for the educator and the therapist who wish to help to reverse this pattern to include in their teaching modern scientific knowledge with regard to sexuality.

We consider the case of the sexually unsatisfied female who avoids further sexual relations because of her frustration and feelings of anger toward her husband. She reflects these emotions in dealing with her children and thereby creates an atmosphere of tension among all family members. These children in turn might carry over unnecessary problems into their own adulthood, creating potential conflict in their own marriage relationships.

Such dysfunction may be a factor in the rapidly accelerating trend toward divorce and family dissolution in a group which exemplified stable marriage and family integrity.

One important first step in the teaching of members of the helping professions, including clergy, is to establish a series of workshops dealing with questions of human sexuality. The purposes of these workshops are first, to estabish an openness in dealing with matters sexual and second, to develop a cadre of professionals who are sufficiently informed and sensitive to make appropriate referrals.

Within such settings, members of the group will discuss all aspects of human sexuality and their relationships to a well functioning family unit. Experience has indicated that in order to achieve a relaxed and trusting atmosphere, which is necessary for this type of learning to occur, a statement at the beginning that no personal questions will be asked is most effective. As the group develops, such personal questions do emerge and, of course, are dealt with appropriately.

In these discussions, it is also essential to establish at the start that the leader is aware of and sensitive to the cultural and religious concerns of the participants. This adds to the trusting climate so important to such learning situations as it is for therapeutic interventions.

Let us cite a few examples to illustrate our points.

We know that masturbation is an effective therapeutic modality; we know too that masturbation evokes strong feelings in most people. Therefore, we must proceed with caution in discussions, especially when we deal with those sexual dysfunctions where the prescription for "homework" include masturbatory activities. We have to be sensitive to the anxiety laden aspects of self-stimulation whether in private or in the presence of the partner. Mutual masturbation may also present problems. For the woman who has the dysfunction of vaginismus where sexual intercourse is difficult or impossible, gradual dilation does involve touching the vagina whether by the gynecologist, the husband or the woman herself.

Now we do know that for the man and woman steeped in much of the western religious traditions, such open looking and touching are proscribed.

Another example is that of a rather frequent male dysfunction—premature ejaculation. Dr. Helen Singer Kaplan reports that in her experience in treating Orthodox Jewish males for this dysfunction, she modifies her original suggested treatment plan which involved ejaculation outside the vagina. In her modification, ejaculation occurs inside the vagina after certain homework prescriptions—exercises, which do not include any ejaculation—have been successfully completed.

For the dysfunctions of erectile difficulties and retarded ejaculation where often prescriptions include permission and instruction in the use of fantasies, here too we must find certain accommodations for the observant Jew.

It is obvious that much more research is needed into the issues of sensitivity in sex education, sex counseling and sex therapy with the many different socio-ethnic and religious groups that make up our population in order to enhance our understanding and their sexual enjoyment.

The Integration of an Orthodox Unit into a Federation Sponsored Day Camp

Kayla Niles

Director, Camp Grossman

and

Judith Wolf

Caseworker, Jewish Family & Children's Service

Boston, Massachusetts

The Orthodox are not usually reached by the organized services of the Jewish community. They tend to be isolated and to use only orthodox institutions and agencies. Integrating these people in the community camp has been a step towards furthering the very important ideal of Klal Israel.

History of the Camp

The Jacob and Rose Grossman Camp was built in 1972. It was designed with very clear Jewish purposes as an instrument of informal Jewish education, and has become one of the foremost Jewish educational institutions for young children in the Boston community. The administrators of the camp have been open to a variety of Jewish programming, and they have staffed the camp with young people whose Jewish commitment is well established and whose Jewish educational background is sufficient to create a meaningful Jewish environment in the camp. The camp was built to accommodate 600 campers, and in 1972, there were fewer than 300 enrolled.

During the winter of 1973, the camp director was approached by the Bostoner Rebbe, (leader of Boston's largest Hasidic group), who was planning to run a camp program for the children of his congregation. The program was to be Orthodox and specifically Hasidic in character. Several hours each day of formal learning were to be the core of the program, plus some outdoor activity, including sports and swimming. It became clear that the program would involve mainly boys, and would serve primarily those children of the Rebbe's congregation whose parents would have seen the Grossman Camp to be insufficiently observant. The Associated Jewish Community Centers committee responsible for the Grossman camp decided to rent one of its unused shelter buildings to Rabbi Horowitz. There was to be no connection between Rabbi Horowitz's camp and Grossman. The program was instituted in July, 1973. The staff consisted of teachers and counselors. Some of the counselors were not Jewish. The Grossman Camp provided program space and lifeguards. The children's swimming hours were after the regular Grossman campers had gone home and did not include instruction. After two summers of operation, it was clear that it was not a viable program. The fees that were charged were inadequate to cover the costs of the program. The Grossman administration was dissatisfied with the quality of the program and the level of supervision.

Rabbi Horowitz introduced us to several members of the Orthodox community whose children had been in his program. These parents were most anxious to continue to provide summer activities for the Orthodox community. The main problems Rabbi Horowitz had faced were in recruiting and financing. Any program they sponsored had to appeal to the whole Orthodox community. In order to develop a broader base of support for the Orthodox camping program the parents formed a committee called Kehilla Day Camp. They saw themselves as a body which could integrate the different factions within the

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

Orthodox community for the purpose of providing a summer experience for their children. This development came rather late in the year, and recruitment did not begin until June of 1975. The committee hired and supervised the staff. They provided food, program materials and all of the supporting services needed to run the program. They registered thirty children, not enough to warrant a separate program.

Merger with Grossman

Between 1972 and 1975, registration at Grossman continued to increase. It was clear as we began planning for the summer of 1976, that Grossman could very well expand into the building that Kehilla had used. The AJCC also felt that they could not continue to extend the use of these facilities to a group which produced no income. A meeting was arranged in January, 1976, at which AJCC planned to inform the Kehilla committee that the arrangement could not continue. At that time, the Kehilla group suggested a merger with Camp Grossman. They were anxious to provide a quality camping experience for their children, and realized that they did not have the resources to do it on their own. A series of negotiating meetings followed, at which projected guidelines for working together were developed.

The Kehilla committee consisted of members of three Hasidic congregations, an ultra-Orthodox, non-Hasidic congregation, and a modern Orthodox, Young Israel congregation. In working with the Kehilla committee, it rapidly became clear that there were two tasks to be accomplished. First, the committee had to be developed and helped to work together, and second, they had to be fitted in the Jewish Community Center framework. A major focus of staff input at meetings where they worked out their philosophy and approach was to remind them that it was necessary to compromise and cooperate with each other in order to provide a program for all of their children. It was difficult for them, since, in matters of religious ritual, they were accustomed to seeking out the authority of their own Rabbi and accepting the theological correctness of his position. The spirit of compromise did not come easily to this group.

In this context, the group decided to select one rabbinic authority in the community who would have the final say on the acceptability of any particular plan, program, project or suggested pattern of behavior. The Rabbi of the Young Israel Synagogue in Brookline was chosen. Clearly, this choice influenced the outcome of many subsequent deliberations. As a result of the deliberations, members of the committee began to see that decisions had to take into account the particular children involved in the program, their families, and their various levels of observance. Some members of the committee would have preferred a less child-centered and more tradition-oriented program.

The Program Participants

The Orthodox community is largely located in the Brookline-Brighton area because both Orthodox day schools are now in that neighborhood. Many of the members of the Young Israel send their children to the Maimonides School. The members of the ultra-Orthodox congregation and the Hasidic group send their children to the New England Hebrew Academy, a Lubavitch Yeshiva.

In order to understand the influences on the children and the structure of the Kehilla unit, it is important to look at the influences of the schooling patterns on the campers.

The Maimonides school has 430 students in co-educational classes, nursery through twelfth grade. The individual classes consist of 16 children at most. The school offers religious and general, or secular, curricula. First and second graders attend school from 8 to 3 p.m. and third through sixth graders attend until almost four o'clock. One half of each day is devoted to general studies, with the other half devoted to religious studies, but the subjects are interspersed. The general studies curriculum is comparable to that in a public school, except that little time is devoted to music, art, or gym. The primary emphasis of the religious curriculum in the first grade is on the study of Hebrew language. The children are taught to read, write, and speak the language, and the classes are taught in Hebrew. The study of the *Chumash* is introduced in the second grade, and in the third grade, the children begin to study the commentaries of Rashi. In the fourth grade, they begin to study the prophets. In the fifth grade, they begin to study the judges, and in the sixth grade, *Mishna*. Religious laws are introduced in each grade at such time as they become relevant, for example, when holidays are approaching.

The NEHA is a yeshiva day school sponsored by the Lubavitcher Rebbe. The admissions policy of the school is determined by the Lubavitcher movement. Students are accepted without regard to their background or knowledge of Hebrew, so a child can be in one grade for religious studies and in a different grade for secular studies. One hundred and forty children attend classes from nursery school through the twelfth grade. The classes range in size from 17 to 8. The school offers a full English curriculum as well as a Hebrew curriculum with special emphasis on Hasidism and the teachings of the Lubavitcher Rebbe. There is little time alloted for art, music or physical education. The classes are co-educational through the sixth grade. Beginning in the seventh grade, the boys and girls attend classes in separate buildings. In the first through sixth grade, the children attend school from 9 to 4 and have their Hebrew classes in the morning and their English classes in the aftermoon. The Hebrew curriculum emphasizes the study of *Chumash,* which begins in first grade. In third grade, the children begin to study Rashi, and in the fifth, they begin learning *Talmud.* The children also study Hebrew language and literature, Jewish history, religious law, and the prophets. All classes are taught in English except for Hebrew language and literature.

The double program is demanding and the children are in school for an extended day. Although there is diversity among the student popoulation, this is certainly less prominent than in the public schools. Yet, families choose day schools for a myriad of reasons. Many of the students come from families who are committed to quality day school education. In some cases, both parents work, or the children may live in one-parent homes with that parent working. The extended day can be appealing because it provides child-care. Other families choose day schools as an alternative to local public schools. For many of the children, there is a conflict between values taught in the home and those taught in the school. The children deal with this conflict in a variety of ways. Some try to make their parents conform to the school's values, while others rebel against the values of the school. This on-going conflict results in some acting-out.

The Camp Program: Grossman

As an arm of the Jewish Community Center, Grossman is committed to a social work orientation and democratic values. All activities are child-centered and directed towards the goal of maximizing the development of the individual child over the course of the summer.

Campers democratically organize their own groups, individually choose activities and evaluate the relevance of the programs. All activities at the camp are available to both boys and girls. The Grossman philosophy is that Jewish activities conducted in a summer camp environment should be joyous, interesting, and relevant to the age and developmental needs of the children. Cultural arts, such as music, dance, crafts and drama are much utilized as vehicles for self-expression. Children come to experience Jewish culture as part of themselves and part of a life-long process of Jewish identification. Ideally, staff shall embody these ideas in their personal lives and serve as role models for the children. Kashruth is observed as a positive Jewish practice and negative prohibitions are deemphasized. The camp does not represent any particular ideological trend in Judaism. Israelis and Americans, Orthodox and non-Orthodox, Zionist and Diaspora-oriented

individuals serve on the staff. Campers have benefitted from exposure to the various approaches to Judaism which have been brought to their attention by the different types of staff members, although this also can produce some conflict.

The Camp Day: Grossman

The most significant difference between the Grossman experience and the Kehilla experience as perceived by the campers was in the structure of the day. The first activity of the day in Grossman differs for different children; one day, a group might begin the day at the waterfront, with swimming or boating, another day, with sports, and another day with crafts and music or dance.

Planning a week's program took place on Thursday of the preceding week. Time was left for unit-wide as well as individual bunk activity. The unit-wide activity might have consisted of mass program or division into small groups in which the children choose attendance individually, led by counselors in areas of their particular interest and expertise. Sometimes choices were offered within a particular activity area, for example, in sports. An entire unit would be given the chance to choose among, soccer, softball, track and field, etc., all of which were available at the same time. Thus, there was an opportunity for individual children to relate to various staff members around many different types of activities. In the Grossman program, each child had daily swimming instruction and frequent additional free swim time. Special activities such as family night suppers, overnights, cookouts and the like were scheduled, depending on the age and interest of the unit. Oneg Shabat preparation began on Monday and culminated in a special rehearsal time scheduled with specialists on Friday.

The Kehilla Day

In Kehilla, the day began with a formal prayer period followed by one hour learning session. The organized service could be a unifying and meaningful experience for children who came from a tradition in which the daily morning prayer was very important. It was conceived as a fine camp activity, given the framework within which the unit was operating. Surprisingly, there was some controversy among the parents about permitting the children to meet their obligation of morning prayer through a camp acitivity.

For the youngest campers, ages four to six, the period included songs or stories and collection of Tsedakah. There were fourteen children ages four to six in this (bunk) group and it was co-educational. For three older groups, girls, seven to eleven, and boys, seven to eight, and nine to eleven, services were followed by the study of *Chumash* and *Rashi* or *Mishna*. The campers spent the rest of the morning in recreational activities—swimming, sports, music, nature, arts and crafts. Then they returned to their unit for lunch, followed by grace after meals, afternoon prayers, *(mincha)* and another study session which was followed by recreational activities.

The Camp Program: Kehilla

The issues with which the committee and staff struggled revolved around defining the Jewish content in the Kehilla program. The parents of Kehilla had made an overriding commitment to the importance of study being part of the program. Some wanted more study and some were content with less. Problems in discipline and maintaining order during classes developed early in the season. It was unrealistic, in this type of setting, to require children to sit at tables, studying for more than a forty-five to fifty-minute period at a time. Many activities similar to those going on at Grossman, involving music, dance, crafts, special projects, special days and Oneg Shabbat preparation could easily be adapted to the specific Orthodox framework of Kehilla as informal education. This was a new concept to most of the parents and the staff and was difficult to implement. The camp setting, with its opportunity for the creative integration of Orthodox content and camp activity, was not being capitalized upon.

The ranges in age and levels of physical capabilities and Hebrew studies presented a challenge to counselors. The differences within groups made it difficult to structure group activities, either recreational or educational. The children were in a large open area and there were times during the day when they were confined to their bunk for a period of study. At other times, they were out playing. It was difficult for the children to shift moods. A conflict developed, focused around the afternoon study session. The afternoon learning sessions were loosely structured and staff was resistant to accepting responsibility for planning and teaching them. The staff felt angry and guilty. As the campers sensed the lack of structure and the counselors' resistance, it became increasingly difficult to involve the campers. Some of them became frustrated and some became aggressive. The need for structure and carefully planned transitions was explained to the staff, who in turn explained the problems to the parents. Midway through the summer, an additional staff person, an educational director, was brought in. He was a rabbi and a teacher at the Maimonides School. He knew many of the children and was able to take over the formal education program immediately. The schedule then had to be changed from one in which everyone had class at the same time to one in which different groups' formal study periods followed each other. It became somewhat more difficult to manage the unit for unit-wide programming, but the immediate improvement in the educational component was striking.

The relative lack of experience with music and art created anxiety among the campers and made it difficult for them to function well during those activities. The parents wanted the children to make only religious articles, but this was negotiated so that the children had the freedom to create whatever they wanted in art. However, the lack of familiarity with media and anxiety over the lack of structure made the sessions frustrating for campers and for staff, who felt ineffective. As for music, the parents decided that the children should sing only Hebrew or religious songs, a decision which took a long time to reach. The children sensed their confusion and had particular difficulty with music. In athletics, the importance of winning was paramount to the campers, and they abandoned rules. What they lacked in skill and coordination, they made up in aggressiveness. The campers had little patience for practice or skill development.

Staff in Kehilla

A camp counselor in the Kehilla unit needed skill in a number of areas; the ability to work with children in groups, the capacity to learn to function in a camp setting, and the ability to teach Hebrew and religious texts. Therefore, a day school or yeshiva education was required. It was also helpful to feel comfortable in one's own identity and to have resolved, or at least to be accepting of, the conflict inherent in the conjunction of their Orthodox Jewish identity with the wider Jewish and non-Jewish world.

The staff of the Kehilla unit had a multi-faceted role. Not only were they counselors, but they were also teachers. They were expected to serve as leaders and positive role models, as Orthodox counselors whose integration of behavioral example was an essential part of their job. Learning or *davening* with the children might be the defined task, but equally important was the staff member's attitude about, and comfort with the activity. The staff members were an interesting group of people. All the counselors could speak Hebrew. The unit head was a graduate of a traditional yeshiva and was attending a professional school. Three of the counselors were graduates of Maimonides and were attending college. A fourth counselor was a student at a teacher's seminary in New York. All the junior counselors had attended day schools. Several of them were experiencing major internal upheaval around identity issues related to their Jewishness. The unit staff had varied experiences with camping. In retrospect, it is clear that the most important qualities required of a counselor in this setting are the capacity to creatively integrate aspects of

Orthodox practice with camping, and flexibility and openness to new ideas. It would appear that staff must be somewhat older so that their identity issues would have been somewhat more resolved, allowing them to function more comfortably in this type of setting. A young Orthodox person is likely to have conflict about his or her religious observance in an environment where there are many young people involved in Jewish life in a non-Orthodox pattern. From the standpoint of parents who wish to minimize the possibility of conflict in their children, the Grossman setting is not ideal.

The Collaboration Between Agencies

In 1976, Kayla Niles, the director of Camp Grossman, approached Jewish Family and Children's Service, and requested that caseworkers provide consultation to Camp Grossman. Three staff members participated in the consultation program. One caseworker served as consultant to the youngest unit, another served as consultant to the latency age unit, and one of the authors was the consultant to the pre-adolescent unit and the Kehilla unit. The caseworker's role was primarily to work with staff to help them handle problems arising with campers.

The consultants had the clinical expertise to diagnose problems and refer children to treatment facilities, and to work with parents to help them accept referrals. Familiarity with the Jewish community and with the philosophy of the camp was essential to the consultation. Prior to working with the Orthodox community, it is important to examine and work through one's feelings about one's own religious beliefs, seeing how they are similar to and different from the beliefs of the client population. The junior author was asked to work with the Kehilla unit because of her previous work with the Orthodox community, primarily with the Lubavitch yeshiva (consultation, treatment and referral).

Gerald Caplan's framework for consultation is clarifying of the multi-faceted relationship with the Kehilla. Consultation is the "process of interaction between 2 professional persons—the consultant, who is a specialist, and the consultee who invokes the consultant's help in regard to a current work problem with which he is having some difficulty—which he has decided is within the other's area of specialized competence."[1] The problem involves the management or treatment of one or more clients of the consultee or the planning or implementation of a program to serve such clients. The consultant accepts no direct responsibility for implementing remedial action, and professional responsibility for the client remains with the consultee. Dr. Caplan describes four types of consultation. The first type is client-centered case consultation in which the client's (camper's) problem is defined and recommendations are made as to how the consultee should deal with the case. The second type is consultee-centered case consultation. In this type the consultee's work problem relates to the management of a particular client and it is necessary to try to understand the nature of the consultee's difficulties with the case. For example, the consultee's difficulties might include a lack of knowledge about the problems, a lack of skill in using the knowledge, a lack of self-confidence, or a lack of objectivity. The third type is program-centered administrative consultation which focuses on problems of programming and organization instead of a dealing with a particular client. The concern of the consultant is the elucidation and remedying of difficulties and shortcomings among consultees that interfere with their grappling with the tasks of program development and organization.[2]

An example of client-centered consultation would be a counselor's request for help in handling an aggressive child. The consultative response could encompass all of Caplan's modes of consultation—depending on the situation. For example, one child who was aggressive was from a single-parent, non-religious family. He had behavior problems in school and was aggressive at camp. He consistently tested the limits and frustrated the counselor. The counselor, advised to speak exploratively with the child, learned that the child was upset about his home situation. The counselor then spoke to the child's mother and learned that the child's parents were recently divorced, the mother was studying for the bar exam, and a move was imminent. The counselor spoke to the child and acknowledged his anxiety. In consultation with the counselor, we decided that consistent limits should be set and that expectations should be clarified. Together, they worked out a plan so that both knew what behavior was acceptable at camp. The camper was encouraged to talk with the counselor about his frustrations and was then able to handle them in more adaptive ways. His mother was helped to see how upset the camper was about the many changes in his life. The family was also helped to see how mother and son needed to be supportive to one another. A referral for treatment was contemplated, but since the family planned to move at the end of the summer, a recommendation was made that the family consider treatment following the move.

In another situation, a counselor cited aggressive behavior as a problem and a different approach was taken. The problem was in the youngest bunk, which was composed of boys and girls aged four to six. The six-year-old boys were stronger and more aggressive than the other children, and were easily frustrated with the groups' activities. Their interest in sports was far greater than that of the younger children. Upon exploration, it became clear that Caplan's second type of consultation, consultee-centered case consultation, was more appropriate. The counselor was helped to recognize the capabilities, needs and interests of the six-year-olds and modify and improve the camp program. The needs of these children were met by changing expectations of them and by giving them time to engage in more vigorous activity with a counselor or with older boys.

In another situation, Caplan's third type of consultation, consultee-centered administrative consultation, which focuses on problems of programming and organization, was appropriate. The consultant and the camp director discussed the committee and their planning meetings. Committee members would come late and expect issues that had been resolved to be reopened. The meetings would last for hours. When the consultant asked why the meetings were disorganized, the response was that it was a reflection of the parents' life style, i.e., not to be conscious of time and to study until late into the night. The consultant and the camp director tried to separate what some might consider to be the influence of Orthodoxy from what was a lack of structure and also questioned how control might be asserted and by whom. Subsequently, meeting times were set and ending times were announced at the beginning of the meeting. Minutes were recorded and late-comers could review them. After the camp director announced the format, committee members were relieved that a structure had been agreed upon for the meetings, and that a way to handle late-comers had been established.

Relationships

Relationships between Grossman and Kehilla were varied, running the gamut from friendly cooperation to ignorance of each other's goals, philosophy and program. Having had several years of experience accommodating Orthodox groups within the camp who were not actually part of the camp, some of the Grossman returning staff had difficulty accepting the children in the Kehilla program as equal members of the camp community. These staff people expressed reluctance to allow equal time to Kehilla in specialty areas and seemed to resent both the space and usage of staff time that Kehilla required. Staff asked whether Kehilla children were to have regular waterfront staff for swimming instruction. Questions were raised as to whether the arts and crafts staff needed to concern themselves about the activities which the Kehilla children were doing with their own arts and crafts specialists. Some of the Grossman staff,

[1] Gerald Caplan, *The Theory and Practice of Mental Health Consultation*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970, p. 19.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 32-34.

even at the end of the summer, in spite of many attempts to explain why the Kehilla program was different, were still reluctant to accept the legitimacy of their place in camp. On the other hand, several of the Kehilla staff seemed to find it very difficult to accept the Jewishness of the Grossman program. They exhibited lack of understanding of non-Orthodox Jewish practices. Kehilla staff could learn a great deal from Grossman Jewish camp programming. It was hard to get them out of their own building to come and look. These attitudes, on both sides, created friction. The camp director played the role of arbitrator and facilitator when misunderstandings arose.

In several ways, Grossman accommodated itself to the needs of Kehilla. For example, Grossman kept a strictly kosher kitchen. With a view towards simplifying the process of buying food for Kehilla, new suppliers were sought and some different types of foods which would meet Kehilla requirements for stricter supervision, were supplied to the entire camp. A swimming schedule was created which to some extent segregated our own male and female campers in order to provide adequate separate-sex waterfront time to Kehilla. Later on in the summer, Rabbi Kelemer stated that he found it acceptable for Kehilla boys or girls to be at the waterfront when mixed groups of Grossman's very young campers were swimming. We were then able to reinstate the usual Grossman practice of having entire units at the waterfront at one time. An interesting problem was raised by some of the female staff in Kehilla who observed the Orthodox practice of modesty and would not go to the waterfront in bathing suits in the presence of male lifeguards. In the spirit of compromise which characterized this summer's experience, female staff who felt unable to wear bathing suits to the waterfront devised ways of swimming with reasonable cover over the bathing suits. One such counselor, who represented the right wing in Kehilla, wore a dress over her bathing suit each day, and was quite happy to do so.

One of the most difficult problems in trying to effect the merger of Kehilla with Grossman was to define the director's role vis-a-vis the Kehilla committee. Prior to becoming part of Grossman, the committee had total responsibility for all aspects of the program. They had not shared that responsibility with the staff they had hired, and initially were not sure whether they were willing to share it with the Grossman director. A major concern was the pattern of committee meetings, as was previously discussed. There was an undercurrent of sexism among the men. One could say that, as a rule, they were reasonably tolerant and willing to listen to other people's wives, but in cases in which both a husband and wife were on the committee, the husbands tended to have difficulty allowing their own wives to participate as equal members. There was some joking in response to these attitudes, but as a rule it was not questioned that they were legitimate attitudes, and it seemed acceptable that they be expressed openly. A major coup took place when a woman was permitted, this year, to serve on the program committee which is a sub-committee of a larger group which functions almost as an executive group. Representation on the committee has been broadened to include every possible faction within the Orthodox community. When parents in the community ask whether the program is truly representative of their particular point of view, they are referred to members of the committee with whom they can speak, to verify that their religious perspectives will be respected within the program.

Goals, Purposes

The Orthodox community represents a significant percentage of the Jewish population in the area served by the largest Center of the Associated Jewish Community Centers in Boston. By accommodating to their needs in the camp, an important bridge was built to connect them to the organized Jewish community. Orthodox enrollment in the Center nursery school this year has increased and should continue to do so, since Orthodox families are moving into the Brookline area in

increasing numbers. The Orthodox community is not usually reached by the services of the organized Jewish community. They tend to be isolated and to use only Orthodox institutions and agencies. Integrating these people into the community camp has been a step towards furthering the very important deal of *Klal Yisrael*. For many of the children in the Kehilla program, it was the first exposure to the larger Jewish community. Riding the bus back and forth from camp every day with other Jewish children and seeing that non-Orthodox Jews could be positively involved with Jewish activities was good for the Kehilla campers. Grossman campers profited greatly from the daily exposure to the intense Jewish identification of Kehilla campers and staff.

In reviewing the experience of the first year, we note that an organizational structure has been established within the Jewish community in which the Kehilla program can function. After three years of attempting to organize an Orthodox camping program for Orthodox children, the Orthodox community has achieved its goal. When the camp brochure was published for 1977, the Kehilla program was an integral part of the offerings of the Associated Jewish Community Centers. We look forward to the continuance of the program and the possibility that progress can be made towards improving the quality. From the campers' point of view, in spite of many problems, the program was a great success. Registration for the following year increased sizably. The integration into the Grossman administrative structure allowed for maximal use of camp facilities and a much higher quality of programming. Grossman provided a happy and challenging environment for the children, and they benefited greatly from being part of the overall camp. The first year's experience proved that with maximum understanding and mutual cooperation, an Orthodox program could be integrated into a community framework without compromising standards of observance or professionalism. For the future, we look for significant improvement in the areas of staffing and professional practice. Our aim is that the Kehilla program be absolutely comparable to Grossman's in quality of staff and programming. There will continue to be differences in the feeling tone of the experiences, due to the different philosophies, and in programming, due to the varied ages of the children in the unit. The second challenge for the future is to bring the Kehilla committee into the fold of the Center. By setting higher standards of professional practice in our relationships with this group, we are laying the groundwork for their increased participation in the total community structure. Hopefully, as they mature as a group, they will want to participate in the overall workings at the parent agency.

The authors feel that it is fair to say that the type of collaboration between Orthodox Jews and the organized Jewish community described in this paper would be much more difficult if the representatives of the general community did not have a sensitivity to and an awareness of Orthodox concerns. In order to open our agencies to Orthodox participation, we will all have to become more conscious of our own Jewishness and we will all have to learn more about traditional Jewish life. The Orthodox group, on the other hand, will need to relate to the principles of compromise and to equality of the sexes, and some of the other values of professional social work.

The *shiddach* will enable high quality service to reach an often neglected part of our Jewish community.