

Leadership and Decision-making in a Jewish Federation: The New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies

by CHARLES S. LIEBMAN

INTRODUCTION • STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS • POLICY AND INFLUENCE • LEADERSHIP
• THE FUTURE

INTRODUCTION

THE NEW YORK FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES (hereafter referred to as Federation) was organized in 1917, following almost two years of discussion and negotiation.¹ New York thus became the 23rd Jewish community in the United States to establish a central fund-collecting society for local agencies serving Jewish health and welfare needs. Today, there are approximately 220 Jewish federations throughout the

Note: A large number of people helped make this study possible. My greatest debt of gratitude is to the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; Federation's files, minutes, and meetings were all opened to me; every person to whom I turned for assistance was most cooperative. Three individuals who read and commented in detail on a first draft of this study merit particular mention: Sanford Solender, Federation executive vice-president; Dr. Donald Feldstein, Federation executive director for community services; and Mrs. Laurence (Billie) Tisch, immediate past chairman of Federation's Distribution Committee. None of them is in agreement with all of my conclusions, but this makes me all the more grateful to them for their help.

¹There is no scholarly history of Federation. The most comprehensive survey is *The Golden Heritage: A History of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York from 1917 to 1967* (New York, 1969). This is surprisingly informative, considering it was published by Federation in honor of its own 50th anniversary. But it was not intended as a systematic, much less scholarly, history. On the early history of Federation see Deborah Dash Moore, "From Kehillah to Federation: The Communal Functions of Federated Philanthropy in New York City" (paper read at the annual conference of the Association of Jewish Studies, Boston, December 1976), and the bibliography cited therein, including Arthur A. Goren, *New York Jews and the Quest for Community: The Kehillah Experiment, 1908-1922* (New York, 1970), and I. Edwin Goldwasser, "Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropies in New York City," *AJYB*, Vol. 20, 1918-1919, pp. 113-146. See also Deborah Dash Moore, "The Emergence of Ethnicity: New York's Jews 1920-1940" (Columbia University, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1975).

United States and Canada. About 200, including all but the smallest, are affiliated with the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF).²

Over the course of time, the influence of the federations has grown. Their functions have come to include increasing control over the expenditures of their beneficiary agencies. Federations today see themselves as organizations responsible for the entire Jewish population in a given geographic area.

Contributing to the growth in influence of the federations were the mergers in various communities between local federations and Jewish welfare funds, which raised money for overseas needs. The merged organization, often called the Jewish Federation and Welfare Fund, or Combined Jewish Appeal, brought new people into the federation orbit. Some of these people, activists and large contributors to the welfare funds, had previously been indifferent to the purely local agencies which the federations served. In many instances they were first- or second-generation American Jews of predominantly East European background, and were particularly oriented to support for Israel. Federation leaders, usually of German Jewish descent, were, on the other hand, often indifferent, if not hostile, to Zionism. The federation-welfare fund mergers, an outcome of the diminishing social and ideological differences between these groups, hastened the process of integration. They also increased in large measure the amount of money that the federations had at their disposal—an amount already increased by greater contributions by American Jews.

The federations' expanding involvement in local Jewish community councils contributed further to their growth in influence. Such councils, which exist in most Jewish communities, are composed of local groups as well as local chapters of national organizations, and are primarily concerned with relations between Jews and non-Jews, though some community councils also concern themselves with internal Jewish matters. In providing funds and services to these councils, and sometimes even the impetus for their creation, the federations increased their visibility, while becoming more sensitive to community needs.

In many communities the federations allocated funds to national Jewish organizations, in return for which the organizations restricted their own local fund-raising activities. Such arrangements limited the visibility of the

²For a summary treatment of the various Jewish federations and the federation movement in the context of American Jewish organizational life, see Daniel J. Elazar, *Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry* (Philadelphia, 1961). A different focus is provided in Harry L. Lurie, *A Heritage Affirmed* (Philadelphia, 1961). For financial and program information, see S.P. Goldberg, "Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances," *AJYB*, Vol. 78, 1978, pp. 172-221. A recent article of particular interest is Marc Lee Raphael, "Jewish Philanthropy and Communal Democracy: In Pursuit of a Phantom," *Response*, Fall 1977, pp. 55-56.

national organizations while enhancing Federation's importance on the local scene.

The development of New York's federation was somewhat different from that of most others. Its focus and concerns have changed in the last ten years, but, until recently, were far more narrow, at least from a Jewish perspective. In many respects it was the last to join the mainstream of federation life. This fact, the size of the New York federation, the number of people it serves, and the amount of money it allocates, all make it a significant subject for study.

In 1978-79, Federation will distribute over \$27 million to some 130 agencies and institutions serving the health, welfare, recreational, and educational needs of an estimated 1,500,000 people. Most of that money will come from Jews of Greater New York and represents Federation's share of the United Jewish Appeal-Federation annual Joint Campaign. To a great extent, therefore, Federation will be exercising its own discretion in the allocation of Jewish public funds not earmarked for any particular purpose.

The sum which Federation receives is arrived at through a negotiated agreement with UJA, as the donors have not specified these funds as being for Federation. Hence the importance of a study which asks:

- To what purposes does Federation allocate its funds?
- Who are the people deciding how Federation's funds are allocated?
- How do these people arrive at their decisions?
- Given the obvious assumption that influence accrues to any institution which distributes money, how much influence does Federation really have? Over whom, how, and in what direction does it exercise this influence?
- What changes, if any, have taken place in Federation in the last few years?

This study addresses these questions, but touches only peripherally on two aspects of Federation which its leaders regard as central, and which merit independent treatment—Federation's sources of revenue, and the activities of its agencies.

Fund-raising has always been a central aspect of Jewish communal life in the United States,³ and the Joint Campaign partnership between Federation and UJA does, indeed, exist to raise funds for local and overseas needs. However, as UJA-Federation is an independent organization, our focus will be limited to the effects of the Joint Campaign on Federation policy.

³A popular survey is Milton Goldin's *Why They Give: American Jews and Their Philanthropies* (New York, 1977). The January 1977 issue of *Moment* magazine was devoted to American Jewish philanthropy. Unfortunately there is no systematic scholarly study of the topic. Two articles which merit attention are Marshall Sklare's "The Future of Jewish Giving," *Commentary*, November 1962, pp. 416-426, and Marc Lee Raphael, *loc. cit.* Sklare's material is dated, but the article remains a landmark study.

The activities of Federation's agencies engage the greatest effort and attention of many of its leaders, with Federation allocating funds directly to roughly 80 agencies and organizations. Fifty-four of these are member agencies otherwise known as beneficiary societies. Under the terms of their membership, these societies are permitted to raise additional funds only from government, foundations, and members of their own boards—not from the community at large. The societies provide a broad range of medical, social, and recreational services. There are ten hospitals, geriatric centers serving 6,000 elderly, 30 Y's and Jewish community centers, and 24 camps. Some of the beneficiary societies are: Mt. Sinai Hospital; the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services, which provides mental-health treatment to children, as well as adult counseling and rehabilitation services; the Altro Health and Rehabilitation Services, caring for the physically and mentally handicapped; the Federation Employment and Guidance Service; the Jewish Association for Services for the Aged (JASA), serving the aged in 18 centers and three housing developments; the Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged; Associated YM and YWHAs of Greater New York, with 11 community centers under its aegis; and the Board of Jewish Education, which provides pedagogic guidance and supportive services of varying intensity to 640 Jewish day and supplementary schools.

In addition to its beneficiary societies, Federation allocates funds to subvented (non-member) agencies. In some cases, these are agencies which Federation itself created. Unlike the beneficiary societies, subvented agencies have no representation on the Federation board. They may, however, raise funds from the community at large. Among the subvented agencies are the Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC), the Metropolitan New York Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty, and the Jewish Association for College Youth (JACY). Federation also subsidizes three neighborhood service centers for inner-city Jews—centers which it established—and provides funding for such varied groups as the New York Board of Rabbis, Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Jewish Museum.

Although this study will not deal with the various agencies per se, it will explore the relationships between Federation and its agencies, the manner in which the agencies are funded, and the direction in which Federation allocations have moved.

Federation spends over \$2 million a year on administration and services to its agencies, employing 150 people (20 in its thrift shop), 55 of whom are professional staff, and involving hundreds of laymen in its activities. Even so, this study will not be an administrative one. It will focus instead on Federation's key committees, which bring it in touch with the larger community. No attempt will be made to assess the efficiency of Federation, or even describe its internal operations, except as these relate to fundamental questions.

This study is based on a variety of sources. Formal interviews were conducted with 58 individuals. Most were professional and lay leaders who had contact with Federation, and might be expected to be informed about its activities. Federation publications, minutes of committees, and other documents of the last ten years were perused selectively. The September 1975–September 1977 minutes of two committees, the Distribution Committee (Federation's allocation committee) and the Communal Planning Committee, were read carefully. Beginning in September 1977, I regularly participated in meetings of Federation's key committees and a number of subcommittees. These meetings afforded ample opportunity for discussion with Federation activists. Finally, a questionnaire was distributed to people who served on the Distribution Committee (DC) in either 1968 or 1978.

The first section of this study describes the structure of Federation and its functions, including its general relationship to its beneficiary societies, the functions of its key committees, and the formal role of the professionals. The second section explores Federation's present policy and how it emerged. The third section focuses on Federation's present leaders—who they are, how they were recruited, what motivates them, and how they compare to the leaders of a decade ago. It also deals with the role of the large contributor in Federation's decision-making, and examines the question of how much control the professionals exercise. The concluding section assesses Federation, and considers its prospects for the future.

FEDERATION: STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS

The Formality of Agency Control

One difference between the New York federation and that of other cities is the degree of formal control exercised by Federation's beneficiary societies. Its by-laws provide for a Board of Trustees with authority over Federation's basic decisions. The Board of Trustees is presently composed of 303 members, two-thirds of whom are designated by the beneficiary societies and called institutional trustees. The remaining trustees are either life trustees or trustees-at-large chosen by the Nominating Committee, whose members are selected, in turn, by the Board of Trustees.⁴

⁴Not all trustees exercise an equal vote. Beneficiary societies are accorded from one to ten votes, depending on their size. The institutional trustees present at any given Board meeting divide the votes to which the agency is entitled among themselves, so that an institutional trustee may sometimes be entitled to cast more than one vote. However, this occurs only in the case of a roll call, or what is known in Federation terminology as a weighted vote, and weighted votes are rare.

The Board also elects the officers of Federation and the members of the Executive Committee (EC). In addition, the Board approves the appointment, by the president, of members of Federation's operating committees. All basic decisions are subject to its confirmation.

The Board, when taken as a whole, is too large a body to control the operations of Federation. Hence, it delegates much of the task to its 54-member EC. The provision of a two-thirds majority of institutional trustees on Federation's Board extends to the EC as well.

The Reality of Agency Control

The theoretical control which the beneficiary societies exercise over Federation is not as crucial in determining policy as one might assume. A number of factors account for this.

First of all, while agency control is exercised through representation on the Board of Trustees, the agency representatives cannot be paid employees. Only laymen represent the agencies, and the extent to which the primary commitment of these laymen is to their agencies, as opposed to Federation interests, or to their own conceptions of the needs of the Jewish community, differs. Many of the institutional trustees are independent-minded, and do not see themselves as accountable to the agencies which appointed them.

Secondly, many institutional trustees adopt a Federation, as distinct from an agency, point of view. Meetings and materials received by Board members reflect the point of view of Federation's president and executive vice-president. There is a strong Federation tradition, enhanced by the fact that service on the Board of Trustees is considered a mark of distinction for most members of agency boards. Hence, although it is the agency and not Federation which designates the representative, even institutional trustees want to play the Federation game. This is particularly true for Board members seeking appointment to Federation's own committees. Service on these committees may confer status and distinction, bringing the appointee into contact with some of the social and financial elite of New York Jewry. The president and executive vice-president exercise a crucial voice in committee appointments.

Thirdly, some agencies are dependent on Federation for help in recruiting their own board members. In the past, Federation was instrumental in helping to raise large sums for the capital needs of many agencies. These agencies, particularly the smaller ones, are unlikely to adopt an independent point of view. On the other hand, some of the largest of the beneficiary societies, such as the hospitals, receive so small a percentage of their funding from Federation (total Federation allocations represented .7 per cent of hospital budgets in 1978) that they are relatively indifferent to Federation Board decisions.

Fourthly, neither the Board nor the EC really makes organization policy. They approve or, on rare occasions, disapprove the policy formulated by a smaller group of people. Neither Board nor EC members have the time, energy, or expertise to continually challenge the judgment of the professionals, or the small number of lay leaders engaging in Federation activity on a full-time or almost full-time basis. The agenda, framework, and decision-making premises are determined by this select group of leaders. One executive head of a large beneficiary society stated that he never bothered to read the Board minutes because, as far as he was concerned, the Board never did anything anyway.

Finally, there are not that many issues involving conflicts of interest. Generally, each agency wants more money for itself, which means less money for others. (There are rare cases of agencies requesting cuts because they have found other sources of income.) But that is something different from an interest shared by all agencies in opposition to Federation interest. Indeed, Federation leaders are very careful not to formulate issues in these terms.

Many trustees-at-large and life trustees have had some agency orientation or served at some time on agency boards. Their involvement in Federation stems from their involvement in the programs of its beneficiary societies. It would be contrary to their own convictions to act against agency interests, of which, for some of them, Federation's interest is simply the sum total. Despite the foregoing, one can point to a Federation as distinct from an agency point of view.

INSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT BETWEEN FEDERATION AND ITS AGENCIES

While Federation and its agencies may be in complete agreement on goals, they may differ on how to achieve these goals. Federation leaders stress the principle of agency autonomy. They emphasize that each agency is independent, and while Federation may seek to persuade, it can never coerce. Agency leaders, on the other hand, stress the importance of Federation planning and coordination. They acknowledge that Federation reduces competition and duplication among the agencies, and that Federation's assistance has helped them to pioneer in the fields of health and social-welfare services. They benefit from Federation's joint purchasing plan. Still, even under the most idyllic circumstances, and even within a framework of mutually acknowledged guidelines, it is only natural that agencies will seek greater autonomy, and Federation a greater coordinating role.

There is also the issue of the extent to which Federation should indent its reserves in order to maintain a certain level of grants to its agencies. The present ratio of expendable reserves to annual grants is about 100 per cent.

This is considerably lower than that of other federations in major metropolitan centers, where the ratios vary from 171 to 483 per cent. In December 1976, the Level of Grants Committee, a permanent subcommittee of the EC, recommended a one per cent decrease in the level of grants for the forthcoming year, to be followed by two and three per cent reductions in each of the next two years, subject to increase in the event of a rise in campaign contributions. The level of grants, which requires the approval of the Board of Trustees, does not determine how much each individual agency will receive. This is decided by the DC, subject to ratification by the Board of Trustees. But the level of grants does determine the total sum which the DC will have at its disposal and provides agencies with a rough estimate of what they are likely to receive.

Many agencies were extremely unhappy over this proposal, which came in the midst of New York's fiscal crisis. They complained that Federation was trying to save money when it was already badly needed. Nevertheless, the proposal was accepted by the EC and the Board of Trustees—a fact that suggests the influence of Federation's leadership. The approval was attributed primarily to a strong presentation by Federation's executive vice-president about the need for maintaining reserves. The following year, the Level of Grants Committee reversed itself, and recommended a three per cent increase, as reserves had grown from a windfall of bequests. The EC lowered this to two per cent, but the Board raised it back to three. Still, the three per cent increase fell short of the inflated cost of living, and the leadership resisted pressure for larger increases in the level of grants.

The issue of the level of grants is one of the few in which agency and Federation interests were opposed. The conflict's resolution suggests how difficult it is to determine which side is the more influential. In general, Federation interests probably prevail, within the constraints set by agency interests.

IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT BETWEEN FEDERATION AND ITS AGENCIES

In addition to the institutional self-interests dividing the agencies and Federation, there is an ideological division. Federation agencies, almost without exception, were created to serve the needs of individuals or families. Federation was Jewish because its beneficiary societies served a Jewish clientele, who were, however, served as human beings, not Jews. A notable exception was Federation's allocation to Jewish education—an allocation which many within Federation viewed as anomalous.

By the end of the 1960's, a growing number of Federation leaders spoke in terms of the organization's communal role, having come to understand Federation's role as one including responsibility to the Jewish community

as a community. Frederick P. Rose, president of Federation from 1974 to 1977, began his farewell message in 1977 with the statement: "Viewed as a tapestry, the New York Jewish community is a richly colored one, in which Federation is a dominant thread weaving itself through every aspect of Jewish communal life."³ Such a conception is strikingly different from that which prevailed a decade earlier, although uttered by a man in the mold of the older leadership. This, then, indicates the rapidity with which the communal ideology of Federation became institutionalized. The change was to have important implications for Federation's traditional agencies.

Federation concern for the Jewish community meant support for a community relations council, for enterprises such as the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry, for Jewish college youth programs, and for neighborhood stabilization projects in such middle-class areas as Flatbush in Brooklyn and Forest Hills in Queens. It added a substantial measure of legitimacy to increased Federation support for Jewish education. Many of the most significant agencies engaging in communal activity are subvented agencies, rather than beneficiary societies. Given increasingly limited resources, there is an understandable agency interest in opposing the communal thrust of Federation, and its subventions to non-members.

The resistance to Federation's communal direction has not come from institutional trustees alone. In the debates that surrounded the early subventions to the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry, observers remarked that they could not distinguish institutional from at-large trustees. If all the institutional trustees had opposed the subvention, it would not have been accepted. Institutional trustees tend to be independent-minded, and agency interests are not necessarily foremost among their concerns, particularly when such interests are narrowly and parochially defined. Even among the agency executives there were those who, by virtue of their own background and perceptions, favored greater communal involvement on the part of Federation. In most instances the grants to subvented agencies were small.

The one resounding defeat for those who supported Federation's communal role came early in the period, in 1970, when the Board of Trustees rejected a proposal for a substantial increase in the support for Jewish education, a proposal which was subsequently accepted in modified form.

The role that agencies play through their institutional trustees can be of much consequence. The initial 1976 proposal to fund the Jewish Community Relations Council at \$125,000 was reduced to \$75,000, as a result of opposition from institutional trustees. In discussing the possibility of a large

³Frederick P. Rose, *The President's Message*, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, May 9, 1977.

increase in the allocation to the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry, objection was raised to granting a subvented agency a greater percentage increase than that which most beneficiary societies received. "Our agencies won't stand for that," one Federation member declared. Although the demands of Federation leaders are usually satisfied, structural constraints limit the recommendations and proposals they can bring before the EC and Board of Trustees. This probably accounts for the fact that while Federation is moving in the same direction as other federations throughout North America, the movement is at a slower pace.

The Committee Structure

Federation has two standing committees, the Executive Committee, with its important subcommittee on Level of Grants, and the Nominating Committee. But its operational activities are carried on primarily through six community services committees and 15 operating committees. The by-laws provide for community services committees (formerly called functional committees) in each of Federation's traditional agency areas: the aged, camping, community centers, family and children's vocational and rehabilitation services, hospital and medical services, and Jewish education. Every beneficiary society is represented on the community services committee concerned with its area of service. The committee provides a forum for the exchange of ideas and makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees and operating committees.

Some of the community services committees are very active. Their meetings are well attended, and the participating agency executives feel they benefit from the exchanges. Other committees exist only on paper, or function haltingly without the participants feeling that they are of much utility.

The 15 operating committees include some, such as the Law Committee, the Labor Relations Committee, and the Investment Committee, exclusively concerned with Federation's internal operations. The activity of these and similar committees have important consequences for Federation's internal management, but only four actually determine Federation's public posture and policies. Three of them, the Distribution Committee (DC), Communal Planning Committee (CPC), and Public Programs and Policy Committee (PPPC), represent, in Federation's own terminology, its major committees.

THE DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE

By general consensus, Federation's most important committee is the 30-member Distribution Committee. Appointment to the DC is perceived as a mark of distinction. It is less a reward for past service than a sign that

the appointee is highly intelligent, energetic, and willing and able to devote many hours a week to communal service. The DC's members, more than those of any other committee, comprise a Federation elite.

The by-laws restrict DC membership to current or former trustees-at-large. None can be institutional trustees. DC members must also resign from the boards of any beneficiary societies on which they may be serving at the time of their appointment.

The function of the DC is to prepare that portion of Federation's budget (about 90%) which deals with allocations. The budget proposal, along with the DC chairman's report, is submitted to the Board of Trustees in June of each year. Ratification is virtually automatic, although there have been exceptions. The DC takes care in the phrasing of its justifications for allocations and may even make minor allocation adjustments in anticipation of Board reaction. Nevertheless, it is the DC that determines, within the framework of the overall sum set by the level of grants, how much each agency or project funded by Federation will receive. In addition, it is the DC that allocates special funds (about \$400,000 in 1978), being required only to report its decision to the Board of Trustees. The only funding activity over which the DC exercises no authority is Federation's operating budget.

For the fiscal year 1978-79, the DC will allocate roughly \$27.1 million. Approximately 18 million of this will come from the Joint Campaign, about three million from the Greater New York Fund, about one million from investment income, and the remainder from unrestricted legacies, with the deficit covered by indenting reserves.

The work of the DC is carried on through subcommittees in the following fields: camping; the aged; community centers; family, children, vocational and rehabilitation services; Jewish education; medical care; and special projects, subventions and memberships. Each subcommittee is aided by a professional consultant. In general, each DC member serves on two subcommittees, with no two members serving on the same ones.

In the fall, the subcommittee members visit the agencies for which they are responsible. Discussions are conducted with each agency executive, and often with some of the agency's lay leaders. During these visits, subcommittee members learn about the agency's problems and make known to the agency leaders their own interests and concerns. These are often concerns which the subcommittee has previously presented to the full DC through a staff memorandum and subcommittee chairman's report. During the next few months, the subcommittee chairman and some members may meet with one or more agency executives to discuss a particular problem. In late winter and early spring, budget hearings are held with the agencies, whose requests are accompanied by budget information summarized for DC

members in a detailed memorandum prepared by Federation's budget director, his assistant, and four budget examiners. Thus, DC members are provided with ample budget information prior to the hearings. In addition, the professional consultant may have prepared a brief memorandum on the agency. At the budget hearings, subcommittee members can evaluate the extent to which their concerns and recommendations, and the general policy of the DC and Federation, have been reflected in agency programs. Although the DC prides itself on not adopting an antagonistic attitude, the hearings are often touchy.

Following the budget hearings, the DC subcommittee chairmen make a tentative decision on the distribution of allocations to each functional field. Each subcommittee then submits its recommendation and report to the full DC. At the May meeting of the DC, all subcommittee recommendations are reviewed and changes may be made not only in allocations to specific agencies, but also in the overall distribution of allocations by functional field.

Allocation recommendations may take a variety of forms other than outright grants. One important variant is a reserve allocation, which provides that a sum of money be made available to a particular agency only after it has met certain conditions or introduced a particular program.

DC procedures are not entirely satisfactory to many agency executives, some of whom doubt whether subcommittee members are well-informed. One agency executive characterized the visitations and budget hearings as a "charade." No one pretends that in one visit per year to an agency, or one budget hearing, a subcommittee member can gain detailed knowledge of that agency's operation. However, a term of office on the DC is three years, which means a member visits the same agency a number of times. A DC member may serve for four consecutive terms (12 years) before he is required to step down for one year. As of June 1978, DC members had served an average of six years. While subcommittee assignments may be rotated, the experience one gains in dealing with one type of agency is helpful in understanding another. The longer one serves on the DC, the greater expertise one acquires. DC members average a minimum of a few hours per week on Committee matters; most subcommittee chairmen spend an average of eight to ten hours a week on DC affairs. A few members are less conscientious than others about attending meetings or doing their homework. DC chairmen, alert to this, encourage such members to resign as soon as their term of office expires, or do not reappoint them for an additional three year term.

Some DC observers feel there is room for more in-depth studies of the agencies, perhaps by having subcommittees focus on a limited number of agencies each year. Agency executives sometimes complain that they have

no opportunity beyond the budget hearings to interact with DC members. They especially seek access to committee and subcommittee chairmen, in order to present their case for more money. The larger agencies with the more prestigious board members are in the best position to do so. Agency executives will, on occasion, request that their board members contact DC members on a social level, at the golf course or a luncheon meeting, to explain the agency position; but DC members view these efforts as singularly unsuccessful.

THE COMMUNAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Communal Planning Committee (CPC) is generally regarded as Federation's second most important committee. As in the case of the DC, all its members must be present or former members of the Board of Trustees. CPC members, however, are evenly divided between at-large and institutional trustees. There are, at present, 32 members on the CPC, whose function is to advise the Board of Trustees and DC about important communal trends and needs to be considered in the formulation of Federation and DC policy. The CPC considers the desirability of proposed beneficiary society projects, recommends modifications and additions to programs and structures, and recommends the admission of new agencies and the disaffiliation of others.

Such projects as assistance to Jews in the inner city and neighborhood stabilization must acquire CPC approval prior to funding. Projects are considered in subcommittee, and then in full committee, before detailed recommendations are made to the Board of Trustees.

A CPC meeting might consider the requests of a camp or community center to purchase new property. Members will have before them the report of a subcommittee or professional consultant on the impact of the project in terms of agency costs and community needs. CPC and DC chairmen are ex-officio members of each other's committees, and close relationships are further insured by the shared services of the same consultants.

The CPC is Federation's major instrument for communal planning. While its concerns and procedures, the intelligence of its lay members, and the quality of its professional staff are impressive, Federation's success in communal planning has not been striking. This is partly due to the fact that it is only within the last few years that Federation has defined its Jewish communal responsibilities in broad terms.

Also, Federation does not have reliable demographic data on the Greater New York Jewish population and its movements. Without such data, intelligent communal planning is virtually impossible. Community centers, for example, have been authorized in areas where many feel they are not

needed, or relocated so that they hasten Jewish movement out of others. The data that the CPC requires are not only of a demographic nature, but must include information on local community sentiments and attitudes. It is only of late that Federation has become sensitive to this fact.

Federation has, also, to take account of the needs of its beneficiary societies. There is agency opposition to Federation's undertaking new projects which mean competition for funding or programming. Thus, for example, there is agency opposition to neighborhood service centers which seek to centralize in one location the social, health, and welfare services provided by different agencies in a particular neighborhood. Federation created the Metropolitan New York Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty in 1972. The Council, in turn, was instrumental in the creation of a number of local community councils. But Federation then exercised its influence to prevent these local councils from engaging in social work or receiving government grants which might compete with its beneficiary societies. It also doubted the councils' abilities to deliver quality services. This opposition came despite Federation's own feeling that the development of strong local Jewish community institutions was necessary for neighborhood stabilization.

Finally, New York City's problems are of such a magnitude that no agency could solve them, and New York's problems are Federation's problems. Fiscal crises, changing neighborhoods, and crime all have an impact on New York City's Jews. Federation, aware of its dependence on the broader social environment, encouraged its executive vice-president to assume the chairmanship of the Task Force on the New York City Crisis. In general, however, communal planning at Federation takes place in the context of living with severe municipal crises, not of meeting them.

THE PUBLIC PROGRAMS AND POLICY COMMITTEE

The Public Programs and Policy Committee (PPPC) is the newest of Federation's three major committees. Created in 1976, it replaced two older committees, one on government programs, and another on social legislation. The by-laws require that there be a minimum of 15 members, ten of whom must be members of the Board of Trustees. There is no provision for the ratio of institutional to at-large trustees. Of its present 33 members, 13 are trustees: 8 at-large and 5 institutional.

The PPPC studies government programs and policies as they affect Federation, its beneficiary societies, and the Jewish community, and recommends action on given issues. Where policy positions already exist, the PPPC acts without consulting other Federation bodies.

Most of the issues discussed by the PPPC deal with government legislation affecting Federation's health and welfare agencies. For example, the

Committee devoted much attention in late 1977 to the Carter Administration's welfare reform proposals. After reaching a consensus on some of the issues, the PPPC expressed its opinion to local congressmen, as well as to the Washington office maintained by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, an office financed by special grants from some of the larger Jewish federations. During the New York State legislative session, most committee time is devoted to state matters, and PPPC leaders (its chairman and three staff members) are in frequent contact with Federation's part-time lobbyist in Albany, as well as with executive and legislative officials. At the municipal level, Federation's contacts are more direct, and matters are handled without the intervention of a lobbyist.

The importance of the PPPC reflects the increasing importance to Federation of governmental activity. Government, at all levels, is a major source of funding to most of the beneficiary societies. Regulatory and other non-fiscal legislation has an impact on the agencies, and local tax policies vitally affect Federation's camps. The assignment of children to child-care agencies and foster homes in accordance with the religion of the parents is of concern to Federation's agencies, as are the rates of government reimbursement for child care.

THE DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS

In 1953, Federation hired Rabbi Isaac N. Trainin as the head of a newly-instituted Department of Religious Affairs. It was Federation's hope to improve its relationship with rabbis and synagogue leaders, some of whom, incensed at what they saw as Federation's indifference to vital Jewish concerns, not only refused to support the Federation campaign, but urged Jews not to contribute.

The Department acts through two committees, the Religious Affairs Committee and the Commission on Synagogue Relations. The first, an operational committee of Federation, supervises the Department's conduct and advises Federation and its agencies with regard to religious matters. The by-laws require that there be a minimum of ten members on the committee, a majority of whom must be trustees. At present, there are 43 members, 16 of whom are rabbis. The committee deals with religious issues within Federation and its agencies, and concerns itself with such matters as the availability of kosher food in Federation agencies, the operation of agencies on Jewish holidays, and the manner in which Federation relates to other Jewish religious practices. It has a task force on medical ethics, and has prepared a handbook on the subject for hospitals and doctors.

The Commission on Synagogue Relations has a broader communal scope. Membership is open to all synagogues, rabbis, and Jewish social-work agencies in Greater New York; laymen may be invited to join. The

Commission functions through task forces, which hold conferences, publish material, and seek to involve the community. In 1977-78, the Commission had 15 task forces focusing on such matters as alcoholism, gambling, the Jewish family, mixed marriages, and singles. Some task forces have their own subcommittees; the one on mental health and Judaism has four. The Commission is governed by an executive council and a small board of governors, which is, in effect, the ruling body of the Commission.

The Department of Religious Affairs (DRA) promotes Federation's image in the synagogue world, and alerts the latter to the existence of Federation's agencies and their services. It also pressures Federation and its agencies to increase their specifically Jewish content and programming, and their services to Jews. Some of those who oppose Federation because they feel its orientation is too nonsectarian, and its control is in the hands of non-committed Jews, regard the DRA as an "apologist." In 1975, for example, the chairman of the Religious Affairs Committee wrote to a task force member asking him to withdraw publication of an article critical of Federation's financial support of Jewish hospitals. Criticisms of Federation, he wrote, should be made only from "within." On the other hand, some of those oriented to the older Federation tradition of nonsectarian service see the Department as troublesome. Federation's present leadership views it as its "eyes and ears" in the synagogue world, serving as a bridge, and alerting Federation to potential problems.

The Religious Affairs Committee and Commission on Synagogue Relations are extremely sensitive about their status within Federation. Many members feel they are "outsiders," not part of the elite whom they perceive as dominating the organization. One leader of the Religious Affairs Committee stated, "We're not Wall Street and we're not German and that's why we're on the outside. Not only are we not consulted; we aren't even informed of the reasons for crucial decisions which we could help interpret to the community." The Committee and Commission are not, however, without influence. As one observer noted, their influence rests in part on the very fact that they have not been fully incorporated into the Federation system. Among the recommendations first proposed by the DRA and subsequently adopted by Federation were assistance to inner-city Jews and local community councils, subventions to COLPA (Commission on Law and Political Action) and the Beth Din of the Rabbinical Council of America, aid to Black Jews, and special help to three fire-ravaged day schools. Federation also turns to the DRA for recommendations regarding representative leaders of the synagogue world to be appointed to its committees. Trainin exercises a virtual veto over the appointments of rabbis to Federation committees, and his recommendations with regard to laymen are given

Careful consideration. Paradoxically, as Federation expands its interest in Jewish matters, the Department's influence may diminish. In other words, "Yiddishkeit" in Federation may become so important that one man or department can no longer be looked to as a source of information, contacts, and support.

Apart from more manifest functions, the DRA provides the opportunity for Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis to meet together. It tends to avoid issues likely to divide rabbis along denominational lines, and the rabbis themselves are careful to keep such issues subdued, should they arise. At one point, the Orthodox chairman of the task force on medical ethics refused to address a Conservative colleague by his rabbinical title. But this incident was an exception, according to respondents, to the customary good feeling.

In most cases, the Orthodox have been pleased by the willingness of even their Reform colleagues to support them on such issues as insistence on kosher kitchens in Federation agencies, closing agencies on Jewish holidays, and protecting the rights of agency employees who do not work on the second day of Jewish holidays. The Orthodox interpretation of Jewish law is generally regarded as normative in the deliberations and decisions of the DRA and its committees. On the other hand, Reform and Conservative rabbis are pleased by the respect shown them by the Orthodox rabbis, and the consideration accorded their concerns and opinions on Jewish issues. In early 1978, this general good feeling became strained. Whether the DRA can continue to insulate itself from the denominational tensions within the broader community remains to be seen.

THE PROFESSIONALS

Federation's professional staff numbers 55, 19 of whom are executive. Since 1970, the staff has been headed by Sanford Solender, executive vice-president. The PPPC is served by three staff members who have other professional obligations within Federation. The DRA also has a professional staff of three, all rabbis, one of whom is responsible for fund-raising at the synagogue level. Relations with Federation's agencies and other beneficiaries, and services to Federation's DC and CPC are under the direction of the executive director for Community Services. Since 1976 this position has been held by Dr. Donald Feldstein. He is responsible for a professional staff of seven, and a Budget Department with its own director and additional staff of five.

The Community Services consultants owe their first loyalty to Federation. They also see themselves, however, as advocates for the points of view and needs of the agencies they serve. Community Services staff functions

include advising the agencies, coordinating and facilitating exchanges between them and, in some cases, representing the agency point of view in governmental or professional organizations.

Federation is a member agency of a variety of organizations. Approximately 70 per cent of its annual membership fees (over \$250,000) goes to the Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare Funds and the National Jewish Welfare Board, and the remainder to such organizations as the Community Council of Greater New York, Council of Voluntary Child Care Associations, Greater New York Hospital Association, and Council of Social Work Education. Federation consultants may be called upon to serve on these councils, or other ad-hoc committees with professional orientations. In addition, they may be called upon to act as intermediaries between government bodies and the agencies.

The Community Services staff members supply the primary link between Federation and its agencies, and, as such, are sometimes placed in a conflict-of-interest situation. Both sides assume, however, that in such instances they act on Federation's behalf. Indeed, most of their time is spent working directly with Federation's committees and subcommittees, primarily the DC and CPC.

FEDERATION POLICY AND INFLUENCES

Federation's Traditional Policy

More scholarly attention has been paid to Federation's early years than to its recent past. The following material is based primarily on memories and perceptions, rather than a rigorous study of written sources. Apparently, Federation was involved in some measure of communal planning, integration of facilities, and agency control, almost from its inception. Certainly, by the end of the 1940's, a consensus among its leadership on the function of Federation began to emerge. Federation was created to centralize the collection of Jewish philanthropic funds, maximize the amount collected, and distribute the money to beneficiary societies. These agencies were established, in turn, to provide health, welfare, and social services to Jews who required them—primarily the sick, the emotionally and physically handicapped, and the poor. Federation also assisted Jewish Y's and community centers providing recreational, educational and counseling services to middle-class Jews, as well as to the needy. Finally, some money was allocated to Jewish education.⁶

⁶The initial decision in 1917 to allocate money to Jewish education was a compromise between those who opposed any allocation and those who sought broad support. The final

But not all Federation leaders perceived their primary function as supporting the agencies. Indeed, more and more of them came to see their roles as maximizing the services to their agencies' clients. Where Federation leaders felt that services could be improved by the creation of new agencies or the merger of old ones, they encouraged this. The challenge was to help those in need. Then, as now, the Board of Trustees was dominated by agency representatives. But large contributors became increasingly oriented to Federation, rather than the agencies. They had a welfare and service philosophy, rather than a loyalty to specific agencies.

The agency point of view lost ground because Federation captured the imagination of the large contributors. It was Federation itself that provided the major portion of most agencies' operating expenditures, and encouraged those contributors to assist them. The 1950's and early 1960's were periods of great construction and expansion. Federation undertook two major building-fund campaigns of 50 and 100 million dollars. One result was the creation and heading of new institutions by Federation people. Federation increasingly directed the pace of its agencies' growth, and recruited wealthy contributors to serve on agency boards. The quality of Federation's professional leadership further contributed to its dominant role.

At the helm of Federation during this period stood two great leaders, each with the title Executive Vice-President. Joseph Willen was responsible for fund-raising, and Maurice Hexter for administration. Serving under Hexter were three professional consultants: Maurice Hinnenberg in the health and aging field; Graenum Berger in the community centers and camp field; and Martha Selig in the family, social-service, and child-care field. Hexter and his three lieutenants have been described by a number of respondents as "giants." They combined intelligence, detailed knowledge of their fields of service, dedication to Federation, and political savvy. Agency executives gave them genuine professional deference, and had difficulty resisting Federation staff recommendations, which were practicable and well-informed.

All of this stimulated an *élan* among Federation's lay leaders, especially among those on the DC. They felt that they were participating in an exciting, challenging, and supremely important enterprise. One was engaged, through contributing, fund-raising, and committee service, in providing outstanding services to people in genuine need. There was a sense

decision limited support to the six principal Talmud Torahs of New York. Mordecai Kaplan, founder of Reconstructionism, celebrated the decision in his diary with the notation: "It has broken the back of the assimilationist tendency." In 1939, the Jewish Education Committee was created out of a merger of the Bureau of Jewish Education and the Jewish Education Association. Federation funds for Jewish education went to this new body, rather than directly to the Jewish schools it served. The new organization, a beneficiary society from its inception, changed its name to the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York in 1970.

that Federation's professionals, agencies, and lay leadership were the very best.

This elitism was reinforced by the backgrounds of much of Federation's lay leadership. Many came from wealthy families with a tradition of communal service. They were disproportionately of German Jewish origin, second- or third-generation Americans. Neighbors on Manhattan's Upper East Side, with second homes in Westchester, many knew one another socially, belonging to the same country clubs; if they had any synagogue affiliation, they were more likely than not members of a Reform temple—most often Temple Emanu-El of New York City. If their memberships overlapped in any Jewish organization, it was likely to be the American Jewish Committee.

Nineteen sixty-eight marked the end of this period. In December 1977, a questionnaire was distributed to the 22 living members of the 1968 DC. Fourteen responded, but some information was available for all 22. For example, four contributed \$25,000 or more to the 1970–71 campaign. Three contributed between \$10,000 and \$24,999; six contributed from \$5,000 to \$9,999; and six from \$2,500 to \$4,999. Thus, 19 contributed \$2,500 or more. In 1970–71, Federation raised \$17.4 million. Given the fact that UJA and Federation today distribute their joint campaign proceeds on a roughly four-to-one basis, and given rates of inflation since 1970, it seems fair to say that 19 of the 22 DC members made contributions comparable to the \$10,000 or more joint-campaign contributions of today. These contributions and, most likely, the gifts (\$1,700 and \$1,600) of two other DC members, fall into the category of large contributor.

Place of residence is another indication of means. Twelve of the 14 respondents had New York City residences. Eleven lived within a ten-block radius of one another, centering on Manhattan's Upper East Side in the 60's between Fifth and Park Avenues; one member lived on Central Park West. The remaining two respondents had homes in Scarsdale and Rye, wealthy suburbs in Westchester county.

Respondents were also asked to list the social clubs to which they belonged in 1968. Six of the 14 belonged to the Sunningdale Country Club in Westchester, considered one of the elite Jewish country clubs in the Greater New York area. Four respondents belonged to the Harmonie Club, the most prestigious Jewish club in the City. All belonged to at least one social club. By contrast, six of the 14 were not affiliated with any synagogue. Of the remainder, three were members of New York's Temple Emanu-El.

Respondents reported that wealth was not a criterion for DC membership, as it apparently had been in the earlier years. But if great wealth was not a necessary requirement, Federation leaders, for the most part, were certainly people of substance.

The children of East European Jews had entered the ranks of Federation's elite by 1968. Four respondents reported that their fathers were born in Russia. All, however, were themselves born in the United States, 13 of the 14 in New York. Most respondents were between 55 and 65 years of age in 1968. They would have entered college between 1925 and 1935, a period of quotas and discrimination against Jews in the prestigious American colleges and universities. Yet, of the 11 male respondents,⁷ nine attended Ivy League colleges (Harvard, Columbia, Yale, University of Pennsylvania, and Cornell). By contrast, their formal Jewish education was slight. Six reported having had no formal Jewish education; five had either attended Sunday school or had some other form of weekly instruction for a few years. Only two had attended afternoon schools which met more frequently than once a week. One respondent reported he was educated in an Orthodox school.

The impression that DC members had a relatively weak Jewish identity is reinforced by other data. Respondents were asked how they would have reacted in 1968 if their child had considered marrying a non-Jew. Only one respondent would have been "strongly opposed"; four would have discouraged it; three would have been neutral; and six would have accepted it.

Many people regard the Federation leaders of this period as assimilationist, but the leaders did not perceive themselves in this light. Respondents were asked how they would have felt in 1968 and how they feel today about the statement, "Being Jewish makes a difference in everything I do."⁸ No respondent reported any change in his feelings over the ten-year period. Of the 14 respondents, eight asserted (three strongly and five "somewhat") that "being Jewish makes a difference in everything I do," while six denied the statement (one "somewhat" and five "strongly"). Yet, the respondents' answers are more "Jewish" than those of comparable age and generational groups in Boston.

Maurice Hexter, in discussing his perception of the 1950's and 1960's leadership, introduced the term "assimilationist," but noted that there were few such people around, and these not particularly troublesome. He related having asked the non-Jewish wife of a Federation leader to remove a cross pendant which she had worn to a Federation dinner. She had obliged. The implication was that if one dealt firmly and politely with assimilationists, one could handle them. The troublesome element, in Hexter's view, was the "hyper-Jews," who had provoked difficulty over their insistence on more

⁷The 11 males out of a total of 14 respondents is proportionate to the 21 males out of a total of 26 DC members.

⁸The question was derived from the Boston Jewish community survey and used to facilitate comparisons with a larger sample.

money for Jewish education, and their request in 1948 that Federation lend one million dollars to Israel. The request was rejected.

Members of the large middle group of which Hexter was a leader were neither "assimilationists" nor "hyper-Jews." Their participation in Federation was, very probably, a surrogate to participation in the synagogue or other expressions of Jewish life. One traditional leader wrote: "For many Jews, Federation is . . . a vehicle by which the individual expresses a major part of his own Jewish fulfillment."⁹ The particular attraction of Federation was that its activity best fulfilled Jewish obligations as the predominantly secularist Federation leaders perceived them, i.e. the obligation to help one's fellow man. Their philanthropic activity was an expression of their view that Judaism is not so much a common set of rituals and beliefs, as a set of ethical imperatives of universal concern. But unlike the East European secularists or Zionists, who also rejected the religious tradition, this group did not perceive itself as being in revolt. The data suggest that this was, instead, a group relatively uninformed about things Jewish. There were exceptions, of which Hexter was the most notable. Perhaps such people reconciled their knowledge of Judaism with the prevailing currents in Federation by finding support for their position in the ideology of classical Reform which prevailed in New York's Temple Emanu-El at the time. This may account for the incorrect perception of outsiders that the majority of Federation leaders were members there.

Federation's Jewishness was further expressed by the fact that its agencies, with the exception of the hospitals, served a predominantly Jewish clientele. Until the 1960's, it was assumed that only Jewish consumers of health, welfare and other social services would seek assistance from Jewish-run agencies, camps, and homes for the aged. But then this assumption became inadequate; the perception of change gave Federation leaders cause for reflection and served to divide the leadership itself. For those to whom Federation was Jewish by virtue of its humanitarian service, the change was, if anything, a source of satisfaction. For those, however, who found service to Jews of particular importance, the change in agency clientele was a cause for concern.

Another "Jewish" rationale for Federation activity was the notion that by serving all needy, regardless of race or religion, Jews enhanced their status in American society. It was felt that non-Jews would appreciate how much Jews were doing, and that this would reduce antisemitism and cement alliances between Jews and non-Jews. This argument suggests a particular sensitivity to antisemitism on the part of a group whose achievements and

⁹Leonard Block, "Comments Re 'Preliminary Draft' Report of the Commission on the Role of Federation," Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, January 28, 1972.

status might be thought to have insulated them. In fact, some members of this group experienced antisemitism in a more traumatic way than did the middle-class descendants of East European immigrants.

The Jewish upper classes of New York, the wealthy descendants of German Jewish immigrants who were born in the first two decades of this century, were well aware of what their families had achieved. At the same time, they were conscious of sharp barriers to the penetration of Jews into the upper circles of New York society. The best clubs were closed to them. While German Jews built their own distinguished city and country clubs, this was as much out of necessity as choice. Those who sought admittance to fine private schools and prestigious colleges were often accepted. Precisely because of their high status and sense of personal or familial achievement, however, they were sensitive to the fact that not every club, group, or type of association was open to them in these schools. The pain of discrimination, even when it assumed a petty social form, was compounded by the fact that they lacked a compensatory Jewish pride. Raised in a tradition of noblesse oblige, concern for the needy, and identification with Federation or one or more of its agencies, they knew, however, little about Judaism. It was not, in their opinion, better to be a Jew than a non-Jew; although, having been born a Jew, it was a matter of self-respect not to deny one's identity. This was thin armor with which to shield oneself from antisemitism.

Two respondents actually reported having believed that Jews weren't fully accepted by non-Jews because they were in some sense inferior. Both had identical reactions to the Six Day War, an event which, along with subsequent visits to Israel, deepened their Jewish identity. The Israeli achievement proved, they felt, that Jews weren't really inferior, and that their earlier conceptions of Judaism had been wrong.

In the final analysis, while many of the respondents' relatives—unable to accept their outsider status, find meaning in remaining Jewish, or resist the blandishments of Gentile society—converted, intermarried, or disassociated themselves from anything Jewish, Federation's leaders remained very much within the Jewish fold.

Those who would disparage the motivation of these leaders point to the fact that Federation constituted a kind of club; that entree into its leading circles may have provided the aspirant with business and social relationships. Those who took an active role in Federation might, therefore, have been concerned with their own self-interest rather than service in a Jewish context. Federation did, indeed, provide some social and business contacts for its leaders, but there were other boards, far more prestigious and socially helpful than Federation's Board of Trustees, open to wealthy Jews. According to respondents, these boards, once closed to even the wealthiest German

Jews, were certainly open by the 1960's. Federation leaders, therefore, chose a specifically Jewish forum for their activity when, in many instances, alternative forums were available. Indeed, this is what distinguished them from those who sought to assimilate.

There were some lay leaders, most likely of East European origin, who had deeper Jewish concerns, specifically that of Jewish survival. One of the professional consultants, Graenum Berger, had become, within a Federation context, radically Judaized, and he influenced others. Federation files from the late 1960's include many memoranda from Berger sharply objecting to the direction in which Federation was moving. On the other hand, the Jewish universalist outlook of the majority of Federation leaders was shared by most agency executives.

There is evidence, from a variety of studies, that many Jewish social workers, even those in such ostensibly Jewish institutions as Jewish community centers, and certainly those in psychiatric and case-work agencies, have tended to perceive their personal and professional responsibility in humanistic, universalist, perhaps even Marxist terms, rather than in terms of Jewish survival.¹⁰ Agency executives clearly varied in their Jewish proclivities, but Federation's own lay and professional leaders found their Jewish conceptions reinforced, rather than challenged, by the executives of the beneficiary societies with whom they came in contact. The agencies were generally in sympathy with the notion of service to non-Jews as well as Jews.

How was it possible that in New York, the city with the largest Jewish population in the world, more Jewish institutions than any other American city, and the headquarters of virtually all national Jewish organizations, Federation leadership could remain so relatively insulated?

By the end of the 1950's, in virtually all communities in North America, federations had merged with the major welfare-fund agency, the United Jewish Appeal, whose leadership, at least at the local level, was frequently of Eastern European descent, had Zionist sympathies, and was committed to the survival, as a distinctive group, of American Jewry. In New York, however, Federation and UJA remained separate entities, joining together only for campaign purposes in 1973. The absence of a merger in New York

¹⁰See, for example, Oscar I. Janowsky, *The JWB Survey* (New York, 1948); Herman Stein, "Jewish Social Work in the United States, 1654-1954," *AJYB*, Vol. 57, 1956, pp. 3-98; and Carl Urbont, "The Purposes of the Jewish Community Center Movement: An Appraisal of its Operation," *Ibid.*, Vol. 68, 1967, *AJYB*, pp. 29-59. Urbont notes in his discussion of the Jewish community centers: "With the professionalization of agency staffs . . . it entrusted its value system to workers whose training and philosophy are not necessarily rooted in the Jewish community. . . . These workers have recognized social group work with its emphasis on the individual, the group, and the process of personality development, as their discipline. . . . They generally have a stronger loyalty to broader social-work aims as espoused by their national professional organization than they do to center purposes" (pp. 47-48).

was both a manifestation and further cause of major differences between UJA and Federation.

The very size of the New York Jewish community, the multiplicity of its societies, clubs, and organizations, meant that even wealthy Jews did not necessarily mix with one another as they did in other cities. In New York, German Jews maintained separate clubs and societies long after they had disappeared in other areas.¹¹ Only in New York City, with its large and diffuse Jewish population, could Federation ignore the wishes of the major Jewish philanthropy, UJA, and the developments taking place within significant Jewish sub-groups. Thus, for example, the increased importance of Orthodox Jews in New York went unnoticed until the late 1960's.

New York's large Jewish population, and the fact that it is the headquarters for almost every national Jewish organization, encouraged the development of a variety of independent Jewish organizational systems. In most Jewish communities, federations contribute to such national Jewish organizations as B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Congress, and the American Jewish Committee. In return, the national organizations restrict their fundraising to special events of a limited nature. But such an arrangement never evolved in New York, where the organizations anticipate raising a significant portion of their budget. Fund-raising, in turn, requires an active organization. Consequently, organizations whose local chapters outside New York have been "smothered" by federations maintain their distance in New York. In addition, the national organizations have a special interest in recruiting a New York lay leadership for their national boards, as well as their local chapters. Thus there is competition for money and lay leaders among Federation, UJA, and a host of other groups, each of which seeks to create its own network of organizational activity. From Federation's point of view, this reduced its potential income (even the combined UJA-Federation campaign has not broken through these distinctive institutional loyalties) and insulated its leadership from trends elsewhere.

Factors Leading to Change

In 1921, Federation's combined allocations to its agencies represented 43 per cent of their expenditures.¹² That figure remained fairly constant until 1947. In that year, Federation's grant represented 40 per cent of its agencies'

¹¹In Philadelphia, for example, the acceptance of wealthy East European Jews into the "upper class" social clubs of German Jews had occurred by 1940. In Atlanta, however, distinctive social clubs still existed in the late 1940's. Two articles on this topic are found in Marshall Sklare (ed.), *The Jews* (New York, 1958), pp. 262-287.

¹²The percentages reported in this section are derived from Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, *Financial Experience of Affiliated Societies: 1939 to 1973-1974*.

expenditures. From that point on, the proportion of Federation's contribution declined with each succeeding year. By 1951, the percentage was 30 per cent; by 1961, 17 per cent; and by 1971, 5 per cent. This transformation is attributable primarily to the enormous increase in government funding. Federation's own grants increased almost yearly, sometimes by as much as ten per cent, but generally by approximately four or five per cent. (On five occasions between 1946 and 1966, grants were reduced.) The decline in Federation's contribution was most pronounced in the case of hospitals, but other agencies were affected as well.

Table I provides information for a selected group of Federation agencies.

Table I
Federation Grant as a Percentage of the Agencies Total Expenditure

Agency	Year			
	1940	1950	1960	1970
Jewish Board of Guardians* (child care)	82	57	31	16
Jewish Child Care Association	41	47	20	8
Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged	43	36	17	4
ALTRO Health and Rehabilitation Services	91	90	82	45
Jewish Family Service*	82**	87	75	71
Educational Alliance (community center)	77	77	66	49

*JBG and JFS merged in 1978

**In 1945

In some cases the decline in the 1950's exceeds that in the 1960's. Federation veterans, however, recall the latter decade as a time of crisis, indicating a possible turning point in the 1960's. In the opinion of agency executives, the tremendous increase in government resources in this period served to reorient agency leaders. They became growth conscious, and increasingly directed their programs to areas where funding was available. Federation encouraged this growth, not realizing perhaps that this weakened agency ties to Federation and provided a rationale for increasingly nonsectarian service.¹³ Some of the Government's eligibility requirements excluded agencies which confined their services to Jews; this was also true of some non-governmental sources of funding. The Greater New York Fund (the New York counterpart of United Way), for example, allocates, through Federation, funds to some of the latter's beneficiary societies, representing about ten per cent of Federation's grants to its agencies. In the 1960's, the Fund required recipient agencies to sign an affidavit affirming that they did

¹³The impact of government funding is discussed in Graenum Berger, "American Jewish Communal Service 1776-1976: From Traditional Self-help to Increasing Dependence on Government Support," *Jewish Social Studies*, 1976, pp. 225-246.

not discriminate in their selection of clients, staff, or board members.¹⁴ Federation was able to overcome the restriction, but a precedent had been set.

The changes occasioned by growing sources of outside support were accompanied by dramatic demographic changes in New York's population. Jews, along with other middle-class whites, tended to move out of the city, while Blacks and Hispanics moved in. Jewish birth rates declined. Finally, the Jewish needy, those who traditionally made use of Federation's services, were increasingly Orthodox, with a high proportion of hasidic Jews, many of whom were reluctant to turn to agencies of any kind with their problems. They did not view problems such as mental retardation or family strife as matters to be discussed outside the family circle. Nor did they expect help in vocational guidance and rehabilitation. Federation's camps and community center services, too, were so nonsectarian in character as to be effectively closed to traditional Jews.

The result was that the number of non-Jews served by Federation agencies increased. Excluding the Orthodox, of whom Federation seemed unaware, demographic changes alone pointed toward a more nonsectarian policy. This policy was further strengthened by the rise of Black consciousness and the notion of community representation, phenomena initially welcomed by many Jews.

Federation's traditional policy came under attack from two sides. The "survivalists" wondered why Federation should continue to support beneficiary societies that had become, in effect, nonsectarian agencies largely funded by the Government. Federation, they felt, should support only those agencies having Jewish programs or providing services to Jews. The survivalists were a minority among Federation leaders, but they included some people of wealth, along with many middle-class Jews who declined to contribute to Federation because of its overly nonsectarian philosophy. The second group, the "nonsectarians," felt that the very conception of a Federation of Jewish agencies had become an anachronism. They viewed the by-laws' provision that beneficiary societies be "organized primarily for the benefit of Jews" as contrary to the needs of the 60's. They may have been responding, at least in part, to the assimilation and intermarriage of their own children; but the fact remains that their ranks were thinning.¹⁵

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 241.

¹⁵It is interesting to examine campaign income in this light. Income from the 1954 campaign was 13 per cent above that of 1949. Comparable increases for successive five-year periods were 20 per cent in 1959, 5 per cent in 1964, and 14 per cent in 1969. This means that, aside from the 1954-1959 period, campaign increases were not keeping pace with inflation. However, in addition to the annual campaign, Federation launched two successful building-fund campaigns. In the particularly lean campaign years of 1959 to 1964, when campaign income rose from 14 to 15 million dollars, close to \$100 million was raised in building funds. Hence, there

The charge that increased government funding made Federation irrelevant was countered by describing the organization's role as providing the added income that permitted the agencies to experiment, carry on pilot projects, and raise the quality of their professional staffs—in short, to uphold standards of excellence. In fact, the idea of "excellence," and the Federation leadership's conception of it as something especially Jewish, was not entirely new.^{15a} But nonsectarians insisted that if Federation's contribution was to upgrade service, it should not limit this contribution to any one set of agencies, or to an exclusively Jewish clientele, but should focus on the community of the needy, which cuts across ethnic-religious boundaries.

The survivalists, for their part, argued that they, too, would look beyond Federation's agencies, to the needs of middle-class people, the young, the poor, the sick, the aged, and the handicapped, on the local, national and international levels. This broad clientele, however, would be a Jewish one.

The first challenge to Federation's policy came from the nonsectarians. Early in the 1960's, Joseph Willen proposed that Federation accept, and even encourage, the shift of its agencies to a purely nonsectarian policy. With the acquiescence of Hexter, Willen proposed that Federation cease the construction of Jewish community centers in Jewish neighborhoods, and rebuild in predominantly Black areas such as Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. This nonsectarian outlook was expressed in the volume *The Golden Heritage*, which Federation published in honor of its 50th anniversary. Its pictorial essay begins: "In this village, this city, in this New York, Man is our concern," and concludes: "Whatever concerns the heart and hope of Man—concerns us." The only specifically Jewish photographs, one of Temple Emanu-El and one of a hasidic prayer room, are grouped together with photographs of four churches.

The nonsectarians sought to formalize acceptance of their position in a document, "Goals and Purposes of Federation." A subcommittee of the

was no sense of immediate crisis. There was, however, in the opinion of those interviewed, intense concern for the future. Federation leaders had developed an impressive organization, but feared there would be no one to manage it after they retired. Although campaign income had not decreased, there was some decline in the number of very large contributors, and a sharp decline in the number of contributors in general. In the 1966 campaign, there were 84,672 gifts of more than ten dollars. The number of gifts decreased by 1,949 in 1967, 1,652 in 1968, and 3,171 in 1969. (Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, *Report of the Commission on the Role of Federation*, "Preliminary Draft," December 1971, p. 27.)

^{15a}It would be interesting to trace the view of "excellence" held by a segment of German American Jews. I suspect that it carried distinctive Jewish overtones; but I hesitate to guess whether it arose out of Jewish defensiveness, a secularization of the "chosen people" concept, or some other source. In a recent unpublished paper, Gerson Cohen argues that Jews in different places and periods have had a particular need to develop a sense of self-esteem in order to protect themselves against currents of assimilation. His analysis suggests that "excellence" filled just this function for some German American Jews.

Communal Planning Committee was appointed to prepare a report to Federation's Board of Trustees. The first draft (June 1967) reflected the nonsectarian point of view, but by the time the final report was adopted in April 1969, its thrust had been neutralized, and the survivalists had taken the offensive. The early drafts recommended that some money be allocated to special programs for non-Jewish agencies, and noted that changes in the clientele of Federation's agencies warranted "reexamination of the composition of the boards of these agencies." By late 1968, the report, now in its fifth draft, paid greater lip service to Federation's Jewish goals, but retained the emphasis of earlier drafts. The nonsectarians insisted that they were merely making explicit the accepted policy of Federation. CPC Chairman David Sher, in presenting a preliminary report to the Board of Trustees, made this quite clear: "The most significant feature of the statement has to do with Federation's role in rendering services beyond those to the Jewish population. What we are seeking here is a recognition of what Federation is already doing in that respect. If Federation, which is already engaged in a variety of general communal services, is to continue to engage in those services, it should do so not unwittingly, not begrudgingly, but should proclaim it proudly as a discharge of a duty which it has to the City of New York, of which it is a citizens' institution."

Sher's point of view was not shared by Federation's president, Samuel Silberman. In a seven-page memorandum dated December 1968, Silberman argued that the statement of goals and purposes had to emphasize that Federation's primary objective was to serve the Jewish community, rather than to support agency programs. He saw no possibility of drawing the nonsectarians into Federation's orbit. To the contrary, he wanted Federation to appeal to the more committed Jews. He cautioned the framers of the report against "alienating groups of worthwhile, responsible Jews because of . . . a rejection of their concerns." To Silberman, community and communal organization were foci of Jewish identity. He, therefore, viewed the entire Jewish community as the constituency of Federation.

The final draft of the Goals and Purposes report was a compromise. It retained a statement that agencies with nonsectarian clients and programs could remain affiliated with Federation, but deleted references to non-Jews serving on agency boards. In general, it eliminated the nonsectarian emphasis, and alluded to some of Silberman's points, without, however, making them the central focus.

At a Board of Trustees meeting on May 12, 1969, a number of amendments which would have strengthened the Jewish emphases of the report were defeated. These emphases, referred to by one past president as a "return to the ghetto," came in a memorandum from the Religious Affairs

Committee which called attention to Federation's role in support of Jewish education and service to Jews. But despite this defeat for the survivalists, the final report differed greatly from the original draft.

The report never played a major role in Federation's life. The language of its final draft was so vague that it could serve many purposes. It was resuscitated in 1977, for example, to legitimate the Jewish emphases of the Communal Planning Committee. The deliberations over the Goals and Purposes did, however, span a crucial period in the development of Federation's outlook. In shifting its focus of concern, Federation veered first toward a nonsectarian position, and then reversed direction. The particularly Jewish emphases of Federation still lay in the future; but the Silberman memorandum, with its communal emphasis, contained in it the core of Federation's new policy.

Silberman and his successor, George H. Heyman, Jr., were especially influential, as a result of a turnover in professional leadership. In 1967, Hexter and Willen retired under terms that assured them a role in Federation's deliberations for another ten years. The three years that followed were difficult ones in terms of professional leadership. One professional recalls that two days after Hexter's retirement, Silberman announced he was returning Federation to lay control. Two Federation executives from outside New York refused job offers because they feared that with Hexter and Willen in the background, they would be unable to act freely. The post was finally offered to an executive with no experience in the field of Jewish communal service, and his tenure was rather unsuccessful. When George Heyman assumed the presidency of Federation in 1969, he chose to leave vacant the position of executive vice-president. Only a year later did Sanford Solender, with a background in Jewish community-center work, take office as the professional head. This meant that Heyman's policies were of unusual importance in this crucial period.

Heyman has been referred to as the architect of Federation's new policies. But, as he himself notes, he would not have succeeded ten years earlier. Conditions in 1969 made Federation policy ripe for change, partly due to the changes in government funding and demography already mentioned. The reorientation of Federation policy was further facilitated by a shift in the outlook of some of its leaders.

Perhaps the most important factors in affecting such a change of outlook were the Black Power movement and manifestations of Black antisemitism. This was the era of the Teachers Strike, of Oceanhill-Brownsville, of antisemitic remarks by Black spokesmen. The assertion by Blacks of their rights led Jews to wonder why they should not think in terms of Jewish rights. Increased government responsiveness, particularly at the municipal level, to demands by ethnic groups, meant that the "rules of the game" had now changed. More and more Federation leaders believed that the growing

emphasis on the distribution of resources along ethnic lines required that Jews insist upon receiving their fair share. Finally, Black antisemitism was a traumatic experience for many liberal Jews who had been deeply committed to the civil rights movement, who saw themselves and other Jews as champions of the Negro cause, and who believed that antisemitism, except from the extreme right, had disappeared in the United States.

A second factor that led at least some Federation leaders to change their Jewish outlook was the Six Day War and its aftermath. Both Israel's victory and the renewed threat to its existence contributed to their Jewish pride and concern. It is possible that perceptions of Black antisemitism heightened such feelings by serving as a further reminder that Jews were threatened in the 1960's as in the past. This time, however, Jews had shown that they could fight back and emerge victorious.

A third factor in the transformation of the outlook of some Federation leaders was the growing disenchantment with conceptions of the "common good." This disenchantment could have been a product of the war in Vietnam, a letdown from the Kennedy era, or a gradual erosion of earlier liberal political beliefs. Whatever the case, it reinforced a feeling that Jews had best be more attentive to their own interests. While Federation has not abandoned its concern for the general welfare, it now views its contribution to that welfare through the medium of group interest. Thus, for example, Solender, in urging upon Federation greater explicit concern for the needs of middle-class Jews, argues that in so doing they serve all New Yorkers, because the welfare of the city requires preserving its middle-class population.

The increased visibility of Jewish survivalists also served to alter the views of some Federation leaders. The upward mobility of East European Jews brought increasing numbers of them into professional and social contact with traditional Federation leaders. Some of the East Europeans had deep Jewish commitments and beliefs; a number were Orthodox. These were not exotic Hasidim, but people to whom Federation leaders related as peers.

A number of respondents ascribed special importance to the Commission on the Role of Federation in the conversion of some of Federation's traditional leaders to a more Jewish point of view. The Commission was appointed in 1970 by George Heyman, and was chaired by the man who succeeded him as president, Lawrence B. Buttenweiser. The Commission included both Federation leaders and a number of Jewish communal figures, including rabbis outside the Federation orbit. The Commission's deliberations extended to a weekend at a kosher hotel. Respondents felt that the resultant confrontation of Federation leaders and a number of articulate, sensitive, and deeply committed Jews made an impact on some of the less Jewishly identified leaders. The Commission saw itself as charting a new

direction for Federation. Its report, a distinctly "survivalist" document, recommended strengthening Jewish communal activity and putting greater emphasis on Jewish educational and cultural programs. It was presented to the Board of Trustees in 1972. No action was taken, but its impact remained on those who participated in its formulation.

Since 1970, Federation policy has increasingly come to reflect responsibility to the Jewish community. Some of the old leaders have been converted to the new policy; some have dropped out of Federation activity; some have remained as proponents of a minority point of view; some have simply shifted with the new tide. Finally, new leaders have been found.

COMMUNAL INVOLVEMENT

The change in Federation's policy has been expressed through its support of agencies and activities of a community-building nature, rather than those serving the needs of individuals. It has, for example, increased its subventions (allocations to non-member agencies). In the five-year period of 1964-69, subventions increased by 8 per cent, from \$271,974 to \$295,237. The overall increase in Federation allocations during this period was 15 per cent. In the next five years, subventions increased by 27 per cent, to \$396,506; overall allocations increased by only 7 per cent.

Federation created the Jewish Association for College Youth and sponsored a Metropolitan New York Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty in 1970. The former organization's genesis was tied to a demonstration by college students in the Federation office in 1970 protesting a lack of attention to the needs of Jewish students. The latter organization stemmed from Federation's growing concern for the Jewish poor of the inner city. The council was the beneficiary of a special allocation of \$1,200,000.¹⁶

Far more controversial was Federation's support for the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry, whose task is to alert the public to the plight of Soviet Jewry through educational, cultural, and political activities. Assistance to the Conference meant not only supporting an agency engaged in helping Jews outside New York, indeed outside the United States, but also helping them in a way foreign to Federation's traditional mode of operation. The initial Federation allocation occasioned great debate. It was possible to justify it on the grounds that anything of concern to New York Jews as Jews was part of Federation's responsibility. Federation was not quite ready to accept that kind of rationale. Even today the allocation to the Conference is a matter of contention. While no one opposes the principle of assistance to Soviet Jewry, there are those who feel this should be the

¹⁶On the genesis of Federation's interest in the Jewish poor, with special attention to the role of the Religious Affairs Committee, see Trainin, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-91. See also Metropolitan New York Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty, *Jewish Poverty Issues* (n.d.).

responsibility of UJA, not Federation. Hence, support is justified on the grounds that the organization "works closely with a number of Federation agencies and provides materials to camps, community centers, and Jewish schools in the New York area."¹⁷

Another expression of Federation's communal involvement, and a reversal of a previous policy, was its creation of, and support for, the Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council. Incidents of Black antisemitism, a mayor insensitive to Jewish needs, and racial tensions within the City University system in the late 1960's had led to a feeling that organizations engaged in Jewish communal relations should confer regularly with one another. Federation was willing to participate in such meetings, but declined to fund a permanent organization, following a 1968 CPC recommendation.

By 1973, attitudes within Federation had changed. A new, younger leadership, led by Daniel S. Shapiro, agitated for a formal Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC). It felt that Federation should take the initiative in creating such a body, as it was, according to Shapiro, "the central body for Jewish communal life." This view differed radically from the earlier one. With noteworthy rapidity the new outlook had become an assumption, at least on the part of the younger element. Thus, despite some internal opposition, and the objection of some Jewish communal organizations which feared the competition, Federation was instrumental in establishing and funding the JCRC in 1976.

Close ties to the JCRC represented a whole new way of viewing society and the Jew's role in it. Jews were now viewed as a distinctive group with distinctive group interests. Such a conception carried political overtones and affected the individual's understanding of what it means to be a Jew. It stood in dramatic contrast to the traditional view of Federation leaders.

Some people have noted that Federation undertook many of its communal projects reluctantly, over internal opposition. One respondent commented that "Federation really backed into these projects." But while it is true that Federation responded to communal pressures, and in the case of its poverty program, to the availability of government money, it also responded to pressures from within, pressures wrought by changing leadership and altered attitudes.

By the late 1960's, Federation had already accepted two new reference groups. One was the national Jewish community as represented by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. Federation responded positively to the Council's requests for allocations and special grants, and the deliberations and decisions of the Council and its General Assembly

¹⁷Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, *Distribution Committee Report*, 1978-1979, p. 62.

provided ammunition for those who sought to change Federation's direction. Proponents of more funds for Jewish education, for example, legitimated their demands by pointing to Council statements and decisions.

Secondly, Federation became increasingly responsive to what its leaders called the "traditional" segment of the community, by which they meant primarily the Orthodox. Members of this segment were influential in that they were perceived as constituting both the bulk of the Jewish poor to whom Federation had to respond, and the anchor for Jewish neighborhood stabilization.¹⁸ They were also represented among the wealthiest Jews in New York. In fact, the two New York gifts of \$5 million to the Israel Emergency Appeal in 1973 came from Orthodox Jews. Hence, campaign needs, too, dictated greater sensitivity to their wishes and needs.

Federation's communal involvement increased along with its recognition that agencies must demonstrate community roots in order to obtain government funding. This meant establishing relationships with local Jewish community councils and seeking neighborhood support for Federation agencies. Federation was rather late in eradicating its image as a rich Jewish club removed from the reality of urban life. Other Jewish groups, particularly Orthodox ones, had meanwhile established their claims, and benefited from government assistance, before local Jewish community councils with ties to Federation could make their voices heard.¹⁹

The single most important Orthodox group competing with Federation for funds for employment guidance and senior-citizen services is Agudath Israel. But there are scores of smaller agencies and institutions that benefit from government assistance. Some of these, hardly legitimate, receive government money because they command, or give the impression of commanding, a constituency of potential voters. Obviously, not all the funds which have gone to them might otherwise have gone to Federation; but without these groups Federation agencies would have been greater beneficiaries of government funding.

Federation has not sought to expose the fraud in which some of these groups engage. Indeed, its policy is not to do so, although information which has led to the exposure of a few of the groups has come from people

¹⁸In supporting a proposal to help a middle-income Orthodox community, a member of the CPC commented that neighborhoods were more stable where there was "a stable Orthodox Jewish community." He pointed out the necessity, therefore, of "involving the Orthodox community in joint programs if viable Jewish neighborhoods are to remain": *Minutes of the Communal Planning Committee*, September 15, 1976.

¹⁹There are approximately 40 local councils of Jewish organizations located in the Greater New York area. A majority of these are connected in some way to Jewish community centers. Federation spends close to \$175,000 in direct and indirect support for 27 of the councils. There are closer ties between eight Jewish community councils in poverty areas and the Metropolitan Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty established by Federation.

in Federation or its agencies.²⁰ Instead, Federation sought to establish ties with that segment of the Orthodox community adept at politics and the art of securing grants, without compromising its own standards of honesty and quality service.

Federation also encouraged its own agencies to strengthen ties to local political leaders. The Public Program and Policy Committee (PPPC) became the vehicle for coordinating this activity, a fact which accounts in part for the growing importance of that committee.

JEWISH EDUCATION

The history of Federation's involvement in Jewish education is a complex one that has engendered much controversy. There is a perception within Federation that the resounding victory won by the proponents of Jewish education a few years ago left a residue of bad feeling among some who were defeated. It, therefore, comes as a surprise to learn that in 1930 Federation allocated 4.9 per cent of its total grants to Jewish education; in 1960, 4.8 per cent; in 1970, 5.5 per cent; in 1977, 6.3 per cent; and in 1978, 7.2 per cent.²¹

These figures however, are misleading. In the first place, the 7.2 per cent total allocation for Jewish education in 1978 consisted of a grant of \$1,701,000 to the Board of Jewish Education, and a grant of \$215,000 for tuition assistance to Jewish schools, primarily day schools, made through the Program Development Fund. The Board of Jewish Education spends most of its money on programs of consultation and guidance to most of the 210 Jewish day schools and 440 afternoon and Sunday schools in the Greater New York area. It also offers some direct support to schools through incentive grants and interest-free loans. (This was estimated at \$169,000 in the 1977-78 fiscal year.) In addition to these sums, and other aid offered by the Board, such as engineering consultation or assistance in securing government aid, Jewish schools also benefited in 1977-78 from approximately \$1 million in interest-free loans from the Hebrew Free Loan Society, another agency of Federation. Federation repaid the interest lost through depletion of its reserves. Finally in 1972, Federation established the Program Development Fund (PDF), presently geared to attracting large gifts. Its largest donor is Joseph Gruss. As of January 1978, Gruss had contributed \$2 million of the \$4.3 million raised by the Fund. There were

²⁰The topic of Jewish corruption is discussed in Perry Davis, "Corruption in Jewish Life," *Present Tense*, Winter, 1978, pp. 19-24.

²¹A sharp attack on Federation's policy with regard to Jewish education appears in Moshe Sherer's "What is Federation doing with the Jewish Charity Dollar?" *Jewish Observer*, February-March 1977, pp. 4-6.

29 other donors, 20 of whom contributed \$100,000 or more. In 1977-78, the PDF distributed \$1,075,000, 90 per cent of which went directly to day schools.

Only in 1978 did Federation itself allocate a sum of money to the PDF for direct tuition aid to schools. The Fund is, however, sponsored and encouraged by Federation. In the fall of 1978, it appeared likely that Federation's assistance to the PDF would be further increased. With the exception of Gruss, few, if any, of the donors would have contributed to Jewish education were it not for Federation recruitment. The number of Orthodox contributors, in particular, has been negligible, as they generally prefer to support their favorite day schools directly.

If one combines PDF grants, allocations to the Board of Jewish Education, and allocations to Jewish schools through the PDF, expenditures for Jewish education represent 10.6 per cent of Federation's total 1978 allocations. This does not take into account indirect aid, loans, and informal programs of Jewish education. Some Jewish community center expenditures, for example, are for educational programs. The Jewish Association of College Youth also spends money on Jewish education. Many of Federation's camps have Jewish educational programs, as do many of the agencies serving children and senior citizens; the recreational facilities of various Jewish community centers are utilized by 50 day schools for their physical education programs; and Federation's family and vocational agencies provide social work and guidance in a number of day schools.

Jewish education has received a growing percentage of the Federation dollar since 1968. While the increments do not match those for community centers (which increased from 23.8 to 28.8 per cent from 1970 to 1978), they are larger than those in any other functional field. The fact that budgetary decisions are made within the confines of minor incremental changes in periods of relatively constant income makes Federation's efforts on behalf of Jewish education all the more notable.²² Federation allocations to Jewish education, exclusive of the PDF, increased by 15.1 per cent from 1977 to 1978. Allocations to community centers increased by 5.6 per cent, and to all other functional fields by less than two per cent.

Nevertheless, Federation allocations for Jewish education fall considerably below those of federations throughout the United States. In 1976, the last year for which comparable data is available, the 15 largest federations outside New York allocated 26 per cent of their funds to Jewish education.²³ Whether one uses a 7.2 or 10.7 per cent figure for New York, the differences

²²Between 1975 and 1976 the 16 largest federations increased their allocations to Jewish education by ten per cent. New York's increase (inclusive of the PDF) ranked fourth highest.

²³"Federation Allocations to Jewish Education 1966-1976," Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, *Reports*, November 1977.

are marked, particularly as the bulk of New York's money goes to consultive services performed by the Board of Jewish Education, rather than to direct financial aid to Jewish schools.²⁴ Federation has, however, encouraged the Board to increase its direct assistance to these schools.

The Jewish education issue was never one of support versus non-support, but rather involved such questions as the extent to which such support should become a Federation priority, whether support for day schools should be a particular priority, and the extent to which schools should be funded directly rather than through the Board of Jewish Education.

Support of Jewish education in general, and of day schools in particular, has indeed become a Federation priority. At the same time, Federation has eschewed the radical change in policy required to increase such support dramatically. Such a change would involve either new campaign mechanisms to permit the earmarking of contributions for Jewish education (a proposal made in 1977 at an informal gathering of a few Federation leaders) or the elimination of some agencies and programs which Federation currently supports.

In 1968, Federation president Samuel Silberman appointed a Functional Committee on Jewish Education, under the chairmanship of Solomon Litt, to prepare recommendations on Jewish education for the Board of Trustees. The committee was composed of trustees and non-trustees favoring greater Federation assistance to Jewish education. The Committee's report was prepared by a consultant (Hyman Chanover of the American Association for Jewish Education) and submitted to the Board of Trustees in 1970. It reviewed the background of Federation involvement with Jewish education, cited the effort of other cities with large Jewish populations to fund Jewish education, and noted the demonstrated association between intensive Jewish education and positive Jewish identity. The recommendations called upon Federation to double its allocation to the Board of Jewish Education, and to establish a 25-million-dollar Jewish Education Endowment Fund. The Fund was to be comparable to a Federation Building Fund; that is, money was to be solicited from contributors beyond their annual campaign contributions. The report recommended that Federation provide an incentive grant by drawing upon its reserves to contribute to the Endowment Fund on a matching basis.

The Board rejected the report. The proposal that Federation indent reserves to match grants to an endowment fund was thought to be unrealistic.

²⁴Ten federations, including New York's, spent over \$500,000 on Jewish education in 1976. Baltimore and New York were the only two communities in which more funds were allocated for consultive services than for financial aid to local schools. In five communities (Cleveland, Detroit, Montreal, Philadelphia, and Toronto) the ratio of allocations for consultive services to those for direct school aid was below 50 per cent: *ibid.*

Nor could the Board accept the notion that Jewish education was an essential ingredient for Jewish survival when most Federation leadership had none.

What Federation leaders were prepared to accept was the traditional Federation philosophy of helping Jews in need. This was the argument developed by George Heyman and other proponents of increased support for Jewish education. It began with the assumption that the public schools were terrible. No Federation leader living in New York, it was argued, would send his children to a public school. Poor Jewish parents, however, could not afford private schools. Were they to be deprived of a decent education for their children? Support for Jewish education was, therefore, justified in terms of helping needy Jews. For Heyman himself, support for Jewish day schools was related, at least in part, to an assertion of Jewish pride. He reported that a turning point in his own position came when a Catholic prelate asked him, "Why are Jews embarrassed to spend Jewish money for Jewish purposes?"

A second legitimation for support to Jewish education was the fact that many of the day-school facilities were so deteriorated as to be in violation of building codes. Hence, they required support to protect the image of the Jewish community and to provide minimum sanitary and safety conditions for Jewish children.

It is ironical that the most indirect rationale for Jewish education—relegating it to an aspect of philanthropy—provided greater legitimacy to aiding Jewish day schools than to helping supplementary schools, and played down the importance of the work of the Board of Jewish Education, which sought to improve the quality of education, rather than to provide schools with direct financial aid. This may help to explain why the Program Development Fund elicited major contributions from people having neither a personal commitment to the value of Jewish education, nor any particular sympathy for the Board of Jewish Education.

The philanthropic point of view pervades a second report on Jewish education, commissioned by Federation, prepared by Eli Ginzberg,²⁵ and submitted in April 1972. This report reflected the view that something should be done for Jewish schools specifically, rather than Jewish education in general. It called for the phasing out of the Board of Jewish Education's consultative services and the substitution of direct support of schools, "particularly of day schools serving low-income students," and a scholarship program for needy students "primarily in day schools."

The Ginzberg report was even less acceptable to Federation than Chanover's. First of all, the Board of Jewish Education had just undergone some

²⁵Eli Ginzberg, "Federation's Responsibility for Central Services for Jewish Education in Greater New York" (April 30, 1972).

reorganization, had hired a new executive, Dr. Alvin Schiff, and was benefiting from an improved relationship with Federation. The Board, therefore, was able to call upon friends within both Federation and the Jewish community for support. Secondly, many, even some who supported its general recommendations, felt the report was based on inadequate data. Finally, Federation was unwilling to assume the responsibility for allocating money directly to Jewish schools and fixing the criteria by which these allocations should be made. An intermediary agency was therefore necessary, and the Board of Jewish Education was the obvious candidate. Since it was to continue in existence, it made sense for it to undertake such functions as educational consultation and guidance.

Federation's present policy reflects elements of both reports. Creation of the Program Development Fund, for example, was a step in the direction recommended by the Chanover report. The spirit of the Ginzberg report is found in modified form in the Distribution Committee's attitude toward the Board of Jewish Education. While the Board's services in raising the quality of Jewish education are appreciated, there is a pressure on the Board to provide greater direct support to Jewish schools. The more indirect the services are, the more probing the DC becomes. Federation's 1978 allocation of tuition assistance to schools established distribution criteria. The Functional Committee on Jewish Education will seek to coordinate the variety of services offered Jewish schools through the Board of Jewish Education, PDF, Hebrew Free Loan Society, and other agencies. This new trend could result in greater selectivity in allocations to schools, as the Chanover report recommended, and in increased Federation leverage to encourage the coordination, even merger, of schools in many areas. These developments might presage a far more centralized authority in Jewish education in New York than hitherto. Many forces in the community view these developments with unease, and are seeking to assure themselves the greatest possible voice in any decisions that will be made.

Finally, the philosophy underlying Federation's support for Jewish education today is that Jewish education strengthens Jewish identity. In June 1977, at the introductory and concluding plenary sessions of Federation's 60th anniversary celebration, the audience heard speakers emphasize that Federation's highest priority was Jewish education as an instrument for Jewish survival.

JEWISH PROGRAMMING

Federation today insists that Jewish values and needs be reflected in agency programs. This aspect of Federation policy received emphasis in the DC report to the Board of Trustees in 1977. DC Chairman Billie Tisch

noted several considerations affecting the DC's shift in funding. The first was "the Jewish purposes of Federation." Federation, she stated, could not be all things to all people. The shortage of funds had forced the DC to "focus on the places and programs where we are best able to serve, and where no one else can or will pay attention to specialized situations."

Another important concern is the proportion of Jewish clientele served by each agency. Budget reports, prepared by DC staff in anticipation of budget hearings, include information on the agency's Jewish census. Agencies serving a predominantly non-Jewish clientele, and unable or unwilling to institute changes in policy to attract more Jews, have faced cuts in allocations and, in a few cases, the threat of disaffiliation. This policy has strained Federation-agency relationships in some instances, but has been accepted by most Federation leaders.

A more subtle policy change is reflected in Federation's desire to enlarge the Jewish content of its agencies' programs. This is a touchy point for Federation leaders, since the lives of many of them are not noticeably rich in Jewish content. Should Federation encourage its agencies to maintain kosher kitchens, or close on the Jewish holidays, when the vast majority of Federation leaders do not themselves believe that Jews are obligated to eat kosher food or refrain from work on Jewish holidays? Should Federation leaders insist that the informal educational programs in its camps or child-care centers contain Jewish content when some Federation leaders are themselves ignorant of, and indifferent to, Jewish culture?

Despite the apparent incongruity, this is the direction in which Federation is moving. Federation leaders rationalize such measures with a philosophy of service to clientele. They argue that serving the needs of Jews means creating a Jewish environment and observing Jewish ritual. Thus, for example, kosher facilities must be available so as not to discriminate against Jews whose religious convictions require them to eat kosher food.²⁶ This argument finds reinforcement in the Jewish-census issue. Agencies are told that if they want to increase the proportion of Jews they serve they must tailor their practices to the needs of a Jewish clientele. Given the relatively high proportion of Orthodox Jews among the pool of potential agency users, this policy means accommodating the Orthodox. There is evidence that those agencies serving the Jewish poor which have taken steps to meet the needs of traditional Jews have experienced increased enrollments. And, as the evidence accumulates, Federation's staff and the DC feel justified in exerting more pressure in this direction.

²⁶All food served in the Federation building itself is kosher, and Federation is closed on Jewish holidays.

The emphasis on Jewish content and programming is justified in part by the need to raise or maintain a high Jewish census. But the attention which DC members and staff devote to the introduction of kosher facilities or more Jewish programming in their agencies, and the pleasure they show when progress is made in this regard, indicate that their interest goes beyond the desire to increase an agency's Jewish census. It appears that many Federation leaders are increasingly committed to Jewish programming as an end in itself. Some see this commitment as a stage in the recovery of their own Jewish identity.

Indeed, another argument for greater Jewish content stresses the benefit of just such a strengthened self-identity. One child-care agency not noted in the past for its emphasis on things Jewish has argued that its professional responsibility toward the emotionally-retarded child requires providing a Jewish ambience which strengthens his sense of identity and security. This kind of programming has been indirectly challenged in the courts in the case of *Wilder vs. Sugarman*.²⁷ Federation has an important stake in the outcome.

HOSPITALS

Ten hospitals are beneficiary societies of Federation. In the 1977-78 fiscal year, they received about \$4.5 million, or 17 per cent of Federation's total allocations. The money represented .7 per cent of their total budget. The hospitals are the pride of the Federation system in the general community, but they have been a source of controversy in the Jewish community.

Federation has reason to be proud of its hospitals, particularly for their pioneering work in medical research. Federation leaders like to point out that many Jews who are critical of Federation hospitals turn to them when they require medical care. On the other hand, the hospitals are the focus of criticism for many Jews who are unhappy with Federation. There is

²⁷The suit challenges the constitutionality of the New York State child welfare system, which provides that neglected or abandoned children are, "when practicable," to be assigned to agencies of the same religious affiliation as the child. (The bulk of child care in New York is provided by religious-sponsored agencies.) Although both Jewish and Catholic agencies serve Black children, the suit charges that the religious preference clause has the effect of concentrating Black children in Protestant agencies which are overcrowded, or placing them under direct supervision of the city in conditions that are inferior to those of the voluntary agencies. If successful, the suit would force the government to assign neglected or abandoned children to agencies without regard to religion. The impact on Federation agencies could destroy whatever special Jewish nature they might have. The suit on behalf of the plaintiffs was brought by the New York Civil Liberties Union. See Richard Severo, "Church Groups See Danger in Child Care Bias Lawsuit," *New York Times*, March 16, 1975, and John R. Hale, "The Wilder Case: Threat to Child Care," *America*, April 20, 1974, pp. 304-306.

resentment that hospitals whose clientele is predominantly non-Jewish, and whose environment is in many cases indistinguishable from that of a non-Jewish hospital, are supported by Jewish public funds. To many, the hospitals epitomize an older Federation image—institutions under Jewish auspices, benefiting from Jewish money, but doing nothing in particular for the Jewish community.

There is further opposition to Federation support for hospitals as a matter of priority. It is argued that even if the hospitals were more Jewish-oriented, they would not merit Federation support, given other unmet Jewish needs. Medical care is almost by definition nonsectarian. While it would be nice to have a kosher kitchen in a hospital (five of the ten have), frozen kosher food is available in non-Jewish hospitals. While it might be reassuring to have a mezuzah on the hospital door (five of the ten have), patients are not required, under Jewish law, to utilize rooms with mezuzahs. Federation's obligation, the argument goes, is to support those Jewish activities which are specifically Jewish in nature, and which depend on the Jewish community for funding. Given the needs of Jewish schools, and the shortage of Federation money, there is resentment that large sums are allocated to hospitals.²⁸

There are, however, some very practical reasons for continued assistance to hospitals. First of all, there are large contributors to the Joint Campaign who serve on hospital boards, and who might reduce their contributions if Federation were to discontinue its support for the hospitals. In one year alone, 66 members of the Mt. Sinai Board contributed over \$2 million; 44 members of Montefiore's Board, about \$1.3 million; and 83 members of Beth Israel's Board, over \$2 million. The average contributions of members of major hospital boards were: Mt. Sinai, \$31,500; Montefiore \$30,000; and Beth Israel, \$24,700. In contrast, the average contribution of board members of some of the largest and most prestigious non-hospital agencies were: 92nd Street Y, \$14,700; Associated Y's, \$11,300; Jewish Family Service, \$7,200; Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged, \$6,400; Jewish Board of Guardians, \$4,400; and Altro, \$2,800.

Hospital participation in the Federation network benefits Federation and all of its agencies in other ways, as well. Hospitals account for some \$24 million of the \$27 million spent annually by Federation's joint purchasing plan. Joint purchasing provides significant discounts to Federation agencies in the purchase of various supplies, and the greater the bulk purchases, the larger the discount. (On the other hand, Federation hospitals are beneficiaries of Federation's joint insurance program, which provides hospitals with

²⁸Cases for and against Federation support for Jewish hospitals are presented by Sanford Solender and J. David Bleich, respectively, in *Sh'ma*, May 2, 1975. See the rejoinder by Bleich in *Sh'ma*, May 16, 1975.

malpractice insurance at considerably less cost than that available to non-Federation hospitals.) Federation leaders also believe that their association with hospitals gives them increased status, which translates into political influence in representations to government agencies. Finally, hospital boards have been an important source of recruitment of Federation leaders.

Whatever the reasons, there is firm support within Federation for continued allocations to hospitals. However, three points should be noted. First, allocations to hospitals as a percentage of total allocations have declined steadily since 1960, and will probably continue to decline. In 1960, 38 per cent of Federation's funds went to hospitals. This fell to 32 per cent in 1965, 25 per cent in 1970, 20 per cent in 1975, and currently stands at 17 per cent. The decline began before basic changes in Federation's policy were introduced, and reflects a general consensus that other functional fields have greater priority.

Secondly, it is Federation policy to encourage hospitals to strengthen their Jewish ambience, and to provide special services for Jews. Brooklyn Jewish Hospital has established an outreach health center in Crown Heights for the Lubavitcher community, and Maimonides Hospital has a special program for the Orthodox Jews of Boro Park. Beth Israel Hospital, in the past two years, has undertaken an intensive program of specialized services to the Jewish community. The Distribution Committee made it known to hospitals that its level of support for each would depend in part on the availability of necessities and conveniences to Jewish patients. In 1977, the chairman of the DC subcommittee on medical care wrote to all Federation hospitals asking them about the presence of kosher kitchens, chapels, mezuzahs, sabbath lights, etc. Increments in Federation's support of hospitals is related to their Jewish programs. In 1977, for example, Federation cut its allocations to hospitals by \$300,000, a reduction of six per cent. However, two hospitals, Beth Israel and Maimonides, received increases "in acknowledgement of their more intensive services to the Jewish community in the number of patients served, and in attention to traditional Jewish values."²⁹

Federation's policy has had an impact on the hospitals. Some hospitals claim that their association with Federation provides them with an identity they value. Others appreciate the historical association. Perhaps some members of hospital boards have wanted to move in a more Jewish direction anyway, and their attempts have been strengthened by Federation's concerns. Finally, whereas Federation's contribution is a small portion of the hospitals' budgets, it is a substantial help in meeting deficits. Hospitals have argued that Federation's contribution makes possible the quality aspects of

²⁹Morton Fisher, *Report to the Distribution Committee on Federation Medical Care Agencies*, September 1977.

their programs, and enables them to carry on their special functions for the Jewish community. Some Federation leaders are troubled by the possibility that if Federation support continues to decline, the hospitals themselves may lose interest in remaining part of the Federation network. Hardly anyone within Federation would welcome this development.

Still, those hospitals serving an almost exclusively non-Jewish clientele, and unable or unwilling to develop programs meaningful to the Jewish community, are being phased out. In the case of Bronx Lebanon Hospital the phasing out is almost complete.

THE JOINT CAMPAIGN

The joint campaign which Federation conducts with the United Jewish Appeal is an outgrowth of policy as well as an expression of institutional self-interest.

When the Yom Kippur War broke out on October 5, 1973, five days after Federation's opening campaign dinner, it was speedily agreed that the Federation campaign be coordinated with a special United Jewish Appeal drive. But that decision followed a year and a half of discussions on the possibility of a merger. In the 1960's, Federation had rejected a UJA proposal to merge the campaigns. The two organizations, however, had continued to provide some services to one another. In the mid-1960's, UJA had threatened to withdraw from any cooperative venture should Federation elect as its president a certain member of the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism. Federation had acquiesced.

During Heyman's administration, Federation leaders began to reconsider a joint campaign. The Yom Kippur War, then, was the final push to a process already begun. In 1974, Federation and UJA concluded a two-year arrangement for a joint campaign. While the sums allotted are subject to renegotiation, the joint campaign seems to have become a permanent arrangement. The joint campaign cannot be understood solely as an arrangement resulting from financial need. Nonmonetary considerations played a vital role in its establishment, and in the continuing desire of both sides to maintain it.

The Joint Campaign has saved the overhead costs of two separate campaigns. UJA executive vice-president Ernest W. Michel, who serves along with Solender as executive vice-president of the UJA-Federation Joint Campaign (a new organization established for campaign purposes and directed by a 30-member board composed of 15 representatives from each side), estimates a saving of two to three million dollars in campaign costs. But there are losses as well. A few past contributors to either UJA or Federation, for example, are so unhappy about the fact that their money

will go to the other side that they refuse to contribute to the Joint Campaign. The number of gifts over \$10,000 has remained constant, however, as the dropouts have been replaced by new givers. Similarly, there are a few large contributors who, because of ideological dissatisfaction, have not increased the size of their gifts, although they are in a position to do so. Others, while pleased with the merger, fail to give a new contribution equal to the sum of their two previous ones. A man who had previously given one million dollars to UJA and \$80,000 to Federation found it easy to round off his gift to the former figure. Campaign contributions have dropped each year since 1974, and while no one attributes this entirely to the merger, it is difficult to argue that the merger has helped.

Some UJA people attribute Federation's desire for a joint campaign to its own financial difficulties. (Indeed, the UJA national office did not favor the merger.) Federation income, they say, reached a plateau by 1973. The terms of the merger provide Federation with a minimum sum regardless of how little is raised. In 1978-79, for example, Federation is guaranteed a minimum of \$17 million from the campaign; ten per cent of net cash receipts from \$55 to \$60 million; 20 per cent of receipts from \$60 to \$62 million; and 30 per cent of receipts from \$62 to \$65 million. Federation receives ten per cent of all net cash receipts beyond \$65 million, but no one expects that level to be reached. Current estimates of net cash income for 1978-79 are 62.3 million, putting Federation's share at \$18 million. Thus, not only is Federation guaranteed a certain sum, but it also can depend on a regular monthly cash flow from the campaign.

These benefits ought not to be overstated, however. Unlike UJA, Federation has never had a serious cash-flow problem, or the problem of uncollected pledges. Secondly, if one looks at Federation's cash income from 1959 to 1972, there is no evidence of a plateau. The pattern, in fact, is one of big jumps in income one year followed by small increases or declines the following year. (See Table II, p.48.)

With campaign and associated costs deducted, Federation's net cash receipts in 1972-73 were \$15.4 million. There is no question that Federation derived immediate financial benefits from the Joint Campaign. It received as much as \$18.4 million on three occasions since 1974, and anticipates \$18 million for 1978-79. On the other hand, if one assumes that Federation's income since 1972-73 would have grown at a rate of three per cent a year, then by 1978-79 it would have reached \$18.4 million, more than Federation estimates it will receive from the Joint Campaign.

In addition to the financial reasons discussed, the UJA-Federation merger was a product of ideological decisions. By 1974, Federation's conception of its Jewish communal role had taken firm root. The desire for a joint campaign with UJA reflected an awareness that Israel was the primary

Table II
Cash Receipts From Campaign Contributions to Federation, 1950-1973

Year	Campaign Income (to nearest thousand)	Annual Percentage Change
1949-1950	\$10,362	
1950-1951	11,672	11.2
1951-1952	11,724	No change
1952-1953	11,341	-3.3
1953-1954	11,732	3.3
1954-1955	11,756	0.1
1955-1956	13,125	10.4
1956-1957	13,061	-0.5
1957-1958	12,885	-0.1
1958-1959	14,132	8.8
1959-1960	14,325	1.3
1960-1961	14,702	2.5
1961-1962	15,242	3.5
1962-1963	15,160	-0.5
1963-1964	15,082	-0.5
1964-1965	15,762	4.3
1965-1966	15,485	-1.7
1966-1967	15,897	2.5
1967-1968	16,862	5.7
1968-1969	17,986	6.2
1969-1970	17,496	-2.8
1970-1971	17,410	-0.5
1971-1972	16,594	6.4
1972-1973	18,765	0.9

Jewish concern of the bulk of New York's Jews. If Federation was to build a meaningful Jewish community, and play a central role in that community, it had to participate with UJA in efforts on behalf of Israel. UJA leaders agreed that there must be a united Jewish community able to express within the framework of one organization its concern for both local and overseas Jewish needs.

An additional factor leading to the Joint Campaign was each side's desire for some non-material resources of the other. Federation leaders were perceived as younger, brighter, more sophisticated, and of higher social status than those of UJA, who had, in turn, an emotional dedication in contrast to Federation's style. This passion was important in energizing campaign workers at all levels and in moving wealthy Jews to make substantial contributions.

It is difficult to measure the impact of the Joint Campaign on Federation's outlook. Many attribute the increased Jewish concerns of Federation to the merger. In an effort to strengthen ties with UJA, Federation has, indeed,

appointed a number of UJA activists to its Board of Trustees and key committees. But Federation was seeking to expand its leadership base with people of deeper Jewish commitment before the Joint Campaign, and the merger is itself an outcome of Federation's growing Jewish concerns. The shift in Federation's orientation began three years before the final agreement.

Nor has the merger dissipated all the old antagonisms. Differences in the two organizations' styles are still discernible. Some UJA leaders label Federation people assimilationists and social snobs. Conversely, a few Federation leaders characterize UJA activists as "Seventh Avenue," a reference to New York's garment district, where some UJA leaders made their money.

The differences in approach which still exist between the leaders of the two organizations were reflected in a joint budget-hearing conducted in 1977. Each organization allocates its own funds independently. However, as there are two agencies which receive allocations from both UJA and Federation, it was decided to conduct a joint hearing at which representatives from these agencies could present their budget requests. One of the invited agencies was the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry. UJA people focused on the needs of Soviet Jewry, on the tragedy of the "refuseniks," and on the importance of doing everything possible to aid Soviet Jews. Federation representatives, on the other hand, expressed their concerns about how the Conference was spending its money, how it justified certain expenditures, and how a small increase or decrease in income might affect its operation.

Nevertheless, all respondents report that, in general, differences and antagonisms are receding, as Federation and UJA people increasingly work together.

Resistance to the New Policy

Not everyone has accepted Federation's new policy of greater Jewish responsibility and commitment. There was resistance, as was noted, within the Board of Trustees. Some resistance continues to this day, as it does within Federation's key committees. In 1975, for example, the CPC rejected a project designed to draw unaffiliated Jews into organized Jewish life. There was objection to the merit of specific proposals, but some also felt the project's purpose was not within the scope of Federation. As late as 1976, objection was raised to Federation involvement in neighborhood-stabilization efforts. According to one CPC member, this was "an inappropriate departure from Federation's more traditional concerns with health and welfare issues." The majority, however, were recorded as feeling that "neighborhood stabilization as well as other efforts connected to the well-

being of the Jewish community were indeed appropriate for Federation."³⁰

Those of the older leadership who would resist Federation's increasingly Jewish commitment deserve recognition for their service in the past. They are serious about their ideological objections to Federation's new direction, even as they feel increasingly uncomfortable in articulating them. They espouse Jewish universalism, and are concerned for the needy, Jewish and non-Jewish alike. They are ready to admit that Jews are entitled to priority in benefitting from Jewish public money, but they regret Federation's reluctance to serve non-Jews. On what scale of moral values, they wonder, would such services as improving the quality of Jewish schools assume priority over the needs of homeless children, the handicapped, the retarded, or the aged poor? They see Federation's new policies—its insistence on kosher facilities in its agencies, its encouragement of Jewish programming, but, most of all, its priority support for Jewish day schools—as “a return to the ghetto.” This Jewish particularism strikes them as anachronistic and as a challenge to everything on which they, as American Jews, have staked their Jewish identity.

Some former Federation leaders have withdrawn, to a greater or lesser extent, from active involvement. Others have remained active because of tradition, a commitment to the good things they see Federation doing, or the special pleasure they derive from Federation work. Finally, there are those who are less critical of the new policy per se than of the manner in which it has been implemented. This point of view is widely shared among agency executives.

The charge most frequently leveled at Federation is that it has become politicized. The charge is unfair in that people were always appointed to the Board, and even to key Federation committees, for reasons besides merit. But behind the charge of politicization is the feeling that a new set of priorities is leading to the appointment of people who would never have played a role in the past. There is more to this assertion than social snobbery or prejudice against East European or Orthodox Jews. As Federation has become more communally involved, and more concerned with Jewish matters, it has sought to recruit a leadership more representative of the Jewish community. Some people have been appointed to committees and then failed to attend meetings. A few new members of key committees have indicated that they are not concerned with the gamut of Federation activities or committee concerns, but only with specific issues. Many appointees are less knowledgeable of Federation and its activities than was the case in the past. It is asserted that the new appointees, with their parochial Jewish concerns, lack the dedication to the needy that characterized the older members. As Federation has come to appreciate the necessity for political

³⁰*Minutes of the Communal Planning Committee*, July 13, 1976.

support, it has recruited people with political connections whose integrity is questioned by some. Finally, it is charged, the new policy has affected the allocation procedure itself, requiring Federation to direct allocations in response to communal pressure, rather than need.

The latter assertion reflects dissatisfaction with specific policies as much as with procedure. The charge is made that allocations are made to agencies, groups, or neighborhoods in order to satisfy new constituencies or potential contributors. Federation leaders, however, believe that their allocation decisions, with but a few exceptions, are justifiable in terms of objective need.

Another criticism of Federation's new policy is that the emphasis on serving Jews is counter productive. Thus, for example, one community center executive argues that if his center is to survive in a predominantly non-Jewish neighborhood it has to earn the support of non-Jews as well as Jews. This requires some provision of services to non-Jews, involving them in program planning as well. Exclusive focus on Jews would destroy the center's community roots, alienate the non-Jews, and harm the center's chances of obtaining government funding. If, the executive argues, the center is to help stabilize the Jewish population in a predominantly non-Jewish neighborhood, it can do so only through the creation of good will and a sense of common interest between Jews and non-Jews. The executive of another agency stressed that the law obligates him to serve a neighborhood constituency. His way of increasing service to Jews is to locate in Jewish neighborhoods. Federation, he feels, is pressing him into a confrontation situation with the government and the local community by seeking to impose a quota system for Jews.

Some charge that Federation's concentration on matters of Jewish concern has reduced its influence and prestige with many of its own agencies. One agency director, deeply committed to his agency's program of special services in the field of mental health, was eager to describe these services to the Distribution Committee. But, he complained, what the Committee wanted to know was how many Jews his agency served, why a particular facility didn't provide kosher food, and what was the Jewish ambience of another facility. He claimed to have no objection to such questions in principle, but maintained that they missed the point of his agency's primary purpose.

Such agency executives, by and large highly-skilled professionals, feel that Federation is less sensitive today than in the past to the quality of service. Some complain that their requests for money for pace-setting programs are rejected because of Federation's new priorities. On the other hand, they see Federation as imposing programs on them which they feel should be of lower priority.

There is also dissatisfaction on the part of some with regard to Federation's own executive staff. After Hexter's resignation in 1967, and until Solender's appointment in 1970, there was no strong professional leadership at Federation. Solender's appointment was followed by a period of tension within the professional staff. The director of Community Services during one period was perceived as especially abrasive, and many agency executives are still sensitive about his relationship with them. Furthermore, the fact that Federation's community service staff has, by and large, stronger Jewish orientations than most agency executives, coupled with the agency executives' sense that their own professional competence is greater than that of Federation's staff, makes them especially sensitive to the manner in which they are approached.

Professionals within Federation deny that their emphasis on Jewish concerns has reduced their interest in the quality of the agencies' services. They argue that many agency executives have been as resistant to discussions of service matters as to those of Jewish issues. There is a resistance, they argue, to strong guidance by Federation.

Finally, some agency executives who enjoy increased influence within their own organizations have expressed dissatisfaction with their personal, as distinct from their agencies', role in Federation's decision-making structure. The voice of the agency executives is heard through the Federation Agency Executive Meeting, convened monthly. In 1977, its participants formed a Governance Task Force which met with the DC and CPC chairmen to express their desire for greater participation in Federation decision-making. They complained that Federation was not adequately responsive to agency agenda and priorities. There is evidence that their desire for an increased role in Federation will find at least partial satisfaction. Agency executives have already been invited to appear before the CPC to discuss issues of general concern, in addition to specific agency items. Moreover, the executives have played an important role in planning the annual Sunday seminar of the CPC and DC, an event of central importance in shaping the perspectives of committee members.

Reflection of Federation Policy in Allocations

Regardless of the changes and new priorities within Federation, its daily activities continue to reflect its traditional concern for its agencies and their work. The Distribution Committee does spend time on such matters as encouraging agency use of standardized equipment and the purchases of services by one agency from another. One DC member remarked, "The agencies *are* Federation." While this statement is not quite accurate, it does reflect both an ideological conviction of some other leaders and Federation's intense involvement with the welfare of its beneficiary societies.

In addition, changes in Federation priorities have not been reflected in radical changes in allocations. This is demonstrated by the following table, which summarizes the percentage of Federation allocations to the different agencies in each functional field since 1960.

Table III
Percentage of Federation Dollar Allocated to Agencies Grouped by their Major Functional Field

Year	Care of Aged	Medical Care	Child Care; Family & Vocational Guidance	Jewish Education	Community Centers	Camps	Special Projects
1960	5.1	37.6	31.0	4.8	17.0	3.1	1.4
1965	5.4	31.7	32.8	4.6	20.3	3.6	1.6
1970	7.7	24.9	31.2	5.5	23.8	4.9	2.0
1975	7.8	20.0	32.1	5.9*	26.4	5.2	2.6
1978	7.7	17.1	30.3	7.2*	28.8	5.0	3.9

*Excludes the PDF

Noticeable changes are the decline in allocations to hospitals and the increase in allocations to community centers. The hospital decline, however, preceded the change in Federation's Jewish policy, and resulted from a sense of the hospitals' relative lack of need. The increased support for community centers, which also predates Federation's new policy, is explained by the relative absence of government funding for community centers. Since users' fees are inadequate to support the centers, and since it was Federation itself which encouraged the massive building campaign of community centers after World War II, there is a feeling that Federation has a special obligation to maintain these facilities. More recently, there has been a conviction among many Federation leaders that centers play an important role in Jewish socialization.

Federation's new priorities have found expression in other allocations. Jewish education rose from 4.8 per cent in 1960 to 7.2 per cent in 1978. (If one includes the Program Development Fund, the jump was to 10.6 per cent.) Special projects went from 1.4 to 3.9 per cent. Overall, however, the magnitude of change is not overwhelming. This stems in part from the nature of the budgetary process, in part from the DC's desire not to antagonize beneficiary societies who have strong allies within Federation, and, most of all, from the DC's faith in the value of the existing agencies and their ongoing programs. Of course, changes in allocations are only one way of reflecting new priorities. The introduction of new elements into agency programs is no less important.

How Much Influence Does Federation Exercise?

FEDERATION AND ITS AGENCIES

Observers believe that Federation no longer exercises the influence it once did over the structure and services of its agencies. The decline in Federation's contribution to agency expenditures, which began in the 1950's, was reflected even then, according to a former DC chairman, in a lessening of influence. Federation influence has also declined because the agencies find themselves increasingly involved in professional networks and associations to which they are accountable. In addition, they are increasingly accountable to government bodies, which fund their programs and seek to exercise a measure of control.

To the extent that Federation facilitates exchanges of information between agency executives, assists in the coordination of programs, eliminates duplication, and provides data useful for long-range communal planning, it is making important contributions to agency programming. A number of agency executives noted that they visited Federation headquarters far more frequently than any other office beside their own. It is to Federation that they turned for help and some of their most satisfying collegial relationships.

Many multi-purpose agencies find that Federation's consultants are useful to them in areas where the executive and his staff lack expertise. No one on the staff of the Jewish Association for Services to the Aged, for example, knows as much about medical care as Federation's consultant for medical services, according to JASA's principal executive. His advice, therefore, is actively sought.

Some agency executives report, too, that Federation's professional influence exceeds the influence of other funding agencies and departments, which may provide far more money. Precisely because Federation concerns itself with an agency's total program rather than with the detailed provisions of one type of service, or the administration of one type of grant, Federation gives the agencies a sense of participation in a larger community, and a sense of direction beyond the specific question of level of services. Many agency executives, for personal reasons or because they feel their own board members prefer it, maintain close ties to Federation, and this makes them aware of Federation's outlook on matters.

Federation is more influential today in shaping the Jewish nature of its agencies. Increasing the proportion of Jews whom the agencies serve and developing specific programs, facilities and personnel who can deliver agency services to the Orthodox Jewish community are examples. Where the agency board and the executive are at all sympathetic, either because

of personal Jewish concerns or a desire to please Federation, Federation has been most influential.

Executives report that in the absence of Federation allocations, they would be forced to look elsewhere for funds, and this would compel them to increase the number of their non-Jewish clients and programs. Others report that only Federation's pressure prevents their own boards from pushing them in a more nonsectarian direction. There is no doubt that in the absence of Federation influence, the composition of the boards themselves would be affected.

Under Federation prodding, the Infants Home of Brooklyn now serves an almost exclusively Jewish clientele; the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services is seeking a kosher facility in suburban New York and has established an office in an Orthodox neighborhood; the Jewish Child Care Association wishes to establish a kosher facility for retarded children; JASA operates a relocation service to move elderly Jews out of slums and into more Jewish neighborhoods; the Federation Employment and Guidance Service operates a program of vocational guidance aimed specifically at the Jewish community; and 13 of Federation's 17 camps have kosher kitchens. Joel Ehrenkranz, chairman of the DC's subcommittee on medical care, noted that in his group's visits to beneficiary hospitals in 1977, the executives emphasized what they were doing for the Jewish community.

Federation has even succeeded in persuading its agencies to increase the Jewish context and environment of services to Jews who simply do not care about a particular agency's Jewishness. The Lexington School for the Deaf, for example, asked Federation how it could increase the Jewish content of its school program. Many Jewish community centers, once devoid of Jewish content, now not only provide special services to Orthodox Jews, but also have a variety of Jewish educational programs for all their members. Richest in Jewish content, as a general rule, are the pre-school programs. But there are also teen, adult, and senior-citizen programs which explore different aspects of the Jewish heritage. The majority of children in Federation agency residential centers are non-Jews, 40 per cent of the Altro Health and Rehabilitation Service's clients are non-Jews, and the Federation Employment and Guidance Service serves more non-Jews than Jews; nevertheless, even some agencies serving more non-Jews than Jews may be providing important services to the Jewish community at an efficient rate of return on the Jewish dollar. For example, the nonsectarian aspects of an agency's program may make it eligible for government or foundation funds that enable it to enrich its specialized programs for Jews.

Federation cannot, however, impose policies where an agency's executives resist them. It is difficult to force a Jewish community center to

undertake an outreach program for Jewish marginal youth, where the professional staff lacks the Jewish skills or the desire to undertake the program. Lack of influence is most noticeable when Federation's contribution is a small proportion of the agency's budget. It cannot force the Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged, the one non-kosher home among Federation's four homes, to install a kosher kitchen against the wishes of an agency board that is proud of its tradition of non-kosher facilities. Yet the Jewish Home and Hospital is a showcase agency of Federation in terms of the quality of services it offers. Its clientele is 95 per cent Jewish, and no one contemplates its disaffiliation. An interesting case is Louise Wise Services, an adoption agency which offers little service to the Jewish community and is adamantly nonsectarian in its point of view. Federation cut its allocation to Louise Wise in 1977, and seems to be moving toward disaffiliation. Yet it has hesitated to take the final step. Support for Louise Wise has come from agency executives who are concerned about the precedent which such a move might establish.

In the final analysis, the ability of Federation to impose a Jewish policy, and the willingness of its agencies to accept such a policy, depends on more than allocations, sanctions, good will, or even a philosophy of Jewish life. It also depends on the demographic facts of life in New York.

FEDERATION AND GOVERNMENT

Federation's declining role in contributing to its agencies' expenditures might be offset by its ability to influence government. Agencies would like Federation support in securing government funding, and they look to Federation to assist them in supporting or opposing legislation which concerns them.

While there are many instances of Federation success in this regard, a recent instance of failure may have greater long-term significance. New York City has a certain number of federally-funded positions under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, which it distributes to a variety of local agencies. These positions, known as CETA slots, are a source of competition between local non-profit groups. In 1977, Federation requested 400 CETA slots for its agencies. After a long wait and subsequent negotiation, in which Federation agencies were pressured to offer political support for the incumbent mayor in the City primary, Federation was given only 80 slots. In many respects, the CETA experience may have been the straw that broke the camel's back, and led to a determination on Federation's part to organize itself to prevent a similar occurrence.

Federation leaders are treated with deference and regard by government officials. Federation people feel this stems from acknowledgement of their expertise, along with the fact that some of the most important business and professional leaders of the City are closely associated with Federation. Respect and personal deference, however, are not always translatable into political success.

At the state and national level success is more difficult to measure. Federation leaders believe that their good relationships with congressmen and state legislators assure them a voice in policy areas which directly affect Federation agencies. They are pleased with the results they have obtained since engaging a part-time lobbyist in Albany in 1976. If activity is any measure of future success, Federation influence should increase. It is inventorying its government contacts and extending its relationships with legislators. Finally, there is an awareness that since developments affecting Federation's agencies are as likely to stem from administrative decisions as legislative action, relationships have to be forged at the bureaucratic level as well.

Federation does not maintain a Washington lobbyist, but does contribute to the support of the CJFWF Washington office. That office, in turn, looks to local federations for guidance. The New York Federation sees itself as better geared to provide legislative recommendations than other federations, and, therefore, as having an especially important role in shaping the policies of the Washington office. Whether Federation can influence government on matters of general concern to the Jewish community depends not only on its contacts but also on its ability to formulate policy in this regard.

FEDERATION AND THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

The changes in the past ten years in Federation policy and in the recruitment of new leaders have certainly contributed to the integration of Federation policy-makers with other leaders of the Jewish community. Although relationships with the religio-political leadership of the Orthodox right wing, as represented by Agudath Israel and the *rashe yeshivot* (heads of advanced academies for Talmudic study), are still marginal or hostile, the Lubavitcher *Rebbe* maintains a cordial relationship with Federation. In general, Federation touches the lives of many Orthodox Jews in the inner city, and many communal leaders of modern Orthodox synagogues and organizations hold leadership positions in the organization. Finally, Federation, through the Joint Campaign, publicity in the mass media and synagogues, its association with a local newspaper (*Jewish Week*), and its activities in subcommunities of New York, serves to remind New York Jews of the existence of at least the semblance of a New York Jewish community.

Although the largest media effort in the 1977 campaign, a five-hour telethon, struck many as tasteless, the campaign itself served to arouse increased Jewish communal consciousness.

Except through the Joint Campaign, Federation is limited in its ability to reach the community directly. Its influence on communal identity and policy comes primarily through its agencies and institutions. Federation has encouraged its beneficiary societies in the direction of greater involvement with the Jewish community and has given increasing emphasis to the local neighborhood as the basis for communal organization. Whether it is possible to develop a sense of loyalty to the Jewish communities of Crown Heights, Boro Park, the West Side, or Suffolk County remains to be seen. It can be argued that Jews are no less likely to develop loyalties to such entities than to the Greater New York Jewish community. Furthermore, as long as the government distributes funds along neighborhood lines, and other ethnic groups perceive neighborhood divisions as relevant to them, Federation's policy makes a great deal of sense.

It is possible that the recently reactivated Functional Committee on Jewish Education will attempt to increase involvement in the local Jewish community. This is the first Jewish area in which Federation may attempt to play an active role in the formation of specific communal policy, because this is an area in which it can call upon people with significant knowledge, understanding, and ideological conviction. Federation has only recently evolved a policy oriented toward the creation and strengthening of a Jewish community. It does not, however, frame its positions exclusively from the perspective that asks: what are the policy implications that flow from a primary concern for a strong Jewish community, for a community committed to Judaism and the Jewish people? It has no research arm and, therefore, does not gather the kind of information that would provide a basis for such policy formation.

The second way in which Federation might exert influence on the Jewish community is through the community-wide organizations it supports. These are the Jewish Association for College Youth (JACY), the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry, the Greater New York Metropolitan Coordinating Council on Poverty, and the Jewish Community Relations Council. All these are subvented agencies, not beneficiary societies. Federation has no clear-cut policy with regard to shaping these agencies' communal policies. In budget hearings with representatives of the Conference on Soviet Jewry, for example, questions focused on printing and staff costs, whether educational materials of the Conference were distributed in Federation camps, and why the Conference didn't list UJA and Federation as its major contributors. At no point did any representative of Federation or UJA ask about Conference policy.

The Metropolitan Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty was created by Federation, and Federation representatives sit on its board. In the early years, Federation expressed concern that the Council might engage in activity which duplicated or competed with that of its beneficiary societies. But Federation evidences no interest in the Council's general communal policy. This is less true of JACY and the JCRC, both of which look to Federation as their primary source of funding. JACY has been asked to explain why it has a policy of distributing small amounts of money to many different groups, rather than larger amounts of money to fewer groups, and there is frequent discussion of such policies as serving committed youth rather than marginal Jewish students. JCRC, in its two years of existence, has had a far greater impact on Federation than vice versa. Some JCRC leaders are also Federation leaders, but Federation's official representatives do not necessarily bring a Federation outlook to JCRC.

Part of the reason for Federation's reluctance to be more active in the formulation of communal policy is its lack of experience. Some Federation leaders are also still leery of communal involvement. Others are aware of their own Jewish limitations and are reluctant to engage in a confrontation with other Jewish groups, or to assert their leadership. For example, it is left to the more committed Jews on the DC to raise questions about the funding of religious organizations.

Policy decisions frequently involve ideological choices, and Federation eschews ideological issues. It does so, in part, to avoid alienating and antagonizing various elements, particularly the element still committed to previous policies. But Federation also eschews ideological discussion because its leadership is uncomfortable with such questions. While there is no shortage of intelligence in Federation, there is an absence of intellectuality. This handicaps the organization by denying it a blueprint for planning. Avoidance of conflict may cost eventual loss of leadership and authority in the Jewish community.

In any case, there are inherent limitations to the policy innovations which any federation can or should offer. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds emphasizes in its publications that since federations are "voluntary organizations representing broad-based support," they must operate through consensus rather than majority rule. Careful attention is paid to such matters as whether an issue divides the Jewish community, and whether the issue bears a relationship to the community's power structure.³¹ Daniel Elazar suggests that, as a result of this, federations have

³¹CJFWF National Committee on Leadership Development, *Discussion Guide*, November 1976, p. 9.

unconsciously become the instruments of government for the Jewish community, a community which, as he observes, is "thoroughly unideological."³² The danger rests in two directions—in failing to recognize that the absence of ideology bears distinct limitations, and in sacrificing too much for the sake of consensus, when it is not clear that all the elements in Federation are committed to Jewish survival as an operative goal.

FEDERATION LEADERSHIP

Composition

Although there are some influential Federation leaders who are not members of the Distribution Committee, the DC will once again be taken to be representative of Federation's lay leaders. Its decisions on allocation of funds are the most important ones that Federation makes on a regular basis, and its members, by virtue of their standing within Federation, are disproportionately represented among Federation officers, on the Executive Committee, and on the Level of Grants Committee.

The president of Federation and the chairman of the Communal Planning Committee are both ex-officio members of the DC, and they, along with 29 available members, were sent questionnaires. Twenty-seven responded.

Twenty-eight per cent of the members, including the immediate past chairman, are women (as compared to 19 per cent ten years earlier). Four members maintain two residences. One member commutes from Palm Beach, Florida. Another 13 live in the suburbs. Of these, one lives in Connecticut, ten in Westchester County, and two, including the present chairman, in Nassau County on Long Island. In contrast to the DC of 1968, a far higher proportion of members now live outside the City. (In 1968 all the suburban residents lived in Westchester.) Of those still in New York City, the majority live in the 60's between Fifth and Park Avenues. But one lives in Riverdale, in the Bronx; and one in Forest Hills, Queens.

In the 1976-77 campaign, four members of the DC contributed over \$100,000, eleven from \$10,000 to \$100,000, eight from \$5,000 to \$10,000, and seven between \$1,500 and \$5,000.

The DC, then, remains a committee with a membership drawn from predominantly wealthy people. As was true ten years ago, great wealth is

³²Daniel J. Elazar, "What Indeed is American Jewry?" *Forum* No. 28-29 (Winter 1978), p. 159.

not a necessary condition for membership, but certainly no one falls below what is generally classified as upper middle-class.

Social club membership provides an interesting contrast between 1968 and 1978. In 1968, all respondents belonged to a social club. In 1978, four of the 27 did not, and three noted on their questionnaires that their club memberships were not very important to them. Members clustered in four clubs; 26 per cent belonged to the Harmonie Club (identical to the 1968 figure), 26 per cent to the Sunningdale Club (down from 43 per cent in 1968), 18 per cent to Beech Point Club, and 15 per cent to the Century Country Club.

DC members still tend to have been educated in elite colleges. Of the 18 men who responded to a question about their undergraduate college, 12 attended Ivy League colleges or schools of a similar status. However, two attended the City College of New York, two New York University, and one Lehigh. Four of the five respondents from non-elite schools were sons of foreign-born fathers. Indeed, 44 per cent reported their fathers were foreign-born, 37 per cent from Eastern Europe. In contrast, 28 per cent of the 1968 members were children of East European fathers. A number of observations by DC members and others suggest that the 1978 members may be as wealthy as those of 1968, but a much higher proportion were born into modest, even humble, circumstances.

It is in Jewish background and identity that the sharpest contrasts are evident. Let us look first at Jewish education.

Table IV
Jewish Education of Distribution Committee Members: 1968 and 1978
(By Percentage)

Jewish Education	1968	1978
None	43	22
Sunday school or equivalent to age 13	36	22
Supplementary school or equivalent to age 13	14	26
Day school and/or formal schooling beyond age 13	7	30
Total number of respondents	14	27

A supplementary-school education to age 13 may not impart much more knowledge than a Sunday school education, and both may leave the child hardly better informed than one with no formal Jewish education. The differences, however, do indicate the kinds of homes in which the respondents were raised.

Differences were also marked in synagogue membership. Some respondents were members of more than one synagogue. In the table that follows, such respondents are listed according to the synagogue they indicated as most important to them.

Table V
Synagogue Membership of DC Members: 1968 and 1978
(By Percentage)

Synagogue	1968	1978
None	43	18
Orthodox	0	18
Conservative	21	11
Reform	36	48
Reconstructionist	0	4
Total number of respondents	14	27

Respondents were asked to indicate their reaction to the statement: "Being Jewish makes a difference in everything I do." The question replicated one asked in a 1975 study of the Jewish population of Greater Boston.³³ The Boston data are reported by age and generation in the United States. Since almost all New York respondents were between 40 and 64, and either second- or third-generation Americans, the comparison is presented. Unfortunately, in the report of the Boston study, data for some of the categories were collapsed so that the detail available for DC members is not available for the Boston respondents.

Table VI
Response to "Being Jewish Makes a Difference in Everything I do."
(By Percentage)

Response	1968 DC	1978 DC	Boston Sample Second Generation US (Aged 40-64)	Boston Sample Third Generation US (Aged 40-64)
Agree strongly	21	44	} 30	} 15
Agree somewhat	36	30		
Disagree somewhat	7	11	} 67	} 81
Disagree strongly	36	15		
No answer	—	—	3	4
Number of respondents	14	27	261	111

³³Floyd J. Fowler, *1975 Community Study: A Study of the Jewish Population of Greater Boston* (Boston, 1977).

The importance of being Jewish has increased for 1978 DC members. However, as indicated earlier, 1968 DC members gave a more Jewish response than did the comparable age and generational group in Boston.

Respondents were also asked to check the statement which most appropriately conveyed what they would be likely to do if their child were to consider marrying a non-Jew. There are only 24 responses from 1978 DC members. Two members, instead of checking a response, wrote out answers that did not lend themselves to any simple categorization. Once again, two of the options were collapsed in the presentation of the Boston material.

Table VII
Most Likely Response to Child's Considering Marrying a Non-Jew
(By Percentage)

Response	1968 DC	1978 DC	Second Generation US (Aged 40-64)	Third Generation US (Aged 40-64)
Strongly oppose it	7	28	19	9
Discourage it	28	36	23	36
Be neutral	21	12	}52	}39
Wouldn't mind, accept it	43	24		
No answer	—	—	6	16
Total number of respondents	14	25	261	111

There are noticeable differences between the 1968 and 1978 DC members. Furthermore, the 1968 members, unlike the 1978 members, report they are more likely to accept the intermarriage of a child than a random sample of the Boston Jewish population in similar age and generational categories. Among the general Jewish population, opposition to intermarriage declined sharply from 1968 to 1978—not so for DC members. This reinforces conclusions that the level of Jewish identity among Federation leaders has risen in the past ten years.

The average age of the 1978 DC members was 57. They were likely, therefore, to have had college-age children during the late 1960's and early 1970's, a time of youthful rebellion. A few respondents noted that the behavior of their children had an impact on their own Jewish consciousness. In some cases, they were troubled by their children's intermarriages, and this led them to wonder if there were some ingredient missing in their own Jewish lives. In one case, the parents' acceptance of their children's right to a radically different life style led them to affirm their own right to a Jewish life style.

Other respondents, however, reported that their Jewish identities were shaken more by the Yom Kippur War than by any family situations. "I

realized," wrote one, "that the whole meaning of my life would be zero if anything happened to the State of Israel."

To many DC members, Federation activity not only expresses their Jewish identity (a fact no less true of the 1968 members), but also contributes to it. Some suggested that the effect was generally intellectual, and not entirely one-directional. As one respondent put it: "On the one hand, I am more inclined to be active in Jewish matters because of the need, and on the other, I resent the religious people pushing their position over the less religious." A more typical response was the assertion that Federation activity contributed to the respondent's sense of Jewish communal consciousness: "While I was interested in matters of Jewish concern, most of my concern was for my congregation and my particular areas of interest. Now, for better or worse, I hardly look at the paper without seeking a Jewish impact." Some noted specific changes in the direction of that consciousness: "I am now an enthusiastic supporter of Jewish education." Most common, however, was the response that Federation activity intensified one's Jewish feeling and identity: "It has made me much more aware and knowledgeable about Jewish culture and concerns. I have been exposed to the entire spectrum of Jewish conviction and identification, and found it appropriate and necessary to reaffirm my own Jewishness."

No one reports specific changes of life style or habits as a result of Federation activity, although some of the responses hint at this possibility. No one reported that he or she had joined a synagogue, established a kosher home, begun observing the Sabbath, or even undertaken a program of Jewish study as a result of involvement in Federation. Perhaps the concrete expression of the intensified Jewishness reported by so many respondents is their own activity on the DC. The profound impact of Federation activity on the Jewish identity of the respondents is affirmed so often and so emphatically that one would be surprised if it found no expression in the life styles of at least some of the respondents.

No less interesting is the effect of Federation activity on some of the more recent DC appointees, who have backgrounds of intense involvement with Jewish matters. One noted that an important aspect of his service was trying to understand other people's concerns in areas to which he had not been exposed. Another observed, "Prior to my active participation in Federation activities, I was not aware of the commitment and dedication of so many key community leaders to Jewish causes through their active involvement in Federation's activities."

In summary, Federation's present leaders are different from those of ten years ago. They are still a wealthy, well-educated group, but they are somewhat more likely to be of Eastern European descent, far more likely to be synagogue members and to have had at least a minimal Jewish

education, and far more concerned with questions of Jewish identity and survival. Six DC appointees are members of Orthodox synagogues, and are identified in one way or another with national Orthodox organizations. Federation President Harry Mancher epitomizes the new type of Federation leader. A self-made man, a graduate of the City College of New York, a member of a Reconstructionist synagogue, Mancher also serves as treasurer of the Joint Campaign, and has a history of UJA activity which parallels his active involvement in two Federation agencies.

How Representative Are Federation Leaders?

Federation has sought greater representation of the Orthodox, and of various geographical areas. It has been far more successful with regard to the former than the latter. The DC remains heavily over-representative of Westchester and Manhattan's Upper East Side. It has only one member from Queens, none from Brooklyn, and two from Long Island, although these areas contain the bulk of New York's Jewish population. The necessity that DC members be able to contribute large amounts of time works against representativeness. It means that there is a larger pool of available women than men. Billie Tisch, the DC's immediate past chairman, estimates that the proportion of women available to fill a DC vacancy, as opposed to men, is five to one. For a period of two years, until mid-1978, all three of Federation's key committees were chaired by women. The greater leisure time available to women means that, by and large, they are able to attend meetings more faithfully.

The time requirement restricts activity to those individuals who not only are economically successful, but who also hold the kind of position which does not require continued presence on the job. Federation's schedule is such that activists must be available during the working day—a result, in part, of the fact that Federation leaders live in the suburbs, making evening meetings unfeasible. This may help account, for example, for the absence of physicians or young businessmen from the ranks of Federation's leaders. There are some young lawyers, but they come mostly from law firms located on Lexington, Park, and Madison Avenues in the 50's, a few minutes' walk from Federation's offices. Less understandable is the absence of Jewish academics. Only one college professor serves on a key Federation committee.

Federation leaders are certainly not representative of New York's Jews, or of Federation's own contributors. By and large, they are more Jewishly concerned and committed. It is ironical that many Federation leaders think of most New York Jews as being more committed than they, and believe that their own heightened Jewish consciousness somehow makes them more representative of New York's Jews.

On occasion, Federation leaders pay lip service to their representative function, in order to justify what they intend to do in any case; never, it seems, as a constraint on what they would like to do. Thus, for example, an agency serving a high proportion of non-Jews will be told that Federation cannot continue to support its program, as Federation contributors expect their money to be spent for Jewish purposes. No one has ever pursued this point too far, nor has anyone ever suggested polling contributors to discover how they really want their money spent.

There is a growing feeling among Federation leaders that their function is not so much to do what the Jewish community wants as to define what it needs and to encourage its component members and organizations to meet those needs. As we noted, Federation is handicapped in this regard by the lack of an ideology. The professional staff, therefore, plays an unusually crucial role in this regard.

The Reward System

Federation has one practical incentive to offer its non-professional leaders—special entree and access to its own agencies, and to the other agencies and institutions with which it has indirect contact. According to one former professional, this service once included assistance to the children of Federation leaders in getting into the college of their choice, or even into medical school. Today it more commonly means providing help in placing someone in a home for the aged, or securing a private room in a hospital, when these are scarce. One rabbi mentioned this as an important incentive for his own activity. He noted that he called upon Federation agencies for help in securing hospital care and a variety of other services for the members of his congregation. Special access to agency services is a pleasant reward for activity, but does not seem to constitute a significant incentive to Federation leaders.

In fact, Federation has a problem generating an adequate reward system, which by its nature must be primarily symbolic. Its leaders are fairly sophisticated and more immune to the kinds of rewards that characterize the UJA and other national Jewish organizations. For example, shaking hands with the prime minister of Israel, or having one's picture taken with a general in the Israeli army, does not provide the thrill to Federation leaders that it does to others. Secondly, rewards such as honorary chairmanships and dinners tend to be distributed to campaign workers and large contributors, rather than to committee members.

Although outsiders assume the incentive of business contacts to be of importance to Federation activists, no one interviewed expressed the belief that Federation activity is very useful for business associations. At most, it was suggested, it is useful in enhancing an individual's reputation among

existing clients and customers. There are those who have pointed to an occasional job or client acquired through Federation activity. Most, however, suggest that their Federation contacts are more likely to involve them in offering free advice and services. Of course, they, in turn, may have received such advice and services.

Federation itself buys and sells securities, engages in real-estate transactions, and purchases supplies. There is a potential here to benefit from Federation involvement. There have been hints of favoritism in the past. Federation leaders are confident, however, that they have protected the organization from this form of exploitation by their insistence that all transactions be open.

Another incentive is the social reward to be derived from Federation involvement. Federation's leadership has traditionally been part of a Jewish social elite. It seems, however, that neither Federation itself nor its key committees constitute social groups. This is in contrast to agency boards, which have a stronger social component. Respondents report that, at most, they have made one or two social contacts as a result of Federation activity. There are instances of large contributors finding that Federation contacts opened the doors to membership in prestigious social clubs. Respondents also report, however, that entrance into social clubs through this route rules out more intimate social contacts. Furthermore, such reported instances go back 20 and 30 years. A number of highly regarded Federation leaders report that their activity has not opened any new social horizons for them, although they would have welcomed it.

This is a weakness, as well as a strength, of Federation. It means that Federation's leaders have not exploited the social status they are able to confer on potential leaders. In this respect, Federation is unlike the UJA, whose leaders have found that the campaign merger has not appreciably increased their social contacts with Federation leaders. Some are prone to attribute this to snobbism. In fact, it is part of a Federation tradition which dissociates social life from Federation activity. Perhaps this was necessary in the past, when there were strong ties of family and friendship between Federation leaders and Jewish assimilationists who sought nonsectarian outlets for their philanthropic activity. Interestingly, this tradition not only differs from that which prevails in most voluntary Jewish organizations, but is also at variance with the style of elite cultural organizations. Symphony, opera, and museum boards in New York have a strong tradition of active socializing among board members.

There is, therefore, a measure of truth in the statement of a former Federation president that the reward for being a DC member is "a lot of hard work." In the final analysis, probably of greatest importance to members is the fact that they find their work stimulating and challenging and

believe they are making a significant contribution to fulfilling Federation's purpose.

Recruitment

Many Federation leaders emerge from the ranks of the large contributors; but individuals known to Federation leaders through business or social contacts are also recruited directly to key committees. This was true of the DC even before 1968. Having agreed to join the DC, these individuals were then appointed to the Board of Trustees, to fulfill the by-law requirement that DC members be selected from at-large trustees. It was hoped that such people would then increase their contributions to the campaign, although there is no requirement to this effect.

A more common method of recruitment, relying essentially on the same social and business contacts, is the appointment of individuals to agency boards, rather than to Federation itself. Agency boards frequently serve as testing grounds for future Federation leaders, with Federation raiding the boards to secure key workers. Sometimes board members themselves express an interest in Federation activity, and transfer the focus of their activity. It is not necessary to leave an agency board to work for Federation. Indeed, two-thirds of the trustees are agency representatives, and may serve on any Federation committee other than the DC. In fact, however, most people find service on key Federation committees so time-consuming that they are able to devote little attention to the workings of the agency boards.

The manpower pool from which Federation recruited its leaders in the past was, by and large, limited to Wall Street lawyers and investors who were members of the same four or five social clubs.

Federation had a New Leadership division (now called Young Leadership and attached to the Joint Campaign), whose purpose was to introduce men and women between the ages of 18 and 35 to the aims and functions of Federation, and to place them on agency boards. The number of people successfully channeled into leadership roles, however, was limited.

The feeling that its leadership pool was drying up led Federation to seek a new direction in the 1960's, a direction initially geared to nonsectarianism. But Federation's professional leaders, even then, sought to keep their options open. The same Joseph Willen who led the move toward nonsectarianism encouraged the Religious Affairs Department to undertake a leadership-training program for young synagogue leaders. One participant recalls a remark of Willen's to the effect that as the children of Federation's founders had assimilated, the burden of leadership was now on their shoulders.

Federation was meanwhile competing with other organizations for the same potential leaders. The major competitor was, and still is, the American

Jewish Committee. There is a significant overlap between Federation and AJC activists. While this means a certain cordiality and mutuality of interest, it also means rivalry for the time and energy of the leaders. One individual who holds leadership positions in both organizations believes the AJC attracts a more reflective and issue-oriented person, who seeks an intellectual challenge. The Federation activist, he feels, still tends to be more concerned with service, although Federation has become more involved in ideological issues in the last few years. He noted that whereas Federation people tend to ask what impact a certain issue will have on their agencies, AJC people tend to ask what impact the same issue will have on the Jewish community. Another observer noted that it is cheaper to become an AJC leader. An annual contribution of \$10,000 to AJC confers more status than does a similar contribution to the Joint Campaign.

Federation has considerably expanded its sources of recruitment in the 1970's. Leaders have been drawn from the Orthodox community, often through the initial recruitment of Isaac Trainin to the activities of the Department of Religious Affairs. A second significant source of leadership recruitment has been the UJA. A number of its campaign leaders have moved directly to key Federation committees.

While there are those who criticize Federation's slowness in recruiting from new segments of the Jewish community, others fear that the large influx of new people in the last few years has introduced an element which does not adhere to the Federation tradition of hard work, service, and concern for the agencies.

The Large Contributor

Federation leaders, past and present, claim that large contributors exert no special influence. They report that they cannot recall a single occasion on which any significant decision was reached as a result of pressure from contributors. There are, however, groups of contributors, as opposed to individual contributors, who are very influential. Federation's undertaking services to Suffolk County and its expansion of services to Westchester County were justifiable independently of contributor demands, but the impetus for the provision of services came from the needs of the campaign. Some allocations to Orthodox institutions, the general thrust of intensifying services to the Orthodox, and the appointment of a relatively large number of Orthodox Jews to key Federation committees are all accounted for, in part, by a desire to please a number of large Orthodox contributors and to attract more of them. It has already been noted that arguments against cuts to hospitals were based on reluctance to antagonize large contributors.

Secondly, Federation's own leaders are, for the most part, large contributors. Although a committee member who is a small contributor has the

same vote as a large one, and being a large contributor does not insure one a seat on a key committee, it is obviously easier for a big giver to find a seat on Federation's highest councils than it is for a small giver.

Finally, it is difficult to assess the influence of the major contributors in that they ask for very little. Minor favors are given as a matter of course. Some professionals feel that while Federation does not respond immediately and directly to the pressures of large contributors, the latter represent a constraint on Federation's decisions.

Professional vs. Lay Control

Federation has had strong presidents, but an occasional weak one. Most of its laymen are strong personalities, but some are not. The stronger the lay leader, and the more control he exercises, the more the professional defers to him.

It is often impossible to distinguish lay from professional influence because of the continuing interaction between the two. As far back as respondents recall, a tradition of respect and even admiration has characterized lay-professional relations in Federation, with one exceptional period. Most important is the relationship between the president and executive vice-president. The two together really represent Federation leadership, and when they work together it is impossible to distinguish leader from follower, superior from subordinate.

Observers are of the opinion that the professionals in New York's Federation exercise greater control than the professionals of other federations. At the same time, it is widely believed that the executives of Federation's agencies exercise greater control over their lay boards than do Federation's professionals over Federation laymen. These observations accord with the notion that the more philosophical or ideological the matter, the more likely the layman is to assert himself; the more technically complex the matter, the more likely the layman is to defer to the professional.

New York City's federation is a far more complex one than any other, as a result of its size, the number and variety of agencies with which it deals, and its interrelationship with government and other voluntary associations. Hence, it is not surprising that New York tends to have a more dominant professional leadership. Federation's agencies, in the business of providing specialized services, are even more professionalized. After all, an agency board hires a professional on the assumption that he knows more about how its services are to be provided than anybody else. He is their major source of information and advice. Even agency boards, however, when confronted by an ideological issue, such as intake policy (e.g. Jewish or nonsectarian clients), will assert themselves.

It follows that Federation will be less professionally dominated than its agencies. Federation laymen have better contacts with their client-constituents (i.e. the agencies) and are better informed about them than are agency board members about the agencies' clients and constituents. As Federation has become somewhat more issue- and ideology-oriented in recent years, laymen have played an increasing role in decision-making.

Federation's present professional leaders contend that laymen control the organization. Some of them point to their own experience with other voluntary agencies, where they exercised far greater control. One staff member commented that while Federation leaders with whom she worked respected her and gave careful consideration to her opinion, they made the actual decisions.

Federation's 1968 communal thrust was initiated by laymen. Solender, who came to Federation from the National Jewish Welfare Board, had a communal orientation, and that was one of the reasons he was hired. However, a number of observers view Solender's emphases as more Jewish today than when he first came to Federation. Lay influence may have played a role in this regard. But Solender and his staff gave the lay-initiated policy sharper form and content, and there are those within Federation who attribute its Jewish thrust primarily to his leadership.

The executive vice-president plays a critical role in the selection and reappointment of non-institutional trustees, in the appointment of committee chairmen and members of major committees, and even in the nomination of Federation's president. He is responsible for the appointment of the professional staff, which in the last few years has become notably more Jewish in background and orientation. Two of Federation's top six community-service staff members are Orthodox Jews. A third has a background of involvement in the Conservative movement. Jewish commitment has become an important consideration in the hiring of new staff. It seems fair to say that the professional leaders of Federation have, since 1970, moved as far and as fast in a Jewish direction as they could, given the composition of Federation's Board of Trustees. But the lay leadership exercises important constraints.

The continuous interaction between laymen and professionals means a process of mutual education. It seems, however, that it is predominantly the professionals who teach the laymen. Indeed, a number of respondents mentioned the impact of the professionals, past and present, on their Jewish outlook.

It is the professionals who establish Federation's agenda of specific concerns. On the other hand, the professionals are constrained by the frequent presence of a number of lay leaders, who are consulted on a regular basis.

If nothing else, such laymen serve as sounding boards for new ideas, which will be abandoned if not well-received.

There seems to be some illusion on the part of Federation's laymen regarding their own role. Although it is a vital role, it is hardly one of control, except in the sense that they have the ultimate right to dismiss the professionals. On the other hand, laymen who cannot get along with professionals often find that their way to leadership positions is blocked. Professionals exercise their own initiative in recruiting potential activists; the professional staff is appointed with only courtesy deference to laymen. Committee meetings are governed by policy papers prepared by the professionals.

Greater lay control would probably hamper Federation's effectiveness; the degree that exists constitutes a necessary constraint on the professionals, and provides a basic incentive to lay service.

The present situation is quite satisfactory to most laymen. They do not really want the responsibility or work that greater lay control would impose on them. They are prepared to operate within the general framework that the professionals have set for them, comfortable in the knowledge that the detailed execution of that policy is in the hands of the professionals, while they have contributed in some way to the establishment of broad policy outlines. They are aware that Federation cannot recruit outstanding professionals, if the latter do not feel they have a real role in decision-making.

FEDERATION AND THE FUTURE

The Joint Campaign assures Federation a regular income, at least for the present. Should contributors lose interest in Israel, however, it is likely that the campaign will suffer dramatic reductions, and the burden of the campaign theme will shift to local needs. This may mean a focus on Jewish communal needs and problems of assimilation and spiritual survival, or an emphasis on serving needy Jews through Federation's traditional agencies.

Federation and Its Agencies

There are people who feel that the age of voluntary sectarian philanthropy is over. No agency executive or Federation leader agrees, but the question concerns them. The beneficiary societies providing social services and health care depend more and more on government funds. Executives in many agencies find themselves increasingly guided by those professional associations and government bodies that deal with their areas of specialization. Moreover, the Joint Campaign has loosened the ties of some agencies

to Federation, in that some agency board members who contribute to the Joint Campaign no longer feel as close to Federation as they did when they contributed directly to it. Each side, therefore, is freer to go its own way. Finally, despite the preference of many agency executives and board members, a number of them face an increased intake of non-Jews.

Government policy is one important factor. It may change in one direction or another, by administrative fiat, as much as by legislative direction. The political climate of opinion is crucial, and no one can predict in what direction it will move. But basic demographic realities are no less important. A government-supported residential facility cannot reject applicants with demonstrated need if it is underpopulated. It would require an executive and an agency board with an extraordinary degree of Jewish particularism to do so, even if the law permitted it. Federation has, in one instance, guaranteed empty beds in a facility for potential Jewish applicants. But to do this on a broad basis, moral issues aside, is beyond Federation's means. Hence, a declining Jewish population means, in the long run, a declining need by Jews for the services of Federation's traditional agencies. Child-care agencies have been the first to experience this, but even homes for the aged are likely to feel the pressure. The Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged has a magnificent facility in a predominantly non-Jewish neighborhood. At the present time, 95 per cent of its occupants are Jewish. But, contrary to the situation of a few years ago, there is no longer a waiting list of Jews. The Home doesn't have a kosher kitchen, but it does have a Jewish environment. There are services on the holidays, a Passover seder, and Jewish classes for residents. This has not deterred some non-Jews from applying for admission. Cultural factors, having to do with the use of such homes, have deterred others, but such factors are declining in importance. How long can the Jewish Home and Hospital for the Aged remain 95 per cent Jewish? At what point will the proportion of non-Jews become so high that one can no longer think of it as a Jewish home? Not all agencies face the same problem; but a significant number do.

The agencies are grateful for the money they receive from Federation. It gives them what some executives call "a standard of living in excess of the norm." They derive benefits from Federation's joint purchasing plan and look to Federation for other forms of help, such as advances in allocations when, as frequently happens, government agencies do not pay their bills on time. But the thrust of their funding and demographic realities direct many of them away from Federation. They, for their part, no longer supply the income to Federation which they once did.

Federation is not yet prepared, ideologically or structurally, for a basic reevaluation of its relationship to its agencies. Ideologically, Federation would have to ask itself where its basic obligations lie. Even if one such

obligation is serving Jews in need, it might still want to consider a variety of alternatives to its present pattern of funding. It could consider reimbursing needy Jews for social services in nonsectarian agencies. Where an institutional Jewish ambience is considered necessary, perhaps the solution would be to encourage a grouping of Jews in a nonsectarian facility, and the provision of Jewish group-work services. This would represent a radical departure from Federation's traditional policy, and the organization would have to overcome the barrier of its agency-dominated Board of Trustees. This domination has not seriously impeded Federation in the changes it has made in the last ten years; but a change of this nature would fall beyond the present Board's limit of acceptance.

Alternatively, Federation might come to view its role as service to Judaism and Jewish values. Of course, there is only a fine line between individual and communal needs, and Jewish values certainly include helping those in need. But there is a clear distinction between providing health and welfare services, which are needs that Jews share with all people, and creating Jewish solidarity and a strengthened Jewish identity.

Providing for the human needs of Jews may be the best way to strengthen Jewish communal bonds. It can be argued, therefore, that Federation's responsibility to build a strong Jewish community requires that it provide health care and social services. But that is a different viewpoint from the one which presently guides Federation leaders, and would require a much greater emphasis on the Jewish aspect in the provision of services. In this respect, the senior-citizen program, rich in Jewish content and clear in the provision of human needs, may be the model. There are other options, but none likely to gain serious consideration until Federation begins to think along the lines of a basic reordering of its relationship to many of its agencies.

Federation and the Middle Class

Federation is paying increasing attention to the middle class. The Jewish middle class, when defined by a family income level of \$12,000 to \$25,000, cannot afford many of the services available free of charge to the poor. Federation senses its obligation to this middle-income group, as well as to the poor. Federation is also confronted with the problem of turning to middle-class Jews for campaign contributions, when many of them feel they derive little in the way of services from Federation.

Given scarce resources, there are distinct limits to the extension of broad human services to the middle class. But even if Federation narrows its concerns to the Jewish needs of the middle classes, it must still confront difficult choices. If Federation gives priority to community centers as institutions which strengthen Jewish identity, how much Jewish programming

should they have? No doubt a center's board, executive, and users will play important roles in shaping its policy. But should Federation confine its role to a general policy concerning the Jewishness of clientele and program content, or should it also adopt a position on what it means to be Jewish? Should Federation determine what constitutes a minimal Jewish education? Having scarcely achieved consensus about the importance of "Jewish," Federation is not yet able to deal with such questions. But Federation must have at least a general sense of the direction in which it wishes to move. Without priorities and some specific sense of what being Jewish means, it will be the target and tool of whatever group happens to organize itself first, approach Federation, or raise a sum of money.

The provision of services to the middle class also raises the question of Federation's relations to synagogues.³⁴ Federation contributes no money to synagogues. The Commission on Synagogue Relations has proposed that Federation allocate funds to inner-city synagogues which require relatively small sums in order to survive. But the impetus here is offering services to the Jewish poor, with a secondary consideration being that Federation might eventually inherit the synagogue's assets. Federation has never considered synagogues in terms of their importance in shaping a Jewish community. The argument for funding community centers and not synagogues, namely that the former are available to all Jews without regard to religious conviction, is not as convincing as some within Federation think. In fact, Federation has approved, in principle, the establishment of a community center in Flatbush led by laymen from an Orthodox synagogue. Synagogues do provide services to Jews, and they are a factor in neighborhood stabilization, a matter with which Federation increasingly concerns itself. The Department of Religious Affairs has dealt with one aspect of this problem; but the problem as a whole, with its multiple ramifications, has yet to be confronted.

Federation and Jewish Education

Proponents of greater Federation support for Jewish education describe the condition of New York's Jewish schools as desperate, and speak about the need for tens of millions of dollars in assistance. They are convinced that Jewish education is the key to Jewish identity and survival, and that this is the area in which Federation has a primary obligation. The proponents of Jewish education are a group with a cause, a program, and an ideology. This makes them a powerful group. The sums of money which they feel are

³⁴A fine discussion of the problem is Samuel H. Dresner's "Federation or Synagogue: Alternatives in the American Jewish Community," *Forum*, No. 2, 1977, pp. 73-95.

required to meet Jewish educational needs go far beyond the annual increments provided by Federation's present allocation procedure. If new sources of funding cannot be found, allocations to Jewish education can be increased only at the expense of other agencies. This would precipitate the kind of ideological conflict that Federation is loath to confront. There are some signs pointing toward such a conflict. On the other hand, as the proponents of Jewish education have moved into leadership positions, they have come to appreciate the needs of other agencies, and the sincerity and Jewish commitment of their advocates. Whether the socialization experience will moderate the drive for dramatic increases to Jewish education remains to be seen.

Neither Federation nor the Board of Jewish Education has sought to exercise significant influence over the direction of Jewish education. Yet, should large sums of money become available for Jewish education, Federation will demand greater accountability. This will raise some difficult ideological questions which will have to be resolved.

Conclusion

Only in the past few years has Federation begun to view itself as an institution with responsibilities to the total Jewish community. Certainly, Federation has done much to create a sense of community, and some people increasingly look to it for leadership. Although Federation eschews this role, it has established and funded agencies which may assume such leadership. However, national organizations, sensitive about their own prerogatives, especially in New York, have resisted communal centralization. Some Federation agencies have their own roof organizations which mediate between Federation and them, and dilute Federation's influence. Synagogues, major foci of Jewish identification and commitment, remain marginal to Federation. Jewish schools, perhaps the most important instruments of Jewish survival, are not really part of Federation's structure. Finally, the Jews of Greater New York do not think of themselves as an organized community. Their loyalties are either parochial (to a particular organization, school, or synagogue) and/or general (to Israel, Judaism, or the Jewish people). If Federation is to create and lead a Jewish community, it will not do so by shifting Jewish loyalties to itself, but rather by serving as an instrument for shaping loyalties. In the last analysis, Federation is an instrument, and not an end, in the creation of a Jewish community.