

ARE THE COMMUNITY AND THE WORKER IN CONFLICT? *

The Worker's Role and Responsibility in Affecting Values

Group Paper, prepared by:

ROBERT PERLMAN, *Chairman*

SAM DOOHA
SIGMUND HELLMANN
THEODORE KANNER

SELIG RUBINROT
MORTON SCHRAG
JEROME WITKOVSKY

WE have reached the age of anniversaries in Jewish communal service. There can be no more appropriate salute to the 40th year of NAJCW and the 60th year of this conference than to use our past to give us a sense of continuity and development as we survey our work today. Our specific interest tonight is to gain a clearer perspective on ourselves as Jewish Center workers in relation to the community we serve. It is fitting that we first glance backward to our beginnings if we are to understand the shifting, changing nature of the community, the agency and the worker.

The earliest antecedents of the Jewish Center were the cultural and social groups organized by young Jewish men in the period from 1850 to 1890. The first YMHA's reflected the status of the Western European Jew in American society—their almost complete participation in the fluid economic and political life of their time. But there was enough need for social and cultural differentiation to call into being a Jewish institution for their social intercourse and their intellectual pursuits.

The next 40 years brought to this country a tidal wave of two million Jewish

immigrants, who differed sharply from the Americanized, middle-class Jews already established here. The huddled masses of Eastern European Jews settled in urban ghettos and their problems and their very presence evoked a philanthropic response from the older Jewish settlers. Jewish settlement houses were founded and the existing Y's "became during this period essentially a social service agency, concerned primarily with the adjustment and Americanization of the immigrant." (Janowsky, Oscar I., "The JWB Survey," p. 240.)

The contents of the "Observer," house organ of the Chicago Hebrew Institute, give a snapshot of the institutional life of the Jewish Center in 1913. There was news of the Immigrant Protective League, the English Teachers Association, the Yiddish Theater, Zionist and Socialist meetings, a Hebrew School and a penny milk station, nature study and gardening to teach "elementary farming, private care for public property and dignity of labor," as well as courses in "practical sociology" dealing with the causes and prevention of harmful living and working conditions.

The turn of the century also saw the first battles over the function and purpose of the Jewish Center, fought between those who wanted the Center to be the pot that would melt the immigrant

Jew into an "American mold" and those who sided with Louis Marshall. Exactly 50 years ago, speaking before this conference, he issued this challenge: "Unless our educational institutions shall create for themselves a Jewish atmosphere and a distinctly Jewish tendency, they have no reason whatever for existing." (Marshall, Louis, Proceedings, National Conference of Jewish Charities, 1908, p. 118.)

The great debate between the proponents of the melting pot and the advocates of cultural pluralism was carried on by the interested laymen who operated the agencies. We were interested in how and why some of the younger men active as volunteers in the Y's and Centers at that time became the first professional workers. One of them, Wm. Pinsker, sent us a rich, human account of his initiation and development as a Jewish Center worker. It is really unfortunate that we can only present brief excerpts here.

Beginning when he was 12 by giving English lessons to immigrants and reading and writing their letters, he saw quickly that people had troubles of all sorts and learned that "giving a man a chance to talk about his troubles often helped him and knowing who could give him advice was at least as good as giving him advice yourself." Later, when he was an active and experienced member of the Y, he was offered the position of General Secretary and accepted, for reasons which he explains in these words: "I loved the kind of work that I was going to do, the organizing, the getting people to see my viewpoint—the feeling of getting things done, the knowledge that I was building for the future. The other (reason) was a deep feeling that the existing agencies of the Jewish community—the synagogue, the Hebrew School, the unorganized 'kind lady' charity society—were inadequate to the job of developing a real American Jewry and

that such a Jewry could come only from the kind of organization which the YMHA could be."

Himself an immigrant, of a family of Jewish scholars, he added history and sociology to his Jewish learning and as a young man "could see on all sides of me the breakdown of old Jewish mores, of religious beliefs. I could see in the homes of my friends the conflict between the European-born parents and their American-born children. I could see that the process of Americanization was often the road to assimilation, was often the cause of deepening chasms between the generations. Assimilation as such did not frighten me, but the rapidity of the process meant a divorce from Jewish traditions, a cutting away from Jewish roots, which boded ill both for the Jews and for America and which brought many personal tragedies."

One era was ending and another beginning; the Jewish community had met one great need and was now facing a new problem. "The Americanization and socialization of the foreign born was a main problem of the early Jewish Centers before there was any considerable worry about the preservation of Jewish life and values. It was after a new generation grew up . . . that the Jewish Center faced its new problem of adjustment, the task of reawakening in the youth an appreciation of its Jewish heritage and a sense of meaningfulness in the present." (Pinsker, William, "Toward the Future," Presidential Address before the NAJCW, 1935.)

The period between the two world wars emphasized another strand in the purposes of the Center. The aftermath of war, the Russian upheaval, the Depression of the 30's, the rise of Fascism and the New Deal—all focused grim attention on social, economic and political issues. Within the Center field, Janowsky records, "some of the lay leaders, more of the staffs and a considerable proportion

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Jewish Center Workers, Chicago, Illinois, May 19, 1958.

of the articulate young adults desired to extend the purposes of the Jewish Center into the sphere of social action" and to devote its energies to the struggle against economic injustice, anti-Semitism and Fascism.

Some of those articulate young adults entered Center work during this time, heavily committed to social action. Many, in this "second generation of Center workers," brought with them their experience and their investment in picket lines, meetings to save Spain or Czechoslovakia, union organization and political activity. While there were differing views on the importance of Jewish emphasis and the Center's role in social action, it was possible to state this composite view of the Center in the president's address to the NAJCW in 1935.

"We must supply to our young people and to their elders as well knowledge, faith, courage. We must give them that feeling of unity with their community which will make them serve that community. We must give them that feeling of responsibility for the future which will make them prepare themselves to mold that future intelligently. We must burn with indignation ourselves at the injustices of the world if we want them to change that world. We must glow with zeal ourselves for a recreated Jewry if we want them to become that Jewry."

Our backward look comes to an end with the period since World War II, the decade in which we live and work. Its main features have been so fully described to us by speakers at our recent conferences that a few short phrases will sketch a picture familiar to us all. A general rise in the economic level, especially in the Jewish community; the movement from older centers of Jewish population to new Jewish neighborhoods within the city and in the suburbs; the emergence of Israel as a State and as

the focal point of American Jews' overseas interest.

This almost wholesale shift of the Jewish community to a middle-class position has had its impact on the goals, standards and values of most American Jews. Moreover, this has been part of a broad shift in values throughout American society, a shift that is the source of growing concern in our nation today. Recently, this has been most dramatically expressed in discussions and debates on our country's educational system. Among the questions being raised are those involving attitudes toward education in general and science particularly; the lack of critical thinking and the development of patterns of conformity; the concern with narrow self-interest and lack of concern with broader citizenship responsibilities. The publication of the Purdue Opinion Poll findings in "The American Teenager" last year revealed substantial disagreement with the essence of the Bill of Rights. This is one indication of the weakening of the democratic heritage and one reason for the widespread concern.

Both traditional Jewish values and historic American democratic values are being modified today. And it is from these sources that we as social workers, derive many of the fundamental values which are basic to our work with people and which today seem to be suffering from more than a mild recession. Let us speak more concretely about a few illustrative developments and trends in the Jewish community.

Take, for example, the traditional place and worth assigned to Jewish family life. One finds today an array of specialized institutions, growing in number and complexity, which tend to splinter the family and bring about an abdication of the parents' role to those with "expertness" in education, recreation, religion, and "social adjustment." Jew-

ish families do less and less as family units. Participation in community activities has become fragmented all along the line—"kiddie shows," movies for adults only and those beamed to the teen-age audience; separate religious services as well as organizations within the synagogue for the different age groups; the early dating patterns that are emerging further draw children away from family participation; they also pose a "chicken-or-the-egg" problem. Has the phenomenon of early dating detracted from the strength of the family, or has the weakening of family life caused children to seek satisfaction and support from other youngsters outside the home?

Much has been said about the increase in synagogue affiliation and religious school attendance, but its meaning is not simple to analyze. Judah Shapiro has pointed out that "increase in enrollment in Jewish schools is concurrent with reduced curricula and limited schedules." The big Bar Mitzvah, at least, has become a pretty clear symbol of social respectability.

Some of the heightened search for identification with the Jewish community, notably in suburbia, is partially based on insecurity in relationships with the non-Jewish part of the community. Many Jews encourage friendship with non-Jews among their younger children, but fear of intermarriage calls such associations to an abrupt halt for the teenagers. As adults, relationships with non-Jews seem to be taking on more and more of a "token" quality.

Many people are making demands on the synagogue that are similar to their expectations of the Jewish Center: they look to both as arenas in which they can acquire the symbols of social acceptability without risking deep involvement in growth, change, thinking. This is not to brand as superficial the increased identification with the synagogue and the re-

ligious school; it must mirror some deeper need, some searching for anchorage and guidance in a world that suffers from troubles far more terrifying than keeping up with the Joneses. Perhaps this search is related to the fact that this has not been a decade which encouraged or rewarded free, independent and creative thought about the post-war world.

How do we measure a man's worth today? Two traditional Jewish values—learning and giving of one's service and resources to those in need in the community—have taken on different meanings and less importance in the scale. Education, study and scholarship, formerly valuable in and of themselves, have paled behind the degree and diploma which are indices of social and economic status and means to better jobs, higher incomes and bigger homes.

As for "tsidukkah," it originally had its meaning in the justice and beauty of the individual's private expression of his sense of responsibility to his community. That meaning has been somewhat dimmed in the highly organized, competitive and often status-oriented practices of contemporary fund-raising. Philanthropy is so frequently the mark of the contributor's rank in the social order. The increasingly professional and institutional nature of our helping services may partly explain this, for they have made human needs less visible and tangible to those who want to help. More and more, it is only the dollar that can travel the distance from the responsible and interested citizen to those in need. And it has taken many millions of dollars to handle our problems in Europe, Israel and the United States, especially since the 30's. The resulting pressure and competition for dollars have been harnessed to the social strivings in our communities and have tended to obscure the essential virtues of social responsibility.

It would come with poor grace from us as Jewish Center workers to make these comments about our communities with a holier-than-thou attitude, because we and our agencies have been very much a part of these changes. The Centers have responded to changing conditions, as they have since 1850 and as they must continue to do, but some of their responses need a more thorough review than can be given here. We can ask, however, what has been the impact of middle-classism on the ways Centers obtain income, determine expenditures and decide where and whom to serve.

For the past ten years, and even less in the midst of a recession, it is simply not true that all the families we serve are solidly in the middle and upper economic group, any more than they are all residents of suburbia. One wonders whether we are often pricing out of the market a considerable number of Jewish families by the fees that are charged. This is particularly so for the more expensive, newer services such as day and country camping, nursery schools and summer programs, where so much emphasis is placed on their being self-supporting.

As the Centers attempt to follow or anticipate the geographic movements of the Jewish population, do we give due weight to providing services to the older Jewish areas and to pockets that have been left behind in the rush out of the central city? Even in the decisions Boards make about the program and the building, they sometimes lose sight not only of sound values, but of our very function, when they structure a Center that seems more and more like a country club in its services and facilities.

Again in raising these questions about community and agency, we are not smugly pointing our fingers at everyone but ourselves. We are concerned, and, at times, confused about our roles as professionals and Center workers. Part

of the explanation lies in what has been happening to us as individuals. As a member of the community, the worker is affected by what is happening in our society. He and his family face the same problems and pressures. In our society, status is related to material things. Success is reflected in job title, income and how far up the ladder a person has climbed in his profession or occupation, rather than his intrinsic worth as a person, or his ability as a worker. People do not acquire status or receive recognition through service to others or to the community. If we also have been using this same measuring rod, then it is no doubt difficult for us to affect any change in the values of others. If we have become part of a pattern of conformity, then how can we help others develop their own individuality and be secure in being different? We need to reinforce our conviction that helping people lead happier and healthier lives is, if you will, a noble profession. If, out of our own conviction, we can help people modify their concepts of what constitutes success, then the helping professions can achieve a different kind of status which will also be reflected in the material advantages accruing to those engaged in such work.

One of the basic goals of our profession, which often appears in our agency's statement of principles, is that we help people play an effective role as citizens in a democratic society. Yet, we ourselves, as citizens, all too frequently take part in community affairs at a minimum level. Indeed, members of the committee preparing this paper indicated that they had little, if any, such experience. Surely we will find it difficult to help others achieve what we have not achieved in this direction.

The same might be said of our association itself. In recent years, how much have we, as a professional association, done in an organized way to affect any

changes in regard to problems with which we as a profession are intimately concerned? One might cite as an example the question of our national budget for health and welfare purposes and our lack of action on behalf of increased appropriations for sorely needed services.

General societal pressures undoubtedly have had an effect on our readiness and ability as individuals and professionals to deal with issues which might be construed as controversial or unpopular. But the McCarthy atmosphere is being dissipated and there is an opportunity now for freer examination and movement on matters of social importance.

Looking into the mirror this way reveals that we have been very much caught up in the changes we earlier saw reflected in the community and the agency. But this self-examination would not be complete without a brief flash-back to see our professional development as part of the proliferation of social agencies in recent decades. We are now part of the highly organized institutional system that has grown up since the days when a 12-year-old was successfully combining the functions of an English teacher and a community referral service.

A significant aspect of the institutionalization of social services has been the training of Center workers. Twenty-five years ago the new ideas brought together from psychology and psychiatry were joined with new developments in education and recreation and were in turn linked to the growing profession of social work. The emergence of "social group work" and its specialized training in social work schools has, in recent years, focused attention more and more on the development of the individual and his relationship to others. Perhaps as part of the widespread emphasis in our day on scientific techniques, there has been great stress on the refinement of our method and skills. This, in an era

when the Jewish community no longer faces pressing problems of physical survival or economic adjustment, has helped to shape the outlook and contribution of the "third generation" of Center workers.

The early meetings of the committee that worked on this paper revealed this difference in orientation which can be described in these terms, subject, of course, to the discount that must be applied to all generalizations: those who entered the field in the last ten years feel that both their training and experience have been concentrated on developing skill to help the individual and the group in their social adjustment. There has been little in their education or experience that has made broad social change an important concern in their work with people.

On the other hand, many workers who entered the field in the thirties and forties feel somewhat restless and resentful that they seem called upon so much to provide people with help in adjusting to the world as it is, and so little to helping people change and improve their world. In the light of some of their goals when they entered the field, they feel guilty and their resentment is directed both at the new middle class Jewish community and at themselves for being part of it.

It is out of this atmosphere (and our confusion because we are so much involved in it) that we now feel so strongly the need to restate our goals and reaffirm our beliefs. We need to find some fixed points as we ride the swing of the pendulum from the concern of the profession with "social betterment" to the concern with the individual and with developing our method and skills. This issue was recently sharpened by the reactions and discussions of the work of the Committee on Practice of the Group Work Section of NASW. What is needed is an under-

standing of the inseparability of these two aspects of our professional responsibility.

If our concern with social conditions is to be meaningful, it must be linked to the effects of social conditions on individuals. Conversely, we cannot affect healthy individual growth and the development of meaningful social relationships, if social conditions counteract or negate the effects of group experiences in our agencies. The kind of housing in a community, the economic factors affecting the community, the quality of education are some of the forces affecting our members with at least as much impact as their experience in our Centers. The question of whether the world survives in the atomic age has a profound impact on the lives of all members of society.

We are then vitally concerned with the inter-dependence between social conditions and the individual. Applying this to current trends in the American Jewish community, we are concerned about some of the tendencies and developments we see, and we cite here just a few as illustrative.

Family life, we would undoubtedly agree, needs strengthening. While we recognize the usefulness of specialized resources, we are loath (or should be) to assume more and more parental responsibilities. We should rather set our sights on helping families play their full role as the most significant setting in which people develop their capacities for sound relations, worthwhile values and life goals.

We could hardly justify ourselves as a profession if we looked askance at group affiliation, but we must question the frenzied, over-organized group life in many of our communities. The ultimate purpose of joining and participating lies in the enrichment of the individual and his ability to contribute to the group and the community.

Learning, the kind that takes place in

a climate of free inquiry, has its justification in what it gives to the individual and again eventually through him to others. Philanthropy likewise is another strong strand that is weaving a satisfying, productive relationship between the individual and his group, his community and his people.

All that we have said thus far is a reaffirmation of our credo and our objectives. We have been exhorting ourselves to be more forthright and secure in handling the "social" in social work, especially at those points at which our values differ from a substantial part of the community. But we have said little about the "how," the skill required to work honestly, effectively and helpfully in the face of these differences. We do not mean manipulative skill, because we are not proposing to foist our will or our values on the people with whom we work. What then is our approach, our method, our skill? We want to describe a concrete situation to help get at this.

Thousands of teen-agers on Chicago's North Side are involved in "charity" dances. From three to a dozen teen clubs combine to run a dance, the proceeds of which go to a designated charity. These dances are held in the swankiest hotels in town, complete with name bands, name entertainers and expensive bids.

In order to hold these dances, adult sponsorship is necessary to underwrite contracts with hotels, bands, printers, etc. The teen clubs seek out, or are sought out by, adult groups in the community engaged in raising funds for a particular charity. The adults meet with a committee from each of the clubs to develop fund-raising activities and quotas to guarantee that several thousands of dollars over and above expenses will be raised and turned over to the charity.

In view of the long-established Jewish tradition of giving and doing for others, it would seem that this is highly com-

mendable. But let us take a closer look at how the "charity dances" developed and their meaning today. During World War II, teen-agers were encouraged to raise funds in support of the war effort. They were helped to run big dances in the ballrooms of prominent hotels. Adult approval was given through newspaper publicity and awards and the teens derived tremendous satisfaction from helping in a great cause and from the enjoyable nature of the activity itself. High status in the eyes of both the adult and teen community was given to those who organized and participated in these activities.

When the war ended, teen groups wanted to continue these activities. In a few instances, members of teen clubs died of diseases, such as leukemia. Their friends and club mates memorialized them by raising funds in their names to fight these diseases. The funds were raised by holding big dances with the aid of adult groups with similar fund-raising interests.

As time passed, a change took place. In order to achieve status in their peer culture today, a club must participate in such a dance. The more money raised, the higher the club's status. The youth involved do not know who or what it is, where the money goes or how it is used.

Most of the adult groups underwriting the dances are concerned only with the amount of money the youngsters raise. They have no idea or interest in making the experience a meaningful one for the boys and girls. They impose adult fund-raising standards on the youth. They threaten, pressure and cajole them. They involve fourteen- and thirteen-year-olds who are not ready for this experience. They encourage, indeed, require youngsters to violate the law by going out with pushkes, which is illegal in Chicago, except for a few approved organizations. They condone if not encourage youngsters to have card parties to raise money.

They require them to solicit door to door at night. In some instances, they organize the teens to collect funds in the area of the city that is filled with bars and night clubs. In several instances, youngsters have been arrested, but the adult group has effected their release and told them not to worry, they would be taken care of. The experience has included witnessing payoffs to the police.

As a result of these experiences, a number of things begin to happen. Teen-agers begin to regard fund-raising as odious, as a necessary evil which they must endure in order to hold the dance they see as necessary to achieve status. They are exposed to dangerous situations. They develop unhealthy attitudes towards the law and law enforcement. They have negative experiences with adult groups. They are so involved in the one project—from six to 12 months—that they do not get the chance to develop the broad and varied program which their membership in a teen club should afford them.

In attempting to deal with this phenomenon, the agencies experimented with varied approaches. In one, policies were established prohibiting a club from engaging in illegal activities. Adults representing fund-raising organizations were required to see a member of the staff in order to help the clubs work out with them more realistic participation in fund-raising. In another agency, the Club Presidents' Council developed a guide based on the problems and concerns teens had faced in their experiences. It was designed to spell out mutual expectations and responsibilities, but this, like the legislative approach mentioned above, did not prove adequate. Another attempt was made to substitute other fund-raising activities for the illegal one, but since these did not yield as much financial return, they did not break the pattern.

The whole "charity dance" situation

was aired at a Teen-Parent Conference in the community and the dissatisfaction of both teens and adults was explored. Following this, a joint committee of the two Boards agreed to tackle the problem on a broader scale. A city-wide meeting was held involving the two agencies, the Welfare Council, teen clubs, adult charity groups and members of the City Council, but it was not possible to reach common agreement among all of the groups represented.

None of these efforts in and of themselves produced a solution, but they did touch on the most crucial aspect of the situation: the growing discontent on the part of the teens themselves with their experience and their lack of satisfaction with much in the charity dance program. This suggested that while the teens appeared to be more concerned with the charity dance as a status activity than with helping people, beneath the surface there was an interest in doing things for others. In searching for experiences that would provide satisfaction in giving of themselves, it was found that a number of teens, already positively identified with the agency through their participation in its program, were interested in becoming counselors-in-training at the country camp, junior counselors in day camp, and in getting experience that would be helpful in connection with their future vocations. Because it was related to their own interest, they responded to the suggestion of serving as volunteer group aides in the children's program. Eighteen volunteered to serve one day a week under staff supervision. A further outcome was the development of a Social Workers of Tomorrow group with a membership of 25 teen-agers.

This process and the skill involved can be seen directly through one high-status girls club, which had participated in a charity dance. In the weeks following the dance, they used their club meetings to evaluate their experience, with the

help of the club advisor. The girls voiced their dissatisfaction and the advisor helped them sort out what, if anything, they wanted from this kind of experience in the future. When they spoke of doing things for sick people, the advisor suggested there were ways and means other than fund-raising. She asked if they would want to visit a hospital and serve as hospital aides. Several girls wanted to try this. Arrangements were made with one of the Jewish Federation hospitals and a small group followed through. They returned to their club with highly enthusiastic reports and soon most of the girls were serving as hospital aides. Girls in other clubs picked up the idea and at this point over 50 girls have taken part in the hospital aide program.

The effects of this development have spread. Other clubs are looking for ways of offering service and two clubs have begun to teach blind boys how to dance. Another is trying to arrange to serve in a home for the aged. While the charity dances are still going on, though somewhat fewer in number, the values implicit in direct service to others are being strengthened and hopefully along with this will come changes in the concepts on which status is built.

If the staff in arriving at this approach and the leader of the girls club that went down to the hospital utilized some skill in working with the teens, quite the opposite was demonstrated by another club leader. The group was sitting around before a meeting talking about a teacher who frequently had directed ridicule at the Jewish members of the class. One of the club members recalled the teacher's making a comment about the "whistles that Jewish students wear around their necks." The club leader replied, "you ought to be careful the way you act in her class."

At this hour, one is tempted to say that these two examples are the long and

short of it. At the very least, we owe you our answer to the question posed by this paper: "Are the community and the worker in conflict?" Many values we hold as social workers are not in consonance with those now held by a substantial part of the Jewish community. But we, as workers, are not and cannot be in conflict with the people who comprise our communities.

We are not ready to bow to "reality" and reinforce the dominant values of the moment. We are not prepared to serve blindly as program tailors who cut and fit just to fill orders. Neither are we proposing to fight tooth and nail against what we consider some of today's false values.

We assert that we have a responsibility and a role in affecting values in our communities. But we are in search, it seems, of a more effective synthesis between our values and our skills. On the surface, the one pushes us toward direct action while our knowledge and skill have taught us that we cannot impose our values on people. In reality, this poses not a dilemma, but a demanding task for us today, to achieve an amalgam of purpose and method, of ends and means.

Our two examples suggest some demands we ought to make of ourselves to achieve this synthesis. First, a genuine interest in helping people tackle something that bothers them and that they want to do something about. We have devoted much of this paper to reinforcing our alertness and confidence in working with people on those issues and problems that go beyond their immediate relationships into wider spheres of social concerns. Some of us will have to stop gazing backward nostalgically to the issues that were important to us ten and twenty years ago and take a clearer look at the social forces that impinge on people today.

Second, we need sensitivity that dis-

tinguishes between overt and covert needs and helps people locate the issue or problem on which they want to act. This means finding what is below the surface, as was the case with the charity dances. We would be sadly mistaken if we thought there was unanimity in a community in regard to their values and, particularly, those we have questioned as false and unproductive. There is a sizable group seriously concerned with bringing about change in regard to those values which obstruct healthy, democratic growth for individuals. We need to work with these forces and strengthen their impact on the community. It is equally important to understand that individuals who hold the values we question are themselves in conflict. They have doubts and confusions. Some of the finest goals in the Jewish tradition and the American democratic heritage may have been submerged or distorted. But the seeds remain beneath the surface and it calls for sensitivity on our part to help people recognize their conflicts and work out their solutions. This, in turn, involves the skill that makes it possible for people to test out their degree of interest and the direction they want to take in dealing with a problem. It means helping people be free to assert their feelings, to examine critically conditions around them, and to use their creativity in arriving at new patterns of thinking and doing.

We also need some humility and a sense of proportion about our place in all this. We are only one of the agencies, institutions and forces which influence values in our society. The family, the synagogue, the school and other organizations play vital roles in the life of the individual. We form one part in this constellation of forces, in which our unique role is dictated by the nature of the service we offer. We must act as much as possible in concert with other

ARE THE COMMUNITY AND THE WORKER IN CONFLICT?

institutions. In fact, we may be able to help at points in bringing about some unity of approach through initiating co-operative efforts among institutions in the community.

Finally, the ultimate test of the values we cherish is their social usefulness to the individual, the group and the com-

munity. Changes in values will depend on the usefulness that people find in alternative ways of feeling and behaving. It is our task to demonstrate the usefulness of some of the values now in eclipse by relating them to the needs, interests and aspirations of the people in our communities.