

STATUS OF JEWISH COMMUNITY LIFE IN EUROPE

by LOUIS KRAFT

*Joint Distribution Committee
Paris, France*

TWO years ago, Mr. Herbert Katzki, Deputy Director General of JDC, described, at a session of the National Conference, what happened to the survivors of the concentration camps and D.P. camps, following the end of the fighting in World War II. In the countries liberated by the allied forces there were almost one and a quarter million Jews. Many were on the move. Thousands left Germany and Austria and were helped to settle in France, Belgium and other Western countries. Others went back to their countries of origin in Europe. By 1946, 210,000 Jews were still in concentration camps and all told some 750,000 Jews were receiving aid through JDC and other private Jewish agencies—ORT, OSE and HIAS. The magnitude of the task has been frequently portrayed. Three years after the end of the war, 150,000 people were still being fed in canteens, 70,000 children were under care, 32,000 of them in children's homes, 70,000 were receiving medical care.

But emigration went on, particularly when it became possible to go to Israel. By 1954, 623,000 men, women and children emigrated to permanent places of residence, over 500,000 of them to Israel. There were left in Europe some 28,000 hard core cases—the ill, TB or post TB rehabilitation cases, the emotionally dis-

turbed, the old people without surviving relatives. They are the residual charge on JDC, in Western Europe.

Up to two years ago, there seemed to be a virtual cessation of movement to or from Western Europe. The process of achieving stability of population was only mildly interrupted by the sudden eruption of the exodus from Egypt and Hungary. The entire dramatic episode of the escape and speedy resettlement of Jews from Hungary, and the equally rapid transfer of Jews from Egypt to Israel, had relatively little impact on the West European Jewish communities. In an amazingly effective operation, JDC quickly mobilized an emergency staff, poured resources of material aid and time-tested experience into a task of immediate relief for the refugees who reached Austria and Yugoslavia. With the help of United HIAS Service and with gates wide open to the refugees in free countries everywhere, 15,000 Jewish refugees from Hungary were helped to emigrate in a matter of months—5,000 to the United States, 4,200 to Canada, 2,500 to Australia, 1,200 to Latin America and 2,000 to Israel. Of the remainder of 4,000, several hundred each have settled in England, France, Sweden, Italy. Only about 1,200 remain in Austria, the people who still require the aid of JDC, while waiting

with undiminished hope for a change in U.S. immigration policies that will permit them to come to this country. Another 700 or 800 that find themselves in other European countries continue to require support. One of the heartening phenomena of both the Hungarian and Egyptian migrations has been the degree of readiness and availability of organizational resources of the European Jewish communities that enabled them to co-operate so effectively with JDC in the immediate tasks of providing refuge and care for those who came to their countries, particularly in Austria, France, Greece, Italy and Yugoslavia. The steady rebuilding of organized Jewish community life since the end of the war was dramatically demonstrated.

One still hears occasionally pessimistic views regarding the future of Jewish life in Europe. They come from people who still have fresh memories of Jewish communal life, of Jewish cultural achievement of the time before the two World Wars; others are convinced that in an unfriendly and uncertain world, only Israel offers hope of Jewish fulfillment. Certainly these are not views that dominate Jewish effort in Europe today. The evidence is to the contrary.

One is impressed, when working closely with the surviving European Jewish communities, if not by an unalloyed optimism regarding the Jewish future, certainly by a strong determination to make the effort to build anew. There is a sense of historic mission, a feeling, that the present generation, as in similar periods of Jewish history, has the obligation to carry on the destiny of an eternal people—a people that refuses to die. And so they repair and replace the institutions, organizations and instrumentalities of organized Jewish living. Schools, synagogues, homes for the aged, summer camps, charitable organizations have risen again, to carry

on the customary tasks of Jewish education, religious practices, systematic help to the needy.

After the destruction and devastation of the war and the demoralizing effect of the concentration camps, the slave labor existence and the aimlessness and dependency of D.P. camp life, the task, at first, seemed hopeless. Inspiring dynamic leaders were not then immediately in view. Experienced Jewish functionaries had disappeared, among the first to be exterminated. But, as it turned out this was an oversimplification of the situation. When the occupied countries were freed of the invader, some leaders returned from countries of refuge and out of a sense of duty and gratitude, they took on the difficult tasks of reorganizing the communities with the depleted resources at hand. Rabbis, who had managed to survive, resumed their functions in refurbished synagogues, social agencies were re-established, community offices were opened and the old time systems of community membership and payment of Jewish taxes were resumed.

It must be borne in mind that except in those countries that were completely occupied by the Nazis and where wholesale destruction of Jews took place, many people did return from places where they hid out and were able to re-establish themselves economically. They also fell naturally back into accustomed patterns of Jewish communal life. Thus almost the entire Jewish population of Denmark, numbering 7,500 individuals who had taken refuge in Sweden, came back in a body when the war was over and found their homes and Jewish institutions largely intact. In France, many of the old established families returned after the war and among them were former leaders with experience in communal affairs. In Belgium, Holland, Italy and in Austria, while survivors were sometimes few in number, there

was some leadership material among them. They took on the responsibility, not only of re-establishing the institutions and communal systems for the surviving members of the community, but of helping the new arrivals from the D.P. camps to integrate into the common traditional pattern characteristic of the past.

The absorption of new elements, with sharp differences in language, customs, Jewish traditions, and with insistence on their own forms of Jewish institutional life, was not easy. But the bitter lessons of persecution and suffering common to all who emerged from the Nazi holocaust, also made for tolerance and for compromise for the sake of unity of effort in creating a new communal existence. The Jews were too few in number to afford the luxury of separation, at least in communal affairs. Although actual unity was not so readily achieved, cleavages are not more deep rooted than the differences one finds in any country where Jews feel free in forming separate organizations, the United States included.

We may in truth speak of this development, still in progress, as one of purposeful reconstruction. The martyrdom, the tragic loss of relatives and friends, the old associations are not easily forgotten by the Jews of Europe, but they no longer affect the purpose of Jewish life.

The mood has changed. It is not so much an expression of what might still be possible as a future for Jewish communal life. Rather there is a positive urge, a compulsion, to provide speedily and fully those institutions, services and programs that are necessary to make a fresh start. The fear is no longer that of physical extermination, but of assimilation through the insidious influence of the new freedom that came to Jews in the democratic countries that welcomed them so generously. Undercurrent is

also the sense of duty towards Israel, the new symbol of Jewish survival. Israel needs a strong Diaspora Jewry and the European Jewish communities, perhaps more spiritually attuned and bound by ties of common origin with the majority of Israelis, feel deeply and respond willingly to the need for revitalizing the European sector of the Jewish Diaspora.

These are among the motivations that are responsible for the truly heroic efforts that have been made and are being made to build a firm foundation for Jewish living in Western Europe. In retrospect, it becomes evident that a wise and understanding statesmanship influenced JDC immediately after the war to lend its support—not solely or even primarily its financial support, but its technical knowledge and skill in Jewish communal work, to the constructive efforts being made by the European Jewish communities. It could easily have been otherwise, because the traditional way of European Jewish life is in many respects so different from the American experience. Had JDC limited itself to the function popularly associated with its work, namely material relief, the European Jews would gratefully have said "dayenu." But the program quickly moved into giving guidance, leadership and aid of specialists, in the direction of community organization, establishment of social services, training of social work personnel and underpinning the structure of Jewish educational work for children.

I believe this emphasis is of particular significance to this audience, because in a very real sense it represents the distinctive contribution of American Jewish social work and of our profession as social workers. The JDC, it seems to me, and I can, as a relative newcomer to its ranks, assume to judge it from a non-organizational perspective, sees itself as the instrumentality not alone of

distributing the generous outpouring of funds to Jews in need, but also as the medium through which American Jewish social work experience and know-how can be placed at the service of Jewish communities in other lands.

There is therefore at work today a policy and a program of technical assistance to European Jewish communities, almost in every phase of Jewish communal work. In this connection, it becomes necessary to describe a fortuitous but nevertheless most potent resource that is available to the Jewish communities of Europe and has already been effective in pushing forward many plans that otherwise could not be realized quickly. I refer to the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, usually referred to as the Claims Conference.

The Claims Conference is a body, especially created by the world-wide Jewish organizations, for the purpose of securing indemnification for the damage done by Nazis to individuals and their property and to Jewish communal institutions. In September, 1952, the so-called Luxembourg agreement was adopted by Germany and Israel whereby (a) payment was to be made by Germany in the amount of 822 million dollars, in the form of goods, over a period of ten years; (b) included in this sum was 107 million dollars which went directly to the Claims Conference for relief, rehabilitation and resettlement of Nazi victims outside of Israel; (c) the agreement provided for the enactment of legislation by Western Germany, for indemnification of individual victims for loss of life, damage to health, deprivation of liberty, damage to property and possessions, damage to economic prospects.

In pursuance of this program, the Claims Conference has aided not only the individual Nazi victims, but the Jewish communities as a whole that suffered

from Nazi occupation and destruction. The responsibility has been broadly interpreted to include every constructive step that would enable the surviving Jewish communities to rebuild Jewish community life. It was obvious that these communities would require time in order to build up their own financial resources to support a communal program. One fact was particularly clear. They certainly did not have sufficient capital nor could they raise the funds to invest in the construction or reconstruction of institutional facilities. Some help was given by local governments that received indemnification for war losses from Germany. But this type of government assistance was limited and restricted and was soon exhausted. New needs developed. In many instances the refugees from D.P. camps settled in small towns where there were no Jewish communities before the war and hence no institutions to serve them; in other instances they outnumbered the settled Jewish population and additional facilities were required for them. For example, Paris has today a very large and new East European Jewish population; the East European refugees who have settled in Sweden equal in number the old-time Swedish Jewish population and many of them live in industrial towns that had hardly any Jews previously; two-thirds of the 25,000 Jews in Brussels arrived as refugees after the war. It may well be said that we are dealing today with many communities of Jews that are new and that are starting from scratch.

For all of these groups, still confronted with the need for making full individual economic and social adjustments, all of the basic institutions, programs and services essential to communal life, had to be created. Hence a high priority was given by Claims Conference to providing capital funds for the construction and equipment of needed

institutions, after providing for the approximately 28,000 individuals who remain as the hard core group requiring financial assistance.*

As of the end of 1957, after 4 years of operation, the Conference has made grants for 190 construction projects of which 134 have been completed. As a matter of firm principle, the Conference has stipulated that in each case the local communities should participate in the capital investment to the maximum of available resources and in all instances should undertake the full cost of operation of the institutions. The reasons for these policies are clear. In the first place the Conference has had many more requests for capital funds than it could meet each year. Hence it had to insist that there be some sharing by the local communities, so that its funds could be spread over the largest number of projects. Furthermore this practice gave the local groups a sense of more responsibility in determining their own needs. Secondly, the Conference, by the terms of the agreement with Germany, has a limited existence. Its funds will be exhausted in about five or six years. It could not therefore undertake to provide operating funds, without the risk that when the money gave out, the institutions would be unable to continue on a sound basis. These are the practical considerations, but the overriding factor was the necessity of discouraging dependency and encouraging local communities to assume responsibility for their own future development as a condition of wholesome growth. As a result of these policies, of the total investment in buildings, amounting to \$7,400,000, the Conference and

JDC gave \$4,000,000 or 54%, and local communities participated in 46% of the cost.

A variety of institutions were built, purchased or renovated, including synagogues, schools, children's homes, homes for aged and chronically ill, Jewish Centers and summer camps. Homes for the Aged represented an immediate need after the war. The capital funds expended or authorized for Homes for the Aged represent 28% of the total of Conference investment for capital purposes. A recent survey of such institutions, made by JDC, showed that in 47 Homes for the Jewish Aged in continental Europe, there were 2,578 residents, all survivors of Nazi persecution; that three-fourths were over 70 years of age and one-third were over 80 years old. Only 167 couples were among the total, the remainder being single persons of whom 70% were widows. Claims Conference and JDC shared in providing capital funds for 33 Homes for Old People.

The JDC survey of programs for the Aged in Continental Europe had several purposes and illustrates a generic method for dealing with the needs of an entire field of social welfare. JDC has charted a course for channeling not only capital investments, but also technical services intended to aid in the improvement of the scope and quality of services in all major fields of the communal program. The Claims Conference and JDC had received requests for several years in succession for capital funds to build Homes for the Aged or additions to existing Homes. There was a quite understandable solicitude on the part of Jewish communities to provide the best of care for widows and widowers and couples completely bereft of kin by the Nazi exterminations. The quick and familiar solution seemed to be a Home for the Aged. No distinction was being drawn between those older people still physically able to look after themselves, and those

who were ill or too feeble to do so. It was not at all clear whether the size of the surviving group constituted a true measure of the number that would have to be accommodated after five or ten years. From this point of view, were too many homes being built and should not other alternatives be considered, particularly the inauguration of community services that would enable old people to live out their years in apartments of their own and amid friendly, familiar surroundings?

The study, employing a detailed questionnaire supplemented by spot field visits by JDC staff, was directed to determining the facts so that a guiding policy could be offered to the Jewish communities. The findings and recommendations of the study were presented to a conference of the European lay and professional community leaders last October. The recommendations were in line with the best European and American practice and the medical staff of the JDC assumed responsibility for aiding communities to develop the necessary programs. In brief, the findings indicated that with but isolated exceptions, the bed capacity already attained was sufficient to meet foreseeable needs of aged people who needed institutional care; that for other aged it was necessary to inaugurate community services—visiting nursing, medical care, housekeeping services, recreational programs, comfortable living quarters in the cities; that the Homes for Aged would then be utilized by the chronically ill or feeble older persons. At the same time, the study revealed the need for repairs, improvements in existing buildings and renewal of equipment to bring them up to proper standards. For these limited purposes Claims Conference funds would continue to be made available. As a follow up of this preliminary study, there is now in progress an intensive examination, community by community and Home by Home, by a

specialist in the field, working under the direction of the Medical Department of JDC. The objective is to develop in each community a socially sound program that will serve the long range needs of the growing number of aged, without burdening the communities with unnecessary structures and costly institutional care.

The largest capital investment by the Claims Conference has thus far been made in the construction of Youth Centers and Community Centers, about 46% of the total allocations for about 60 projects. Community Centers of the program type are institutions that are relatively new in the communities where they are being established. They do not replace Centers that previously existed and that were destroyed by the Nazis or bombed in the war.

Community Centers and Youth Centers are in the eyes of the surviving communities symbolic of the new, the hopeful approach to a future life. As Mr. Katzki pointed out in his paper two years ago, the educational work of the World Federation of YMHA's and Jewish Centers, conducted by its representatives in the years following the end of hostilities, may have helped to crystallize the yearning of the survivors to give an institutional form to this hope. There is no doubt that there was a high degree of readiness in any event, for the establishment of Community Centers, indeed almost a compulsion to create Centers of Jewish living and activity, for all residents, particularly the growing children and youth. It seemed that only the lack of sufficient capital funds delayed the inauguration of the programs. This lack was met to the extent required by Claims Conference and JDC. Both organizations were quick to recognize the serious interest that motivated the Jewish groups to place a high priority on the establishment of Community Centers, as basic institutions for future growth.

Obviously when the European Jewish

* The Claims Conference has a very small administrative staff at its office in New York. It relies on JDC to perform all the technical tasks of investigating the merits of requests from local organizations, recommending action, helping to implement grants and supervising the expenditure of funds.

communities thought of Community Centers, they conceived of them in very simple terms—a building to provide meeting rooms for existing groups, a modest auditorium for Jewish gatherings, a community office—in short a building to house existing scattered activities and a central meeting place for the Jews of the community. Since in most cases the communities could afford to build and maintain only one building, they aimed to include under one roof all their requirements for physical facilities that were missing in the community. Hence a very large proportion of the Centers include facilities for religious services, a Kosher kitchen and dining room, a Jewish library, class rooms for the Jewish supplementary school, offices, meeting rooms, in some cases apartments for Jewish functionaries. The conception of the Center was, generally speaking, static. The articulated aim, however, was dynamic. The problem was therefore of transforming a static, "housing" type of Center into an active, purposeful institution with a Center-sponsored program for groups and individuals that would serve the educational, cultural and social purposes of a positive and vital Jewish community life.

This is precisely the function performed by the Jewish Center as we experienced it in the United States. JDC assumed the obligation of providing the guidance and technical know-how, to help the local communities to realize the objective of a functioning, programmatic type of democratic Jewish Center. Here we have another good illustration of the role of JDC, stemming from its responsibility as agent of the Claims Conference, to see to it that the capital funds contributed by the Conference would serve a maximum constructive purpose. The process begins when the application is made by a local community and JDC is delegated to make the investigation into

the merit of the request and to recommend the action to be taken. The community asks for funds to build a Center, but in most instances does not support the request with sufficient demographic data or information about needs of groups or individuals, the kind of facilities that will be required, the program to be conducted. Estimates of cost are often in very general terms. The sponsorship is not always clear; there generally is no operating budget to indicate the ability of the community to support the Center.

Obviously it is not sufficient to consider only the factor of need. The applicant must be helped to develop the project in all of its phases. The group needs to have a full understanding and acceptance of the programmatic aspects based upon a determination of the need. All of the familiar steps involved in establishing a new Center in an American community that never had one before are involved in Europe as well. A community study is made by JDC—limited of course to the gathering of essential quantitative information about the Jewish population, its numbers and composition by age groups; a description of the activities and facilities of existing organizations; community resources and needs. This information provides the basis for preparation of a building program or architectural space budget and a calculation of cost of construction and equipment. An operating budget is prepared and this involves a consideration of the program and financial policies, including the acceptance of a system of membership affiliation. Generally a new form of organization is required, to take responsibility for management; statutes (what we call by-laws) have to be worked out expressing and defining the purpose of the Center, responsibilities of the governing body, privileges of membership and relationship to the central body. In

short, the community is helped to organize for operation of the Center as a functioning organization.

It is then possible to expect that the capital grant will be more than a one time philanthropic gift, but will actually serve as a productive investment. The task does not even end with these preliminary organizational procedures. There is guidance in the selection of building sites, developing architectural plans, in examination of contractors' estimates, in purchase of equipment, in preparations for the inauguration of the program. Where the Center requires the employment of a director, assistance is given in the selection of a qualified person and in providing basic in-service training under competent supervision.

The concentration of effort in the past three years has been on the creation of physical facilities for Jewish Center work. In the past year, however, with the appointment on the JDC Headquarters staff of an American specialist of long experience in Jewish Center work, the emphasis is on program development, education of lay leadership and training of professional workers. In addition, the central local body in France has now a field secretary for Jewish Center work and summer camping and JDC has engaged an American Jewish Center worker to serve in a similar capacity in Germany. It is expected to fill a similar post in Greece on the staff of the local Central body, and it may well be that the same procedure will be followed in one or two other countries. The general aim is to centralize responsibility for direct supervision under the existing indigenous national bodies and for JDC to provide specialized assistance, working with the national bodies and their national professional staffs.

Thus far, of the 60 Community Centers and Youth Centers that have received support from the combined Claims Conference and JDC program, many are al-

ready functioning; others are under way and a few are still in the planning stage. In the course of the next few years, there will doubtless be some additional requests for help in creating Community Centers, but the major emphasis will be on program development, including the locating and training of lay leadership, leaders of group activities and full-time and part-time professional personnel. There is much local talent everywhere and as in our own country, Centers in Europe will serve to attract young people and provide them with experience in leadership, so essential to the continued progress of sound community organization.

Closely related to the work of the Centers is a corresponding interest in the establishment of summer camps. The motivation that inspires the intensive effort to provide camping opportunities needs to be understood to be fully appreciated. It stems from a strong feeling that the future of Jewish life rests with the growing generation of children born since the end of the war. Summer camping is not therefore regarded as the privilege of those children whose parents can afford to pay. It is recognized, more and more, as a right of childhood. This attitude is encouraged not only by Jewish communal organizations but by government policies as well. Most of the governments subsidize camping in some way, including camps under Jewish auspices. Counsellor training is conducted systematically by government agencies in some of the countries and counsellors are licensed or certified. This is especially true in France. In other countries, assistance is given in renting camp sites and in meeting costs of construction and equipment. Camps are subject to inspection and are required to conform to health standards.

A survey was made by JDC last year to determine the European-wide needs for summer camping, in line with its practice to aid in planning for the sys-

tematic establishment of needed communal services for the Jewish population. The study revealed that some 75 summer camps, accommodating about 10,000 children, were in operation, approximately one-half in France. The auspices vary. Some are sponsored by central community organizations, others by Jewish social service bodies, and a large number by ideological groups, including religious organizations and Zionist party groups. Central coordinated intake procedures are virtually unknown, except for children of families known to the relief organizations.

Apparently the camping movement is largely a post-war development. Only 14 camps out of the 75 were in existence prior to the war. Large numbers of children were hidden during the Nazi occupation and when the countries were liberated, had to be immediately placed in children's homes, which were also used as summer camps, until they could be reunited with families. Thus many of the facilities, about 75% of the total, consist of single, large buildings, a farm house, villa or chateau, in the country.

The type of country camp as we know it, consisting of groupings of bungalows and special units for recreation, arts and crafts and administration, does not as yet exist in Europe. That is one of the tasks that lies ahead. Another difficulty arises out of the fact that fully two-thirds of the camps utilize rented facilities and very often not the same house from summer to summer. This makes for instability and inadequacy of accommodation, since renovations and improvements cannot be made in rented properties. Nor do we find any beginnings as yet of day-camping. There is a shortage of camp counsellors and qualified directors in most countries. The fact is that because of the war, there is as yet no sizeable reservoir, even in France, of young adults from whom camp personnel can be recruited in sufficient numbers.

Leaders of youth groups were either casualties of the war and underground activities or if they survived, left in substantial numbers for Israel. It will be some time before the present generation of youngsters will provide a sufficiently mature group of counsellors. In the meantime, some training is being offered by government agencies and JDC embarked over a year ago on an intensive training program, particularly in Germany. Training manuals have been produced and widely distributed, and seminars for directors of camps have been conducted. Hopefully, also the Jewish Centers which have been established and others which will be soon functioning and which now employ full-time and part-time personnel, will be able to make available, as some are already doing, the basic corps of camp directors and speciality counsellors. It is of interest that fully 60% of the children attending camps also continue their contacts in Jewish Centers and youth organizations, frequently under the same leaders as serve in the summer camps.

There are some variations from the generic form of summer camping. For example, some of the facilities are winterized and are used during holiday periods and weekends. Winter camping is growing. Of special significance is the use of camps for formal Jewish instruction, especially in countries where Jewish children have no opportunity to attend Jewish schools during the year. Many live in small numbers in provincial towns, where their parents settled after liberation. They are too few in number for the formation of classes, but when they assemble during the summer in the country camp from the various towns, it is possible to form classes and to provide formal instruction several hours a day. Claims Conference funds have helped in the construction and equipment of some school camps and the experience has been so satisfactory that there is

every reason to assume that the movement will grow.

In general, the prospects for constructive development of summer camping are encouraging. The central community organizations are taking more responsibility for camping under community auspices; national supervisory personnel is being employed. Camp standards are being raised and there is a growing appreciation of the importance of recruiting, training of personnel and enrichment of program.

In the field of social casework, immediately after the end of the war, JDC concentrated on the technical training of social workers, through the Paul Baerwald School established in France. In the course of a few years, a cadre of trained personnel was supplied to the social agencies in key places and social services were organized. The task today is primarily that of refinement of methods and the evaluation of standards. The Baerwald School ceased its formal school activities, and became a Social Service Department in JDC, with a staff of consultants who concentrate their efforts over periods of time in local communities. They make intensive evaluations of the program and administration of the agencies; do on the job training of personnel and interpretation to the governing bodies leading to necessary changes in policy and practices. It is possible to pin point the weak spots in family welfare services in the European countries and to concentrate the effort in correcting and improving local services. The efforts of the mobile staff of experienced American caseworkers are supplemented by specialists on the country staffs of JDC. Case loads are under periodic study both by the Country Directors of AJDC and by Headquarters personnel, and support is given to the efforts to improve standards. The work of JDC in this field has already resulted

in reorganization of some agencies and the strengthening of others.

A major problem is looming up in a number of countries that is presently engaging the attention of JDC, namely that of underpinning the central community organizations, so that there may be sound social planning and adequate local financing looking to the longer range future. European Jewish communities have traditionally depended almost entirely on a Jewish community tax on individuals, supplemented by income from legacies. Voluntary fund raising, as a means of financing operating budgets, was rare before the war.

It is obvious that with the decimation of large numbers of the Jewish population and the loss of substantial taxpayers, even the reduced requirements of the community program can no longer be met by the limited traditional sources of income. A beginning was made some five years ago in France. With the help of JDC, a national federation was organized, the Fonds Social Juif Unifié, to raise funds from individual contributions and steady progress has been made. Last year, 6,000 individuals, in Paris and in the provinces, contributed \$600,000 to the central fund. Individual member agencies raised an additional \$300,000 and JDC supplied about \$1,000,000. An effective fund raising organization is now operating and gives good promise of sustained growth.

In other countries, the instituting of voluntary fund raising is yet to begin, on any substantial scale. However, there is a growing awareness of the need to build up fund raising capacity, to meet the new obligations undertaken by the communities where new institutions and community services have been established. A conference of leaders, both lay and professional, is being called next month, for a full review of the problem and to stimulate local effort in strength-

ening the central bodies and in undertaking supplementary fund raising. An American worker with experience in community organization and fund raising has just been appointed to the European staff of JDC, to assist local communities in this field.

The program that is envisaged recognizes that fundamental to systematic and adequate fund raising is sound community organization and social planning. In the past decade, there was little opportunity to think of long range needs. The immediate problems were too pressing and there have been and still are unexpected emergencies to be faced. But now that a degree of stability has been reached and some leadership has been developed, conditions are more encouraging for sound planning for the future. In any event, it is felt that a beginning needs to be made to insure orderly operation of the community program and adequate community support.

It is quite impossible to cover the entire range of Jewish activity in this

paper. Many important areas have not been touched upon—Jewish education, religious activities, cultural programs and activities on behalf of Israel, all of which reflect dynamic aspects of European Jewish life.

I have tried to indicate the developments in those areas of Jewish communal work that fall more nearly in the scope of our professional interests as Jewish social workers. I hope this paper has conveyed some idea of the planned effort to utilize American Jewish social work experience, adapted with sympathetic understanding and deep Jewish feeling, to the needs of European Jewry. I hope also that this brief account has made clear that there is a highly responsible agency at work in Europe, JDC, mindful of the need for distributing funds, but what is equally important, providing technical skill and enlightened professional leadership in the historic effort of our fellow Jews in Europe to obtain a secure and constructive future community life.