

- throughout the nation, Jacksonville's program (one of the few in the United States not using federal matching grant funds) costs significantly less, particularly in terms of direct expenses during the initial resettlement phase. Many of the costs incurred by communities elsewhere were covered by state or federal programs or by volunteer efforts.
- The scope and quality of this resettlement program are in no way less comprehensive and may perhaps be more effective than others in resettling new immigrants during the first phase of their arrival. Since professionals and volunteers in the Jewish community have the opportunity to work more intensively on the creation of social and organizational relationships with the new arrivals, closer connections with the community have been created. Savings from the initial resettlement phase enhance other aspects of the program—funding for driver education courses, more Jewish programming, social outings, etc.
 - A collaborative relationship with another social service agency can allow Jewish refugee resettlement to remain under Jewish auspices while simultaneously enlisting additional resources and expertise for the effort. Furthermore, this experience indicates that Jewish agencies can directly gain access to an array of federal, state, and local funding to offset a significant portion of resettlement costs without the assistance or intervention of other agencies.
 - Large numbers of immigrants can be resettled by smaller communities. The impact upon the community is positive, with many educational and fund-raising benefits. The new arrivals come to appreciate the advantages of the personalized attention unavailable in the resettlement process of large metropolitan areas. Once the appropriate staff and volunteer structure is created, it becomes increasingly efficient to serve larger numbers. Jacksonville's decision to accept an additional 150 free cases (for a total of 300) was a logical outcome of the staff and volunteer structure developed months earlier.

CONCLUSION

American Jews live in what may be the most affluent Jewish community in history. We have immense resources at our disposal. There is very little that we cannot accomplish if we so desire. The immigration of Soviet Jews presents a sublime challenge that we have no choice but to meet. To do so, communities through the nation must creatively examine all possible alternatives to devise a successful resettlement process.

In My Opinion

Federation: An Agency in Need of Change

Does today's federation possess the ability to shape our community and begin honestly to confront new realities?

GERALD A. KLEINMAN
*Executive Director, Jewish Federation of Greater
Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Connecticut*

It is no great revelation to acknowledge that the American Jewish community is currently facing severe problems. If not addressed in a direct and honest way, these problems will, at worst, foster growing intracommunal tension and an increasingly divisive atmosphere and, at best, for those of us in the federation world, simply produce fund-raising anomie. While the demand for campaign dollars has increased and the range of needs has expanded, there has been no concurrent increase in the communal campaign base. In fact, community fund raising, although seeming to produce more funds through the inclusion of "special campaigns," has actually generated fewer real dollars for use both locally and to support the ongoing work of the Jewish Agency. This single issue has the potential of creating animosity where harmony has existed, fostering inter-agency strife where cohesion and unity may have prevailed, and, as a result, setting into motion an ongoing downward spiral,

both in available funds *and* in community solidarity. It is the responsibility of the federation, the single most inclusive of community agencies, to deal with this shortfall in fund raising and to do so now!

THE ISSUES, ONE AT A TIME

Israel

During the 1970s and 1980s, our national campaign effort increased dramatically. Communities across the country experienced unprecedented economic growth, and the Jewish community had more philanthropic dollars available for its use. We developed a national network that attracted the influential and the financially secure, and we anticipated a national campaign that would produce \$1 billion! Israel, on the heels of Entebbe and Camp David, was still the major fund-raising draw, and the programs we offered took advantage of an upbeat mood. Both Israel and our local agencies reaped the benefits of this positive sense of Jewish identification.

Generally, fund raising was in a "coast" mode. We did what was necessary and knew that each year would be better than the year before. Our attitude was glib. We boasted of Israel's accomplishments and knew that most in the Jewish community would support us. But we were ignoring signs of change. We did not address problems as they arose, but continued to respond according to old patterns, based upon outmoded assumptions. Although our community and Israel were changing, we were not.

Initial concerns regarding the Likud election victory in 1977 soon abated with the signing of the Camp David Accord. Will any of us ever forget the smiling faces of

Menachem Begin and Anwar Sadat as they stood shoulder to shoulder in Israel and on the White House lawn? Those historic events lulled us into a false sense of fund-raising security. But, in 1982, with the incursion into Lebanon, initial concerns aroused by the 1977 Likud election were reawakened, and those most perceptive among us began to envision the dark clouds on the fund-raising horizon. Ariel Sharon, an Israeli war hero, had deceived us into thinking that the 25-mile limit to the Lebanon invasion was real. When this limit was overrun we felt betrayed, but nevertheless maintained our support. In fact, with the Israel Special Fund, we actually provided significant support for this war effort. We had to. For then, as at each previous time in Israel's threatened history, we could not abandon Israel during a time of crisis. Meanwhile, Israel's political climate was shifting to the right, but just as we were beginning to understand the implications of that trend, Operation Moses emerged out of the imperative of a starving people. We were elated at the rescue of Ethiopian Jews. This new challenge awakened our sense of pride and reinforced our sense of egalitarianism as we expended funds and energy to save black African Jewish lives. We flaunted this rescue to the world. We landed Israel's efforts in the media. And our campaigns continued to flourish.

But the rumblings from Israel persisted. Was the Jewish Agency acting on the "up and up"? Was it too political? Did we really have a voice in its actions? How could we ensure better accountability? Valid concerns, to be sure, but not in and of themselves reasons to dramatically decrease contributions. By and large, the American Jewish community was ignorant of these issues and we federation leaders certainly would not place them on our federation agendas. It was not until we were somewhat assured that these items were being addressed that we began to create lay committees on the Jewish Agency, the supposed purpose of which was to serve as a positive Agency

voice within the federation, as well as a community voice to the Jewish Agency itself. Even then, we still questioned the impact of our input and the extent of our control.

And then it happened—the *Intifada*—and we were exposed to an Israel that, for us, heretofore did not exist. Our perceptions changed dramatically. We now saw a country that was less than honest in what it related to those of us who were her "partners" and to the nations of the world. Some of our communal leadership became resentful and more hostile to the State, but confronted by the "guilt of their fathers," were unable to turn away. Israel could not be abandoned. But those less committed, who did not have a large measure of Jewish historical guilt, either withdrew totally or became less involved financially. And that trend, coupled with an increasing inability to attract new, young people to the campaign ranks, was creating serious campaign problems. Moreover, controversy over "Who is a Jew?," the need for Israeli electoral reform, the willingness or unwillingness to become involved in peace initiatives, the resettlement of Soviet Jews in the occupied territories—all have affected our ability to significantly increase a decreasing campaign base.

Objective reality is not necessarily at the core of our relationship to Israel, but rather the subjective perceptions of Israel held by individuals in our communities. This is not to suggest that we forget this 43-year-old country, mired in a sea of hostility, struggling continually for her very existence. For Israel and its centrality to the Jewish people must continue to be a major rationale for community fund raising and a focus of community support; during times of crisis, this certainly is the case. What must change, however, is the manner in which we approach Israel and our relationship to her during times of relative normalcy. Today, both Israel and the American Jewish community are different from the way they were decades ago. Our federations must be different as well.

The Local Community

Our local community and its agencies are caught in a budget crunch. Do we address financial needs by providing only those programs and services that will produce a profit, or do we institute programming, regardless of its return on the dollar, because we believe that in the long run it will create a better Jewish community? During the "years of plenty," when our communal emphasis on Israel increased campaign dollars, local agencies were in fact beneficiaries of the financial commitment to Israel. Accordingly, we were hesitant to decrease our allocations to Israel (though some did) in order to address increasing local needs.

As a result, our agencies relied more and more on their ability to produce additional dollars internally through fees and separate fund-raising campaigns. Of necessity, the scope of their activities focused on a constituency that could pay; one, for example, that used the health club, rather than the adult education program. We were competing in the general community arena, but not really addressing our uniquely Jewish concerns. The question being considered was whether we could create a Nautilus room equal to that of the health spa down the street, not whether we could do a better job meeting the Jewish educational needs of our community. We now know that the answer to these questions is that we can do neither. We cannot compete with a glorified spa, nor have we adequately confronted the Jewish needs of our community. Both answers are predicated on the availability of funds. We do not have the funds necessary to create that spa, and we cannot seemingly afford to have programming that will not produce plus dollars. And Jewish education and culture programs simply have not produced even the funds necessary to pay for the activities being conducted.

Our communities are increasingly aware of our inability to meet local needs. These local issues and the requirements of a new

generation of givers demand that we reshape our campaigns to reflect what appears to be a growing concern for local needs over those of Israel. And we must be prepared to confront this reality.

Our Constituency

Our constituency is radically different from what it was in the 1970s and early 1980s. Then our supporters were people who had been alive when the State of Israel was created, who could remember the Holocaust, either from listening to their parents or by some form of direct exposure. To them, the Exodus was more than a Leon Uris novel. They had the ability to look beyond the deficiencies of a young, struggling country and see a Jewish state that must continue to exist. They had to do for Israel what they did not do for those six million who had perished. "Never again" were their watch words; "If only there had been an Israel," they would say, and they continued to literally pay to ensure her existence. But this population was an aging one, becoming less involved and less able to influence those moving up the ranks.

The new, younger constituency is less emotionally bound and more pragmatically oriented, bringing to our not-for-profit agencies a business mentality. Products of the late 1950s and early 1960s, they espouse the belief that equality is a major component of action; we are all brothers. Yet, this is a generation of extremes. For although there appears to be a keen sense of justice for all—was not this the generation that marched on Washington, stood hand in hand for civil rights, pressed for equal opportunity in education and employment—there is also at times a posture of "me," rather than "we."

This change in our clientele has not, however, produced a concurrent change in how we raise funds or approach our tasks. As a result, we as professionals and our communities continue to pay a dear price. Local agencies are starving. More and differing demands are being placed upon us

as professionals, demands with which we are not necessarily equipped to deal. And today Israel at times has become more of a deterrent to the raising of increased dollars than the major asset that she has been historically, regardless of the excellent results of Operation Exodus.

TOWARD RESOLUTION: WHAT CAN WE DO?

If what I have described is even partially true, then we must confront each issue with all the energy that we can muster. We cannot afford too many years of flat or decreasing campaigns. Considering the current tight economy, our continuing difficulties with and in Israel, and our tendency to repeatedly conduct new and supplementary campaigns (Passage to Freedom, Operation Exodus I and II), I am convinced that, without a new direction, we will continue to produce annual campaigns that do not meet the basic needs of Jews locally and for the Jewish Agency for Israel. If a new direction is to be found, it will by necessity have to come from the grassroots, from local federation leadership, both professional and lay, for there is no sign that our national agencies, specifically the United Jewish Appeal, has done or will do any more than continue to espouse the "party line" and recommend the raising of funds in the old-fashioned way. Similarly, Israel's absorption of new olim, particularly its attempts to meet their housing and employment needs, remains a thorn in the side of each caring Jew. We and our leadership must be bold. We must be willing to take risks and to develop approaches that may be radical in nature and depart from what we have done historically. Our approach must be formulated through a broad-based coalition, involving *all* segments of our Jewish community and not only the big givers. For each segment is, or soon will be, affected by our inability to produce adequate dollars. Further, I strongly encourage new initiatives by our top leadership on a national level as well. Would not it

be fantastic to create a national campaign think tank not tied to the sins of the past and one that is truly representative!

I. Create an Influential, High-Powered, Intracommunal Committee

We must create a committee that involves top leadership from our agencies and our synagogues, as well as the unaffiliated Jews of our community. This committee, reflecting the Jewish community at large, should include major givers and good givers, who contribute to various community agencies and organizations, as well as to our own campaign—those who have historically demonstrated a deep commitment to community. These individuals must be willing to meet on an ongoing basis for at least one year and be prepared to make specific recommendations that will be shared with and approved by the federation board of directors, as well as agency and synagogue boards. Following such approval, an extensive public relations campaign must be undertaken, which will share with the community at large the committee findings about the scope of issues to be confronted, priorities for doing so, and a timetable for enactment. At the same time, there needs to be an understanding imparted that, just as the recommendations have been created by representatives of the total Jewish community, so implementation must be a total community effort as well. The "we-they" atmosphere that has at times existed in our communities among the federation, agencies, and synagogues just cannot be allowed to continue. Too much is at stake!

II. Wipe the Slate Clean

We have been raising funds on the back of Israel for many years. Most of our local campaigns have been more UJA campaigns than federation campaigns. The essentially single-minded nature of campaign material from UJA has tended to continue to emphasize international and national issues. This approach should be re-evaluated. Com-

munities must develop messages appropriate to their own constituency, rather than continue to buy the party line. If, after deep soul searching, it is concluded that the party line is that which will sell, so be it. Use it to the fullest. If not, have the courage to make the necessary changes. Concurrent with this effort, there should occur a re-evaluation of funding priorities—how we raise funds, why we do it, to whom we give it, what demands (yes demands!) we must make, as individual federations or as a united bloc on those recipients of our dollars, whether they be local or overseas agencies. No matter what we call our budgeting approach, most of us continue to fund based on last year's allocation. We can no longer afford, philosophically and financially, to do that. I am not suggesting that we either increase or decrease allocations in any specific area—local or overseas. Only that we have the fortitude to do some communal soul searching.

III. Respond with Honesty

Consider the following case examples:

A. The phone rings after the final allocations meeting. The caller just wants to express a personal opinion (and knows it is the opinion of others as well) that we are throwing good money after bad in allocating funds to the When asked why this issue was not presented for discussion at the meeting, the caller says that it was better not to do so for the sake of "shalom bayit."

B. A major giver, one who has been a consistently superb supporter of the federation, calls to ask what the federation is doing with respect to the situation in Israel. He also happens to mention that his son, who is in business with him, is finding it more difficult to understand why the federation does not take an active position against certain policies of the Israeli government. The party line answer goes something like this: "We give to the Jewish Agency for Israel for social and humanitarian needs, not to the government." Or, "While we do not support the policy of the government, we cannot/will

not/have not become involved in criticizing its actions." I am sure that you can think of others.

At what cost is communal harmony maintained? Wouldn't it be good if we could say that, as partners with the State of Israel, we felt it our responsibility to express our opinion. We can no longer continue to bury our heads. During times of stress, negative reactions to events occurring either in our own back yard or in Israel will be experienced by all segments of our community. Some will be valid; others will not. But each will be an expression of a frustration that says, "Though we have worked so hard as volunteers, we still are unable to achieve the desired results. We just do not have the funds necessary to do so." If we do not put all the issues on the table, separate fact from fiction, we will be faced with growing communal disharmony that will take years to correct and that will cause a further erosion of our campaign base. We must transmit a sense of togetherness and understand that what affects a portion of our community affects us all, more so now than ever before. I believe that we, as professionals, will be more at risk if we choose not to do so and opt to take a "business as usual" posture.

IV. Create a Change in Attitudes

Federation is an entity that at its core must be perceived as allowing all to work for the common good of the Jewish community. We must be viewed as such and not as just another agency out there pounding the pavement for the community's dollars. All too often, it is the latter perception that prevails, and, in most cases, it is because of our actions that it does. Federation, agencies, synagogues, and organizations all conduct fund-raising campaigns at various times. The issue is not whether the timing of such campaigns conflicts with that of the federation, but just the mere fact that they are conducted at all. How many times have we said that

the campaigns of X and Y have affected our annual drive, the underlying feeling being a resentment by federation people that these campaigns have been conducted? Have not we all been faced with the giver who will contribute to the home for the elderly, but refuses to give to the federation? There often exist among us, whether we admit it publicly or not, a number of adversarial relationships. What can we do to improve these relationships?

Suppose we acknowledge the problem and attempt to involve within the federation those individuals who are financially committed to other Jewish community agencies but not necessarily to the federation. Why not, along with our \$10,000 or \$25,000 or \$50,000 federation clubs, create a club that recognizes anyone who contributes, on a yearly basis, at least a certain amount to any segment of the Jewish community? I believe that, in the long run, those individuals will come to view the federation differently as truly a community entity. The fact is that these people exist. Why not admit it and, in the spirit of community, welcome them to the federation family?

Another approach is to involve all of our givers (or just some of them at the major gifts level) in the allocations process by allowing them to designate a small percentage of their gift wherever they feel appropriate. When I first considered this option, my initial reaction was very negative, yet now I do not wish to eliminate this approach. I believe that if it can be implemented, it will involve these givers in a more meaningful way and further solidify their commitment to federation. Further exploration is required to determine all of the ramifications of this approach, but they should be explored.

Often at the core of those not involved in the federation family is a lack of ownership, of a sense that "this organization is mine." We have always said that federation is not membership oriented as are some organizations in our community, such as

Hadassah, ORT, or B'nai B'rith. What we are, and what we must be viewed as, is an organization having a broad-based constituency. The reality is that for most federations, if one gives to the annual campaign, then one is a member. So why not take advantage of the membership concept? Allow people to see that they have a vested interest in federation. Issue membership cards with definitions of membership. It just might enhance the potential for involvement. Convince your givers that they "own" a piece of the federation, that with membership comes certain rewards and opportunities. Build on this concept.

Our local community has taken a fundraising beating these past few years, and the prognosis for the near future is not very encouraging. We have been raising more dollars than ever before, but the benefits have been received by Israel and not at home. Synagogues and agencies have played a major role in our Operation Exodus campaigns and will be asked to continue to do so as we address the needs of the Soviet and Ethiopian Jewish communities in Israel. Many have even deferred their own campaign efforts as a result. But the time is past for giving serious thought to how best to provide our local agencies their just due. Could we run a second-line campaign after Operation Exodus, specifically to allow those in our community to give an additional gift for us locally?

Whether such a campaign would be successful remains to be seen, but at the very least, it would make an extremely positive statement on the needs of local agencies by federations. National agencies, such as the Council of Jewish Federations, must expend the time, energy, and brainpower to address local needs in the same fashion that they have done for Israel, for local needs now approach crisis proportions.

These ideas may or may not be valid. Yet, the underlying concept that we professionals have a responsibility to initiate change, to be innovative and suggestive, is most certainly valid. We must share in the

responsibility for the situation today. It is past the time to stand up and be counted.

V. Coordinate Services to the Jewish Community

More and more, federations will be coming under pressure to curtail local expenditures. In many cases, this pressure will be reflected in demands to "do something about federation/agency budgets." Federations and agencies should be thinking of innovative ways to address this issue and, in so doing, to address the potential for coordinative services. Smaller federations have done so by becoming functional, and although I am not suggesting that this route is feasible for larger federations, aspects of such an approach should be explored. For example, one could create a Jewish education specialist for the community, one who might teach Hebrew at the day school, organize cultural programs for the Jewish Community Center, and lecture for the Jewish Family Life Program of the family service agency. Such a person would be hired by the federation, supervised by the federation and be answerable to a federation committee made up of laypeople from each area of involvement. Or, a social worker from the

Jewish family service agency could work with groups of teens at the JCC, consult with parents at the day school, and serve as a resource to the elderly. Although I am sensitive to "turf" issues, I know that if we do not begin to break down barriers to cooperation, each of us will find that the financial trauma of the future makes today's issues pale by comparison.

CONCLUSION

Our community, our country, and the world are undergoing radical changes in the way that they function. Federations, if they are to be the central agencies for communal growth that they must be, will have to make major changes as well. Each community must set its own priorities, develop its own agenda, and establish its own manner of doing business. In order to do that, however, each must base its actions and decisions on the realities of today, not on responses of the past. We must all take risks, explore even those options that may initially seem ridiculous, and together redefine the manner in which we function. Only then will we be able to achieve our potential for significant change and long-term success.