service, and the rabbinate.

Some of our institutional settings such as synagogues already include within them a wide range of professionals. In such settings, there are natural capacities to meet with colleagues with diverse skills and perspectives. In other more homogeneous settings such as day schools, where everyone has had similar training, we must intentionally create opportunities to meet with prospective partners in other institutions.

We should not minimize the difficulties of either intra- or inter-institutional professional collaboration. We each have professional orientations and languages that give us a particular focus. In addition, our institutions

have their own missions and interests. Sometimes we find ourselves guarding that turf. Sometimes we compete for limited dollars. In an era of shrinking resources, we all struggle with smaller staffs, fewer dollars, and greater demands.

All the more important, then, that we as professionals find ways in which to join with one another to advance the work that is to be done.

This article focuses on inter-disciplinary collaboration between educators and social workers as a model for discussing collaboration in general. It examines the Jewish Family Service agency—not a traditional educational setting, but one with a long record of working with the Jewish family in variety of modalities—and how its staff of social workers and family educators work as partners in the field of Jewish family education. The article explores commonalities and differences among educators and social workers linked to training and mandate and what we bring to planning for the Jewish family. Collaboration itself is an area that requires "capacity building"—building the capacity both of individual professionals to understand one another's work and of institutions to create and share common goals. Therefore, the article also looks at training issues—not only how to work together but how to develop a common language with which to build programs and create services to serve our families.