

Mrs. G. established a life of her own and proved herself successful as a business woman.

Both Mr. and Mrs. G. recognized their lack of communication and their need to change this situation. Their primary goal in short-term therapy was to be able to elicit each other's needs and listen to what the other was saying. A man easily frightened by anger, Mr. G. interpreted every disagreement as a rejection and felt shut out by his wife. By using interactions of the same nature with members of his telephone socialization group as a point of reference, I was able to help Mr. G. recognize this, and with his wife's support, work on modifying it. As a result he was able to listen to her when she pointed out that although he could not get up and walk out of the room when angry, he very effectively "left" her emotionally in the face of any conflict. Mr. G. was in touch with his over-reactions to minor problems and in our joint sessions Mrs. G. became sensitive to the dynamics behind her husband's escape into these ruminations.

Mr. G. is an active participant in many of our programs and with his wife's encouragement and interest he now shares many of these experiences with her at the end of the day.

In exploring the conflicts in this marriage I learned that they were the same conflicts present, to some extent, prior to Mr. G.'s illness. When Mr. and Mrs. G. had to restructure their lives to accommodate this illness, they were exacerbated.

For the marriage where communication and emotional investment have broken down prior to the onset of illness the task is often a more difficult one. Both partners have probably made use of their environment either to deny the deterioration of the relationship or to have begun, consciously or unconsciously, to move away from it. When one partner becomes chronically disabled he often has to come to terms with being physically dependent upon someone who may not be able to give him the emotional support he needs.

Mr. F. became known to our agency when his wife applied for help with their 13-year-old daughter. In my initial contact with Mr. F. it was clear that he needed counseling

for himself around his depression. A victim of multiple sclerosis, Mr. F. was in his late 40's and homebound for two years. Exploration of previous functioning prior to onset of illness showed Mr. F. to be a dependent man who externalized his need to function in roles as husband, father, and breadwinner. No longer getting support from colleagues and friends, he was forced to turn to his wife, who because of her own problems brought on by her husband's illness, was unable to address herself to his needs. Directly related to his depression, and not related to his physical condition, Mr. F.'s emotional and physical functioning decreased.

My short-term treatment goals with Mr. F. were to work with him towards not personalizing his wife's inability to respond to his needs, but rather to understand them as part of a problem of her own on which she was working with her therapist. Mr. F. had to learn to look to himself for gratification when he accomplished a task. After a period of several months Mr. F. was able to take pride in his physical and emotional accomplishments and relate in a less defensive way towards his wife. Although Mr. and Mrs. F. are a long way from what one would call "good communication," they have begun to share some feelings regarding common concerns around their daughter and their marriage. Before Mr. and Mrs. F. could begin to relate as a couple, Mr. F. had to become emotionally more self-sufficient than he was prior to the onset of his illness.

In addition to using our counseling services Mr. F. frequently contributes poetry to our newsletter, works with our art therapist, and is a member of our art history telephone group.

The cases I have outlined above are not really very different from the ambulatory individuals we see in our offices every day. It is common practice for individuals to come to our offices with problems related to identity, self-esteem, and object relations. What about the people who cannot come to our offices because these problems are further exacerbated by chronic, physical disability? The Quality of Life program has reached out to this population at home and given them tools with which to function more effectively in their own environment.

## Issues in Public Funding of Jewish Communal Services\*

STANLEY B. HOROWITZ

Executive Director, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, Ohio

*Our Jewish agencies and the whole voluntary sector are at a turning point in deciding whether to seek large amounts of increasingly available public funding. If they do receive such funds they can serve more people and become larger and more powerful. If they do not, they would do less, be smaller, and operate within more traditionally prescribed limits as to program and clientele. It is apparent that many agencies believing that "more is better," have opted for the former and will continue to do so.*

### Straws in the Wind

The new "Program for the Future" of the United Way of America projects that by 1985 its affiliates could be raising 3 billion dollars per year in the United States, which would be applied to total member agency budgets of 12 billion dollars; currently the local United Way organizations provide 1 billion dollars against total member agency budgets of 3 billion dollars. Notwithstanding the great growth projected in fund-raising, United Way expects that the gap between the amount of funds that can be raised by its local affiliates on the one hand, and the needs of their agencies on the other hand will increase to 9 billion dollars. It is anticipated that the gap will in part be filled by increasing governmental support of voluntary agencies.

Presently there are discussions in some communities, including Cleveland, about the reorganization of public service delivery systems. The discussion is also going on at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The main question is whether the proposed reorganization would provide more effective and efficient public services and hence better use of available resources. Central to our local discussions is a new way of contracting for purchase of service from voluntary agencies by the public agencies. The objective is for the public agencies to provide all or most of the services, or give leadership, do the coordinating, and "leverage" the

\* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Washington, D.C., June 6, 1977.

public dollars used to purchase service in such a way that the voluntary agency utilizes the public dollar for sound public purposes. The private or sectarian purposes for which these agencies were established may not be considered at all unless they coincide with public goals. The rhetoric of such proposals tips its hat to pluralism and to the mission of the private agencies. However, the rigid formulae that often emerge call for a system in which the entry point for all clients will be the public agency. In the words of the preliminary report of the Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) proposal, the "challenge is whether voluntary agencies will accept the growing leadership role of public agencies (when it comes to the use of public funds)."<sup>1</sup>

The report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs<sup>2</sup> (the Filer Commission) indicates that in 1974, 23.2 billion dollars of government funds were received by private non-profit organizations (excluding religious organizations), while only 13.6 billion dollars were received from private philanthropy. A recent study<sup>3</sup> by the Council

<sup>1</sup> A Report to the Board of County Commissioners of Cuyahoga County; by the Ad Hoc Committee on Public Social Services. "Toward an Improved System of Social Services in Cuyahoga County." April 1, 1977.

<sup>2</sup> Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, *Giving in America*. 1975.

<sup>3</sup> Alvin Chenkin, background paper for the Sidney Hollander Colloquium, "Government Support to Jewish Sponsored Agencies in Six Major Fields of Service, 1962-1973," Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, April, 1976.

of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds indicates that government support of Jewish agencies (excluding hospitals) grew more than 600 percent from 17 million dollars in 1962 to 108 million dollars in 1973. During the same period, support from Jewish Federations and United Ways for the same agencies grew from 15 million dollars to 25 million dollars, or about 62 percent. The great bulk of the government support of Jewish agencies takes the form of third-party payments to our Jewish hospitals and homes for the aged which in 1973 amounted to 539 million dollars. The homes for the aged represent an interesting case in point. In 1962 government funding represented 35 percent of their budgets (a selected group of Jewish homes for the aged studied by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds); by 1973 it had grown to 66 percent of their budgets; on the other hand, Federation—United Way allocations declined from 11 percent of the combined budgets to 5 percent in the same period.

In analyzing this public support, we can infer that the means by which the public dollar reaches the private agency is as relevant as the amount of such support. There is little to worry about when an individual uses his social security or other government check to buy our services in the open market. On the other hand, there should be some concern when the government is a third-party payer or a purchaser of service. We are most "at risk" when receiving an outright grant since this lends itself to the dangers of excessive direct or indirect control over program and purpose.

#### Consequences of Public Funding

What have been the consequences of this trend towards increasing governmental financing of Jewish agencies?

These funds have enabled Jewish agencies to offer a greater volume of service at a higher level of quality to far more people than would have been possible otherwise. Public funds have made it possible for private agencies to utilize their unique manpower and other non-fiscal resources in contributing more

heavily to the resolution of our general community's problems and have encouraged us to be instruments for social betterment. Government funding also has meant that privately contributed funds to Jewish Federation and United Way campaigns could be directed towards more particularistic, in our case more sectarian, objectives, and also to enrichment, innovation, research, and path-finding. Finally, use of government funds by Jewish agencies has permitted the "Jews in trouble" to seek help from the government by using a Jewish agency for services and assistance which he might not seek elsewhere; it is a simple fact that many of our Jewish people are far more comfortable in seeking and receiving help in a Jewish place than in a public or non-sectarian voluntary place and therefore are more willing to seek the needed service.

Other consequences have not been quite so constructive.

One important outcome of "following the dollar" is a temptation to bend agency programs to meet criteria of government funding sources. These consequences have been fully and frequently discussed elsewhere and can be summarized as potential diminution of sectarian emphases, the inappropriate changes in intake policies, the changeability and perhaps unreliability of the funding leading to fiscal and program instability and the possible neutralizing of the advocacy role of the voluntary agency. (Can you bite the hand that feeds you?)

When public funds are sought and received there is a proper expectation that the recipient agency will be accountable. If we take the money we should not complain about the formalities required, although we can work to get them simplified. A serious consideration in regard to the acceptance of government funding is the indirect costs, both money and manpower, involved in writing grants, seeking the funding, record-keeping, and meeting all of the other government regulations. Costs associated with the requirements of accountability include special reporting, bookkeeping,

statistics maintenance, and so forth. Frequently recipient agencies are required to report to multiple government agencies on multiple time schedules and with different information. As the New York Times of April 3, 1977 reported, "since the 1930's the American welfare system has developed in an uncoordinated fashion with programs piled on top of programs and administrative agencies assigned overlapping jurisdiction." It was recently reported that one non-sectarian consortium of agencies in Cleveland was required to file reports to a public agency documenting the change of funding source for each client—the total number of pages filed was 27,000.

These programmatic and excessive reporting phenomena were recently summarized by the director of one of our homes for the aged who said: "The amount of paper work documentation, inspections, and heavy load of other requirements, little of which accrues to the benefit of the resident, is upon us with little hope of relief. Even worse, the bureaucracy in Washington determines what may be considered as acceptable standards of care, with a degree of rigidity that limits the individual facility from being innovative and from providing higher standards than those being specified by the government agency. The Medicaid and Medicare programs follow the general medical model and ignore to a great extent, the special emotional, social and cultural needs of the frail older persons who reside within the facility. Government programs are geared to a typical 'patient' rather than a frail and chronically ill 'resident'."

Some of these matters may be considered of major importance while some may be merely inconveniences, especially considering the opportunities made possible by public funds. The real dilemma is whether the private organization can remain private if it is or becomes heavily reliant on government funding; whether the voluntary sector can survive under such circumstances in a way that is conducive to fulfilling its own mission. Do we continue to believe that human services should be delivered by a dual stream, including a

public stream and a voluntary stream—or do we believe that the two sectors should be at most one public and one quasi-public sector? Fundamentally, do we believe that America should continue in the tradition of pluralism and individual initiative, or should we accept or even encourage increasing centralization as a condition of government funding? On the other hand, in light of the recent campaign experience of United Ways and Jewish Federations can we expect our voluntary funding sources to meet the impact of inflation, and beyond that, to meet new and increased needs?

Is there a course of action which can strengthen the near term viability of our voluntary agencies, and assure their long term sustenance?

#### Needed: A Balance of Two Strong Sectors

It is suggested here that our long term objective should be to work off excessive reliance that our non-institutional Jewish agencies may have on government funds, and to resist the temptation to seek a disproportionate amount of such funding. This is no mean challenge; all of the trends and prognostications—and indeed some of our newly established programs aimed at aggressively pursuing government funds—point exactly in the opposite direction. To achieve this objective would require a fierce commitment to preserving the independence of the private sector.

At the same time, Jewish agencies should not turn inward; they should contribute generously to the solution of public problems; they should lend their talents, resources and creativity to advocating, planning and helping to implement a strong system of public social services; they should even meet individual needs for which the government is willing to pay and which are appropriately within the scope of their missions. However, with 25 million Americans still in poverty, the great majority of whom are not Jewish, and with a multitude of other social problems affecting millions of Americans most of whom are not

Jewish, it can be safely assumed that securing a disproportionate amount of government funds for Jewish agencies will lead to a disproportionate amount of effort for causes unrelated to our private sectarian purposes.

To work ourselves out of potential dependence on public funds we must raise sufficient voluntary dollars to meet our unique internal needs. This is achievable if Jewish Federations can learn the secret of sharing equitably in the growing "Jewish gross national product," the funds are within our reach. This is a long term objective and will be achieved only by commitment to our cause, commitment to private initiative and, commitment to our heritage of "taking care of our own." Regardless of our success, however, we will not be able to meet all needs of all Jewish people. It will be required that there be a sorting out; some of what we do now as a Jewish community may be curtailed in favor of higher priorities and either left to the public sector as part of its proper responsibility or just not done at all. We would tailor our programs to what we can afford and to what our people need most. In short, we may find it more desirable to follow the needs than to follow the government dollars. This dual objective of raising sufficient money and tailoring our program to the highest and most unique priorities will take time.

Until we can reach those objectives, it is suggested that consideration be given to a means by which the Jewish community should interface with public funding bodies.

#### **Interfacing with Public Agencies**

As Americans we have a fine record of being involved in the political process. This involvement is absolutely crucial and requires specific participation with respect to public programs for meeting human needs. Leaders of the Jewish community should participate with other community leaders in a "surveillance" of governmental activity and policy-making. We should positively influence the shaping of public policy, of human needs programs, of the ways they will be administered, and of the

accountability requirements. We should help our mayors, our county commissioners, our state legislators, and our congressmen understand the nature of the Jewish community, the thrust of the Jewish agencies, and the effect on them of proposed legislation and human service programs. Where proposals and programs carry with them unnecessary interference with the private sector, we will find a receptive ear to creative ideas for the formulation of public policy that encourages the use of public money for the common weal by both public and private sectarian agencies, without the requirement of compromising our basic mission.

Moreover, we should recognize that money coming from governmental sources is not "someone else's" money. The source of these funds is taxation, and American Jews contribute their share to the tax base. It is reasonable in the context of our present service delivery system to expect that some of these funds should return to the Jewish community through the Jewish communal service sector which is a most natural entry point for many Jews needing services. It is therefore appropriate in the selective pursuit of government funds by representatives of the Jewish community, to do so with an attitude of entitlement and in the context of our rights, rather than seeming to plead for funds belonging to "someone else." If there are Jewish children at Jewish schools who qualify for school lunch programs, we would be remiss in not seeking and securing such funds; if there are Jewish poor in need of nutrition services, Jewish agencies serving them should be supplied with government funds no less than others; if there are Jewish children in need of camping services supplied at Jewish sponsored camps, they should benefit from government funds available for camping just like any others.

The matter of "purchase of service" should be carefully considered. Frequently Jewish agencies are unique or, if not unique, of a singularly high quality compared to similar services in a community. The government may

wish to purchase services on behalf of its clients from those Jewish agencies. We should be responsive to these needs. However, we should insist on reimbursement for full cost of service and on upholding the Jewish nature of the program. Governmental officials sometimes believe that they are distributing largesse by buying services from Jewish agencies; in fact, this should be viewed as a mutual undertaking in which both the government and the Jewish agency benefit from a well-balanced and properly financed program.

If government dollars are to be channeled wisely through voluntary agencies either through third-party payments, purchase of service, or in the form of grants, there should be a joint planning process. Governmental bodies and the Jewish communal service system (as well as other voluntary systems) should plan together for the proper matching of needs and resources. But this should be done on the basis of parity, with neither party attempting to dictate to the other.

And in the end, an atmosphere of trust must be engendered. Jewish agencies have an impressive "track record" of providing quality services at reasonable cost. In light of this, too much money and time—which could be otherwise used to provide service—are spent on accountability requirements. The public and private sectors must begin to view one another as "honorable partners."

#### **Challenge to a Pluralistic System**

The system of Jewish sponsored services has a primary obligation to the continuity of the Jewish community through meeting the health and social service needs of its people; it also has responsibility for enriching the quality of life for all Americans. Together with others in the private sector the new challenge upon us is

one of preserving voluntary initiative and a society in which there is room for multiple expressions and group self-determination.

Is it conceivable that the private sector will have the courage to move ahead in the furtherance of its goals with its own self-generated funding, leaving to the government, with our appropriate participation, the use of public funds by public agencies for public purposes? Is it possible that we will seek and accept only those public funds which can be spent on programs where there is an unmistakable and clear coincidence of interest between the Jewish agencies and public goals? Is it thinkable that the Jewish community will raise substantially more money while it simultaneously reshapes a program that has been carefully worked out over generations so that it will drop off lower priority programs in favor of those which are uniquely within our scope—raising the quality of service; path-finding; deepening Jewish identification? And in general, can the private sector consider adopting as a special area of interest the satisfaction of those human needs held by persons ineligible for public funding such as the lower middle-income-family needing counselling for a drug addicted adolescent or art lessons for a talented child? Can we help, in this way, to make the difference between a nation which lives on bread alone and one whose spirit is as well nourished as its body?

These are some of the challenges to the private sector in the 1970's and 1980's. If we can meet them, there will be a stronger public sector and a more vital private sector which together will provide the means to enrich life and to ameliorate suffering while providing those in need with alternatives—a basic ingredient of a free society.