

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9218268

**Political activities of social work membership organizations: An
historical study of the New York City Chapter of the National
Association of Social Workers**

Schachter, Robert S., D.S.W.

City University of New York, 1992

Copyright ©1992 by Schachter, Robert S. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF SOCIAL WORK
MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATIONS: AN HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE
NEW YORK CITY CHAPTER OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

by

ROBERT S. SCHACHTER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Social Welfare in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Social Welfare, The City
University of New York.

1992

(c) 1992

ROBERT S. SCHACHTER

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare.

12/18/91
Date

Michael J. Smith
Chair of Examining Committee

12/18/91
Date

Samuel S. Shuman
Executive Officer

Dr. Michael Smith

Dr. Miriam Abramovitz

Dr. Rose Starr

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

Political Activities of Social Work
Membership Organizations: An Historical Study of the
New York City Chapter of the
National Association of Social Workers

by

Robert S. Schachter

Advisor: Professor Michael Smith

An historical study was conducted of the political activities of the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) for a 15 year period beginning at the organization's inception in 1955. Building upon the work of interest group theorists who have examined the internal functioning of membership organizations, the author starts from the assumption that social workers need to understand how they can collaborate with one another to be more effective in the political arena. The study's objectives included developing a history of the external political activities of the NASW chapter directed toward influencing policy makers in government. The second objective sought to understand the role of active members and Chapter leaders who participated in the internal development of the organization's

political activities.

The study showed the interdependence of the internal and external activities through the development of three case histories focusing on the chapter's priorities addressing public policy: obtaining New York State certification for social workers; pursuing federal civil rights legislation; and developing public welfare policy. Revealed in these efforts was that influencing government decisions often depends on how leaders and active members come together to jointly develop their political agenda and strategy, and then develop the requisite activities that are brought to bear in the policy arena.

A fourth case history addressed another objective of learning what NASW leaders have done to manage conflict within the organization and showed that leaders can choose to ignore dissent or engage in bargaining and compromise. It showed that choices have significant implications for member involvement and achieving organizational goals. Finally, a set of empirically based concepts were drawn from the case histories that could be useful to social workers who are interested in addressing public policy through social work membership organizations such as NASW.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several people deserve thanks for their participation in the preparation and writing of this dissertation. The members of my committee, Mike Smith, Mimi Abramovitz and Rose Starr provided much needed criticism and insight throughout the stages of the dissertation. Dr. Smith provided the initial guidance for undertaking a qualitative study and helped maintain perspective for the undertaking. Dr. Abramovitz was instrumental in helping me develop a conceptual frame of reference for policy analysis. And Dr. Starr's belief that this dissertation is important was a fundamental reason for choosing the subject. My warmest regards to Ruth Brooks and Dr. Bertram Weinert for their early insights into the rich history of the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. Of course, the study would not have been possible without the support of the leaders of NASW, including Chapter Executive Director, Dr. A. Lenora Taitt-Magubane, who assigned primary importance to my receiving a doctoral education and Chapter President, Nita Henick, who obtained permission from the Chapter leadership to conduct the study. Finally, my wife Lynne enabled me to maintain the commitment to the dissertation while she nurtured and raised our son, Benjamin, who will always remain four weeks older than the doctoral class that began in 1987.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
Objectives of the Study	4
Literature Review	5
Social Workers in Politics	8
A Partial Framework for Social Workers Addressing the Governmental Arena	9
Interest Group Theories in Political Science	18
The Internal Dynamics of Membership Organizations	22
 CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH DESIGN	 34
Methodology	39
 CHAPTER 3: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH FINDINGS	 51
 CHAPTER 4: THE PURSUIT OF LEGAL REGULATION OF SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE	 60
Part I: Introduction and History of Legal Regulation Before NASW	60
Part II: Legal Regulation at the Formation of NASW in 1955	63
Part III: The Main Work on Legal Regulation; 1957 through 1964	71
Part IV: The NASW National Delegate Assembly and Lobbying For A Revised Bill; 1964 to 1965.	84
 Chapter 5: The Pursuit of Civil Rights in the New York City Chapter	 95
Part I: Civil Rights in the Early Years of NASW; 1955 to 1963	95
Part II: Making Civil Rights a Chapter Priority; 1963	97
Part III: The Civil Rights Act and After; 1964 to 1966	104
 CHAPTER 6: PUBLIC WELFARE AS AN ISSUE IN THE NEW YORK CITY CHAPTER	 123
Part I: Addressing the City's Department of Welfare; 1958 to 1960	124
Part II: Addressing Public Welfare at the State Level; 1960 to 1963	133

	viii
Part III: NASW and Mobilization for Youth; 1964 to 1965	148
CHAPTER 7: DISSENT IN THE CHAPTER	162
Part I: Evidence of Dissent	162
Part II: The Emergence of a Rival Group within the Chapter	165
Part III: Views About the Change Effort	177
Chapter 8: DISCUSSION	184
Part I. Analysis of the Data	185
Part II. The Literature on Social Workers in Politics	214
Part III: The New York City Chapter Today: A Comparison to the Findings in the Study	231
Part IV. Conclusion	239
Bibliography	243

LIST OF TABLES**TABLE ONE**

Organizations that Merged to Form NASW in 1955	52
--	----

TABLE TWO

Membership in the New York City Chapter for the study period, 1955 to 1970 and comparison with 1990	53
---	----

TABLE 3

Concepts Derived From The Study	214
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This dissertation addresses the prevalent expectation within the social work profession that social work interventions are needed to shape public policy and programs. Not only do these politics have extensive influence over the programs that affect social work clients, but government actions also shape the very nature of social work services, as well. While individual practitioners are politically active, and more need to get involved, collective activities on behalf of the profession are critical to pool the potential resources required to exert political influence. In this regard the activities of national professional organizations such as the National Association of Social Workers and their local divisions provide examples of how social workers have organized themselves to address common professional concerns including the initiation of policies and programs by government.

Despite examples of collective social work action, it is a common concern among social workers already active in politics and those who have written on the subject that more activity is needed to effect policy. On the one hand, many issues arise that don't seem to get addressed by social workers. At the same time, issues that are targeted for intervention are not easily influenced without sustained activity. It is also the case that not all social workers agree that the targeted areas eliciting sustained activity

are the most important or deserve the organization's limited resources. The resulting dissatisfaction can threaten the unity of an organization. Just as unity is needed for an organization to be effective, its demise can threaten the existence of the collective body.

This research examines the collective action by social workers in their own professional organization. In general, it addresses the relationship between the political strategies adopted by large social work organizations and the internal dynamics of an organization's membership. More specifically it asks how issues chosen to be addressed by professional organizations are affected by conflicting interests within the organization among its leaders and its active members. How do members respond when the organization chooses issues that they believe are not important enough to use limited organizational resources? How do organizational leaders manage member discontent or to seek consensus?

These questions will be explored by examining the records of the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. The Chapter, formed in 1955, has never been smaller than 1,900 members and in 1991, 36 years later, has approximately 8,800 members.

As the Director of Public Affairs from 1982 through 1990, and subsequently as the Executive Director, I have had the opportunity to work extensively with the members of the organization as they addressed various policy issues. These issues included obtaining a social work insurance vendorship

law in the state, advocating for increased benefits for families in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, maintaining standards for hospital social work departments, and improving the utilization of social workers in public schools. But these issues did not cover all that might have been considered essential for the profession, raising questions about why and how issues were selected. Similarly, the question of whether the Chapter utilized truly effective strategies has been a longstanding concern.

While organizational issues relating to involvement in the political arena need to be better understood, so does the complex impact of member interests on the overall process. For example, when a request was made to hire a lobbyist to work on obtaining the vendorship law to make social workers eligible providers in group health insurance policies, some Board members feared the choice would express organizational preference for vendorship over other issues of concern to members. The Board did not want to create the impression that the issue relating to the private practice of psychotherapy was more important to social work than numerous other issues such as the adequacy of public assistance grants. If that reluctance had prevailed, the vendorship law would not exist today.

At another time when Chapter resources were targeted to improving services in public schools, some Board members expressed concern about neglecting more traditional services to families and children. Such dissatisfaction limited the

public school strategy.

This dissertation examines how the Chapter has dealt with political issues outside of the organization and the internal dynamics within the organization that facilitate or impede addressing those issues. A longitudinal/historical approach was chosen in order to make a range of circumstances available for study. While looking at one moment in the present might provide an opportunity to study indepth how Chapter leaders address these issues, it would not allow an examination of numerous instances that an historical approach allows. By looking over 15 years, it was possible to determine a broader range of ways in which Chapter leaders have handled such issues. In addition, it was anticipated that undertaking a study in the present might be resisted by some members. An historical approach provided the needed distance.

Objectives of the Study

While many articles and a few books have been published on the general subject of social workers participating in the political arena, this study adds an empirical dimension to the discussion. While some social workers are involved in the political arena, many are members of professional associations. This study examined how such organizations are vehicles for social workers' political involvement, including variables that might facilitate or impede political

effectiveness.

The objectives of this study are:

1. to develop a history of the political activities of the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers that are external to the organization and directed toward influencing policy makers in government.
2. to understand the role of active members and Chapter leaders who participated in the internal development of the organization's political activities.
3. to learn what NASW leaders have done to manage conflict within the organization regarding the choice of political activities.
4. to develop a set of concepts than can help in the understanding of collective action by social work membership organizations.
5. to determine some of the underlying themes behind the particular issues chosen by the social work profession for political action.

Literature Review

The political arena has long been important to the social work profession. At least since the Great Depression

of the 1930s, government has played a predominant role in the development of social programs, and many of its decisions have the potential to influence the lives of millions of people. Social work practice, as well, has become integrally tied to government financing and rule making, and it is connected in fundamental ways to the decisions of policy makers in the public domain.

In New York City, for example, funding of human service agencies from the United Way (excluding hospitals) amounted to approximately \$30 million in 1986. In contrast, New York City government funding amounted to somewhat over \$1 billion in the same year.* The types of programs, who is served, and expectations for practice are to a great extent tied to the receipt of these funds.

Since the decisions of government are by their nature political, involving elected officials, competing interests and limited resources, it follows that the development of social welfare policies and programs will be political. There is little question, therefore, that the social work profession has cause to concern itself with politics. It is not surprising then that numerous articles and a few books have appeared on the subject of social workers in politics. This literature has a few themes in common: (1) that the profession, having its roots in the Progressive era early in the century, was more political at the time of its inception

* Litow, S. and Wilner, R. Public Contracts for Human Services, Interface, New York City, May, 1986.

than anytime since; (2) that political activity involves knowledge and interpersonal relationships that are akin to the social work practitioner's everyday experience in practice; (3) that politics is an area in which social workers should be engaged; and (4) that the profession has not involved itself to the extent feasible or necessary to seriously influence government decision making.

For the purpose of this study, the literature on social workers in politics is helpful in understanding the range of activities that are available to social workers for engaging in the policy making process. Nevertheless, the emphasis tends to be upon the activities of the individual over the collective activities of groups. By also examining the literature on the political activities of membership organizations, which has primarily emerged in the political science field, it becomes possible to construct a framework for examining the political activities of social workers in their professional associations. In the review that follows, literature from both social work and political science will be drawn together. In addition, since the unique concerns of social work as a profession are very likely to be relevant to its choice of political activities, literature on the sociology of the professions will be turned to in order to elucidate what role being a profession might have on such activities.

Social Workers in Politics

Several authors have defined political activity by social workers as within the sphere of social action and have identified it as an area of professional responsibility. They urge social workers to utilize the methods of social action to bring about social change (Fitch, 1939; Hill, 1951; MacRae, 1966; Pray, 1948; and Thurz, 1966 and 1971).

Others have been more analytical in connecting social action to social science concepts. For example, Khinduka and Coughlin (1975) relate social action to the concept of social change. They differentiate between small group change and radical social change but focus upon change at an intermediate level. It is here, they argue, that social workers should target their social action strategies. Within this context, the authors contend that social workers should establish legitimacy with their constituents in the attempt to achieve change, basing their concern on redistributing power from the "haves" to the "have-nots" in a given community. Others, such as Rothman (1970), place social action, and by implication political action, squarely within one of the recognized social work methods, community organization.

One of the most frequent discussions on social workers in politics has suggested that social workers in practice settings connect the daily experience of delivering clinical or concrete services to the political arena. According to

Specht (1968), information or data from direct practice is one of the most critical elements in developing policy. The casework practitioner possesses this resource as a result of the immediate contact with clients. He exhorts social workers to develop the techniques in order to bring their first hand knowledge into the political arena.

In order to accomplish this, social workers have to understand lobbying and the legislative process (Cohen, 1966; Haynes and Mickelson, 1986; Kleinkauf, 1989; Mahaffey, 1972; Patti and Dear, 1975; and Sharwell, 1982); to know how to work effectively in coalitions (Keith-Lucas, 1975 and Roberts-DeGennaro, 1986); and to address the administrative agencies in government that implement policy decisions (Albert, 1983, Bell & Bell, 1982). A related concern is the need to reconcile the values of social work professionalism with the requirements of political activity and to address whether such activity advances social work values or undermines them (Levy, 1970; Haynes and Mickelson, 1986).

A Partial Framework for Social Workers Addressing the Governmental Arena

Drawing out a number of the concepts developed in the social work literature is helpful in examining the activities of social workers, whether as individuals approaching the governmental arena or as members of a group. These concepts involve the role of the caseworker as well as the lobbyist,

the stages of policy making, gaining access to decision makers, as well as the nature of the legislative process and how it compares to implementation in the administrative sphere of government. Following this discussion, another important element in addressing governmental policy making will be drawn in. This element involves how collective action is brought about in membership organizations and creates a more complete framework for social workers in politics.

Specht (1968) argues that to influence social policy, the caseworker must understand the overall process and one's relation to it. He identifies eight stages in this process and the tasks called for in each stage.

The caseworker plays an especially salient role in the first and last stages, identification of the problem and evaluation of a policy. Both phases involve the tasks of case finding, recording the problem, the discovery of gaps in services and gathering data. In a real sense, these stages are the same in a circular process that persists over the life of a social policy.

The other stages in social policy development include policy analysis, informing the public, developing policy goals, building public support, pressing for legislation, and implementing the policy. While the practitioner might get involved during any of these stages, it is more likely, according to Specht (1968), that this would happen during the implementation phase than during the others. During these

other phases the roles of the community organizer, planner, researcher, public relations specialist, administrator, legislative analyst, and lawyer are likely to predominate.

Additional insights into the formulation of policy can be gained from discussion of legislative advocacy. In an article on this subject by Patti and Dear (1975), nine ideas are presented as basic for social workers to understand when entering the legislative arena.

First, the possibility of influencing the legislative process is quite limited. Contingencies can seldom be controlled, no less anticipated. This suggests that success needs to be judged in terms of how close goals can be achieved, not in absolute achievement. Second, compromise is often necessary at every stage of the process. This results from the inevitability of conflicting points of view. Patti and Dear warn against the danger of losing the substance of a proposal as compromise is achieved.

The third point is the notion that developing legislation is a cumulative process. The time for legislation to be developed usually extends beyond any one legislative session, and one would be wise to set limited subgoals such as promoting familiarity with a proposal before it is enacted into law.

The fourth and fifth points both relate to the utilization of information. The legislative process requires the ability to assemble, analyze and articulate relevant information, but the process is more than a rational one.

Rationality is only one component among a host of contingencies. In addition, the presentation of information must be timely, balanced in terms of its point of view, responsive to the needs of legislators, and realistic as to the possibility of being implemented.

The remaining points concern gaining access to the decision makers and being influential. Choosing which legislator to work with goes beyond whether the official agrees with one's own position. Factors such as the legislator's expertise, committee membership, electoral vulnerability in the legislator's home district, and credibility can all be considered in looking for a legislator to take the lead in promoting one's cause. In addition, it can make a difference if the advocate is from the legislator's home district, as well. A local constituent is given an amount of preferential treatment.

Working with a legislator is not the only avenue in working in the legislative arena. Patti and Dear make the point that legislative staff play important roles in filtering information to legislators as well as initiating ideas, planning hearings, drafting legislation and reports, and negotiating differences among competing proposals. Such staff are often more accessible than legislators. Administrative staff are also viewed as important in addressing legislation because they often have expertise and information resources that are valued by legislators. Finally, Patti and Dear warn that the use of "heavy handed

tactics" with legislators can be counterproductive. They suggest considering elected officials' sensitivity to maintaining their public images, and the wisdom of exercising influence privately and subtly.

Mahaffey's (1977) discussion on lobbying compliments that of Patti and Dear as it focuses on the sophisticated requirements of being a paid lobbyist. She draws out the relationship between the special role of the lobbyist and the social work organization that would employ such a person. While the specialized nature of the professional social work lobbyist is stressed, the discussion has clear applicability for any social worker who is interested in lobbying.

Like Patti and Dear, Mahaffey points out the need for compromise but acknowledges more clearly the element of conflict and struggle and the possibility of confrontation with an existing oppositional group. The implication is that social workers need to be willing to fight for what they are attempting to achieve. She also goes beyond Patti and Dear in addressing influence, describing power along a range of activities from simple persuasion and bargaining to manipulation and ultimately, coercion.

In addition to highlighting some of the major tasks of the lobbyist, Mahaffey points out a number of concrete activities that need to be engaged in. These include such things as paying attention to who is likely to support legislation including the positions of the relevant administrative departments and who votes in a particular way

in legislative committee.

In addition, she discusses the role of the lobbyist with the employing agency. This can range from training and organizing members, planning, coordinating delegations to meet with decision makers, and assuring that members and selected experts appear at hearings. Tactics are explicated such as carefully timed phone campaigns, letter writing campaigns, the provision of testimony, as well as the protocol for sending thank you letters after obtaining sought after support and action.

Special pointers include the value of developing information through brief, one page summaries. Common mistakes are also considered, such as the presentation of moralistic arguments and the provision of information not backed up by research or documentation. The value of presenting testimony at hearings, their purpose, and the presentation of a strategy corresponding to the legislative calendar are also presented.

While much activity needs to be focused upon the legislative arena, it does not constitute the whole of policy making. Other areas of political activity supplement what is involved here. One involves activities within the administrative arena of government which addresses, in particular, the implementation of legislation.

Haynes and Mickelson (1986) discuss the need to monitor the bureaucracies that are responsible for how legislation is translated into social programs. They list four areas

needing attention: 1) the promulgation of rules following legislative enactment; 2) implementation and adherence to the rules by agencies; 3) executive orders and administrative changes; and 4) the budget allocation process.

They make the point that monitoring is different from lobbying the legislature with the former requiring that the social worker keep a "watchful eye" on government to ascertain whether legislative intent is carried out.

Promulgating rules are described as the development of policy statements that transform the "legislative ideal" into program design and delivery stages in which there is much latitude for interpretation. Opportunities for public input usually exist, and this opportunity is what social workers need to be aware of. Once the rules are finalized and adopted, they subsequently need to be monitored as they are implemented by the responsible agencies.

Haynes and Mickelson give several reasons why agencies might deviate both from legislative intent as well as from the promulgated rules. These include resistance among vested interests in a bureaucracy, flexibility in interpreting the language of rules and legislation, as well as covert purposes for the passage of a law that differs with its public justification.

Their discussion on the relationship between budget allocations and legislation is important for bringing out the central role of funding to the quality of program implementation. Once this role is acknowledged, social

workers are drawn into the overall political issues of revenues and expenses as well as for specific program areas, including the amount of discretion that is exercised in budget proposals. Finally, changes made in programs or executive orders are cited as additional ways in which policies can be altered. Mechanisms include the determination of which agencies or departments will administer a program, withholding funding, allocating staff or putting a freeze on hiring, changing eligibility requirements, or how outreach is conducted.

In an earlier article on "Social Work Advocacy in the Regulatory Process", Albert (1983) discusses techniques for intervention within the regulatory or administrative arena. He warns social workers that in analyzing regulations, what is being proposed may be difficult to discern by reading it and suggests numerous questions to ask to gain insights. He goes on to highlight what social workers need to know in dealing with the administering agency, including being familiar with the agency's structure, its decision hierarchy, its jurisdiction, existing policy statements, and staffing. In addition, sophistication in monitoring and intervening comes out of developing acquaintances with staff and knowing where there are sources for support and opposition.

When taken in combination, addressing both the legislative and administrative spheres of government reflects much, if not all, of the activities pertinent to policy making. Most of this material, however, uses as its point

of focus the individual social worker. There is less recognition and discussion of the role of collective action of social workers working with others, such as those who receive or require services, working in coalitions, or of social workers working with other social workers, perhaps through professional associations such as the National Association of Social Workers.

For example, Wade (1966) discusses how the Illinois Chapter of NASW participated in an effort to change the public assistance law. Teitelbaum (1964) describes how the Maryland chapter advocated for the adoption of criteria for the appointment of a commissioner of social services to reflect social work education and experience, and Van Gheluwe and Barber (1986) reviews how a coalition that included the Mississippi chapter lobbied for Medicaid reform. In addition to these case examples, Wade (1962) proposed a model for members of NASW to use to engage in political action and articles have appeared (Dempsey, 1982, Abrams and Goldstein, 1928, and Haynes and Mickelson, 1986) about the creation of NASW's legislative network and political action committees.

These articles add to the understanding of addressing politics because they illustrate that social workers do not necessarily work alone and their interest in influencing policy making can be enhanced through collective action. These articles, however, do not touch upon how groups actually come together in order to focus their attention on politics. These articles leave unclear how social workers

form groups or how they operate. Such a focus for inquiry, which is important to this study, has been of interest in political science for the past 25 years.

Interest Group Theories in Political Science

For a good part of this century political scientists have argued that collective action rather than individual action is the more relevant level of political activity; that the activity of the group and not the individual is what matters in politics. When a group forms there is presumed to be a shared interest that brings people together.

The conception of group behavior in politics was advanced by Bentley (1908) and developed by Truman (1951) who turned the notion of interest group behavior from a pejorative reference, often used by the media to describe the undesirable influence of lobbyists, into a scientific, value neutral concept needing systematic description and analysis. This conception of interest groups has even found its way into social work literature. Smith (1979) outlined some of the ways interest groups influence legislators, and Barbaro (1980) has advocated that social workers form into interest groups or align with existing ones, including trade unions, in order to increase their influence. Barbaro (1978) also studied 19 social welfare organizations in New York City to determine under what circumstances they were likely to

advocate for particular issues.

The notion of interest groups stems from pluralist political theory. This theory assumes, as noted by Truman (1951), that interests groups form when governmental decisions affect individuals who have a common stake in the outcome of those decisions. To protect their collective interests, these individuals will work together to influence government policy in their favor or to minimize any potential harm.

Among other things, interest group theorists have been criticized for assuming that groups will form and make their concerns known to government. Critics point out that such theorists have taken for granted the organizational elements involved in bringing people together, pooling resources, and coordinating activities before they are able to address the policy making process in government.

The criticism of interest group theory first arose as a result of the work of Mancur Olson (1965) who reasoned that it would be irrational for individuals to join an organization to influence government when the outcome of the collective action would benefit them regardless of whether or not they participated in the group. Government benefits are so distributed because decisions cannot be limited to members of an organization. With the exception of granting specific contracts, government decisions typically affect a larger population. Therefore, one can benefit from the outcome without joining the group.

Olson argued that in small groups an individual might calculate that participation in the group could make a difference in whether the collective action is successful, and thus participate to assure the success of the group. However, in a large organization the addition of one individual would appear to make an insignificant difference to the outcome, yet the benefits would accrue even without joining. Olson concluded that under such circumstances it would be irrational for an individual to participate in collective action of large organizations.

Olson looked to elements of organizational life other than collective action to account for organizational membership. He concluded that the only reason to join an organization would be to obtain material benefits that could only be obtained by virtue of membership in the organization. Such benefits might include specialized information, insurance or travel discounts, or access to potential markets.

Olson determined that organizations become politically involved, not because members want to, but because it benefits the organization's leaders. They can afford to engage in politics by creating surplus from selling material benefits to members. This surplus gives the leaders the resources they need for participation in politics without regard to the political concerns of the members. For example, labor unions attract members because unions promise higher compensation or because workers are required to join

through closed-shop agreements. The union, according to Olson, is able to use the surplus it gets from dues to participate in politics without direct concern for whether their positions reflect the stance of the members.

Olson referred to the political activities of large organizations as a "by-product" of the material incentives it offers to members. The surplus material resources that the organization obtains from its members in the form of dues is a by-product of giving individuals a reason to join the organization. The leaders are then free to pursue political ends.

Olson's criticism of interest group theory focused attention on the internal dynamics of interest groups for the first time. His work also generated a debate in the political science field, focusing on whether individuals join and participate in organizations for material benefits or whether other incentives operate. Criticism of Olson has also focused on whether members are actually unconcerned about the political activities of their organizations (Manzer, 1969, March, 1976, Salisbury, 1969, and Wilson, 1973). Reactions have included the idea that members participate for more than material incentives. There have also been arguments that "nonrational" reasons fuel participation in, or being concerned about, an organization's political activities. For example, members join organizations to express their views about an issue and see the organization as a vehicle for that expression. If an organization does not satisfy that need,

the individual is likely to leave it, form a new one or join one that does. Alternatively, an individual might form, or join with, a rival faction within the organization.

In summary, the literature on social workers in politics has tended to focus upon the individual. To the extent that the focus has also included group action, it parallels the view of interest group theorists who have given attention to how groups influence government decisions. With Olson and the debate that was subsequently generated, the focus shifted beyond policy making to also focus upon how individuals come together and develop the mechanisms for collective action through membership organizations. This shift culminated in a thorough description of an organization's internal dynamics. It is to this description that we now turn. It will ultimately allow for a more complete framework for approaching a study of how social workers collectively influence governmental decisions.

The Internal Dynamics of Membership Organizations

According to Moe (1980), both material and nonmaterial incentives to participate in an organization shape the internal politics of large membership organizations. In his studies of several trade organizations in the Midwest, Moe demonstrated that members were concerned about the political positions taken by their organizations even when they did not bring material benefits. There was also interest in the

benefits from associating with other members. These findings added to the critique of Olson and provided the basis for Moe describing the internal dynamics of membership organizations.

Moe sees leaders and members of an organization in an entrepreneur-customer relationship. In essence, the founders of an organization and the subsequent leaders promise, or provide, services to attract individuals who might find value in them. Leaders enroll members, design and sell benefit packages and establish administrative structures to manage the exchange relationships with participants. This helps to assure that the group survives with an adequate surplus to cover costs. In addition, when it is advantageous to play a political role, leaders will lead the group in attempting to realize goals within the political system.

Moe stresses that leaders must assure the organization's survival. To do that, alternative strategies are available, including ones that emphasize the collective pursuit of political goals. On the other hand strategies can emphasize selective incentives only available to those who join the organization. The strategy that is selected will determine the kinds of individuals that will respond, the types of contributions members will make, and the actions that will be undertaken.

One dimension of any strategy will involve communications with members. Members are not assumed to have perfect knowledge of the incentives that are available to them in the organization and may not even be aware of the

leaders' existence. Leaders, on the other hand, may lack information about the members, or potential ones, about who they are, where they are, or what they want (Moe, pp.39-47).

This places great emphasis on communication. Through communication leaders can shape perceptions. They can choose the types of information that is transmitted. The process of communicating can include direct contact through newspapers, broadcast media, direct mail or personal contact. Another approach involves indirect contacts with members through the utilization of what Moe terms communication middlemen. Such individuals who are particularly situated within networks of individuals can pass information along from the leaders to many others, often with the ability not available to the leaders directly. While leaders may be able to get across a message that might not be possible without such help, the disadvantage of this method is that the middlemen can change the message in various ways to suit their own purposes.

Other elements of the leaders' strategy to assure the organization's survival involve the administration of selective incentives and collective goods. With the first, leaders set up the administrative apparatus for the production and distribution of valuable incentives to members. With collective goods, which are of central interest in the consideration of the relationship between membership organizations and the political process, incentives are shaped in several ways. One involves the

demonstration of success by the organization's leaders in the pursuit of collective goods. This is important to satisfy particular individuals whose membership and contributions to the organization depend upon expectations in this area. Or leaders can pursue collective goods because they are of special interest directly to themselves (Moe, pp.47-57).

In order to pursue collective goals, organization leaders must develop access to government arenas, lobby with public officials, cultivate contacts to develop coalitions, and obtain information. In addition, they need to develop resources to support candidates for office, disseminate information resulting from related research, and deliver messages through speeches and testimony.

To pursue such activities leaders must develop the organization's political structure with such activities in mind. They must recruit personnel who can perform political tasks or alternatively rely upon members to perform activities. How to induce members to participate is central to this task and necessitates an awareness of the motivation that members have and what types of benefits they may receive for their participation. This involves the whole issue of membership bargaining and the structuring of subgroups through which members can become involved.

Other actors that leaders will be interested in considering include government officials upon whose decisions leaders are primarily concerned. The requirements for developing relationships with such actors have implications

for the type of organization the leaders will want to develop. In addition, the leaders will be concerned about the existence of rival leaders who can emerge to form competitive organizations interested in the contributions, services, and membership of the same individuals who are members of the leaders' organization (Moe, pp. 59-70).

Of central concern to Moe's organizational analysis is the internal politics of the membership organization. Key to this are the relationships that the leaders have with members. For example, members can be seen in terms of the services that they can supply to leaders. When a member has a valuable service that leaders will want, then the member has a degree of leverage. Such services are illustrated by individuals functioning as communications middlemen, as providers of specialized information, or as providers of political resources, including access to decision makers. The amount of leverage that the potential of providing services has with leaders will vary to the extent leaders can get the same service elsewhere and to the extent that the member can actually withhold the service (Moe, pp. 81-84).

Another way in which members become involved with leaders is in terms of the role of rival to leaders. A member can remain within the organization and emerge as a rival and threaten to set up an alternative group. This threat implies for leaders a loss of members, funds, and a threat to the organization's maintenance. The more credible the threat of creating a rival organization, the greater the

leverage. The question for leaders in such a situation is whether the rival really is in a position to supply members with the incentives to attract them to leave (Moe, pp. 84-86).

Members may also become engaged with leaders in the internal politics of the organization through the organization's subgroups. Politically oriented subgroups can influence leaders' decisions as individuals can. They can threaten to withhold services or to drop out of the organization. However, the subgroup is special in its own right in that it can control greater amounts of resources than is available to individuals alone (Moe, pp. 86-96).

The overriding point is that members of an organization can influence the formulation of goals. The resources that they can bring to bear upon the leaders can condition the direction the organization takes.

Beyond elucidating what takes place in a large membership organization, Moe extends Olson's analysis based on a model of rational actors motivated by material gain to one where additional incentives motivate activity. The existence of these incentives allows for more to be understood in terms of organizational life than advanced by Olson. One type is solidary incentives. These are social benefits such as friendship and status that derive from social interaction in the organization or subgroup. Becoming a member qualifies one for taking advantage of them. A second type are purposive incentives. These accrue to a

person by the organization's support of causes, value systems, principles or goals considered worthwhile (Moe, pp. 116-119).

Leaders can use non-material incentives to motivate participation among members instead of relying upon the offer of material gain. For leaders, as well, material gain alone may not be the primary factor in their own work. Two examples illustrate how these incentives can play out as the dynamics in an organization and create dilemmas for organizational leaders.

In the first example, a leader's own value system influences the goals of the organization; he or she may not be concerned about increasing membership as much as the attainment of the goals themselves. Moe points out that such an approach can rigidify internal politics because leaders may not be willing to respond to member preferences. Under such circumstances one would expect leaders to tie members in for nonpolitical reasons. However, problems with group maintenance would also be expected. Those who differ with the goals would be likely to become involved in policy disputes with the leaders with the result of dropping out, reducing services to the organization, or participating negatively (Moe, pp. 134-142).

In the second example, leaders may be interested in achieving a higher level of democracy in the organization and could make the pursuit of political goals secondary to this end. As a result there would be more tolerance of diversity

of opinion and participation. However, among the members who believe that certain goals should be pursued more in-depth but aren't could become involved in disputes for this reason. In either case, it is not possible to merely pursue an objective without consideration of member reaction and implications.

In sum, Moe has described what can be expected in the interplay among the leaders and members of an organization. There is an interdependence among them, and the decisions that are made, including decisions concerning the political arena, will influence these relationships. Leaders can pursue political goals to a greater or lesser extent with member involvement, but the maintenance and even survival of the organization can be affected by the responses members have to the goals that are chosen as well as to the means used for achieving them.

It is this analysis from Moe that was utilized in developing this dissertation. The intent was to develop a better understanding of social work membership organizations in regard to the relationship between leaders and members and the political goals and activities that are pursued by such organizations.

Politics and Professional Organizations

By looking at the way social workers participate in their membership organizations, it becomes possible to

examine social workers' involvement in politics. Since much political activity among social workers emerges out of social work membership organizations, it makes sense to examine the organization as an intervening variable between the organization's political activity and the activity within the organization that enables the organization to address politics. With regard to this question, the social work literature, while illuminating in other ways, leaves virtually untouched how social workers actually come together within their organizations to engage in political activities. By looking at the social work literature through the lens provided by Olson and extended by Moe, it was anticipated that new understanding about social workers in politics would emerge.

Political scientists interested in interest groups and membership organizations have studied a wide variety of organizations, including business associations such as the National Association of Manufacturers or the Chamber of Commerce; labor unions such as the AFL-CIO; public citizen groups such as the National Organization for Women or American Association of Retired Persons; or professional associations such as the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association. It is the last type of organization that concerns the social work profession and this dissertation.

Freidson's (1986) work on professions in the United States helps to examine social work and its representation

in a professional association. Freidson draws out the relationship between the scientific, disciplined development of formal knowledge for the professions and the inevitable transformation of that knowledge into practice as a result of economic realities, bureaucratic demands and the circumstances facing the practitioner. This is important because these realities and demands act as impediments to utilizing such formal knowledge. The politics of professions becomes, as a result of this, an attempt to control the circumstances of practicing a profession's craft in order to minimize these impediments.

Central to this politics of control, according to Freidson, are how professions carve out their place in society in order to claim and gain recognition for their expertise. This involves the different credentialling systems that exist. There are several types of credentialling systems: voluntary credentialling within professional organizations; credentials administered by government bodies; and those given by accrediting bodies to educational institutions for the programs that train individuals to enter a given profession.

Freidson also discusses the role of professional employees in a bureaucracy and professional power in such settings, as he does the special role of faculty and administrators. The latter two roles are differentiated from the practitioner. In addition, the place of professions in politics and the role of organized associations, are

considered, as well.

According to Freidson, different professions have much in common in regard to establishing themselves and assuring that their expertise is utilized, although many differences exist among professions in terms of the recognition granted to them and the relative power they possess. Such considerations are useful in examining the political activity of social work.

Freidson's sociological analysis provides a yardstick to see what social work membership organizations have been doing in comparison to what might be expected by raising a number of questions. Do professional social work organizations pursue issues such as credentialling in order to control who renders service to the public? Do they influence policy to assure that professional standards are incorporated into the way services are delivered? Are their activities primarily related to economic self interest or are the special interests of clients the target of political activity? And, given the common characteristic within professions of member diversity, what happens when a professional organization does not have a consensus in regard to an issue?

All of the questions could be anticipated to have bearing on both the political activities of social work membership organizations as well as on the internal dynamics within the organizations themselves. This dissertation attempted to examine these issues in the context of one

social work organization.

CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH DESIGN

This dissertation studies both the political activities of a large social work membership organization and the involvement of its members in relation to these activities. In regard to the first objective, it describes the types of activities engaged in to address issues of concern to a social work membership organization that would involve decision making by government bodies. The second objective involves the study of how the demands of active members and organizational leaders influence the types of issues or activities that an organization chooses.

These questions are examined by studying the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) which ranged in membership from 1900 members in 1955 when it was founded to 8800 in 1991. The composition of the membership has reflected the full range of diversity in the profession, and interest in effecting government decision making has been evident throughout its 36 year history.

The study is both descriptive and historical. An historical approach was adopted so as to be able to examine the range of opportunities available to the organization in addressing issues in the political arena. While a study of the present would have been interesting, the proximity of events to both the organization's leadership and the researcher as a person on staff could have compromised objectivity, even if unintentionally.

While practical reasons suggested an historical approach to the study, there is significant methodological justification for this, as well. Phillip Selznick (1957), for example, has discussed the importance of understanding organizational history. He makes the point that organizations often evolve without attention to basic organizational issues. Over time an organization makes fundamental decisions or commitments to advance its goals. By examination of these commitments one can determine whether the organization has been fulfilling its basic purpose for existence, whether its operations have been ineffective to fulfill its purpose, or whether its purpose has been beyond its ability to achieve.

Henry Mintzberg's (1978, 1982) studies of organizational history were designed to discern patterns of decisions that organizations make over time. He used this focus to delineate an organization's policies or strategies. By examining organizations over time, he has shown differences in strategies including those that are intended, those that emerge without planning, those that are realized, and those that are not. Particular attention has been given to changes in strategies, why they occur, and the role of the environment, bureaucracy, and leadership.

The examination of a social work membership organization over time is designed to determine the patterns or strategies relating to the organization's political activities, the particular objectives of such activities, as

well as the methods utilized to influence the policy making process in government. In addition, the study seeks to delineate the relationship between the patterns of political activities and the interests of members and leaders.

A preliminary pilot study of the NYC Chapter during one historical period was undertaken in the Spring of 1989 to test the feasibility of this historical approach. While historical research poses problems related to the availability of documentary evidence and the recall by informants, the pilot suggested that the study was feasible. The Spring study also uncovered three major periods in the history of the New York City Chapter of NASW:

1. 1955 - 1970 during which the founding leaders and officers maintained an identified amount of influence and control over the organization;
2. 1970 - 1982 during which new leadership emerged that shared a history as members of an organized subgroup within the Chapter, seeking organization reform.
3. 1982 - 1991 in which there is an identifiable break with the leadership of the second period.

This study focuses on the years between 1955 and 1970. While it would have been desirable to have examined the

entire history of the organization, such a full scale inquiry was too time consuming to be practically carried out. Focusing on the first period permitted a study of the organization's initial goals. Following the 15 years provided an opportunity to examine how activities were sustained or changed over time under the same leadership. A sampling of shorter periods or various activities over the entire history might have been an alternative to the chosen approach, but this would not have allowed a review of activities continuously sustained over time.

Because the scope of the study was already sizeable, it was neither practical and realistic to attempt a study of the full national association, nor was it practical to begin to compare different chapters within the broader association. This dissertation could create the desire for broader research. Also, because the focus of the study was upon the New York City Chapter, generalizations beyond this group must be recognized as speculative. Nevertheless, the results from the study are interesting and discussion about the broader population of social work organizations should be meaningful.

Three major questions that frame the study regard the activities utilized by NASW in New York City to influence government decisions:

1. Social work membership organizations are likely to become involved in making their views known about legislation or governmental administrative decisions that

will affect social welfare policy, including programs that serve social work clients and the ways in which social workers will be employed to deliver services. What do membership organizations such as the New York City Chapter of NASW do to make their views known to the government?

2. Active members and organizational leaders are fundamental participants in membership organizations. What role do such individuals play in the development of the political activities of membership organizations?

3. Finally, large membership organizations typically contain diverse interests and views about what is important both within the organization and in politics. What happens to an organization's political activities when this diversity results in conflicting views over chosen goals and strategies?

The relevant variables in this study center around the political activities engaged in by the organization through the efforts of members and other individuals, such as staff. These include the following:

1. Political activities of the organization carried out by members which are focused on government institutions and policy makers and include such things as visits, phone calls or letters to legislators, mayors, governors or government

staff; dissemination of position papers addressing the decisions of government officials or government bodies; or efforts at gaining support for one's concerns about government decisions through getting support from outside of the organization.

2. Activities of members (individuals such as the elected officials of the organization, leaders of committees, committee members, as well as the rank and file membership which may or may not be involved in the organized activities of the organization) that are focused on preparing the organization for its external, political activities. These activities, which are internal to the organization, include such things as participation in Board, committee or membership meetings, development of drafts of position papers and correspondence, and developing consensus about priorities and strategies.

Methodology

In order to study the political activities and the involvement of active members and leaders in the New York City Chapter during the period 1955 to 1970, several steps were followed. These are discussed below along with the strengths and limitations of the study. Issues of obtaining informed consent from the New York City Chapter of NASW are also presented.

1. Pilot Study

In the Spring, 1989, a study was undertaken to determine the feasibility of conducting a broad historical study of NASW. For this study one period was chosen based on the knowledge that a major event had occurred in the Chapter around 1970 in which there was a change in organizational leadership and priorities.

By focusing on this event, it was anticipated that a variety of viewpoints and approaches to the organization would become evident based on the assumption that the change reflected moving from one stage of the organization to another. This was important because comparisons would be possible among different leadership and priorities, as well as how the change, itself, was managed.

Seven interviews conducted during this pilot study detailed this organizational change. The study revealed conflict in the organization at the point of the study, and supported the assumption that the change moved the organization from one stage of the organization's life to another. In addition, it identified the three major historical periods described above.

The pilot study also revealed the potential for using interviews as well as the limitations of relying upon the memories of individuals who had participated in a series of activities 20 years earlier. In effect, it demonstrated the need for more reliable source material such as archival

records.

2. Data Collection

a) Accessing the Archival Data: The second step in this study was the accessing of the Chapter's records. These are kept in a storage warehouse outside of the Chapter office. While this presented special problems of access, most of the minutes of the Chapter's Board of Directors and Executive Committee were obtained. The archives also contained files on Chapter committees, including minutes of committee meetings and correspondence, as well as plans for events undertaken by Chapter committees. The material in the archives covered the period from 1955 through approximately 1980. There was also material from the organizations that merged to form NASW in 1955.

b) Review of Minutes: All of the minutes of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee, which consisted of the officers of the Board, were reviewed. It is estimated that minutes for no more than 25 meetings were missing out of a total of 300. In all, minutes for both Chapter units were reviewed over the 15 year period 1955 through 1970, averaging approximately ten meetings of each leadership unit per year. In all, approximately 275 sets of minutes were reviewed.

The Board and Executive Committee minutes were the primary focus for the initial review of the Chapter's activities. This was seen as a practical method for ascertaining what activities were engaged in by the Chapter. Reviewing all of the records in the archives would have been an insurmountable task. On the other hand, sampling records would have left gaps in understanding the evolution of the activities that were chosen, something that reading the minutes would avoid. In addition, it was assumed that all official activities of the organization, including those activities aimed at governmental bodies even when initiated by Chapter committees, would appear in the minutes as decisions of either the Executive Committee or the Board of Directors.

c) Review of Selected Committee Records: In addition to reviewing the Executive Committee and Board minutes, the records of selected committees were reviewed. The basis for the selection of the committees is delineated in the section on data analysis below. The files of these selected committees consisted of committee reports, minutes, news articles, letters, and memoranda. The Chapter's newsletters were also reviewed to determine how issues and activities were presented to the Chapter membership.

d) Interviews: Eight interviews were conducted with selected actors who were leaders in, or familiar with, the

activities under study. When combined with the interviews conducted during the pilot study, a total of 15 interviews were conducted.

3. Data Analysis

a) Selection of Issues: Given the enormous amount of activity undertaken by the New York City Chapter in each year of the 15 years under study, the research progressed from a comprehensive review of minutes of the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors to focusing upon three major issues, or priorities, involving political activity. These were (1) the pursuit of legal regulation of social work practice, (2) civil rights, and (3) public welfare.

A fourth area of activity was also included because it highlighted the question of member diversity expressed through dissenting opinions about the Chapter's political activities. This fourth area was also the focus of the pilot study involving the organizational change around 1970. Thus, the dissertation actually examined four critical periods in the Chapter's history.

The first three areas were chosen because they were determined to be the most significant political activities undertaken by the Chapter during the period being studied. While the Chapter addressed a wide variety of issues, these three areas either involved the greatest amount of Chapter

resources and interest among the Chapter leaders, or they represented the most sustained effort. The latter case was manifest in the pursuit of legal regulation of social work. The fourth area of activity was chosen because, as it focused on dissent, it was expected to provide information about how the Chapter dealt with conflict within the organization as it pursued its political goals.

In each of the four areas selected, the minutes of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee were reviewed a second time in order to synthesize the monthly reports on these topics. This allowed a chronology to be constructed. After developing the chronology for the four areas, the archival records were accessed for a second time in order to review all of the existing files for these specific four areas.

b) Development of Case Histories: The case histories presented in chapters four through seven of this dissertation were based on the material found in the selected archival records and the interviews. The final chapter provides an analysis of each of the case histories as well as comparisons among them. The significance of what is found in these analyses is then discussed in terms of the literature on social workers in politics.

4. Strengths and Limitations of the Study

a) The Nature of the Data: Before moving to the four case histories, it is necessary to discuss the nature of the data in this study. In historical research the proximity of the data to the reality they represent is critical (Moss, 1984). The closer the data is to this reality, the greater its evidentiary value. The types of historical data and their relevance for this study follow. They include transactional and selective records, recollections, and reflections.

Transactional records. Such records refer to actual organizational actions. They are not abstractions of behavior and interactions. They are considered primary evidence. There is no interpretive process between the document and the reality it represents. Examples include constitutions, laws, contracts, certificates, instructions, and advertisements.

In this study transactional records include drafts of legislative proposals, organizational by-laws, and position papers.

Selective records. These records are attempts to communicate to others what has happened at a given time and are characterized by their being recorded concurrent to the event itself. Examples are video and audio recordings as well as stenographic notes of conversations. These

recordings should not be confused with reality itself, as transactional records are, because they are selectively focused. Because of the contemporary nature of the recordings, this type of evidence is highly valued as historical evidence.

In the study of NASW, minutes have the characteristic of this type of data since it is presumed that notes, similar to a transcript, are kept during the proceedings of a meeting.

Recollections. Recollections are the memory of an initial event or reality. They are a selective record at least one step removed from the reality itself. These can be divided into two types: 1) those emerging soon after the events and 2) those emerging later.

In this study, the utilization of correspondence and news articles to ascertain what activities transpired constitute recollections emerging soon after the event. Such recollections, along with selective records and some transactional records, constitute the primary data of this study. There was a high degree of corroboration among different types of data from these sources.

The interviews undertaken for this dissertation constitute the second type of recollection: those that emerge later in time (20 to 35 years in this study). Since these recollections are removed in time from what actually occurred, they are the least reliable of the types of data

utilized in the study.

In the NASW study, interviews, which were given secondary importance, served to fill in gaps left by the archival records. While the interviews did serve this purpose, much of what was recalled was selective. However, in every instance it was possible to compare the data obtained from the interviews with the archival records to verify its consistency with events revealed in the written record or to determine that what was said was not verifiable.

Reflections. This last type of historical data goes beyond the simple recollection of facts to individual thoughts about the past and includes subjective and emotional content. Such data is not historical but constitutes current thinking about, and evaluation of, the past. It provides clues as to the significance of events as seen in the present. The interviews that were conducted for this study contain reflections as well as recollections.

b) Reliability and Validity: Since the study minimized its reliance on interviews, the issue of reliability of data was correspondingly minimized. At the same time, the validity of the data was enhanced to the degree source materials were recorded close to the events being reported. Validity was also enhanced by the high degree of conformity among the

different forms of data that were utilized.

An attempt was made to be as inclusive as possible of the material available within the archival records for each of the case histories developed. In addition, an attempt was made to let the records speak for themselves, allowing what occurred in the experience of the individuals reflected in the study to determine what was considered as data.

The only exception to inclusiveness was in the review of the Chapter's work on public welfare. This study excluded a detailed account of the organization's involvement with a social service union and the Chapter's responses to the formation of the Human Resources Administration in the late the 1960's. In all, the public welfare case history focused on approximately half of the activities that occurred during the period. It is believed that the sample of activities drawn from this period adequately represents the work of the Chapter in this area.

In the area of civil rights activities, the study included the activities defined as political, that is, relating to decisions of governmental bodies. The study included activities focusing on non-governmental organizations to the extent that they led to the development of support for activities focused on government bodies. In the area of legal regulation of social work practice, the case history is considered to be relatively inclusive of the available material.

While the review of the records was inclusive, sources

of data outside of the Chapter records were not included in the study. Records of organizations other than those belonging to NASW were not systematically examined, nor were interviews conducted with actors outside of the Chapter. While it is possible that such sources would challenge the accuracy of the data that was obtained, the Chapter records did contain documents from outside organizations in the form of correspondence and news articles. This material was included in the study and tended to corroborate the events and activities reported on in the Chapter's own documents, even when viewpoints and perceptions were reflected that differed from those of the Chapter.

5. Informed Consent and Confidentiality

An initial concern in this study was securing permission from the leadership of the organization for a study touching upon the internal dynamics of the organization. To an extent, the study could be seen as examining and reporting about the organization's relatively hidden internal relationships. Even though such dynamics are a part of any organization's life, it was important to be sensitive to the potential concern about this aspect of the study.

A few methods were adopted to decrease this concern. The first, as already stated, was the decision to design an

historical study. A second method involved requesting informed consent from the Chapter leaders. The leaders of the organization were given the opportunity to choose whether to be studied.

In seeking informed consent, a commitment was made to the organization to utilize any information obtained in the study in a responsible manner: neither the organization nor any individual should be hurt or made to feel uncomfortable by the study. To assure this without compromising the study, the identities of the individuals involved were treated as confidential. As a result, the history that emerges does not focus on specific individuals but on generalized roles and time periods.

CHAPTER 3: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

In the chapters that follow, case histories are presented on legal regulation of social work, civil rights, public welfare, and dissent within the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. This chapter provides basic information in order to develop a context for understanding the case histories in relation to the overall functioning of NASW in New York City for the 1955 - 1970 period.

The National Association of Social Workers was formed in 1955 as the result of a merger of seven different social work organizations (see Table One on the next page). The separate organizations came together to both advance the profession and to develop the unity and strength needed to influence social legislation. They sought 1) enhanced status and visibility for the profession as a whole; 2) development of uniform professional standards and uniform education and training; and 3) the formulation of social policy and actions toward implementation of those policies.¹

At the same time the new national organization was formed, NASW was structured into both a national unit and local chapters located in cities and regions throughout the United States. The largest chapter was located in New York City, as was the office of the national headquarters. As is still the case, NASW members belonged automatically to both the national organization and to their local chapter,

TABLE ONE

Organizations that Merged to Form NASW in 1955

1. American Association of Social Workers
 2. American Association of Medical Social Work
 3. American Association of Psychiatric Social Work
 4. National Association of School Social Workers
 5. American Association of Group Workers
 6. Association for the Study of Community Organization
 7. Social Work Research Group
-

with dues going to the national headquarters and then shared with the chapter.

From the beginning through the period of study, staffing of the New York City Chapter was minimal. There was an executive director who was a social worker and limited clerical support. At two different points in the 1960's, the staff included an additional person to assist the director. Chapter leaders recognized that limited funding also prevented securing the level of staff needed to support the desired level of programming. In response, the Chapter encouraged active member participation in its numerous committees, established early in the Chapter's history.

During the transition into a single organization, members active in the pre-existing organizations together planned how to structure the New York City Chapter. It was hoped, at that time, that membership participation would be

deemed important and that every member would be involved in some way.² One way this was anticipated being accomplished was through regularly scheduled membership meetings.

The New York City Chapter contained 1900 members at the time it began. The founders saw member interest in the specialized associations from which they came as a primary focus of future programming (see Table Two for membership through the period of study). This was especially in regard to social work practice. After one year, the minutes of the Board of Directors reflected the concern that "the chapter has not yet resolved the basic question of whether it will be a genuine 'single membership' organization for the profession or will function as a 'federation' of more or less autonomous groups."³

TABLE TWO

Membership* in the New York City Chapter
for the study period, 1955 to 1970
and comparison with 1990

1955	1960	1965	1970	1990
1900	2700	4500**	4800	8600

* Figures are approximations.

** NASW's adopting a voluntary credential in the early 1960's, the ACSW, has been credited with producing a significant increase in membership.

A 1961 report to the Board of Directors illustrates the interest in specialized areas of practice. The report described the largest of the Chapter's units, the Psychiatric Social Work Section, as having 506 members. It alone had seven committees. The report noted that the Section held three meetings for its members during the course of the program year, and that the two that addressed practice averaged 90 people. The third meeting focused on the conditions of a residence for adolescent girls and drew few people. The point was made at the board meeting that the attendance at these meetings reflected the perception that "meetings on practice are most popular".⁴ The last meeting was perceived as addressing government policy.

Although member interest was seen as associated with social work practice, the founders of the Chapter were nevertheless committed to addressing social policy- both the decision making centers in government and in non-governmental organizations. With regard to the latter, focus, Chapter leaders took positions about the right of social workers to engage in collective bargaining with their employers. While specific support for one side or another in a labor dispute was consistently avoided, a controversial stance was engaged in.

For example, when hospital staff went on strike against voluntary hospitals in 1959, the Chapter publicized its belief that there were circumstances in which social workers

going out on strike would be consistent with the NASW Code of Ethics. Many members, including directors of hospital social work departments, as well as the leadership of national NASW, disagreed with the Chapter's view about this. Chapter leaders remained firm despite criticism that the needs of patients were being ignored when social workers go out on strike.

The Chapter also questioned the level of salaries available to social workers. Surveys of agencies were conducted and standards were set. This aroused the concern of social work administrators in the voluntary service sector. They felt that many agencies could not afford to pay their staff at NASW's recommended level. As a result, they expressed concern that such standards would in effect result in a "black list" of those agencies that fell short of the salary standard.

Even more important to the Chapter's activities were its efforts to address governmental decisions. From the very beginning and through the end of the period under study, a committee on social policy and action existed. A great deal of thought and planning went in to determining how the committee would function. At an early meeting of the Chapter's Board of Directors where the Chair of the Social Policy and Action Committee reported that "it would be wise to concentrate on a few items and deal with them consistently and intensively rather than dissipate energy by serving as a broad clearinghouse for many diverse issues".

It was felt that such an approach would result in more efficient functioning of the committee.⁵

Despite laying out such guidelines for how it would function, the social policy committee consistently took up a great number of issues with little opportunity to work intensively. While the New York State legislature was in session, letters would be written on each of the issues that the committee considered. At the same time, the leaders of the committee continued to struggle over the number of issues that it would take on. Reports to the Board of Directors on several occasions expressed the need to set priorities, limit the number of issues that would be addressed, yet it seems as though this committee had limited success in achieving this.

Over the 15 year period in this study, the more intensive work that might have fallen to the social policy committee was instead delegated by the Board of Directors to newly created committees. For example, despite the idea that the social policy committee would work on public welfare issues, when the Chapter attempted to respond to a series of governmental reports on welfare, a special committee was established for this purpose. Similarly, despite the idea that the social policy committee would work on civil rights issues, when the Chapter made civil rights a priority, a special committee was set up to work intensively on it.

It was these two areas of social policy concern, public

welfare and civil rights, that emerged in this study as the two top priority areas for the Chapter during the 15 year period under investigation. A third priority area linked the Chapter's interest in social work practice and the powers of government. This was in the pursuit of legal regulation of social work, the desire to limit who would be qualified to practice social work or, falling short of such encompassing a restriction, limiting who could be called a social worker.

These three Chapter priorities became the focus of this study. Examination of these priorities in the next three chapters will detail what activities were engaged in for the purpose of influencing government decisions. They will show how issues within these priorities were addressed, how members became involved, how activities were sustained over time, and how individual expertise and relationships were integral to what was accomplished.

In addition, these case histories show how the disagreements by members with what the Chapter was doing in these three areas were dealt with. This last theme, disagreement or dissent, is given fuller attention in a fourth chapter which focuses primarily on a series of events that mark the end of the period under study, between 1968 and 1970. It was in this period that member disagreement with the New York City Chapter became a primary issue. How members who were not leaders of the Chapter expressed themselves, the response of the Chapter, and the outcomes,

will be brought out.

Notes

1. Dolores Delahante. Writing in the Forward to Harriett Bartlett, *Analyzing Social Work Practice By Fields*, 1988, Silver Spring: National Association of Social Workers, Revised Edition, pp. v to vi.
2. Annual Report of the Membership Committee of the American Association of Social Workers, May 6, 1955.
3. Secretary of the Chapter Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, December, 1956.
4. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, April 13, 1961.
5. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, January 5, 1956.

CHAPTER 4: THE PURSUIT OF LEGAL REGULATION OF SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE

Part I: Introduction and History of Legal Regulation Before NASW

In June, 1965, 10 years after the formation of the National Association of Social Workers, the governor of New York State signed legislation into law that restricted the use of the term "certified social worker" (CSW) to individuals who hold masters degrees in the profession. The social work profession had been interested in obtaining licensure for a long time, and the law that was obtained reflected a lengthy process of deliberations, compromise and lobbying involving both a small group of individuals who spearheaded the effort and thousands of social workers represented in ten NASW chapters in New York State.

While it is clear that a sophisticated process is required in order to get legislation passed in the State legislature, involving attracting sponsors and obtaining enough votes to pass through committees and each legislative house, the story of the CSW law is much more than its proceeding through the State Assembly and Senate. While it basically required three months to move through the legislature, members of the New York City Chapter had begun their work at the very formation of the Chapter in 1955, ten years earlier. In addition, the Chapter's leaders were aware of the fact that the predecessor organization, the

American Association of Social Workers, had accepted the responsibility at its 1947 Delegate Assembly for the "development of a long range program of study, education and action leading to the adoption of legislation in each state which will restrict the practice of social work to persons designated as qualified practitioners by an appropriate agency of the state."¹

This clearly suggests that the effort to gain legal regulation was a lengthy process that even preceded the efforts of the members of NASW. In fact, a report developed for the Chapter in 1957 claims that the initial interest in New York City social work circles was in 1936 when the New York City Chapter of the AASW formed a committee to examine the desirability of seeking some form of legislation. It was not made clear, however, what came of this effort except it was noted that a certification bill was drafted. Interest revived following World War II when what was referred to as "wartime agencies" became concerned about the lack of public understanding about the purpose and method of social work in comparison to such professions as medicine, law, and teaching.²

The AASW goal had not been forgotten as representatives of that organization's chapter in New York City, in collaboration with six other social work organizations, formed the New York City Chapter of NASW. The Inter-Association Committee On Legal Regulation of Social Work Practice, which comprised in addition to AASW the American

Association of Group Workers, the American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers, and the American Association of Medical Social Workers, recommended in 1955 that the newly formed Chapter have a broadly representative committee that would promote legal regulation of practice of social work in the State. By "broadly" they meant that the practitioners in community organizing and social action should be represented, as well as the more clinical approaches to practice. They anticipated the need to resolve differences of opinion that might exist and to form a "united front" before approaching other professional groups for support. This included the need to develop a liaison with the other chapters within the State and to develop a uniform position.³

The Inter-Association Committee pointed out four reasons for social workers to be regulated by state government. They believed that legal regulation would add status and prestige to the profession and give it recognition "in the family of professions". Second, regulation would insure "maximal" professional service to the community and protect against incompetence and fraud. A third reason related to the perceived inadequacy of self-discipline within the profession to set standards, as well as to standards set by individuals and agencies through adherence to ethics and policies. Finally, it was believed that salary scales for qualified social workers would be increased.⁴ Such possibly relevant issues as private

practice of social work, especially the practice of psychotherapy, and becoming accepted by insurance companies for insurance reimbursement, were not mentioned.

This chapter will detail what was revealed in the archival records of the New York City Chapter of NASW and through interviews with several leaders in the effort to obtain legal regulation. It will show the types of efforts that were involved in seeking to have the social work profession recognized in New York State law, and in what ways the members of the organization were involved. In addition, how the Chapter addressed disagreements regarding the issue of legal regulation will be discussed as it emerged during the time the Chapter pursued its long term objective.

Part II: Legal Regulation at the Formation of NASW in 1955

Once NASW formed, the Chapter's leaders established the Committee on Personnel Standards and Practice to deal with legal regulation as well as career and salary issues.⁵ A subcommittee structure was established to address it, but within a year, a standing committee was established to deal with legal regulation.⁶ During this early period in the Chapter's life, at what was one of the first Chapter membership meetings, the members in attendance passed a resolution: "... that it is the sense of this meeting that the legal regulation of social work practice in New York

State is a desirable professional goal toward which the New York City Chapter should work with all deliberate speed..."⁷

At just about the same time, representatives of the Chapter met with representatives of the other NASW Chapters in the State at the State Conference on Social Welfare to discuss joint action on legislation. They acknowledged the need for a "statewide pattern of organization" to deal with the NASW legislative activities within the state. They anticipated that calling upon members who had agency business to conduct in Albany, the State capitol, would facilitate having representation and reduce the potential cost of travel. They also recognized the need for discussions about legislation within each Chapter before there would be any formal positions taken. A statewide Committee on Legal Regulation was called for.⁸

Within a year of the formation of the New York City Chapter, a direction was set for moving on the existing concerns about obtaining regulation. Although the Chapter leaders had not clearly articulated what their priorities for the new organization would be, it was evident that the legal regulation of practice was not only of considerable interest, it was receiving attention at multiple levels of the NASW membership structure. This included the establishment of a standing committee at the Chapter level, attendance of individual members at Chapter meetings, and State Chapter activities.⁹

The Chapter's Board of Director's continued its interest in pursuing the legal regulation of social workers, and providing members with an opportunity for input. Early in 1957, the Legal Regulation Committee issued a report on the "pros and cons" of legal regulation. While the earlier report by the Inter-association Committee that predated NASW's formation listed four reasons to obtain legal regulation, this later report provided additional reasons. But it did not mention the benefit of higher salary scales as the earlier report had. Nor were the issues of private practice or insurance reimbursement mentioned, which was consistent with the earlier report. Among the reasons that were stated in the longer list included:

1. Improving agency standards through the establishment of job specifications to meet minimum qualifications.
2. Providing a legal basis for cooperation between social work and other professions and institutions; "it will affirm the distinctive responsibility and discipline of the social work practitioner in multi-professional services to the client."
3. Assuring official recognition of the profession by the State legislature when social welfare legislation is being enacted.
4. Achieving a wider understanding and support for both social welfare programs and social work.

5. Aiding in the recruitment of people into the profession and encouraging the untrained individual to qualify for professional status.¹⁰

The report went on to list several "questions raised about the advisability of legal regulation" including whether legal regulation would freeze titles, functions, and levels of training; whether a reduction in service would result from there being a shortage of professionally trained personnel; and whether it was necessary to regulate the practitioner since agencies already assumed responsibility for standards. In each case answers were provided to assure that legal regulation would not cause problems in the noted areas but actually have a beneficial impact.¹¹

In addition to providing an argument for legal regulation of social work, the report outlined the pros and cons of regulation by licensing social workers versus certification of title. Licensing, a more comprehensive form of regulation, restricts the practice of the functions of social work. Certification more narrowly denotes who can be called a social worker but does not attempt to restrict who might perform the functions.

In other words, the enactment of a law that regulates social work through licensing requires explicitly stating what the activities of social work are, and anyone not licensed as a social worker would be prohibited from engaging in these activities. Certification, on the other hand, does not require an explicit delineation of social

work activities. Social work activities, however they might be conceived, continue to be in the public domain allowing anyone to engage in them. What is restricted is the use of the title "social worker". Any unauthorized use of the restricted title would constitute a crime.

The Committee on Legal Regulation recommended certification to the Board of Directors on the grounds that the unique functions of social work could not be adequately defined as the members of the profession themselves had not done so. According to the Chair of the Committee, there was a great deal of discussion about this point. He indicated that there was agreement that licensure could not be achieved since a universal definition of social work functions did not exist.¹² In addition, they expected other professions to oppose restrictions on functions that would overlap with their own practice. Finally, it was feared that limiting practice would exacerbate staff shortages. On the other hand, it was believed that title certification would not prevent the social work profession from pursuing licensure at a future date and would still allow the profession to regulate social work through legal channels.¹³

Subsequent to the Board's review, it authorized funds for a mailing to the entire membership. Before the end of the calendar year, a second Chapter meeting to explore the meaning of "certification" was held on the subject, drawing 175 members. According to the minutes of the May, 1957 Board meeting, the membership meeting was called because the

Board could not agree on the pros and cons of legal regulation. "The Board of Directors felt that the lack of knowledge of pros and cons of legal regulation evident among the Board members themselves, as well as in the membership, made it impossible to take action at the present time in supporting any particular form of legal regulation".¹⁴

Following the membership meeting, Board members expressed concern that some members who had attended the Chapter meeting had felt that the negative aspects of Legal Regulation had not been adequately presented, and the matter was scheduled for further discussion at the subsequent Board meeting. The Executive Committee nevertheless supported moving forward with the issue. The minutes of the Executive Committee simply states that "...the Executive Committee, after considerable deliberation, voted to request the Board of Directors to take favorable action on the report and recommendations of the Committee on Legal Regulation of Social Work Practice. Following such approval of the committee's report, if it is voted by the Board of Directors, the committee should then be asked to outline a program of committee action designed to implement the committee's recommendations."¹⁵ The Board subsequently accepted the Executive Committee's recommendations.

The archival records contain no reference to the nature of the concerns that were raised about legal regulation at this period. They merely indicate that the presence of dissent and that the Chapter's leadership saw its way clear

to move forward with legal regulation. Of 173 members, 80% present at the membership meeting supported legal regulation, suggesting that over 130 members were in favor. That still left as many as 40 in some form of dissent.

In response to questions regarding the sources of dissent, the Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation said in an interview that the schools of social work were "vehemently" against it. He said that the leaders in front of legal regulation were accused of only working on the issue for their "own egos" and that it had nothing to do with the profession. He said that the belief among the opposition in the schools was that if social workers did their job as it should be done, the public would give recognition for it. The root of the opposition, in his view, was political; the schools did not want a state board of social work, which would be created to administer the legal regulation of social workers, to take powers that had belonged to the schools, including setting standards for practice through rules and regulations. This information had not surfaced in the archival material.¹⁶

The Chair of the New York City Chapter Committee further indicated that one of the Chairs of the Board of Directors was among the leaders from the schools of social work in opposition. He said that this Chair never attempted to stop the work on legal regulation, saying that he was too ethical to interfere with a program that the members clearly wanted. The Committee Chair said, in regard to the

opposition, that "we won this", meaning that a majority of members were clearly for it. Perhaps this accounts for why many of the decisions about legal regulation were put before the members in Chapter meetings and in referenda. Knowing that support would be achieved, it was a way of using democratic means to solidify one's position.

In the following program year, the Executive Director presented for the first time to the to the Board of Directors an evaluation of the Chapter, reflecting on the organization's functioning. The report provides a glimpse into the size of the Chapter and highlights members' demands for opportunities for participation, and suggests the context for the Chapter's pursuit of legal regulation.

According to the evaluation, with approximately 2,200 members, the New York Chapter had 83 committees and subcommittees with 400-500 members participating within the various structures. Concern existed as how best to serve and coordinate the "various units to enable progress toward the betterment of the profession..." The report went on to state that constant demands for new activities "requires services that cannot be managed without considerable overtime even though everything done by staff is minimal in comparison to what is required and with most ... Chairmen (sic) carrying on an exorbitant amount of responsibility..."¹⁷

The report also raised the issue of setting priorities, and recommended that legal regulation be given a high

priority, based on the interest of the membership.

Part III: The Main Work on Legal Regulation; 1957 through 1964

Over the next seven program years, from September, 1957 through June, 1964, the Chapter moved forward in its pursuit of legal regulation of social workers in New York State. It needed to accomplish many tasks before a final proposal would be adopted for submission into the New York State legislature.

In late 1957 the Chapter report on legal regulation was sent to the entire membership as well as to the nine other NASW Chapters in New York State. Within a short period three Chapters in Syracuse, Rochester, and Albany officially adopted the New York City Chapter's recommendation to pursue legal regulation in the form of certification.¹⁸ As of June 1959, only one additional Chapter, Hudson Valley, had joined the ranks of Chapters supporting legal regulation through certification. Although five Chapters were still not on board, representing 50% of all Chapters in the state, the New York City Chapter moved forward to develop a legislative proposal.¹⁹

While pursuing support for the basic idea of legal regulation via certification, the New York City Chapter also began to develop criteria for who would be certified. Chapter leaders were informed by the members of the Legal

Regulation Committee that the legislation would "blanket-in" practitioners who might not meet the requirements for certification at a later date (this is also known as a "grandfather clause" in legislation). The issues were about who would be included and who would be left out, as well as the fear that because only a small proportion of social workers were professionally trained, only a few would qualify.

The Legal Regulation Committee recommended that in addition to persons with a masters degree in social work, the following categories of social worker would be accepted for certification: 1. persons who had successfully completed one year of masters education plus 4 years of full-time experience; 2. persons with a bachelors degree plus 10 years of experience in a social work job; and 3. persons with a bachelors degree plus 5 years in a job as well as completion of a special course which the committee would recommend. Regardless of the qualifications for grandfathering, after three years, only the graduate degree would be accepted.²⁰

In commenting upon the proposal, the Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation expressed the concerns of the members of the committee. "In determining the qualifications for blanketing-in, the Committee wanted to give recognition to both training and experience. There was a moral obligation, we thought, toward those persons who have occupied social work positions over a long period of

time and who have clearly made social work their career. They should not be penalized because the field has now developed to the point where professional education is a must.²¹ The main point was that the Committee was attempting to develop standards, yet at the same time include as many persons as possible. The Chair apparently felt that this was a fair and inclusive approach.

The Board subsequently agreed to forward to the membership the proposed report and hold an informational meeting to learn about the proposals. By April, 1960, the informational meeting had been held and minor changes were suggested and incorporated.²²

Within this same general period, the Committee on Legal Regulation also drafted its first version of legislation containing all the provisions needed in any proposal that would ultimately become a New York State law. In addition to the provisions for blanketing-in, the proposal established a State Board of Examiners of Social Workers, to be appointed by the Board of Regents, to examine applicants, and the proposal provided clients of social workers with the right to privileged communication when working with a certified social worker.

Perhaps the most important provision was the most basic. The proposal defined what was meant by certified in the following way: "A person represents himself (sic) to be a social worker (underlining was in the original) when he presents himself to the public with any title including the

terms or words 'social work' or 'social worker' and under such title or description offers to give or gives services to individuals, groups, agencies, corporations."²³ Aside from the provisions for blanketing-in individuals, the basic qualifications for certification were (a) the possession of a master's degrees from a two year course of study at a graduate school of social work accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, and (b) passing the state examination.²⁴ The Executive Committee and the Board of Directors subsequently accepted the Committee's recommendations.

What is most interesting about the proposal was that the term to be certified was "social worker". In the current form of certification for social workers in New York State, the legally protected title is different, being "certified social worker". Today, the term "social worker" is not protected by State law. This suggests that the original intent to establish title protection was for a broader scope of protection than what has come to pass.

On June 13, 1961, the Chapter's members voted to support the proposed draft bill. During the following program year, the Chair of the Joint Committee of New York State Chapters sent copies of the bill developed by the New York State Chapter to all of the other Chapters in the State. This was done under the name of the Joint Council rather than the New York City Chapter, something that the local committee was "glad to go along with". Having

ownership for the proposal was secondary to the building a consensus among the coalition of NASW Chapters.²⁵

By the end of June, 1962, two other Chapters joined New York City in granting official support of the draft bill. Seven other Chapters were reported to be in the process of reviewing the bill, and it was expected that additional Chapters would have approved it within the upcoming six month period.²⁶

During the same year, the Committee presented an action plan for lobbying on behalf of the draft bill. The plan focused upon "the key persons, governmental departments and organizations whose support and cooperation would be needed to secure sufficient backing for the introduction of and passage of a bill for certification of social workers in the New York State legislature ".²⁷ The plan consisted of three phases: steps to be taken preliminary to introduction of a bill; steps to obtain a sponsor for and introduction of a bill; and steps to obtain legislative support after introduction. It was explained that in preparing the report, consideration was given to the factor of timing and sequence as well as to the reasons for selection of key persons and organizations.

The first phase focused on what should be done before introducing a bill into the legislature, and targeted the State Education Department. As the one State department that would eventually administer any certification law, that Department would be in a position to block the bill. It was

therefore considered important to consult an appropriate State official and obtain agreement that passage was desirable. The only specific strategy suggested was to get endorsement from the deans of the schools of social work to show support from within the educational field.²⁸

The second component of the first phase involved consulting the Governor's counsel for technical advice and to assure that the reasons for seeking certification were clear. A third concern was the need "to test the degree of support of certain professional groups to learn of any opposition, and to neutralize it. Then those concerned, including the Governor's counsel, may be prepared for dealing with any 'hot potato' aspects." This included in particular the Medical Society, the New York Psychological Association and selected leaders in State agencies.²⁹

The second phase, obtaining a sponsor and introducing the bill, was only briefly discussed in the report, merely noting that these tasks would only follow the completion of the first phase. It was noted, however, that consideration would need to be given to either an upstate or downstate member of the legislature, depending upon how support seemed to be lining up. It was believed that the sponsor should be both a "dynamic person and one who had conviction about the bill".

The third phase of the plan was mobilizing "enthusiastic" support of the bill within the social work profession and other groups. Advocates were urged to seek

support from the New York State departments of social welfare, corrections, health and mental hygiene; the state's public welfare association, the local county welfare commissioners; and executive directors of social service agencies. In addition, developing support was seen as possible within the civil service union, the AFL-CIO unions, and specialized groups of social workers.³⁰

By the fall of 1962, seven years after the Chapter began work on legal regulation (since the organization's founding), the threat of significant opposition to legal regulation was recorded for the first time. In a letter to the Chair of the Chapter's Board of Directors, the Commissioner of the New York City Department of Welfare, himself a social worker and member of NASW, expressed the hope that communication could be opened up between the Chapter and public welfare officials in New York State. Although the Chapter had been able to make progress with few expressions of opposition, a letter emerged that had the potential to throw the eventual success in the pursuit of legal regulation into doubt.³¹

The Commissioner's letter raised questions about pursuing legal regulation on the grounds that social work already has sufficient protection through standards maintained through voluntary agencies, community councils, schools of social work, professional associations, existing legislation, and government bodies. The letter said that social work was still developing training programs,

definitions of who practices, and methods for establishing accountability.³² While supporting the social work profession, the letter criticized legal regulation. "It appears that we are, what some have termed, 'enthusiastically pushing a tenuous package' where we might be more concerned with superficially uniting ourselves and developing our public image rather than emphasizing the services which we have been authorized to perform. A consequence can be non-acceptance of difference and our professional leadership not sufficiently responsive to the grass-roots groups in our fields of practice."³³

In other words, this public official was critical of the Chapter because, in his view, the profession was separating itself from the staff in public welfare who did not have the benefit of formal education in social work. This was underscored by his concern that focusing on the delivery of services needed attention more than the image of the profession.

The letter went on to call for giving a priority to establishing "a more realistic relationship" between the social work profession and public welfare. It was pointed out that public welfare workers comprised a large percentage of people employed in social work positions, and as public welfare programs expand as expected, the training of staff will increase in importance. It was further explained that public welfare employees had strong feelings about the professional association "...not gearing its programs,

activities, services and orientation to the needs, problems, and concerns of the public welfare worker. You know that I believe there is validity to these feelings."³⁴

Finally, the letter addressed the specifics of the proposal for legal regulation. The grandfather clause which allowed a large number of people already in social work positions to be certified, was approved. But it raised concern about the three year cap on the blanketing-in provision, suggesting that it would become difficult to recruit and maintain staff who had not obtained a graduate degree in social work.³⁵

Since the law would not require advanced training among those hired, but would limit who could be called "social worker", the Commissioner was apparently placing great value on what the position would be called in filling positions. He may also have been concerned with the precedent that was being set. Once certification was obtained, the more restrictive form of regulation, licensing, could ultimately follow.

In concluding the letter, the Commissioner addressed what he called the public welfare workers' point of view: "...I submit that we have to come to terms with whether a single portal entrance to professionalism is acceptable or desirable in terms of long term goals and developments. Taking the current situation into account and anticipating the future picture, I believe that we will require more than a single portal for employed social workers to enter the

professional community. For the present, both professional training and/or experience should be the credentials and qualifications for taking advantage of whatever privileges, prerogatives, and status the community confers upon the profession of social work."³⁶

The Commissioner expressed an additional concern that the proposed legislation did not address the issue of private practice of social work. "This area is handled quite nebulously and does not reflect a position or stand which I think the professional association is obliged to take." This was the first time that the archival records even reflects the issue of private practice and whether there was any discussion about it within the context of obtaining legal regulation.

Within days of receiving the Commissioner's letter, the Chair of the Chapter's Committee on Legal Regulation sent a draft of a letter to the Chair of the Chapter's Board of Directors to respond to the Commissioner and asking that a meeting be arranged. It was acknowledged that although the Commissioner was strongly opposed to certification, he appeared "unwilling to dismiss it outright and may be open to suggestion - specifically talking about 'coming to terms' with the idea of a single portal entrance to the field".³⁷

In a draft of a letter responding to the Commissioner, the Committee's Chair agreed that a full discussion with the social work community was desired. He added that such discussion were being held in at least one area of the

field, and he referred to those taking place with the ten Chapters of NASW throughout the state. He indicated that as of the time of drafting the letter, eight of the ten Chapters had officially agreed to support the proposed legislation. Positive support from the other two Chapters was expected within a few months.³⁸ The Committee Chair said that he recognized the right of agencies to set their own standards and that such standards afforded the public some amount of protection. Nevertheless, he believed that the professional organization needed to set its own standards for those who are called social workers, a community larger than any single agency. In this context, it was pointed out that legal regulation would be a step toward professional and not agency regulation of the field.³⁹

In responding to the Commissioner's point about there not being one "portal entrance" into the profession, the Chair said that "...if the word 'professionalism' is to mean anything similar to what the public expects it to mean, then educational training must be the only entrance after a blanketing-in period." He went onto say that "...this is not to dismiss lightly the very acute problems that public welfare has in recruiting and maintaining staff. We certainly do not wish to exacerbate this." He went onto propose raising the idea of doing what had already been considered in California, having a professional title which was in that state called "Registered Social Worker" for

those who have a professional degree and one called "Associate Social Worker" which is reserved for those having a bachelor's degree.⁴⁰

In regard to the issue of status and image, the Chair responded by saying that this "may well seem like a 'tenuous package' but which is perhaps not really so intangible after all. The results of a poor public image may perhaps be most apparent to public welfare departments when they have to defend programs to the legislature and to the public at large. More than anyone, public welfare might be interested in bettering the image of itself and of social work - not for selfish reasons - but to provide better services to the public that is served. In this society it is an accepted measure of importance to be legally sanctioned. Operating unrecognized by the law is looked upon with some feeling of incompetency not only by legislatures and the general public but also by other professions."⁴¹

The Chair's draft letter was silent on one issue raised by the Commissioner. Nothing was said about how the proposed legislation might address social workers in private practice or whether special consideration was needed to discuss this further. It is interesting to note, however, that almost 30 years later this Chapter leader acknowledged in an interview for this study that the interest in private practice and ultimately in qualifying for insurance reimbursement was a "bread and butter" issue behind the pursuit for legal regulation from the beginning.⁴²

By June, 1963, in its annual report, the Committee on Legal Regulation announced that all ten Chapters in the State had come to support the original bill proposed by the New York City Chapter. It also reported that in a meeting in May between Chapter leaders and the Welfare Commissioner, "Issues were raised . . . by the Department which ultimately brought forth the idea of a second, non-professional category being added to the present draft for legal certification." The report went on to say that the Department of Welfare might support a bill that included a second category for certification, but without it there was most likely to be opposition. Despite this, the Board of Directors subsequently reaffirmed its support for a one title bill. The Board did leave open the possibility that some form of compromise might still need to be considered, but it is not clear what that might have meant.⁴³ One possibility is that, unless representatives from public welfare had the ability to stop legislation, there was no need to negotiate.

Over the course of the following year, from September, 1963 through June, 1964, time was spent gearing up for getting the draft bill ready for introduction into the 1965 session of the New York State legislature. Minor changes in the bill were considered and agreed to by each of the ten Chapters in the State, and plans were laid out for Chapters to share costs in the State Council of Chapters employing a parttime lobbyist. In addition, as part of the state

coalition of Chapters, the New York City Chapter assumed responsibility to develop a fact sheet about the importance of legal regulation of social workers.

Part IV: The NASW National Delegate Assembly and Lobbying For A Revised Bill; 1964 to 1965.

In July, 1964 the Legal Regulation Coordinator of the State Council of Chapters informed the New York City Chapter that the national body of NASW had decided to consider changing its policy on seeking certification of social workers in each state. When NASW was first formed out of seven social work organizations in 1955, it was agreed that the 1947 position of the American Association of Social Workers to pursue legal regulation of social workers would be in effect until NASW officially established its own position. This was established in 1958 at NASW's Delegate Assembly, NASW's policy making body. The New York State draft proposal conformed to this national policy. As the 1964 - 1965 program year opened, the fact that the 1964 Delegate Assembly unexpectedly considered altering its existing policy surprised the New York State leaders who had been working on the issue for so many years and were about to introduce a bill into the state legislature.

Basically, the issue at the national level centered around modifying what title would be restricted. Until this

point the policy restricted the title "social worker". The Delegate Assembly was considering limiting the policy so that only "certified social worker" would be restricted. This would allow others in the field to be called social worker.

In a letter, dated July 9, 1964, from the Legal Regulation Coordinator of the New York State Council of Chapters to the Chapter's Executive Director, a conversation held with the president of the national NASW was reviewed. According to the State Coordinator, "there had been long debate about acceptance of the proposals for submission to the Delegate Assembly with indication that the greatest support for these proposals had come from the Mid- and Far West where public welfare was the dominant group in the field... The basic argument seems to be that people feel the professional group have isolated themselves from the main stream of Social Welfare, and therefore are not considered as representative of Social Welfare interest."⁴⁴

While there is no indication that New York City's Welfare Commissioner played a role in this development, it appears that the concerns of people in public welfare about restricting the social work title were not only pervasive, but they had effectively taken action to modify the stance of NASW at the national level. Despite efforts by members in New York City and New York State to defeat the proposal, public welfare's position prevailed in the November Delegate Assembly.

At the first meeting of the Chapter's Committee on Legal Regulation following the Delegate Assembly, Committee members discussed the implications of the change. "The committee felt unanimously that now that we were no longer able to offer protection to the public on as broad a basis since our proposed bill, which had been brought back to and approved by all Chapters in New York State, had sought to pre-empt the title Social Worker. Now, in view of the position taken by the National Association, our bill must be brought back into line with National policy by changing our bill to limit the use of the title, "Certified Social Worker" thus regulating a smaller group within the field of social work." The committee consistently referred to the change as "radical".⁴⁵

The impact of the decision at the NASW Delegate Assembly on the form legal regulation would take was profound, whether one agrees or not that it was radical. Knowledge of this development stands as one of the most interesting findings in this study. Yet, in interviews with both the former Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation and the former Legal Regulation Coordinator of the New York State Council of Chapters, neither leader had any recollection of this development. Not only was the Delegate Assembly action not remembered, the fact that restricting the title "social worker", which was central to the original proposal, was not recalled. Given the clear and consistent evidence in Board minutes, materials in the files from the

Committee on Legal Regulation, and the existence of the original draft proposals for introduction into the state legislature, there is little doubt that a pertinent fact about social work in New York State had been forgotten.

In order to move forward, the Committee recommended a process to obtain the support from the Chapter membership before the proposed bill was modified. They called for a referendum to be mailed to members with time for a reply of one to three months. At the time, they hoped to pursue introduction of the bill for the 1966 legislature, one year later than earlier hoped. Despite this intention, both the Chapter's Executive Committee and the State Council of Chapters decided to hold to the original timetable of introducing a bill in the 1965 legislative session. To accomplish this, there would be too little time to hold a referendum. Instead, the Chapter held a membership meeting during which some time was taken to discuss the changes with members in attendance. According to the Committee's Chair, "I do not think we would want the New York City Chapter to be in a position of holding up legislation of the bill into the State Legislature if the other Chapters want this."⁴⁶

This is interesting because the process until this point was one of broad member involvement in the decisions on legal regulation. This was one reason the pursuit of this issue took many years. Now, the desire to move quickly relegated member input to a secondary concern.

Three months later, on March 16, 1965, a bill was

introduced into the State Senate by a Senator from New York City. The Chair of the Assembly Committee on Education introduced the bill into the Assembly.⁴⁷ The Committee on Legal Regulation set out its legislative strategy which included the following activities:

1. having national NASW send a letter to all members in New York State advising them of the introduction of the bill and asking them to write their legislators to support the measure.
2. using the Chapter newsletter for the bill and the need for individual action.
3. sending letters to executive directors and directors of social work departments asking them to involve their boards of directors and staff in a writing campaign.
4. obtaining support from the New York State Psychological Association.
5. informing the bill's sponsors that both the State and City Commissioners of Welfare expressed support for the bill.⁴⁸

A few weeks before the legislation was introduced, the Chair of the Committee wrote to the City's Welfare Commissioner about the new bill.⁴⁹ Apparently, the Commissioner found the change from restricting the title of "certified social worker" to be acceptable.

Over the next two months, each of the above outlined

activities were carried out. In a memorandum from the Chair of the Committee to the Chapter's Executive Director, it was reported that at least two trips were made to Albany to meet with legislative leaders. In addition, support from agencies was summarized. "Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and CSS (Community Service Society) officially supported the measure, as have more and more agencies so that this is being used effectively with the legislators. Although the New York City Department of Welfare and the State Department of Social Welfare have expressed support of the measure, some local welfare commissioners throughout the state are opposed to it. . . . However, there is, as yet, no organizational opposition to the measure. Our greatest enemy at this time is apathy and an unbelievably crowded legislative calendar - where our measure is not considered to be of great importance."⁵⁰

In regard to lobbying for the bill once it was introduced, the Chair of the New York City Chapter's Committee indicated that no one knew how long it would take to prepare for the introduction of legislation, which was approximately nine years from the founding of NASW. He said that the New York City Chapter was the "workhorse" and that what the New York City Chapter adopted was followed by the rest of the State. While this appears to be corroborated by some of the archival records, the Legal Regulation Coordinator of the State Councils also gives much credit to a parttime lobbyist who had been hired to work on the bill.

He said the lobbyist worked on all of the issues of the State Council, but legal regulation was a top priority.⁵¹

The lobbyist had access to legislative staff whom she cultivated, especially in the office of the Senate leader who was in the Republican party. She also had access to identified opposition, and she developed arguments to respond to their concerns. In addition, she developed a book containing letters from agencies indicating support, and this was used right up until the last day when voting was held in each legislative house.

In regard to the sponsors of the legislation, the Legal Regulation Coordinator said that the Senate sponsor was chosen by the New York City Chapter because his wife was a social worker and that he had enough "clout" to move the bill. This Senator chose the sponsor for the Assembly, but this choice was considered secondary. On the days the bill passed, the sponsors came over several times for discussions, and they asked questions. While the vote was not close, the debate indicated that it was closer than the vote count would have made it seem.⁵²

Before the 1965 legislative session ended in June, Governor Nelson Rockefeller signed into law the legal regulation of social workers. The vote in the Senate was 55 - 1 and in the Assembly, 125 - 15. While this was good news for social workers who desired such a law, the Committee Chair wrote soon after passage that "it is a fact that one reason for the lack of public news for this bill and for the

little stir it created is the unimportance with which social work is considered by many legislators. Several times, we had the experience of a Senator telling us that he would vote for the measure only because he could not care less about the bill but voted for it because he wanted to do a good turn for a neighbor of his (whom we had asked to call him). . . . However, there does exist a small group of legislators who are quite convinced of the importance of social work and these, such as ... (the bill's sponsor), accomplished much in convincing other less enthusiastic legislators to support our measure."⁵³

It should be noted that the Chair accounted for the positive vote in the legislature coming from an "unusually efficient vote getting machine", presumably referring to the lobbying activities of the social workers in the State.⁵⁴

Notes

1. Committee on Licensing. Licensing of Social Workers, January, 1950, a pamphlet of the American Association of Social Workers, New York, NY.
2. Committee on Legal regulation of Social Work Practice. Report of the Committee, Page 2, September, 1957, NYC Chapter, NASW.
3. Inter-association Committee on Legal Regulation of Social Work Practice. Final Report of the Inter-association Committee on Legal Regulation of Social Work Practice, New York City Chapter, AASW, May, 1955.
4. Inter-Association Committee on Legal Regulation of Social Work Practice. Review and Recommendations of Inter-Association on Legal Regulation of Social Work Practice, page 3, November, 1954.
5. Executive Committee. Minutes, August, 1955.
6. Board of Directors. Minutes, July, 1956.
7. Executive Director. Action on Legal Regulation by the New York City Chapter, October 1955 - December 1957, December, 1957, NYC Chapter, NASW.
8. Board of Directors. Minutes, October, 1956.
9. Board of Directors. Minutes, October, 1956.
10. Committee on Legal Regulation. Report of the Committee on Legal Regulation of Social Work Practice in New York State, September, 1957, pp. 3 - 4.
11. Ibid, pp. 5 - 6.
12. Interview with the former Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation, January 2, 1991.
13. Ibid, pp.8 - 10.
14. Board of Directors. Minutes, May , 1957.
15. Executive Committee. Minutes, December, 1957.
16. Interview with the Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation, January 2, 1991.

17. Executive Director. Report evaluating the functioning of the Chapter, submitted to the Board of Directors, June 28, 1958, and discussed at the November meeting of the Board.
18. Committee on Legal Regulation of Social Work. Annual Report, May, 1958.
19. Committee on Legal Regulation. Annual Report, June, 1959.
20. Committee on Legal Regulation. Report of the Committee on Legal Regulation of Social Work on Minimum Qualifications for Certification (Including Blanketing-In) of Social Workers in New York State, January, 1959.
21. Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation. A Plan for Legal Regulation of Social Work in New York State, presentation at the New York State Welfare Conference, November 17, 1959.
22. "Legal Certification Discussed" in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, May, 1960.
23. Committee on Legal Regulation. Draft of an Act to Amend the Education Law of the State of New York in Relation to the Profession of Social Work, February, 1960.
24. Ibid.
25. Committee on Legal regulation. Annual Report, June, 1962.
26. Ibid.
27. Subcommittee to Formulate a Plan of Action. Memo to the Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation, March 27, 1961.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Commissioner of the New York City Department of Welfare. Letter to Chair, NYC Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, November 23, 1962.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.
37. Chair of Committee on Legal Regulation. Memo to Chair of New York City Chapter Board of directors, NASW, November 28, 1962.
38. Chair of the Committee On Legal Regulation. Draft letter intended for Commissioner, New York City Department of Welfare, November 28, 1962.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Interview with the former Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation, January 2, 1991.
43. Committee on Legal Regulation. Annual Report, June 1963.
44. Legal Regulation Coordinator of the New York State Council of Chapters. Letter to Executive Director, New York City Chapter, NASW, July 9, 1964.
45. Committee on Legal Regulation. Minutes, December 2, 1964.
46. Chair, Committee on Legal Regulation. Letter to Chapter Chair, December 15, 1964.
47. Secretary, Committee on Legal Regulation. Minutes for February 25 and March 24, 1965.
48. Ibid.
49. Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation. Letter to Commissioner of the New York City Department of Welfare, March 5, 1965.
50. Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation. Memorandum to Chapter Executive Director, May 5, 1965.
51. Interview with the former Legal Regulation Coordinator for the New York State Council of Chapters, December, 1990.
52. Ibid.
53. Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation. Annual Report, 1964-1965.
54. Ibid.

Chapter 5: The Pursuit of Civil Rights in the New York City Chapter

Part I: Civil Rights in the Early Years of NASW; 1955 to 1963

When the Chapter first formed in 1955, the issue of civil rights was not garnering significant attention by the organization. Certainly, it was a value social workers shared as exemplified by the strong positive reaction to the announcement at the AASW Chapter meeting in 1954 that the Supreme Court had decided *Brown v. the Board of Education*.¹ Nevertheless, once NASW was formed the Chapter declined to involve itself in issues that the national NAACP brought to the attention of NASW. Requests to support developments in southern states were determined by the Chapter leadership to be beyond the scope of concern for New York City.

One exception to this was in March, 1956, when workers from the University Settlement House requested that NASW write to the United State Senators from New York State to urge an investigation pertaining to the denial of civil rights.² The Till case, which involved the lynching of a 14 year old boy, and the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama, were cited as reasons for the concern. In April, the Chapter sent letters to the Senators and to national NASW.

It wasn't until 1962 that the Chapter became involved in the civil rights issue. At that time, the Social Policy and Action Committee sent letters to President Kennedy

urging that Federal troops be sent into Mississippi to protect the enrollment of James Meredith as the first African-American to attend the state's university. Within another six months, concern was focused on activities in Birmingham, Alabama. According to a recent history of the civil rights movement by Robert Weisbrot, the boycott of department stores and the confrontations with the infamous Public Safety Commissioner, Bull Conner, resulted in nationwide attention to the issues in the South. "Television coverage of the clubbings and hosings in Birmingham stirred indignation among Americans who had long been complacent about racist mistreatment of Negroes. One evening the national news featured film of Birmingham policemen pinning a black woman to the ground, with one officer's knee at her throat. A photograph carried on front pages of newspapers around the world showed a huge, snarling police dog lunging at a black woman. For the first time the media brought a graphic knowledge of racist violence into every American home."³

This chapter will detail the political activities of the New York City Chapter of NASW following the events in Birmingham, from 1963 through 1966. The Chapter, along with the national NASW, made civil rights a priority, and for the Chapter, the work in this area exemplified the quality and magnitude of activities that a social work membership organization can undertake. As will be seen, the first six months following the designation of civil rights as a

priority was an intensive series of actions geared toward the promotion of civil rights legislation in the United States Congress. Following this initial period, the level of activity gradually tapered off, even in the face of events right in New York City. Ultimately, social workers lodged complaints that not enough was being done to involve the members, despite the involvement of a large number at various points in time.

Part II: Making Civil Rights a Chapter Priority; 1963

While there is no evidence to show that social workers were complacent about racism prior to Birmingham, a new level of activity clearly followed on the heels of the incidents in the spring of 1963. Recommendations were being made by members of the Board of Directors to have civil rights become a Chapter priority, and the Chapter moved to call upon the national organization to press for federal civil rights legislation. According to minutes of the Board of Directors meeting on May 15, the Chair of the Social Policy and Action Committee reported that "the Chapter office has received some letters and telegrams from members urging NASW to take a public stand with regard to the current situation in Birmingham...The question was raised as to whether the Chapter should take action at this time and if so, what action. It was decided that the first line of action should be addressed to the national Board, urging

that they take specific action in directing chapters to act in civil rights issues and that more pressure be exerted for civil rights legislation."⁴

Whether the New York City Chapter was instrumental in getting national NASW to respond to the developments in civil rights is unclear. Nevertheless, national held its Board meeting just two days later in Cleveland, Ohio at which time immediate steps were called for, including the writing of a formal statement to reaffirm the organizations' goals in assuring civil rights, and a request for information from chapters about problems being faced within their own jurisdictions and actions being taken to confront them.⁵ In addition, the following resolution was made at the opening of the 90th Annual Forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare in Cleveland:

The Board of Directors of the National Association of Social Workers expresses the concern and backing of the social work profession for the objectives of Negro Citizens to seek and secure their civil rights.

We call upon the Federal Government to be more active in insuring the civil rights of all Americans and not to settle for too low goals and minor achievements in this area.

The social work profession believes that full opportunity for education, vocational training, and employment, for equal access to public facilities and

for the right to vote and hold office must be fully insured for Negroes as for other citizens...⁶

At the next Chapter Board meeting, it was announced that a special Chapter Committee on Civil Rights had been formed, and its Chair reported to the Board that the Committee wished to make civil rights a high priority within the Chapter. She said that the Committee planned to hold an educational meeting in the fall and that the president of the National Urban League, Whitney Young, and the widow of the civil rights leader, Medger Evers, should be the speakers. In addition, she also recommended that the Chapter develop a position paper and that civil rights legislation be lobbied for at both the local and national levels. The Board approved these and other recommendations and called for their immediate implementation.⁷

In an interview with the former Chair of the Civil Rights Committee, the point was made that she believed that it is difficult today to understand the meaning of the Chapter getting behind the civil rights issue in the 1950's. She implied that there was a radical aspect, not because racism was manifest among NASW members but because of the tactics being used in the civil rights movement were confrontational. She underscored the significance of the Chapter getting involved, including the point that NASW was somewhat unique in its support for civil rights outside of the civil rights organizations such as the NAACP.⁸

In additional interviews with the former Executive Director and a former Chair of the Board of Directors, it was brought out that civil rights was a good issue for the Chapter to get behind because of the merger and the different interests represented in each of the organizations that came to be NASW. They both indicated in separate discussions that civil rights created the opportunity to allow the Chapter to unite behind one issue.⁹

By the Fall 1963 a great deal of energy and activity had already been invested in the civil rights issue despite the typical summer hiatus experienced in many organizations. A position statement was written and passed by the Board of Directors at a July meeting. Press releases were sent to the media and a telegram was sent to the President of the New York City Council requesting that the Council "memorialize" Congress to pass the President's civil rights bill. A letter had been sent to the governor of New York State asking him about his position on the bill, and a letter had also been written to the City's Commission on Human Rights asking that body to strengthen its own organization and to work with other groups. Finally, Board members reported having met with the leadership of national NASW, and as a result of their meeting, national agreed to form its own Committee on Human Rights.¹⁰

The position statement endorsed the President's Civil Rights Bill and urged its adoption in the 1963 session of the United State Congress. In it the Chapter called upon

"all civic, business, religious, educational, and political leaders to join with it (the Chapter) in taking positive steps to end discrimination in every facet of American life..."¹¹ On July 21, the *New York Times* ran an article saying that the 4,000 member Chapter of NASW was promoting civil rights and had made it a Chapter priority. The article noted that the Chapter had called upon "those community leaders who serve on boards of welfare and health agencies and who understand the social consequences of discrimination to lend their names and hearts to the cause of the equality of all our citizens."

The Chapter also took leadership over the summer to organize social workers to meet at a central place in Washington, D.C. to join the "March for Jobs and Freedom" held on August 28, 1963. It was at this massive demonstration the Dr. Martin Luther King gave his now historic "I have a dream" speech. One month later, on September 26, the membership meeting originally announced in June was held. The topic was "Social Workers and Civil Rights". As reported in the Chapter's newsletter, "a record crowd (one that still holds into 1991) turned out to hear Mr. Whitney Young, Mrs. Medgar Evers, and Dr. Algernon Black speak on "Social Workers and Civil Rights" at an open membership meeting on September 26. Mr. Young spoke on the responsibilities of social workers to work for civil rights and opportunities for all, Mrs. Evers on unfinished matters in the South, and Dr. Black on concerns of social workers in

New York City."¹²

Another development over the summer were visits to the two U.S. Senators. In one meeting, Senator Kenneth Keating suggested that the Chapter circulate petitions to urge the passage of the civil rights legislation. He expressed the belief that this would strengthen the Congressional delegates representing New York City to work for the bill's passage. The Chapter's newsletter called upon members "to have your friends, family, colleagues, members of your community groups sign it - and any others who vote in New York State...".¹³ A few months later, just weeks before the assassination of President John Kennedy, Chapter leaders presented 15,000 signatures to the two United State Senators on the Steps of the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C. The November 1 issue of the *New York Post* said "the petition from the New York City Chapter of the National Assn. of Social Workers called for the passage this year of the Kennedy Administration's civil rights bill with 'strengthening amendments'".¹⁴

Following the presentation of the petitions, letters were sent to all of the members of the House of Representatives from New York State informing them of the petitions and urging their action on behalf of the bill.¹⁵

Of 41 Congressmen who were sent letters, 24 responded and indicated that they supported the legislation.¹⁶

While much of the Chapter's activity focused on the federal government, attention was also directed at the

governmental body closest to home, the New York City Council. On August 5, the Chapter's Board Chair sent a telegram to the President of the City Council urging "that the Council of the City of New York take the lead for municipal legislatures throughout the United States in passing a resolution in support of the President's civil rights bill." Subsequently, in mid-November following discussions with the counsel to the President of the City Council, the New York City Chapter submitted a suggested resolution for the Council to consider and adopt.

It is interesting to note the contents of the resolution for the way in which the civil rights issue was framed for the Council. It began by noting that the year, 1963, marked the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation in which President Lincoln declared all slaves to be "forever free". It then cited the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the United States Constitution and stated that none of them had been fully enforced in the past century. The denial of equality of citizenship, which was the result of this lack of enforcement, was noted to be based solely on the base of race and color. The resolution then went on to express the historic role of New York City as "a pioneer in enacting corrective municipal legislation in this area and has been supported in this effort by the overwhelming majority of its citizens..."¹⁷

A slightly modified resolution was introduced into the

City Council on December 6. Five days later it passed unanimously.¹⁸

Within the first six months of making civil rights a priority for the New York City Chapter, a whole series of activities had been undertaken. Not only did the Chapter pursue what it had called its first line of action, contact national NASW to urge that civil rights be made a priority by the national organization, the Chapter succeeded in involving thousands of social workers and others in their efforts. A thousand social workers were reported to have attended a membership meeting on the subject, and following a meeting with the United States Senators from New York, 15,000 signatures were collected urging passage of federal legislation. This was the basis for subsequent contact with the New York State delegation in the House of Representatives, and eliciting the involvement of the New York City Council was undertaken as well. In addition, a delegation of members marched in the mass demonstration in the nation's capitol, a position paper had been written and coverage was obtained in several New York City newspapers of the Chapter's efforts.

Part III: The Civil Rights Act and After; 1964 to 1966

It is worth noting that while not directly responsible, the Chapter participated in a "Special Human Rights Assembly" held by national NASW in Washington, D.C. in

March, 1964. The meeting had originally been scheduled for November but was postponed because of the Kennedy assassination. The Chapter worked to turn out the media through contacting the New York City press and requesting that they have their Washington correspondents cover the event. To attract their interest, NASW could claim such participants as United States Senators Hubert Humphrey and George McGovern, Roy Wilkins, the Executive Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Whitney Young, Jr., Executive Director of the National Urban League.¹⁹

In a report to the Civil Rights Committee shortly after the event, it was noted that approximately 160 people attended representing all states except Alaska and Mississippi. It was also noted that the national speakers, especially those representing the NAACP and the Urban League, made presentations not normally heard by people from many parts of the country. In addition, information was provided on the current status of the civil rights legislation and pointers were given on how to make one's case with legislators. On the second day, social workers visited representatives from their own states, with the New York City delegation visiting their United States Senators.²⁰

In a two column report in the *New York Times*, a visit with Senator Richard Russell of Georgia by social workers from his state proved newsworthy. Russell, who had led the

filibuster in the Senate for the purpose of completely delaying any action on civil rights legislation, told the integrated group of social workers "this bill may pass, but I think in the long run it will work to the disadvantage of the country and hurt the people you want most to help." The social workers told the *Times* that they had not changed anyone's mind but they learned a lot about social action. The article went on to report on President Lyndon Johnson meeting in the Rose Garden with all of the social workers who attended the Assembly. Johnson said that the civil rights bill would pass even if it took the entire summer.²¹

While the event in Washington was not a Chapter activity, it appears that social workers from New York City were in a position to initiate activities among social workers nationwide as a result of the close contact between New York City Chapter leaders and national NASW leaders, whose office was also located in New York City. There is little doubt that Chapter leaders in civil rights saw their role vis-a-vis the rest of the country. One clear example of this occurred when members in New York City were called upon at the Chapter's April 29 meeting to contact relatives and friends in other parts of the country to stimulate action in Congress, especially those not favoring the civil rights bill.²² This example is in addition to the Chapter initially turning to national NASW urging the issue be made a priority for social work across the country.

While the Chapter had been putting energy into getting

support for a federal civil rights law, there was at the very same time a great deal of activity meriting attention in New York City. In public school education there was increasing concern about segregation of the schools. On January 29, 1964 the New York City Board of Education came out with its "Plan for Better Education Through Integration" for the stated purpose "to prepare pupils to participate fully in economic, social and political life, regardless of environmental handicaps, and to develop better citizens".²³ Although no details were given in the report about the extent of segregation in New York City's school system, the presence of the report spoke to the heightened concern about the issue and it developing into a political concern.

Many groups in the City had called for a boycott of the public schools which was scheduled for February 3. The Chair of the Citywide Committee for Integrated Schools, the Reverend Milton A. Galamison, a critic of the Board of Education plan in that it did not go far enough, said that unless the Board set up a timetable for integrating the schools, Negro parents would boycott imbalanced schools. According to the *New York Times*, Mr. Galamison said that he was responding to the president of the Board of Education who apparently stated that civil rights organizations were dealing in "jingoistic slogans" instead of constructive and practical suggestions.²⁴

To be in a position to respond to the Board of Education plan and to the called for boycott, the Chapter's

Civil Rights Committee, in collaboration with the Chapter's Council on Social Work in the Schools, developed a position paper in response to the Board of Education's plan. Then, at a special meeting of the Chapter's Executive Committee, discussion was held about what the Chapter's stance should be. It was agreed that the draft position statement be adopted with some minor changes and referred to the Board for approval.

In regard to the boycott, the minutes of the special meeting report that "it was agreed that while we realize that groups working for school desegregation were forced by the Board's inaction into planning extreme measures, we believe the deliberate withdrawal of children from school at this time would serve no purpose except to deprive them of hours of much needed education. The Executive Committee did not wish the inference to be drawn that at another time the use of a boycott might not be supported by the Chapter".²⁵

It remains unclear whether this stance disappointed any of the Chapter leaders; it was simply noted that one member of the Board expressed "strong" disappointment about not supporting the boycott. No other mention was made of this.²⁶

In the statement that was subsequently adopted by the Board of Directors, the Chapter took the position that the Board of Education was only taking a very small step toward integration. "The New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers joins with those groups working for school desegregation in demanding a fuller and

more inclusive plan for integration of public education in the City of New York. We believe that only through total integration and the raising of educational standards can all children be prepared for the pursuit of their individual life goals."²⁷ The statement went on to declare that the Board of Education had allowed five years to pass since "it recognized in 1958 that it had responsibility for correcting the ethnic imbalance in the public schools..."²⁸

At the February 19th meeting of the Board of Directors, it was decided to use the content of the position papers for communications with the Board of Education, the Mayor, and other appropriate officials, and to communicate the position to the membership. Within a week letters had been sent to the designated individuals including the Commissioner of the State Education Department. Three responses were in the archives; one nothing more than a form letter from the State Commissioner thanking the Chapter's Chair for his "thoughtfulness" in writing. Another letter, from one of the members of the Board of Education, said with perhaps some sarcasm, she agreed "so heartily that a plan for desegregation requires the most tremendous involvement of the community. You as social workers know only too well the tremendous amount of community organization that this entails." She referred NASW on to communicate with the Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Integration.²⁹

This superintendent had already received the Chapter's correspondence from other members of the Board of Education

and wrote to the Chair of the Chapter. He said that the Chapter's position "contain allegations and charges of a serious nature, as well as requests for further unspecified actions in the direction of further integration, which are difficult to discuss in a letter. Therefore, I should be happy to meet with you and a small committee of your Association, at some mutually acceptable time."³⁰ It is unclear whether a meeting took place, but it was noted in the Civil Rights Committee minutes of April 29 that the Board of Directors would select representatives to meet with the education official.

As the program year approached an end in the late spring of 1964, Chapter leaders reviewed where they were and where they were heading with the civil rights issue. This was now approximately one year into work on this priority. In a memo from the Chapter's Executive Director to the Chair of the Civil Rights Committee and the Chair of the Board of Directors, a summary of an earlier discussion between the three Chapter leaders was presented. In it the director recounted that they had discussed the basic program of the committee and that "the matter of segregated services was considered the most urgent for the Chapter such as in housing (including relocation), schools, child care, etc, etc. It was further agreed that although the committee had started out with doing something in employment, housing and education it had been unable to move into the two areas of employment and housing and that the committee would take up

these. In addition the committee should make suggestions to the councils of the Chapter for work in civil rights in relation to their own particular areas of practice."³¹

While the Chapter leaders planned for the next program year to span from July, 1964 through June, 1965, it was not possible to know the events that would first unfold. Three young civil rights workers, which included a social worker and Chapter member from New York City, Michael Schwerner, would be murdered in Philadelphia, Mississippi on June 21. Three weeks later there would be riots in Harlem. In addition, the nomination of Barry Goldwater to be the Republican candidate for President appeared to many a threat to the entire civil rights cause. At least one positive had been accomplished, however, on July 2 the President signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In responding to initial reports that the three men were missing, the Chapter wrote letters to the President, the Attorney General and the two United States Senators urging federal involvement into the investigation. Senator Keating responded to the Chapter within a few days with a copy of a telegram that he had sent to the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, saying that he was "confident that you will make the facilities of your office fully available for that purpose (investigating the disappearance)". He also suggested that Kennedy assign U.S. marshals "to protect the constitutional rights of the young people who are in Mississippi in connection with voter registration drives."³²

Despite this response and the amount of activity of the Chapter in civil rights since June, 1963, the Chapter Chair received a letter on July 24, 1964 expressing concern about the Chapter's involvement in civil rights. The letter was from a social worker from a hospital in Queens. She indicated that social workers needed to become involved in helping to ease tensions and resolve problems. "We need the leadership of the Chapter of NASW to help clarify the issues and to give direction so that we can use ourselves most effectively. There are so many social workers saying 'what can we do?' It is for this reason we are requesting that an immediate emergency meeting of the New York City Chapter be called."³³

The social worker went on to say that NASW has not publicly responded in a timely fashion. "Although the Civil Rights Committee of NASW has been constructively active this year, it has not involved the general membership in any direct action."³⁴ A letter received at the Chapter office a few months later indicated that this social worker had become the Chair of what was called "Social Workers for Civil Rights Action", which formed to address the issues relating to civil rights.³⁵ The letter stated that "we face a crisis in civil rights in New York City as well as in the South and must move ahead quickly to supplement the efforts of our professional organization and agencies." A meeting was announced which included the director of the Congress of

Racial Equality, James Farmer, and the goals were stated as the "establishment of a Michael Schwerner Fund to advance the cause of civil rights, by funding a Community Center Program in Mississippi as well as additional civil rights activities in our own city."³⁶

Despite the level of energy and activity of the Chapter, especially through its Civil Rights Committee, there appeared to be some amount of dissatisfaction with what the Chapter was doing. While the social worker who had written to the Chapter Chair was aware of the Civil Rights Committee, she was apparently most concerned about involving individual social workers, something she did not believe NASW had done. In forming a new group for social workers to become involved in, there is reason to believe that others shared her point of view. The group had a letterhead reflecting the involvement of a number of social workers, and they had enough energy to establish activities in response to the death of the social worker in Mississippi.

It is worth noting that in the annual report from the Chapter's Civil Rights Committee in the spring, 1964, the Chair wrote that upon the formation of the committee one year earlier, "a very small group of Chapter members immediately volunteered to serve on this Committee. Unfortunately the number has continued small although their dedication to the cause of equal rights has made possible the kind of activity which perhaps a larger less interested number could not have accomplished. " This limited level

of participation occurred despite the Chair's point that "although no charge was given to the Committee at that time (June 1963), implicit in its appointment was the urgent need for stimulating social workers whose voices were not being heard among the many voices in the arena of the struggle for equal rights for minority group citizens."³⁷

Despite the criticism leveled at the Chapter, no emergency meeting was held for members to discuss how they might get involved. However, it was given serious consideration. At the July 30 meeting of the Civil Rights Committee, members of Social Workers for Civil Rights Action attended as guests and expressed the need for more involvement on the part of all social workers especially given the nomination of Goldwater and the riots in the city. "They stated that many rank and file social workers were eager and ready to do something immediately. Further, that this sense of urgency had expressed itself in the spontaneous organization of about 125 to 150 members into a "Social Workers for Civil Rights Committee". Meetings of this group have been held at the Educational Alliance with a great deal of enthusiasm expressed for an immediate program."³⁸

The invited group suggested that a large rally or meeting be organized to be held in September. "The action would deal with what the members felt was the most urgent single issue -- work on voter registration." The Chapter's Chair and the executive director, both of whom had also

attended the meeting, told the guests that there was too little time to carry out such an event. They indicated that the national delegate assembly was forthcoming in November, the Chapter office would be closed for part of the summer, and that no monies were available in the Chapter budget for such an undertaking. In response to this, the guests stated that they were prepared to supply volunteers and to raise needed funds. The meeting ended with the guests being requested to submit a written statement outlining their suggestions and supplying specific information about individuals who would be willing to work with the Chapter on the plan.³⁹

At the September Executive Committee meeting, the executive director reported to the Chapter office that it was not possible to arrange a membership meeting for September, but a release was sent to the membership urging assistance with voter registration. Information on how to do this was to have been obtained by calling the office of the Chair of the Civil Rights Committee.⁴⁰ It was not made clear how these decisions were made; the executive committee meeting only received a report on the decisions.

The Civil Rights Committee subsequently moved onto plan an all day workshop for the spring titled "Civil Rights - Responsibility and Realities in Agency Practice". One topic to be included was the theme "Does Your Agency Unintentionally Discriminate Against Minority Groups?". The keynote address, to be given by the president of the NAACP,

was to be "What Next in Civil Rights". Workshops titles were: "How Can Administrative Policy, Personnel Practices and Service Promote the Elimination of Discrimination?"; "How Can Agencies Meet Their Responsibilities to Minority Group Communities?"; "How Can Agency Staff Members Better Relate to Persons of Ethnic and Economic Backgrounds Different From His Own?"; and "Sectarianism Challenge to Discrimination".⁴¹ This last topic was not included, however, in the meeting.

To turn out people for the meeting, the Civil Rights Committee arranged for the Chapter Chair to send letters to executive directors of agencies in New York City. In addressing the directors about the meeting, she said "we know that you will agree with us that the fullest realization of human rights is basic to achieving the programs of all welfare and health agencies today. Yet despite our best efforts there exists a disturbing gulf between theory and practice in our agencies. We think, therefore, that you, members of your Board of Directors and your staff will welcome the opportunity to participate in a program to examine and discuss CIVIL RIGHTS - RESPONSIBILITIES AND REALITIES IN AGENCY PRACTICE (emphasis was in the original)."⁴²

It was hoped that the conference would result in agencies undertaking self-studies and appraisements of their programs, and operations. In addition, it was hoped that there would be increased sensitivity of all agency staff as

well as boards in the area of human relations and civil rights.⁴³ It is unclear that these hopes were realized as a result of the conference. However, in evaluating the conference at the end of the year, the committee's Chair reported that the meeting was extremely successful. It was noted that 521 people had attended.

Plans were subsequently made to follow up on the conference with open meetings on subjects relating to discrimination in agencies, but several months after the event no follow up had yet occurred. At that time, in December, 1965, Social Workers for Civil Rights Action wrote to the Chapter expressing its disappointment. "Seven months have since elapsed and we, in Social Workers for Civil Rights Action, are disappointed at the lack of follow through, and the failure to take advantage of the interest exhibited by the more than 500 social workers who attended that conference. Our members wish, therefore, to register their dissatisfaction with the leadership provided by the Chapter's Civil Rights Committee. It seems to us that the climate has never been more favorable than now for involving social workers of New York City in some meaningful civil rights activity...".⁴⁴

After such an intensive first year of political activity, it now appeared that the Chapter, despite the developments with the riots, a social worker and a member of the Chapter being murdered for his efforts on civil rights, and other developments, was on a downturn in its activities.

Even though there may have been value in having a workshop of the nature held in the spring of 1965, the focus had clearly turned more internal to the profession and away from the political arena. But this was the intent of the committee; it was now determined to address civil rights issues in social worker's "own house", referring to the social welfare community in New York City. Nevertheless, even in the area in which the Chapter had turned to concentrate its efforts, the efforts were clearly much less than they had been in the past.

A year later the Chair of the Chapter's Civil Rights Committee reviewed where the committee was with members of the committee. She said that the last year had not been as productive as the year before in terms of committee activity. According to the minutes, "she indicated that interest lags when there is no 'crisis' to stir people up about human rights and to cause the excitement in the community that is necessary for concrete action."⁴⁵ Basically, the committee focused on examining the Department of Welfare's approach to possible discrimination in the services under its charge. But the level of activity that would indicate that the issue was clearly getting priority attention was in the past.

A significant aspect of the Chapter's work on civil rights through this point involved the amount of time and energy a few individuals put into it. The Chapter's Executive Director made the point that the Committee Chair

worked very hard to develop the priority for the Chapter, writing position papers and giving direction. One source for the Chair was her non-social work husband who was the executive director of one of the national civil rights organizations in the forefront of civil rights activities.⁴⁶

According to the Committee Chair, she had an advantage due to her husband's position in that she knew what events and issues were emerging when they were first being discussed among civil rights leaders. This relationship between leaders of two organizations, one of them NASW, also helped when NASW went to Washington for its national meeting and lobbying. According to the Chair, the leaders of NASW became discouraged when they attempted to set up a meeting with President Lyndon Johnson to discuss civil rights. When it was determined that no meeting would be scheduled, NASW leaders concluded that Johnson did not have much regard for social workers. She said that she was able to call upon her husband, who had on-going contact with the President during the civil rights debate in Congress, to personally request a meeting with the social workers coming to Washington. It was arranged and the President met with the entire delegation at the White House.⁴⁷

Notes

1. Interview with former member of the New York City Chapter of the American Association of Social Workers, April, 1989.
2. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, March, 1956.
3. Weisbrot, Robert. *Freedom Bound*, Penguin Books, New York, 1990, page 72.
4. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, May 15, 1963, page 3.
5. NASW National President. Memo to Chapter Chair, June 14, 1963.
6. Public Relations Director. Undated press release of the National Association of Social Workers, New York, NY.
7. Secretary to the Board. Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, June 26, 1963, page 4.
8. Interview with the former Chair of the Chapter's Civil Rights Committee, January 10, 1991.
9. Interviews with the former Chapter Executive Director, February 5, 1991, and with the former Chair of the Chapter Board of Directors, February 28, 1990.
10. Secretary to the Board of Directors. Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors, October, 16, 1963.
11. "A Chapter Statement on Civil Rights" in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, August 5, 1963.
12. "1,000 at chapter Meeting on Civil Rights", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, October 18, 1963.
13. Anonymous article. "Petition Now", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, August 5, 1963.
14. Anonymous article. "Chapter Acts on Federal Civil Rights Bill", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, December 12, 1963.
15. Ibid.
16. Secretary to the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, December 11, 1963.
17. New York City Chapter, National Association of Social Workers. Draft of Resolution on Federal Civil Rights Legislation Suggested to the Council of the City of New York - November 19, 1963.

18. Executive Director of the New York City Chapter. Letter to the Legislative Council, Office of the President of the City Council, December 6, 1963; handwritten notation, December 11, 1963.
19. Press release, March 19, 1964.
20. Secretary to the Committee on Civil Rights. Minutes of the Civil Rights Committee Meeting, April 1, 1964.
21. Emma Harrison. "Social Workers Push Rights Bill", in the *New York Times*, March 25, 1964.
22. Chapter Executive Director. Memo to Chair of the Civil Rights Committee and Chapter President, April 27, 1964.
23. Board of Education of the City of New York. *Plan for Better Education Through Integration*, January 29, 1964.
24. Fred Powledge. "Pupil Integration in 3 Years Urged", in the *New York Times*, December 24, 1963.
25. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Special, Meeting of the Executive Committee, January 30, 1964.
26. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, February 19, 1964.
27. Committee on Civil Rights. Draft statement in response to the Board of Education's plan for integrating the schools.
28. Ibid.
29. Member of the New York City Board of Education. Letter to the Chair of the New York City Chapter, NASW, March 9, 1964.
30. Assistant Superintendent of the New York City Board of Education. Letter to the Chair of the New York City Chapter, NASW, March 6, 1964.
31. Executive Director of the New York City Chapter, NASW. Memo to the Chair of the Civil Rights Committee and the Chair of the Board of Directors, April 27, 1964.
32. U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating. Telegram to Robert Kennedy, U.S. Attorney General, June 23, 1964.
33. Letter from Chapter member to the Chair of the New York City Chapter, July 24, 1964.
34. Ibid.

35. Chairman, Social Workers for Civil Rights. Undated letter addressed to "colleagues", received at the NASW chapter office in November, 1964.

36. Ibid.

37. Chair of the Chapter Committee on Civil Rights. Draft of Committee's annual report, June 11, 1964.

38. Secretary of the Civil Right Committee. Minutes of Special Meeting of the Civil Rights Committee, July 30, 1964.

39. Ibid.

40. Secretary to the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Meeting of the executive Committee, September 24, 1964.

41. Secretary to the Chapter Civil Rights Committee. Minutes of the Civil Rights Committee, January 25, 1965.

42. Chapter Chair. Letter addressed to executive directors of New York City agencies, March 11, 1965.

43. Secretary to the Civil Rights Committee. Minutes of the Civil Rights Committee, March 10, 1965.

44. President of Civil Rights for Civil Rights Action. Letter to the Chair of the New York City Chapter, NASW, December 7, 1965.

45. Secretary to the Civil Rights Committee. Minutes of the Human Rights Committee of NASW, December 12, 1966.

46. Interview with the former Chapter Executive Director, February 5, 1991.

47. Interview with the former Chair of the Chapter Committee on Civil Rights, January 10, 1991.

**CHAPTER 6: PUBLIC WELFARE AS AN ISSUE
IN THE NEW YORK CITY CHAPTER**

In setting up NASW in 1955, the Public Welfare Committee of AASW recommended that the new organization promote standards in the field of public welfare focusing on the programs of the City's Department of Welfare. The Committee expressed support for the idea of having a social policy and action division within the Chapter and, within it, a subdivision on public welfare expressing that public assistance "warrants special emphasis on the part of the division". The Committee felt that NASW must have sufficient machinery to take prompt action on current issues as they develop.¹

It is not surprising that such recommendations came from the AASW. According to the former Executive Director of the New York City Chapter of NASW, the AASW was the one organization out of the seven that merged into NASW that was very interested in public welfare.² At least some members became interested in public welfare in the 1930's when the Social Security Act established the public welfare system in the United States. Members were employed in the system at its inception and not only watched its develop, they were part of the development.³ As a result of this, a number of social workers became expert in public welfare, including leaders of the New York City Chapter of AASW and, later, NASW.

This chapter details how the New York City Chapter priority issue of public welfare was pursued. The focus is primarily upon efforts in response to three government reports on public welfare, one at the City level and two in succession at the State level. These three efforts are believed to be representative of other efforts that came later in the period under study when the Human Resources Administration was created. Not included in this study are efforts to address workforce issues involving the union representing public welfare employees.

The extent of the three efforts are contrasted with the development of what much of the news media termed a scandal at a community based organization that was attempting to address public welfare in a new way through the federal anti-poverty program. This chapter, as a result of this comparison, not only highlights significant political activities undertaken by NASW, it also reveals opportunities for political action not taken despite member requests to play a leadership role.

Part I: Addressing the City's Department of Welfare; 1958 to 1960

Once the Chapter began operations, public welfare did not become an important social action consideration until 1958 when Mayor Robert Wagner, responding to reports in the

press that the City's Department of Welfare was not well run and that fraud was going unchecked, set up a "Mayoral Committee on Inquiry" into the Welfare Department. The Chapter's response was within the context of its national policies. A few months before the Mayor's Committee was announced, NASW's national Delegate Assembly updated its "Goals of Public Social Policy" which were established as guides for both national and chapter action. Public welfare was defined "as including those governmental functions (a) in which social work constitutes the central professional discipline, (b) which are carried out through public welfare agencies, and (c) which have as their purpose the assurance to individuals of the means to meet those social needs - whether for economic aid, personal service, social relationships, or social protection - which the community recognizes as basic but for which other resources have been inadequate".⁴ When the Chapter decided to respond to the Mayor's Committee, which issued its final report in October, 1959, the NASW goals relating to public welfare would be important to stir action and provide the principles for responding.

In addition to the guidance derived from the national policy statement, Chapter leaders had their own convictions about what public welfare should be. According to a former Chair of the Board of Directors, there was a desire to apply concepts and principles of social work practice in public welfare, that public welfare should be defined as social

work and not only as control over the poor. The issue of providing counseling seems to have been an important concern to this.⁵

According to an account in the *New York Times*, the Mayor set up the Committee on Inquiry in response to a grand jury investigation into charges of misuse of relief funds. The Committee, which was headed by the executive vice president of a major city-wide federation of voluntary agencies, called for the creation of an advisory board to the Mayor. It would not have administrative or policy powers, but would be available for consultation on basic policy, changes in services, and relations with private welfare agencies. The article barely mentioned the issue of fraud, which reflected the fact the Committee's own report gave scant attention to it. The *Times* article also skipped over the major discussion of the report.⁶

The report of the Mayor's Committee of Inquiry opened with a central discussion of what was titled "Welfare in the American Way" which addressed the circumstances under which public welfare should be used. "In our society those in need are expected to solve their own problems by self-help, through the resources of the family, by neighborly assistance, or when all such individual efforts fail, by assistance from voluntary organizations. When voluntary agencies are unable to meet the needs of families and individuals, public welfare and health services should be called upon."⁷ The report went on to say that government

should purchase services from voluntary agencies before government itself expands its function. While readers of the *New York Times* could learn of the proposal to create an advisory council to the Mayor, the article made it impossible to see the connection such a body would have in seeing to it that government accept the report's major thrust, contracts to voluntary agencies.

The Chapter moved to set up a "Special Committee On Report of Inquiry on the New York City Department of Welfare". The Committee delegated responsibility among its members which consisted of ten people. This included the current Chair of the Chapter, the two previous Chairs, and two who were to be the next two Chairs. It was clearly a high level Committee of Chapter leaders. In addition, two members would eventually become welfare commissioners in the City of New York.

The members of the Committee agreed that once a response was drafted, it would go before the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors for approval. To determine what action would follow that, assuming there would be support, the Committee planned future steps and focused on the need to influence the Mayor.

"If he (the Mayor) felt there was considerable opposition by citizens to the recommendations, he might not be so willing to carry them out. It was agreed that professional social workers alone would not have influence on the Mayor. It was therefore suggested that our efforts

go beyond our own membership and work with civic organizations such as the Women's City Club, Citizen's Budget Commission, Citizen's Union, among many others, and also get individual lay leaders to join in the efforts."⁸

Discussion also focused on the possibility that NASW members might not all agree on the position the Chapter was evolving. "It was suggested that this matter be discussed with membership from the standpoint of the effect on families when this (purchase of services) occurs -- the 'splitting of families' between agencies, duplication, etc. rather than to approach the matter on the appropriate use of tax funds, basic issues of voluntary and public agencies, etc. This approach would be more understandable to Chapter members."⁹

It is interesting to note that while Chapter leaders were more involved in this issue than in legal regulation or civil rights, members were not involved even to the limited extent that they were with the other two issues. It appears as though the Chapter leaders did not think that members would appreciate the issues as they were being addressed on a policy level. Another possibility is that leaders were concerned that members, especially those in voluntary agencies, would disagree with the stance.

A former Chair of the Board of Directors said in an interview that addressing the interests of the voluntary organizations in obtaining contracts for counseling was very difficult for the Chapter. On the one hand, the voluntaries

wanted to address "the sophisticated and humane aspects of service" and leave the City to do welfare investigating. He said that despite most members working in the voluntary sector, "the Chapter stuck to its conviction that public welfare should be professionalized to the greatest extent possible". He went on to say that the Chapter was the strongest voice in the City on this issue.¹⁰

A month after the Committee was formed, it was still discussing which organizations would be approached to join with the Chapter in addressing the Mayor. In this context, it was reported in the minutes that "our position would be non-negotiable and therefore we could at no time modify our position if some groups might differ with parts of it - however, a group could support some of our position, if not all. They could also develop their own statements."¹¹ It was noted in the minutes that Chapter members would be notified of the Chapter position at an upcoming Chapter meeting.

At the February meeting of the Chapter Board of Directors, the final draft of a Chapter statement was adopted. Citing the national NASW "Goals of Public Social Policy" on public welfare, the statement congratulated the Mayor's Committee on a number of items they had discussed and recommended. However, in regard to the purchase of services from voluntary agencies, the Chapter statement went in depth into why it should be opposed. "We oppose this recommendation on three grounds: (1) it is completely at

variance with established public policy regarding the responsibilities of the public welfare authorities; (2) it would result in poorer, rather than better service to the clients; (3) it would involve unnecessary administrative complexities and further intensify the already serious problem of the coordination of social services in New York City."¹²

To substantiate the first point about public policy, the Chapter's statement reviewed the Social Security Act, especially the 1956 amendments which "redefined the public assistance responsibilities of public welfare agencies specifically to include the provision of services calculated to promote self-help, and care and self-support and to strengthen family life."¹³

In regard to the second point about contracted services resulting in poorer services, the statement indicated that "all the evidence has shown drop out rates is very high - either the client does not accept referral or he avoids contact." The statement went on to make the claim on behalf of the public department providing services directly through arguing that the problems of families on public assistance "are usually intertwined with their financial and economic problems - it is almost impossible to discuss or act upon the former divorced from the latter."¹⁴ In addition, the point was made that many of the families are hard to reach and that the public assistance worker is in a more favorable position to be in contact with families through the "regular

need-meeting responsibilities". Finally, in regard to expecting poorer services, the Chapter pointed out that clients would have to deal with two different sets of professional personnel answerable to two different sets of agencies. They expected that fragmentation, not integration, would be the result.¹⁵

The third argument about contracting out, focusing on the creation of increasing administrative complexities, made the point that oversight would be needed. "On the one hand it would create a need for a large amount of personal clearance between the public and the voluntary staffs serving any individual case and introduce the possibility of much duplication of effort - on the other hand, the expenditure by voluntary agencies of vast sums raised by taxation would have to be accompanied by provisions to assure accountability."¹⁶

With these points having been made, the Chapter's statement criticized the proposed creation of an advisory board to the Mayor which would be comprised primarily of people from voluntary agencies. "The proposed required composition of the Board of Advisors does not assure, as is usual with public boards, representation of the public or citizen interest...To give voluntary welfare agencies principal voice in determining public welfare policy would be comparable to requiring that a bloc of places on a public school board be reserved to private school executives."¹⁷ The Chapter left little doubt that they were citing a

conflict of interest.

Soon after the report was completed and adopted by the Chapter's Board of Directors, a letter was written to the Mayor. The letter requested a meeting and advised him of the intention of having representative from four New York City based organizations other than NASW present. A request was made that the Mayor have the Commissioner of the Department of Welfare present because of the centrality of the Department to the planned discussion.¹⁸

Leaders of the Chapter along with the representatives from the other social welfare organizations met with the Mayor on June 30. The only indication of how the meeting actually went was a sentence in the Chapter's Executive Committee minutes the following month where it was reported that "the Mayor seemed interested in the Chapter's position".¹⁹ On the very day of the meeting, however, the *New York Times* ran an article stating that the Mayor had already appointed an advisory committee. It left unstated which organizations were represented and whether they included voluntary welfare organizations.²⁰

While the appearance of the article suggests that the Mayor had already made decisions about implementing his Committee's recommendations prior to meeting with the NASW contingent, it remains a possibility that NASW's concerns were considered even before the meeting took place. It is most likely, however, that the Chapter had limited impact on the Mayor. What is clear is that the Chapter managed to

distribute its statement to a wide variety of social welfare organizations both in the City and nationally, and responses from those who received the statement indicated appreciation for the views expressed. As one deputy commissioner in the Welfare Department said, the statement drew out issues that were not apparent in the Mayor's report. One can surmise that this centered around contracting out and its implications, as the Chapter saw them.

Subsequent to the meeting with the Mayor, there is no further documented evidence that the Chapter pursued this issue. It appears that the Chapter's political activity not only centered on the Mayor, the activity ended with him, as well. The issue with voluntary agencies would, however, re-emerge at the State level in the Chapter's response to the soon to be created Moreland Commission.

Part II: Addressing Public Welfare at the State Level; 1960 to 1963

The Chapter's efforts in response to the Mayor's Committee appear to have ended with the meeting with the Mayor on June 30, 1960. The Chapter was subsequently quiet in regard to public welfare with the exception of responding to concerns involving qualifications for caseworkers in the Welfare Department. There seems to have been some attention given, however, to developments in Albany in the fall of that year. In a brief report at the Chapter's Executive

Committee meeting on November 1, mention was made of a legislative subcommittee on public welfare of the Temporary State Commission on Coordination of State Activities. The minutes show that there was interest in having the Chapter appear at a hearing scheduled in New York City for November 17, 1960. Chapter leaders agreed that support should be expressed for the City's Welfare Department.²¹

Nothing else was reported on the State Commission, no less whether the Chapter provided testimony, until April, 1961, when the Board of Directors was given a brief report that the State Commission had hired a management firm to study the State Department of Welfare. The Chapter's Social Policy and Action Committee recommended that an ad hoc committee be established to study the report as had been done in response to the Mayor's Committee on Inquiry the year before.²² By the next meeting of the Board, such a committee had been established.

That July, events unfolded that would eventually result in the work of the Temporary Commission taking on secondary importance for both the State of New York as well as the Chapter. As a result of rules passed by the City manager in Newburgh, New York, State and national attention became focused on issues of welfare. While the Chapter's newly formed Committee proceeded to address the findings of the Temporary Commission, the Chair of the Board of the Chapter urged that NASW develop an immediate response to the Newburgh developments, involving the national organization,

all of the Chapters in the State, as well as the New York City Chapter.

The Chapter's newsletter detailed the developments. "City, State and national NASW groups have been active in the situation existing in Newburgh, New York where some drastic measures were taken last July affecting persons in need of financial assistance. The NASW efforts were and are directed toward countering these measures.

"In the early summer some Newburgh City officials made plans to curtail expenditures to assistance recipients. It was recognized that their announced plans to institute rigid requirements both for obtaining aid and continuing to receive it were in contradiction to the regulations of the State and federal government. Thus federal aid to New York State for its needy was endangered since violation of federal regulations by one community in a State jeopardizes federal aid to any other locality."²³

The article went on to say that the Board of Directors recognized that there could be severe consequences as a result of the situation because it could establish a pattern if other communities were to adopt similarly restrictive measures. It was noted that the members of the Chapter's Board wrote to officials in Newburgh, and the Chair of the Board wrote a letter to the *New York Times* which was published.

The Newburgh situation was eventually resolved when State officials brought a successful lawsuit against the

City.²⁴

The minutes of the Chapter's Executive Committee noted that following the letter published in the *Times*, the Chair of the Chapter's Board received several phone calls and letters, some anonymous and some identified as from members, expressing disagreement with the Chapter's position in opposition to Newburgh.²⁵ The minutes also pointed out that the Governor, in response to the issues raised in the Newburgh case, set up the Moreland Commission to examine how welfare was being administered in the State. This effectively set aside the work of the legislature's Temporary Commission which was investigating welfare administration.²⁶

In one sense it must have seemed frustrating that the Temporary Commission was set aside because the Chapter had completed an analysis of the Commission's report titled "Study of the Administration of Public Welfare in New York State". At the Chapter's Board meeting in January, 1962, the Chair of the Board asked the Chapter's leaders to decide what to do with the Chapter's findings. During the deliberation, discussion focused on how the Chapter saw the State report. In essence, the Chair of the Chapter's ad hoc committee said that "his committee went into the matter of whether a regular department of public welfare should be established with decreasing emphasis on local control or whether substantial local control should be continued". The ad hoc committee recommended that there be a State

administered program with the welfare commissioner to be appointed by the Governor.²⁷

In regard to another aspect of the State report, which recommended that the State Health Department become responsible for the delivery of health services to public assistance recipients instead of the Welfare Department, Chapter Committee members disagreed. While one Board member agreed with the proposal arguing that its implementation would lead to a more adequately staffed system, the consensus was that local welfare departments were the proper provider of health services to people on welfare because it allowed for one department to deliver services. From that point of view, the issue of significance was avoiding fragmentation. The final issue of concern to the Chapter Committee was the issue of rehabilitation and to what extent the welfare departments in the State should be addressing this concern. The Chapter felt that the report had given too little attention to the issue.²⁸

The Chair of the Board reported during this discussion that a meeting had been held with the Commissioner of the Department of Welfare to get his opinions. These included concern about centralizing administration at the State level, feeling that New York City would be disadvantaged by such a development. In addition, the City Commissioner believed that the Welfare Department was the proper provider of health services to people on assistance.²⁹

Despite developing a point of view, the Chapter

ultimately agreed that it would not issue its findings in response to the Temporary Commission. Since the Commission was not going to have the political ability to effect the welfare system and another governmental body was going to supplant it, the Chapter decided to wait for the findings of the new body, the Moreland Commission. Nevertheless, one exception was made. A consultant hired by the Moreland Commission to advise it about how to investigate the State's public welfare system requested the Chapter's paper in order to aid in the determination of the Commission's scope of inquiry. Given that the consultant was a recognized Chapter leader and former Board member, the Board of Directors agreed to provide him with its written statement.³⁰

When the Governor set up the Moreland Commission, there was no direct mention of the developments in Newburgh. In the official announcement in August, 1961, the Governor declared that "the maintenance of public confidence in the objectives and in the operation of the laws relating to aid, care, and support of the needy is an essential task for responsible government."³¹

The Commission took a year before it held a public hearing, preparing itself instead through conducting its own survey. At the hearing eight experts were called upon to testify, and one included a representative of the New York City Chapter of NASW, who spoke on behalf of all of the chapters in the State.

As in the case with the legal regulation of social

work, the New York City Chapter worked with all of the NASW chapters in the State. As a result, the testimony was developed around points that all of the chapters agreed upon. In corresponding to a former Chair of the Chapter's Board of Directors, the current Chair, who was to eventually become a New York City Welfare Commissioner, asked his colleague to be the one to testify before the Moreland Commission. He said that the testimony prepared for the New York State Joint Committee of Chapters "unfortunately, at least in my judgment, it represents a 'sorry' statement, representing 6000 social workers in the State of New York... I feel that it is particularly important in view of the quality of the statement, for us to really have a 'pro' representing the Joint Committee in the actual testimony. I hope that you will take on this assignment."³²

The letter indicates the level of concern about the position the Chapter takes and how the information is conveyed to a public body such as the Moreland Commission. The Moreland Commission Report, titled *"Public Welfare in the State of New York"*, was released on January 15, 1963. By mid-March the Chapter had its response drafted. They did not pursue a joint statement with the other chapters in the State, however, apparently feeling compromised by the previous collaborative effort.

While the Moreland Commission was formed in response to the situation in Newburgh and the public's readiness to perceive people on welfare as undeserving of assistance, the

Moreland Commission focused its analyses and recommendations on the technical aspects of service delivery. It was not a document to written for the public. On the other hand, at least in some significant respects, it appears to have been written for social workers.

The first recommendation made by the Commission addressed the shortage of professionally qualified social workers in public welfare in the State. It called upon the State Department of Welfare to cooperate with the State University, as well as private universities, to develop undergraduate programs that would prepare personnel to enter public social service.³³ The Commission also recommended funds be allocated for graduate programs in social work and public administration. In responding to this recommendation, the New York City Chapter supported the Commission.

The Chapter supported the second recommendation which would raise salaries for public welfare employees to a level comparable to other State and local governmental employees with similar education, experience and responsibility. Support was also given to the third recommendation: that qualified staff be assigned to conduct applications for public assistance and that cases be grouped according to the complexity of the "social diagnosis" made by the worker.³⁴ The fourth recommendation to reduce excessive paperwork was also supported.

In each case, the Chapter's position paper gave explicit commentary to clarify the specific ways in which

the social work profession perceived the issues being addressed. These issues were very much social work issues and even have the appearance of having been written by a social worker. Whether they were, however, is not known.

Two additional recommendations of the Commission came at the end of their report but were central to the administration of social welfare in New York State. The first related to the need for establishment of standards for qualifications for the position of local welfare commissioners. It was noted that New York State was the only State in the country that did not at that time have minimum qualifications for commissioners. The Chapter recommended that for districts with a certain size welfare population the qualifications include a master's degree, "preferably from a graduate school of social work with substantial public welfare experience".³⁵

The second recommendation addressing administration resulted in a major disagreement between the Chapter and the Commission. Although a Commissioner of the State Department of Social Welfare was responsible for the administration of a sophisticated and complex bureaucracy, there was a Board of Social Welfare at whose pleasure the Commissioner served. This Board was intended to have policy making powers with regard to public welfare, but, according to the Moreland Commission and the Chapter, the Board involved itself in detailed implementation and procedural issues. As a result, there was confusion between the roles of the State

Commissioner and the Board. According to the Chapter's statement, the Moreland Commission recognized the problem but came up with a solution that would continue to confuse the administration of public welfare.

The Moreland Commission proposed that the Chair of the Welfare Board become a paid, fulltime position. The Chair would then be the Commissioner of the State Department of Welfare. According to the human service newspaper, *Better Times*, both the Board of Social Welfare and many voluntary organizations opposed this recommendation on the grounds that the powers of the Board would be undermined. "The Board stated its conviction that the Commissioner, as chief administrative officer of the department, must be professionally trained in social welfare. We are equally convinced that the Chair of the Board should not be a professional social worker... Merger of the two posts, the Board held, would inevitably defeat the objective of continuing the State Board as head of the Department... The State Board also expressed the opinion that adoption of this recommendation would 'inescapably dilute the quality of lay leadership and open the way for professional domination of the State Board'." ³⁶

The Chapter, on the other hand, expressed its belief that the need for a professional administration was insufficiently appreciated and that this problem would continue under a lay board. The NASW statement pointed out that "since the Depression of the 1930's a wealth of

experience and knowledge has been cumulated in the administration of public welfare. Already there has been a generation of careers devoted to the proper and efficient exercise of governmental responsibility in the field of social welfare. The State Commissioner of Social Welfare should be an outstanding representative of that expertness."³⁷ The statement went on to criticize the Moreland Commission for a lack of sympathy toward professional leadership and the Commission's citation of the Board of Social Welfare as protecting the public against the "professional dominance of social welfare".

Perhaps more importantly, NASW claimed that the problem with the State Board of Social Welfare was the representation of "private charity" on the Board. This concern reflected similar issues around the Mayor's Committee on Inquiry into the New York City Department of Welfare which moved toward contracting services to voluntary agencies. "The administration should, of course, be hospitable to the representations of voluntary, civic, social and professional organizations. But it must be recognized that they cannot speak for all segments of the community on the wide range of policies and programs which are the responsibility of the State Department of Social Welfare... This confusion the Moreland Commission deems not a defect but a virtue, and so would continue the administrative Board of Social Welfare."³⁸

NASW recommended an alternative that was acknowledged

to have been an idea already being floated in public welfare circles. The recommendation called for the Commissioner being appointed by the Governor, the Board becoming an advisory body, and rule making and regulatory authority residing with the Commissioner. While it is not clear from this study what the direct outcome of the Moreland Commission was nor the results of the responses to it, the ideas in these recommendations are reflected in the way social welfare is administrated in New York State today.

Following the development of the Chapter's response to the Moreland Commission report, a strategy was planned for disseminating the paper. The plan called for sending the paper to the Governor, all legislators, the Commissioner of the State Department of Social Welfare as well as its top staff, leaders in the New York City Department of Welfare, and the Chapter members.

In addition, Chapter leaders planned to request a meeting with the State Commissioner.³⁹ Two months later such a meeting was held. The minutes of the Board of Directors indicates that the Commissioner was favorable to the Chapter's position and he recommended sending the paper twice to the legislators, immediately and again when the legislature reconvened in the next legislative session when it would be more likely the Moreland Commission report would get specific legislative consideration. In addition, the State Commissioner recommended that the City Chapter send its paper to every local commissioner of welfare through the

State Council of NASW Chapters.⁴⁰

It is interesting to note that the archives contain a list of who was sent the Chapter paper, and it is quite extensive. At the State level the paper was sent to the Governor, three leading members of the legislature, the commissioners of several State health and human service departments, all of the members of both the Moreland Commission and the State Board of Social Welfare, the State public welfare association, as well as the local councils of the State Charities Aid Association. Even more than were sent state-wide were sent to officials and organizations in New York City, and numerous copies went out to national organizations including officials at the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare.⁴¹ Still pending at the time were mailings to the full legislature and to the local commissioners of welfare.

As far as working with the State Council of Chapters was concerned, one Chapter in the western part of New York State had its own position on the Moreland Commission report and it was in conflict with the City Chapter's position. As a result the State Council decided it could not send out the City's paper. The Board of Directors of the City Chapter subsequently decided to issue the paper itself to all State legislators and local welfare commissioners.⁴² NASW was thus in the awkward position of expressing differing views on the same issue.

In addition to strategizing with the State Commissioner

about disseminating the Chapter's position paper, discussions were also held with a consulting firm hired earlier by the Moreland Commission to conduct a survey of public welfare in the State. The Commission's recommendations were based on this study. The firm was headed by a social worker who praised the statement and recommended to the Chapter that its paper be distributed widely, including every NASW Chapter in the country. In addition, it was suggested that the paper also go to "the chairmen of the Boards of Supervisors in each of the cities and the counties in which there are local welfare departments"...⁴³

Three letters sent to the Chapter in response to receiving the paper suggests how the paper was viewed by officials. The New York City Commissioner of Welfare said "I want to commend the Chapter, and particularly the Committee that drafted it, for its excellent statement on the Moreland Commission Report. It is splendidly done and is a credit to the Association and the profession which it represents."⁴⁴

The Commissioner of the Welfare Administration in the federal Department of Health Education and Welfare indicated that the paper was helpful as she prepared to address questions coming before her office about the Moreland Commission. In addition, she indicated that she had been discussing the Chapter's statement with one of the authors of the paper.⁴⁵ Finally at yet another level of service delivery, the director of the Council of Community

Services of Chemung County in New York State wrote that "this NASW job is the clearest, most concise, and best overall presentation of the issues. In addition, the NASW statement moves beyond mere commentary and/or evaluation of the Moreland Report to make a real contribution to the current thinking about public welfare."⁴⁶

The New York City Chapter's leadership personally devoted itself to the issue of public welfare from 1958 through 1963. By so doing the broader social welfare community in New York City and New York State, and even on a national level, considered the Chapter's viewpoint as important and informative. While it cannot be said that NASW shaped public welfare policy, the position of the Chapter was seen by those who were involved in shaping policy, such as commissioners and consultants, as informing and supportive of the type of welfare system they attempted to implement. In effect, the Chapter's interest in public welfare appears to have been addressed most directly to the leaders in the established public welfare organizations. They communicated directly with the commissioners on an informal basis and developed strategies with them.

The Chapter did not again have much direct involvement with public welfare issues following the Moreland Commission report until 1966 when the Mayor of New York City reorganized public welfare services into the Human Resources Administration, which represented a consolidation of several agencies into one very large institution. The level of

Chapter activity diminished in the interim period which lasted approximately three years. One reason for this diminished level of concern reflects changes in leadership. The Chair of the Board of Directors during the time of the Chapter's responding to the Moreland Commission resigned in the middle of his term to take a new job in Washington, D.C.. The two leaders who succeeded this individual appeared to have had less interest in public welfare. In comparison, the departing Chair would eventually return to New York City to become Commissioner of the City's Department of Welfare.

Part III: NASW and Mobilization for Youth; 1964 to 1965

While the Chapter's concerns about public welfare centered around governmental activity in public welfare agencies, a new federal strategy emerged during the early 1960's that recognized the limits of government to deal with issues associated with poverty. This was an important component of the "War on Poverty". A demonstration project called Mobilization for Youth on the Lower East Side of Manhattan exemplified an alternative to the efforts of public welfare as the main approach to helping families and children in low income communities to obtain support and achieve independence from governmental assistance.

Funded by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, the Ford Foundation, and the

City of New York, Mobilization for Youth had several components including a youth employment program, four neighborhood family and children service centers, legal services, an educational program, and a community organization project.

The community organization project involved the following goals: assisting residents to participate in the life of the community; dramatizing community needs and mobilizing public action to deal with those needs; increasing the responsiveness of community institutions to the needs of low-income groups; and improving the competence of local leaders to defend their constituents' rights.⁴⁷ While comprising less than 5% of the total budget, the community organization project became controversial because of its goals and its utilization of various methods of social protest.

In the summer of 1964 news accounts that Mobilization for Youth had misspent funds and that staff had subversive political backgrounds, specifically that some of the social workers had allegedly been Communists, created a public scandal. It is possible that social work had never before, nor at any time since, been so much in the news and in the public eye.

While several investigations were launched into Mobilization for Youth which threatened its survival, many people came to its defense. In a letter to the *New York Times*, the Chair of the New York City Chapter of the Congress for

Racial Equality said that City officials were using anti-Communism and the issue of fiscal responsibility as a cover for a vendetta against Mobilization for Youth because it was challenging the Department of Welfare in its criticism of that agency as well as other agencies. There was especially concern because, as he wrote, "the ghetto dweller" was becoming directly involved in bringing about social change.⁴⁸

In another letter to the Times, a professor of American History summarized a perspective of the situation rather succinctly: "Not deviously or accidentally, but openly and purposefully, Mobilization encourages local efforts to improve housing conditions, educational resources, occupational opportunities, and the general welfare services of its area. Because local government is deeply implicated in the fortunes of a slum community, these efforts at times take the form of pressures exerted against city hall."⁴⁹

The New York City Chapter also came to the defense of Mobilization for Youth. In a statement issued to the press soon after the "scandal" broke, the Chapter's Chair pointed out that New York City government knew in its capacity as a funding source which types of approaches would be used with local residents. She said that "it was known in advance that this approach would involve actions by neighborhood residents that would not be popular with all segments of the community. Present attacks on the program are, in large measure, a consequence of the neighborhood action effort."

A little later in the statement, the Chair said that the City requires methods that work in meeting the needs of people, and that unless there is tolerance for social experiments, "social inventions so urgently needed cannot be developed".⁵⁰

The statement went on to address concerns specifically related to the allegations against the staff. The allegations were referred to as "broadside attacks" that would inevitably lead to demoralization and impede future efforts to recruit social workers. A fair process was called for including appropriate procedures for addressing possible unethical conduct and the need for grievance procedures.⁵¹

Despite the Chapter's quick response, NASW members wrote to the Chapter urging that NASW use its resources to intervene in the situation to prevent Mobilization for Youth from closing. The statement to the press was seen positively, but reflecting an inadequate level of response.

One member wrote that she felt very gratified to read the statement from NASW. She felt it was well written and had some chance of being effective. Another letter was not so optimistic. "As a professional social worker very much concerned with the development of 'Poverty Programs' I want to say that I think that the NASW's defence of Mobilization for Youth is grossly inadequate...I am suggesting nothing less than a life and death struggle is required by NASW or else it will die along with pioneering programs like

Mobilization for Youth."⁵² For this member, survival of Mobilization For Youth was more important than NASW, and the professional organization could only justify its existence by fighting for such innovative programs.

A third letter inquired whether the Chapter had taken any further action beyond the statement. The writer pointed out that schools of social work had a forum on the subject and that Social Workers for Civil Rights Action had presented the issue at a public rally, but the efforts of NASW would be needed to effectively address the issues. A fourth letter outlined possible actions that the Chapter might take including setting up a temporary committee of NASW members "whose purpose would be to work closely with MFY for the survival of the project and protection of its staff". This social worker indicated that such a committee would work on public relations, community organization and political lobbying.⁵³

Another letter, signed by 19 social workers calling themselves 'Social Workers Committee in Support of Mobilization for Youth' outlined additional steps that the Chapter should take: NASW should meet with the Mayor and other City officials; time should be taken at a Chapter meeting to consider further action; an educational campaign should be undertaken to inform the community of the facts behind Mobilization For Youth; and finally, the issues should be brought before the national Delegate Assembly of NASW.⁵⁴

Finally, a December 6th letter from one of the deans of the schools of social work in New York City wrote to confirm a phone conversation held with the Chair of the Board of Directors. He informed the Chapter leader that a group called 'Social Workers for Community Projects' formed to respond to emergency situations such as the one faced by Mobilization For Youth and other community action projects. He pointed out that members of the Committee had met with the executive assistant to the Mayor and indicated that a meeting with the Mayor was about to be set up. Participation by NASW was requested: " It would seem to me that any committee representing the professional viewpoint should have on it an official representative of the New York City Chapter of NASW. We see this Chapter representative as indicating to the Mayor precisely that which it has already stated in the statements as officially approved and adopted by the NASW."

The Chapter had already demonstrated the type of energy and skill it could bring to bear on issues it considered of priority importance. The actions undertaken within the first six months of having made civil rights a priority is one case in point. Activities in response to governmental inquiries into public welfare are another. In contrast, the Chapter's response to the issues posed by the investigations into Mobilization For Youth were significantly less. A handwritten memo from the Chair of the Board to the executive director is revealing of how the issue was

perceived. The Chair asked: "could we say...we agree on the importance of MFY and to the extent of our very limited financial and manpower resources and with the Delegate Assembly activities, we are doing all we can? We hope following D.A. we may be able to give further attention to it. We must remind members that there are other issues too that are being pressed and the Board will have to determine the degree of participation. (Use any or all of the above.)"⁵⁵ No doubt the Chair was protecting the organization from becoming over extended given the many activities already being undertaken.

The following day after the memo was written, a full page advertisement appeared in the *New York Times*. Another group called "Committee for Community Action Against Poverty and Delinquency" was responsible for the ad which read "In the 'war' on poverty and delinquency IS DEMOCRACY THE ANSWER?" The text claimed that Mobilization For Youth was one of several projects that were vulnerable to attack, the others included HARYOU-ACT, Bedford Stuyvesant Youth in Action, and a project being planned by the Puerto Rican Forum. The ad concluded by urging the Mayor "to break the silence he has maintained during the attacks on Mobilization For Youth". Several dozen people were identified as comprising the Committee, and another several hundred names appeared in endorsement. Neither the current Chapter officials nor the past members of the Chapter committees on public welfare signed the advertisement.⁵⁶ While the

advertisement had reflected the type of activity members were calling for, Chapter leaders had not even endorsed this public statement, no less initiate it.

The issues posed by Mobilization For Youth died out partly because the executive director of that agency resigned and was replaced by an former official from the national NASW. In addition, news accounts eventually revealed inaccuracies in the original charges against the agency, and one investigation that reported to the United States Attorney General endorsed the aims of the program while calling for the removal of staff if it was found they used their positions for private purposes.

At the time these events transpired, a Chapter Executive Committee report summarized the discussions that had already occurred within NASW. The summary shows that after receiving letters from members, the following had happened: "after long discussion it was agreed not to hold a Chapter meeting at that time, not to seek a conference with the Mayor. The Executive Committee agreed to follow the situation closely and report any new information to the Chapter Chair." The Executive Committee decided to send a letter to the Mayor expressing concern and agreed to set up an ad hoc committee to mobilize broad community support. Nevertheless, no committee was formed as the approach of the Delegate Assembly held out the promise that the national meeting would become the arena for addressing the issue within NASW. The Assembly did produce a resolution

supporting Mobilization For Youth but no action was initiated. In addition, the summary revealed that the Chapter eventually agreed that representatives should meet with the Mayor, but it never moved to implement the decision.⁵⁷ It appears that the Chapter was acting cautiously to obtain the facts in the situation but by the time decisions were made, the situation had changed and earlier decisions were felt to require reconsideration.

Interviews were conducted with two former Chairs of the Chapter's Board of Directors, both of whom served prior to the experience with Mobilization For Youth. One had provided consultation to the federal government in designing the anti-poverty program. The other was a member of the board of Mobilization For Youth. Each indicated that NASW regarded Mobilization For Youth's intention of hiring people who were not professional social workers as a major mistake. Although social workers were major figures in the program, social work as a profession was not well regarded by many in the anti-poverty program, including its national leader. This negative view of social work, or at least aspects associated with professionalism and legal regulation, were shared by a number of social work academicians and practitioners, and they had moved the issue at one point to a consideration of who should be eligible for membership in NASW. Many believed formal education should not be a requirement. These former Chairs of the Chapter Board independently indicated that this split in social work about

hiring non-professionals was behind the Chapter's lackluster support of Mobilization For Youth.⁵⁸

The situation with Mobilization For Youth offers a sharp contrast with the Chapter's interest in public welfare. While numerous Chapter leaders were quite expert in public welfare, they did not involve Chapter members beyond selected experts. On the other hand, Mobilization For Youth represented an alternative to public welfare, an approach that was anti-public welfare as it existed, and many social workers were supportive of such efforts. In the final analysis, the New York City Chapter's leaders were more involved in supporting the established approach to fighting poverty than in supporting the innovation that emerged.

Notes

1. Public Welfare Committee. *Report of the Public Welfare Committee, American Association of Social Workers, New York City Chapter, May 10, 1955.*
2. Interview with the former Executive Director of the New York City Chapter of NASW, February 5, 1990.
3. Interview with a former Chair of the Chapter's Public Welfare Committee, April 27, 1989.
4. Delegate Assembly. *Delegate Assembly Workbook 2, National Association of Social Workers, pg. 15, May 7, 8, 9, 10, 1958.*
5. Interview with former Chair of the Board of Directors, February 13, 1991.
6. Paul Crowell. "Revisions Urged in City Welfare", in the *New York Times*, October 17, 1959.
7. Mayor's Committee on Inquiry on the New York City Department of Welfare. *Report of the Mayor's Committee on Inquiry on the New York City Department of Welfare, September 30, 1959, page one.*
8. Chapter Executive Director. Minutes of NASW's Special Committee on Report of Inquiry on the New York City Department of Welfare, December 5, 1959.
9. Ibid.
10. Interview with former Chair of the Board of Directors, February 13, 1991.
11. Chapter Executive Director. Minutes of the Special Committee on Report of Inquiry on the New York City Department of Welfare, January 26, 1960.
12. Board of Directors. *A Statement on the Report of the Mayor's Committee of Inquiry on the New York City Department of Welfare, January 28, 1960.*
13. Ibid, page 2.
14. Ibid, page 3.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.

17. Ibid, page 4.
18. Chair of the Board of Directors, NASW. Letter to the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of the City of New York, April 20, 1960.
19. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Executive Committee, July 26, 1960.
20. Paul Crowell. *New York Times*, June 30, 1960.
21. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Executive Committee, November 1, 1960, page 3 to 4.
22. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, April 13, 1961, page 7.
23. Anonymous. "Newburgh", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, September 7, 1961.
24. Ibid.
25. Secretary to the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Executive Committee, October 4, 1961.
26. Ibid.
27. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, January 11, 1962.
28. Secretary to the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Executive Committee, December 19, 1961.
29. Ibid.
30. Secretary to the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Executive Committee, December 19, 1961.
31. Press Secretary to the Governor. Press release, August 30, 1961, Executive Chamber, Albany, New York.
32. Chair of the Board of Directors of the New York City Chapter, NASW. Letter to a former Board Chair and member of the Chapter's ad hoc Committee on Welfare, August 26, 1962.
33. New York City Chapter's Special Committee on Moreland Commission Report. Draft of Position Statement on Moreland Commission Report on Public Welfare In The State Of New York, March 7, 1963.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid, page 4.

36. Beatrice Sherman, editor. "Controversy Aroused by Moreland Recommendations" in *Better Times*, Volume 44, Number 26, March 22, 1963, Community Council of Greater New York, NY.
37. Op. Cit., NASW Special Committee on Moreland Commission Report.
38. Ibid, page 6.
39. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Executive Committee, March, 1963.
40. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Executive Committee, May, 1963.
41. "April 1963 Distribution of Chapter Statement on Moreland Commission Report ", prepared for the Executive Committee, May 1, 1963.
42. Secretary of Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, June 19, 1963.
43. President of Consulting firm to the Moreland Commission. Letter to Chapter Executive Director, April 17, 1963.
44. Commissioner of the New York City Department of Welfare. Letter to the Chair of the Board of Directors of the New York City Chapter, NASW, April 29, 1963.
45. Commissioner of Welfare administration, Department of Health, education and Welfare. Letter to the Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the New York City Chapter, NASW, April 22, 1963.
46. Executive Director of the Council of Community Services of Chemung County, Inc. Letter to the Executive Director, New York City Chapter, NASW, April 3, 1963.
47. Office of Public Relations and Information, Mobilization for Youth. Copy of Report of the Technical Review Panel on Mobilization for Youth, distributed November 18, 1964.
48. Clarence Funnye, Chairman of NY CORE. Letter to the Editor of the New York Times, November 16, 1964.
49. Walter Metzger, Associate Professor of American History, Columbia University. Letter to the Editor of the *New York Times*. September 4, 1964.
50. Chair of the Board of Directors, New York City Chapter, NASW. Statement on Mobilization for Youth, NASW, August 28, 1964.
51. Ibid.

52. Letter from a Bronx social worker to the Chair of the New York City Chapter, NASW, October 30, 1964.
53. Letter to Chair of the Board of Directors of the New York City Chapter, NASW, October 1, 1964.
54. Temporary Chairman, Social Workers Committee in Support of Mobilization For Youth. Letter to Chair of the Board of Directors, New York City Chapter, NASW, October 9, 1964.
55. Chair of the Board of Directors, New York City Chapter, NASW. Memo to the Executive Director, November 5, 1964.
56. Committee For Community Action Against Poverty and Delinquency. Advertisement in the New York Times, November 6, 1964.
57. Executive Committee, New York City Chapter, NASW. Summary of Discussion on Mobilization for Youth at meetings of Executive Committee and Board, February 9, 1965.
58. Interviews with two former Chairs of the Board of Directors, February 8 and 28, 1991.

CHAPTER 7: DISSENT IN THE CHAPTER

Part I: Evidence of Dissent

The review of the leading issues receiving Chapter attention from 1955 - 1970 has revealed how social workers in NASW made their views known to governmental officials. The review also raises the question of which social workers were involved in determining how the Chapter addressed issues and decided upon points of view to put forward. Within each of the areas considered, legal regulation, civil rights, and public welfare, there was some evidence that groups of social workers disagreed with aspects of how the Chapter was pursuing an issue or with the substance of the issue itself, or there was concern about the failure to address an issue.

In the pursuit of legal regulation of social work practice, officials and workers in public welfare had significant disagreements with the position taken by the Chapter. Leaders in schools of social work were also reported to have been in opposition to the issue, and leading representatives of Black social workers were opposed, as well. In the area of civil rights, there wasn't an expression of disagreement with the position of the Chapter, but dissatisfaction emerged with the limited opportunity for members to participate with the Chapter on

the issues. Finally, while public welfare was of primary importance to many of the Chapter's leaders, there was very limited responsiveness to get involved when members urged Chapter action to save Mobilization for Youth, a program determined to address the many failures of the public welfare system.

In each of the instances of member disagreement, it was difficult to determine the reactions of those who dissented when they failed to influence the direction of the Chapter to their satisfaction. The scope of this study was primarily limited to exploring the Chapter's own records, and these did not reflect member dissatisfaction beyond what was revealed in the decisions that were made in determining the course of the Chapter's own activities. However, limited data is available to shed some light on what social workers did following their failing to obtain the decisions they hoped for in order to influence the political arena.

It has already been shown that people interested in public welfare were effective in ultimately changing NASW policy at the national level with regard to legal regulation of social work practice. While NASW leaders in New York State and especially in the New York City Chapter were determined to have the state government restrict the title of "social worker", they basically ignored the desire of local public welfare officials and workers to not have such a restriction. This study did not determine whether representatives of public welfare from New York attempted to

influence NASW at the national level, but it is clear that representatives from public welfare somewhere in the country did exert the necessary influence to change NASW policy. As a result the legal restriction is on the term "certified social worker" and non-graduate degreed staff in social services are able to call themselves "social workers" if they want to. It is clear that if local public welfare workers had wanted to exert influence to counter the NASW Chapters in New York, there was a potent mechanism available to them at the national level of the organization in the Delegate Assembly.

Related to NASW's pursuit of legal regulation of social work in New York State was the concern among many Black social workers that restricting either title of "social worker" or "certified social worker" would create educational barriers for many Blacks to obtain social work jobs. According to the New York City Chapter's Chair of the committee responsible for pursuing legal regulation, meetings had been held with Black social workers on this point. As he said, "they agreed to disagree" about NASW pursuing legal regulation. He said that the position of the Black social workers was that legal regulation should not be pursued until barriers to education no longer existed.¹

In 1967 the Association of Black Social Workers (ABSW) formed. The leadership of this organization, which is both national and local in scope, came from New York City. The Association does not require members to hold a graduate

degree from a school of social work. According to a social worker who has over 20 years of experience in public welfare and who was interviewed during this study, one of the reasons ABSW formed was in response to NASW holding out the standard that social workers should hold graduate degrees. She indicated that at the time of the formation of the organization, Black social workers saw NASW as attempting to limit access to jobs through educational requirements.² Given the significant role Black social workers have played in public welfare in New York City, it is possible that the formation of ABSW was in part a response to the Chapter's seeking and obtaining legal regulation of social work practice.

In effect, the public welfare workers and Black social workers were to some extent an overlapping group. While the New York City Chapter might not have been responsive to their needs, at least two mechanisms were available for them to express a collective sense of their interests as social workers. The first was the use of the national NASW Delegate Assembly. The second was the formation of an alternative organization of social workers, ABSW. These social workers found a collective voice to represent their concerns outside of the New York City Chapter of NASW.

Part II: The Emergence of a Rival Group within the Chapter

The rest of this Chapter will concern itself with a

set of events beginning in 1968 that provides more detail about what social workers might do to make their views known when Chapter leaders are not responsive to them. The mechanism that was utilized in this situation was the formation of a group in order to change the organization from within NASW.

In the view of these social workers, the New York City Chapter had not been responsive to the current issues of the day. While they acknowledged that many of the issues that NASW had addressed were done so in exemplary fashion, they were characterized as addressing long term problems. Meanwhile, crises of the moment were not being addressed.**** To change this situation, an internal group was formed and organized a large constituency among the Chapter members. Then, using mechanisms available within the Chapter's by-laws, they used petitions that forced Chapter meetings to be held and created opportunities to amend the way members get elected to the Board of Directors. The final outcome was gaining the opportunity to develop the type of program that was deemed more desirable. In the end, they gained control of the leadership of the organization. It shows dramatically what can happen in an organization such as NASW when members do not feel that their concerns are being adequately addressed or that they are not being

**** While the Chapter's unresponsiveness to Mobilization for Youth can be cited as an example of this, it is not clear that any specific situations already discussed in this study were among the concerns being addressed here.

given the chance to participate. At bottom, it shows what can happen when a group comes to dominate a membership organization at one time or another.

A letter to the Chair of the Board of Directors dated December 26, 1968 informed him of the formation of NASW Members for Action Now, and enclosed was a statement of the organization's purpose. The statement said that the group was set up as part of the Chapter to develop programs to achieve the goals of the Association. "The need for more relevant, responsive and active professional Association has been a concern of social workers for many years. The membership of NASW with its wealth of manpower (sic), expert skills and concern for people demands more direct involvement in developing and implementing programs within an organization which responds to the issues of the times."³ The statement went on to say that Members for Action Now planned to develop a more action oriented Chapter and once this was accomplished, the group would disband.

A few months later, in March, 1969, Members For Action Now released to the social work community a three page newsletter which gave more detail about its concerns in New York City. It charged that NASW is irrelevant if it does not "bear witness" to the injustices experienced by many people and who ultimately pass through every site in which social workers are employed. The statement referred to the impact of racism as well as to the implications of the war in Vietnam. "The toll of racism on the exploited and

exploiter passes before us in every clinic, every public school, and every welfare center. The violence of a society that has to sacrifice its youth and its resources to a war without national purpose, drains us of the ability to deal effectively with poverty, substandard housing, inadequate, medical care and more."⁴

According to the group's leaders, Members For Action Now formed following two Chapter meetings in the fall, 1968.⁵ The group's organizers had been involved with planning the Chapter meetings, and they were given autonomy in setting the program. This may have come about as a result of the Chair of the Board of Directors at the time being an individual who was more conciliatory toward diverse groups within the Chapter than previous leaders had been.⁶

Although it was not clearly anticipated by Chapter leaders nor announced in advance to the membership in general, decisions were made at the meeting that were believed to be binding on the organization because the by-laws allowed a group of 100 members to make decisions in the name of the organization. Following the decisions, the Board of Directors nullified them, setting in motion protests by the meetings' organizers. One protest was directed toward national NASW. The other took the form of creating Members For Action Now.

The protest directed to national NASW took the form of petitions to have the Board of director's nullification of the members' actions investigated. The report from the

national president, issued several months later, is informative. What is important here is not the conclusions of national NASW about the incident, but the review of what occurred. Three resolutions were brought before those in attendance at the first Chapter meeting on October 29, 1968. The first resolution called for restructuring of the Chapter to "more effectively deal with social work's role in solving urban crisis problems". The second resolution called for "an enlarged role for the Association in seeking changes in programs to eliminate poverty, particularly the need for drastic changes in public welfare". The third and final resolution called for strong support for school decentralization and community control and opposition to the teachers strike led by the United Federation of Teachers. With approximately 185 Chapter members in attendance, each resolution passed with overwhelming majorities.⁷

From the point of view of the current Chapter leaders, these resolutions must have seemed radical. The restructuring of the Chapter called for the creation of a new unit to be called the Urban Task Force which would report directly to the membership, not to the Board of Directors. This was found to be constitutionally illegal by the Board. It would certainly have undermined the very reason for having a governing body.

The idea of enlarging the role of the Chapter especially to seek "drastic changes" in public welfare ran directly counter to some of the most significant work

accomplished in the Chapter in this area. Whether the resolution reflected discontent with the Chapter's lack of involvement with Mobilization for Youth three years earlier is unclear, but the resolution appeared to be picking up on the type of issues that program had been designed to address.

Finally, supporting school decentralization and community control and opposing the teachers strike was not only an education issue but a racial one involving the attempts by members of the Black community of Ocean Hill-Brownsville to have more influence over the school system. While the Chapter had been very active in civil rights including issues pertaining to public school education, the civil rights committee had no role in addressing these emerging issues.

What was perhaps the most controversial aspect of this matter was that hundreds of Chapter members were members of the teachers union as they were school social workers. They were very disturbed that such a position was taken. They petitioned national NASW, as Members For Action Now did, but on the grounds that the resolutions were not taken in a legal manner. They felt that other mechanisms within the Chapter would have been more appropriate for addressing the issue. One of their charges, which Members For Action Now did not dispute, was that attempts at the membership meeting to have their viewpoint heard were "shouted down" by zealous supporters in favor of the resolution. This speaks

graphically to the intensity of involvement experienced by social workers at this time and to the intensity of the community - school issue.⁸

Subsequent to the Chapter meetings, the Board of Directors submitted the resolutions with the exception of restructuring the organization to a full membership referendum. In doing so it deleted the reference to the school strike. In a statement to the membership, the Board of Directors expressed their belief that there had been "irregularities and ambiguities" at the Chapter meetings where the resolutions had been voted upon and that there was a need for a mandate from the membership. Although the results of this referendum supported the resolutions on public welfare and education, the organizers of the Chapter meetings protested the Board's action because they believed the original vote was binding and that by submitting the resolutions to the membership, while being legally unnecessary, would also delay the expected implementation of Chapter action on the resolutions at least until the results of the referendum would be known. At issue to them was the ability to respond to issues quickly. Waiting an anticipated three months for a referendum was seen as typical of the problems of working within NASW.

Following the incident around the Chapter meetings, Members For Action Now formally came into existence as a group with a name, and its leaders addressed their concern that the Chapter leadership was preventing a more action-

oriented program from coming into being. Interviews with the leaders of Members For Action Now revealed that this was underscored by their perception that relatively few social workers were actually allowed to run for the Board and to achieve leadership positions. They saw this as having been the reality since the inception of the Chapter some 13 years earlier.⁹ Even one of the chairs of the Board in the latter part of the 1960's, who had nothing to do with Members For Action Now, said in an interview that she felt that the leadership was in the hands of others and not herself while Chair. She indicated that the executive director had a great deal of control along with a Board member who had been Chair of the Board at an earlier time.¹⁰ Several leaders in Members For Action Now corroborated this perception. They came to the conclusion that a more open nominations process than existed was needed in order to assure that leadership would change.

Members for Action Now engaged in several related initiatives to accomplish their objectives. One was to communicate with NASW members on a broad scale to get their message across. In a letter to the Chair of the Chapter's Board, a request was made for the Chapter to do a membership mailing that stated the concerns of Members For Action Now about the need for members to take action around the issues of concern at the two fall meetings. The mailing was to include the criticism of the Chapter for causing delay. In anticipation of the Chapter declining to perform this task,

the letter stated that Members For Action Now was prepared to do the mailing itself, at its own expense.¹¹ What they needed was for the Chapter to turn over its mailing list, something the Chapter refused to do. That didn't end the matter. According to the co-chair of Members For Action Now, they got free representation from an attorney and forced an agreement for the list to be made available.

A second initiative undertaken by Members For Action Now was the placement of an advertisement in the human services newspaper, *Better Times*, again criticizing the Chapter for not carrying out the resolutions of the Chapter meetings. In addition, the advertisement was critical of the Chapter's recent election for members of the Board of Directors. As a result of the appearance of this advertisement, the Chapter's publication, *Currents*, carried a front page defense of the Chapter. It was unprecedented for conflict within the Chapter to emerge in such an open way. The front page statement addressed NASW members by saying "we take this exceptional action of writing to you out of duty to inform you of recent developments in the Chapter. In the February 24 issue of *Better Times* there appeared an advertisement addressed to members of this Chapter. You will hear more from these members, who inserted the advertisement, and no doubt from others since the Chapter has made it possible for members to write directly to the full Chapter membership."¹²

Whether the Chapter leaders saw the inevitability of

change overcoming them at this point or not is unclear. What is clear is that the Chapter's executive director, who had been in her position since the founding of the Chapter in 1955, resigned within six weeks of the appearance of the advertisement.¹³ It seems likely that the advertisement, which forced the Chapter's response in the newsletter, significantly increased the pressure on the Chapter, and this led to the Director's resignation.

Other changes would soon follow as a result of Members For Action Now forcing a special meeting to amend the Chapter's by-laws to assure that all members had an opportunity to be notified of upcoming elections and that nominations were being considered. The nominating procedures were modified to allow candidates to be nominated through a petition process requiring 50 member signatures. In addition, a Chapter meeting would be required at which time nominations could be made from the floor. This was meant to increase the opportunities for a more diverse group of members to be elected to the Board of Directors.¹⁴

Subsequent to the success in modifying the way future candidates for elections would be selected, a second attempt was made to change the by-laws. This time the purpose was to invalidate the recent Chapter elections and to have a new election of Chapter officers. As a communication from Members For Action Now stated, without a new election the same leaders would remain in office for two years while Chapter members had been making it clear that new leadership

was desired to carry out an innovative type of program. In response to Members For Action Now, the Chair of the Chapter's Board of Directors informed Members For Action Now that an amendment to the by-laws would not be a valid method for forcing a new election. There was no legal method for calling for a new election once members had been elected.

The Chair of the Board nevertheless made an important concession to Members For Action Now. In acknowledging the issues underlying the petition calling for a by-laws amendment, he said that since the petition "indicates that its signers are dissatisfied with the present administration of the Chapter, a dialogue is clearly in order... We suggest that representatives of your group meet with members of the Board of Directors to discuss dissatisfactions and to make any proposals that might further our common goals."¹⁵ This appears to be the beginning of the end of the conflict between Members For Action Now and the Chapter. At the next Board meeting five members of Members For Action Now made statements to the Board of Directors, laying out the reasons for their concerns as well as their recommendations for programming.

In effect, Members For Action Now would soon be embraced and its program would become the program of the Chapter. The details of exactly what brought about the transition from a conflictual situation to some level of resolution in which the Members For Action Now were accepted is not clear. Information from two interviews suggests that

while Chapter officials had prevented new leaders from emerging and new program ideas from taking hold, as Members For Action Now wanted, there had not been a monolithic force in opposition to change. First, the Chair of the Board had earlier allowed leaders from Members For Action Now to organize two Chapter meetings, even if the results went beyond what had been expected. This attempt at including Members For Action Now in Chapter activities may have been what was behind the subsequent invitation to address the Board of Directors following the second petition for a by-laws change. Second, members of the Board of Directors, themselves, were likely to have sensed the strength of Members For Action Now's organizing effort and felt a sense of futility in preventing representatives from this oppositional group from participating in the decision-making of the Chapter.

In a summer issue of the Chapter newsletter, the results of the meeting of the Board of Directors and representatives of Members For Action Now was reported. The article reflected a tone of acceptance and articulated the concerns of Members For Action Now: "MAN's purpose is to move the Chapter into more timely and more responsive action on the critical issues in health, education, welfare, and civil rights that characterize the urban crisis in our city". The article went on to clarify a concern of Members For Action Now that they not be perceived as dissidents but as "bona fide NASW members who wish to share the

responsibility of making the Chapter a vital organization".¹⁶

Within one year of the formation of Members For Action Now, a new regularly scheduled Chapter election was held and many of the members and supporters of Members For Action Now were on the ballot. While the Co-chair of Members For Action Now lost his bid to become Chapter president, others were elected to the Board. This included the first African American in the Chapter to become the top elected official. The Board established the Urban Task Force as originally conceived in the fall Chapter meetings, and the Chapter became active in the welfare rights movement, moving beyond issues more closely associated with the administration of public welfare. In addition, activities were initiated on school decentralization.

Part III: Views About the Change Effort

In an interview with one of the Chapter's leaders prior to the success of Members For Action Now, concern about responding to the events of the day was not the only impetus for discontent among Chapter members. The claim was made that the Co-chair of Members For Action Now, who was in academia, was influenced by social work students who were involved in the student movement of the 1960's. The Co-chair was characterized as giving too much credit to the students' point of view. In addition, the Chair of the

Board of Directors during the emergence of Members For Action Now, was characterized as lacking in the abilities required to address dissent.¹⁷ In contrast to the characterization of the Board Chair was the perception by one of the supporters of Members For Action Now and future President of the Chapter subsequent to the change effort that the Chair of the Board was "a great man" for his handling the situation with Members For Action Now.¹⁸ It seems from this perspective that the Chair of the Board played a mediating role between the Board and Members For Action Now.

A similar perception was shared by the last Chair of the Board prior to Members For Action Now who frankly admitted that she did not have the courage to confront some of the Chapter leaders for their tight reign over decisions, even over her own in her role as Chair. She said that her successor had more courage than she did through his addressing the issues of leadership and control.¹⁹

A social worker who was a faculty member in one of the schools of social work in the late 1960's provides some insight about the influence students had on faculty, and possibly on Members For Action Now. She painted a picture that went beyond the question of issues to the intensity of the situation. The situation was part of a larger series of developments on university campuses in the late 1960's that was to a significant extent a reaction to the Vietnam War and a movement to question the dominant values of American

society.

This academician told of how student demands and subsequent protests at her own school of social work went beyond what faculty could generally agreed with or accept. Despite disagreement by faculty with students, faculty themselves boycotted classes when students picketed the school even in the face of the faculty planning to resist the demonstrators. Only three faculty members showed up at the school on the morning of the demonstration although there had earlier been wide agreement among the faculty to attend classes. Those who did attend were confronted with the possibility that they would be singled out for resisting the students, and there was concern that their future reputations would be at stake. They subsequently left the school for the day.²⁰

The suggestion by one of the Chapter's former leaders that Members For Action Now was influenced by students in becoming critical of the New York City Chapter may or may not have been correct. What seems clear is that the student movement that swept college campuses in the late 1960's had the potential of profoundly affecting social workers as it did society in general.

Related to the possible influence of students, as well as events of the day which were detailed by Members For Action Now in their statements and newsletters, were perceptions about the Chapter leaders who were the targets of Members For Action Now. One member of the Board of

Directors at the formation of Members For Action Now related in an interview that the Chapter leaders emerged in the 1950's at a time when "McCarthyism" was rampant in the country and people were easily accused of being Communists and of having their reputations destroyed. He detailed how one of the largest social work agencies, which was headed by the spouse of one the Chairs of the Chapter's Board, red-baited a union leader who had been attempting to organize the agency's staff. According to his account, the union was defeated and another more moderate union was allowed to come into the agency. The episode was recounted to characterize the leadership in the Chapter. He indicated that there was a fear that newer, younger members would attempt to gain control of the organization and radicalize it.²¹

The Co-chair of Members For Action Now corroborated this characterization of the Chapter leaders but also indicated that in order to become a member of the Board of Directors and to be taken seriously by the Chapter's leadership, one had to have established a respectable reputation in the profession. He said that some of the supporters of Members For Action Now who had already been on the Board were only accepted because they had achieved prominence as administrators of large agencies or departments of social work. And once on the Board, being taken seriously was still believed to be a problem.²² In effect, he characterized the Chapter's leaders as a closed elite.

While this study is not intended to examine the long term effect of the organizational changes initiated by Members For Action Now, it is clear that the organizing effort was relatively successful in accomplishing its immediate goals, namely changing leadership and having the opportunity to implement a new program. For the purpose of this study, Members For Action Now demonstrated how the mechanism of changing an organization from within can be implemented.

Notes

1. Interview with former Chair of the Committee on Legal Regulation, January 2, 1991.
2. Interview with social worker in public welfare, June, 1991.
3. Chair, NASW Members For Action Now. "Statement of Purpose and Organization" (draft) in Letter to the Chairman of the Board of Directors, New York City Chapter, NASW, December 26, 1968.
4. "A Revitalized NASW" in newsletter of NASW Members For Action Now, March 17, 1969.
5. Ibid.
6. Interview with the second President of the Chapter subsequent to the activities of Members For Action Now, May 10, 1989.
7. President of the National Association of Social Workers. Final Report of the Special Board Committee to Study Alleged Irregularities at the Two New York City Chapter Meetings October 29 and November 14, 1968, June 9, 1968, page 4.
8. Ibid, pages 7 to 10.
9. Interviews with the Co-chair of Members For Action Now, April 19, 1989, and the third President of the Board of Directors following the activities of Members For Action Now, May 1, 1989.
10. Interview with the last Chair of the Board of Directors prior to the emergence of Members For Action Now, April 26, 1989.
11. Co-chair, Members For Action Now. Memo to the chairman of the Board of Directors, New York City Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, February 6, 1969.
12. Board of Directors, New York City Chapter, NASW. "A Statement To Our Membership From The Board Of Directors", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, March 4, 1969.
13. "Executive Director Resigns", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, April 14, 1969.
14. "Membership Revises Bylaws On Elections", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, April 14, 1969, pages 5-6.
15. Chair of the Board of Directors, New York City Chapter, NASW. Letter to the Co-chair of Members For Action Now, June 3, 1969.
16. "Board Meets Representatives of Members For Action Now", in *Currents in the New York City Chapter*, July 18, 1969.

17. Interview with a former Chapter leader, February 5, 1991.
18. Interview with the second President of the Board of Directors following Members For Action Now, May 10, 1989.
19. Interview with the Chair of the Board of Directors prior to the emergence of Members For Action Now, April 26, 1989.
20. Interview with a professor at a New York City School of Social Work, February 8, 1991.
21. Interview with member of the Board of Directors at the time of the emergence of Members For Action Now, May 11, 1989.
22. Interview with the Co-chair of Members For Action Now, April 19, 1989.

Chapter 8: DISCUSSION

This study of the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers from its inception in 1955 through 1970 sought to learn about the political activities of social workers through the example of this organization and the members who participated with it. Three major areas of activity targeting government decision making during this period were examined in depth, and a fourth area was included to increase understanding of how organizational dissent gets expressed in response to decisions about involvement (or non-involvement) in politics.

What do the research findings reveal about the New York City Chapter's political activities? This involves an analysis of each of the four areas studied and a comparison among them. Concepts about social workers in politics derived from the analysis will then be discussed. Finally, recent political activities in the New York City Chapter will be discussed in terms of the findings from the study.

Part I. Analysis of the Data

Legal Regulation of Social Work

The Chapter's pursuit of a state law to regulate who could be called a social worker was one of the first activities within the Chapter to receive priority attention. This reflected interest and decisions made no less than eight years before the Chapter was even formed when the American Association of Social Workers made it a national policy to pursue such legislation. When NASW, as well as the New York City Chapter, were formed out of seven organizations, there was already a strong thrust to move in this direction.

Not every one of the groups that merged to become NASW appear to have been concerned about this issue. But clearly, the groups that were concerned included psychiatric social workers, medical social workers, and possibly group workers. It is possible that if the Chapter did not pursue legal regulation, the very merger would have been threatened. Although this study did not directly reveal this, it is probable that an important force behind the merger was specifically for the unity needed to enter the government decision making arena. Thus it is not surprising that the Chapter established a standing committee on this issue shortly after its founding.

One of the most interesting findings in this study was

the amount of time-consuming work that was necessary in order to prepare to enter the legislative arena. It took over nine years from the inception of the Chapter until legislation was introduced in the state capitol. If one counts the time from the establishment of legal regulation as a priority in the AASW in 1947, then it must be admitted that 18 years passed and involved the activities of the merger as well as everything that followed it within the Chapter.

The preparatory work that led to introduction of a bill in the legislature included a number of activities. One of the most important was the process of informing members about the issues. Chapter meetings, articles in the organization newsletter, development of papers explicating the issues, fact sheets, and mailings to the entire membership reflected an extensive communication mechanism. In addition, dissemination of information was coupled with obtaining the approval or disapproval of members on the positions the Chapter was to take. It reflects direct democracy in that members weren't simply electing representatives to make decisions on their behalf. Members were actually deciding for themselves through referenda where they stood on the issues. This member involvement in decision making was the second preparatory activity leading to the legislature.

A third activity was the coordination with the other NASW Chapters in New York State. In order to structure this

relationship, the Chapters created the State Council of Chapters through which the various NASW units would speak with one voice. Not only did the original social work organizations prior to the formation of NASW require the unifying structure that NASW became through the merger, but NASW itself needed to bring its own units, the Chapters within a state, together.

Eventually, in the mid-1970's, NASW was reorganized and the local Chapters throughout the country, except for the New York City Chapter, were brought together into single Chapters representing entire states. In the absence of a single state entity, each Chapter in New York State had to determine for itself its position on each of the issues relating to legal regulation. It then met with the other Chapters and if there were disagreements, they had to be addressed until they could be overcome.

In essence, the existence of numerous Chapters multiplied the work of the New York City Chapter as well as each of the others. This reflected a two step processes of first working internally within a Chapter and then working at an inter-Chapter level. Each step was time consuming and together conspired to make the pursuit of an acceptable legislative bill a very time consuming affair.

A fourth step involved addressing which sets of actors or institutions would support or oppose any proposal that would eventually be put forward. While the New York City Chapter identified numerous organizations in this regard,

its plan did not include the need to address actors in the public welfare sector.

In addressing the legislative requirement that there would have to be a "blanketing-in" period for existing staff who would not ultimately meet the criteria for certification, the Chapter leaders who drafted the proposal identifying who would be included in this category believed that they were being very inclusive. Since many public welfare workers were in this population being considered, it is clear in retrospect that these Chapter leaders underestimated the response to their own benevolent thinking.

Representatives of the concerns among this group in public welfare ultimately made it clear that they opposed restrictions on the title "social worker" regardless of "blanketing-in". When attempts to find a compromise proposal were rejected by the Chapter, the Chapter subsequently found itself forced into accepting a more limited form of restriction in the title "certified social worker" when national NASW gave in to the expression of these concerns at the Delegate Assembly.

This demonstrates that strategizing to meet opposition and gain support is not necessarily a rational process. A systematic, planful approach was paralleled by a process characterized by unanticipated positions and reactions.

It appears that even before a Chapter plan was devised to address opposition, the leaders in legal regulation knew

that opposition existed among academicians in schools of social work. Despite some of these academicians being in leadership positions within the Chapter and having the potential to exercise their preferences, they did not according to a leader of the legal regulation effort. As this individual indicated, it was clear that most of the members in NASW wanted some form of regulation. It was a popular endeavor. This may be why members were frequently turned to in Chapter meetings or in referenda to express their preferences. It was not simply an expression of democratic good will, but a form of leverage against opposition.

This is given credence by the infrequent use of member input on the other two Chapter priorities studied. Member input was not sought in the pursuit of civil rights legislation or in responding to the various commissions studying public welfare. If there was a strong philosophical commitment to democratic participation, member input would have been solicited more consistently.

Aside from the activities that needed to be pursued in order to first enter the legislative arena were the fundamental reasons, or assumptions, for pursuing legal regulation in the first place. Members interested in legal regulation both before and after the formation of NASW identified why having the government regulate social work was important for the profession. Assumptions about the need for regulation set the stage for support and

opposition. Eventually members of the profession were arguing about whether the image of the profession needed a boost from the type of regulation government had bestowed on other professions.

This position was contrasted with the need to give more attention to issues relating to the delivery of services. One group, the proponents of legal regulation, saw no difference between the two. The second group, representing public welfare, believed there were fundamental differences. The first group believed legal regulation would improve services because those providing them would be better qualified. The second group believed that such qualified staff would not enter the public welfare sector, so it would not make any difference.

At bottom, there were important differences that would result in conflict. Related to these assumptions were concerns about whether those interested in legal regulation actually cared about traditional service delivery. It was believed by some that the interest in establishing private practices and becoming eligible for insurance reimbursement was really behind the issue. To the extent that this was true, it belied concern about traditional forms of service delivery. However, it would be a mistake to assume that legal regulation was only about private practice. There was also a belief, probably among different individuals, that well qualified staff would improve public welfare services. Concerns about both private practice and public welfare

existed.

Other assumptions about legal regulation also brought out racial divisions within the profession. Leading Black social workers made the point that limiting practice or title would create additional obstacles for Blacks who faced economic barriers to education and to becoming qualified.

Once the NASW Chapters entered the legislative arena, a number of activities were pursued to enhance the likelihood of successful passage. One was the call to members to make their views in support of the legislation known to their elected representatives. Similarly, directors of social services throughout the state were called upon to do the same. This would work to create the identification between the need for legal regulation and the provision of services through the established service delivery systems. This could possibly work to offset the sense that social workers were pursuing regulation simply out of self interest.

Interestingly, it does not appear that any representatives of consumers of service were brought in to support the issue. Perhaps this could not be realistically expected when consumers are more likely to concern themselves with receipt of services and not with the more technical aspect of what qualifies someone to deliver those services. That this was a technical issue may also be why legislators expressed minimal concern about the issue themselves once it came to a vote.

Another set of activities were carried out by a parttime paid lobbyist for the State Council of Chapters. She was viewed as having brought expert skills to the legislature and adeptly addressed questions legislators had about the proposal. However, this contrasts to the fact that most of the work on legal regulation, not only at the point of moving the proposal through the legislature but from the very beginning of the work, was carried out by a few members who contributed their time and expertise to the issue.

Finally, obtaining support was brought about through what might be termed special relationships between the social work profession and a few persons who could influence the passage of the law.

One relationship involved the choice of the legislative sponsor of the bill. The person chosen was not only considered potentially influential with his colleagues, he was also married to a social worker. It was anticipated that he would be more committed to the issue than someone who did not have a personal stake.

Relationship was also important in obtaining the support of the City's Commissioner of the Department of Welfare. As a governmental official, this person's original opposition to legal regulation was likely to get a hearing. Once the national Delegate Assembly modified the title restriction to "certified social worker", this individual's opposition probably abated. However it happened, he came

around to agree to support the legislation. One of the Chapter leaders attributed this to the Commissioner's membership in NASW and his concern about the opinion of Chapter leaders, his colleagues.

In sum, the study of the New York City Chapter's pursuit of legal regulation of social work reveals not only an example of social workers involved in the governmental arena. It also demonstrates what a historical perspective can bring out. Forces from the past can exert a strong influence on an organization's direction. In addition, influencing governmental decisions can take a great deal of time and energy. The possibility of disagreement within a diverse group such as the social work profession can result in the failure to obtain a goal, and the possibility of finding a compromise must be considered if such failure is to be avoided. The late breaking mandate from the national delegate assembly to narrow the restriction on the social work title was a form of compromise that was imposed upon the chapters in New York State, even if it was not desired. Finally, the utilization of special relationships with influential actors in the governmental arena gave depth to whatever tactics were available to the organization, such as member contact with legislators and the utilization of professional and volunteer lobbyists.

Civil Rights

Unlike the Chapter's concern about legal regulation of social work, there was no historical push from the past to propel the Chapter to focus on the issue of civil rights. While social workers had been struggling with the issue of legal regulation for many years before NASW was organized, it is not evident that there was a similar historical concern about civil rights. Yet, history played an important role in making the issue of civil rights a priority in the New York City Chapter.

The evolution of the civil rights movement pushed its way into people's consciousness at least as early as the Supreme Court decision in *Brown vs. the Board of Education* up through the unprecedented media coverage of the events in Birmingham, Alabama in 1963. While the influence of history on legal regulation came from within the profession, the influence of history on the Chapter about civil rights came from outside, from the events in the South and their coverage by the media.

It was by no means inevitable that the civil rights issue would become a priority, and just why it did is not clear. Even when issues are considered socially important and worthy of concern to social workers, an organization such as NASW does not automatically get involved. Limited interest and limited resources in the form of funds, staff and member time and expertise frequently prohibits taking up

an issue. But the combination of a well regarded member with knowledge of the issues ready to take leadership in heading up a committee and the readiness of the Chapter to take on an issue that the diverse groups within it could support, enabled civil rights to become an important issue for the New York City Chapter.

Unlike legal regulation which had limited appeal as a social issue, civil rights was thoroughly a social issue. Legal regulation was an issue for professional social workers, and its relationship to helping people become better off requires some technical understanding of the profession itself. Civil rights, on the other hand, was something that the entire country would have opinions about, and social workers could have something to say about it since many people who received their services were the victims of the racism that the civil rights struggle was seeking to address. That the New York City Chapter would take leadership in this area had the potential to appeal to its diverse membership, and it appears that this potential was borne out.

Organizing Chapter meetings for the purpose of educating members about issues is a traditional and common activity of NASW. That 1,000 members were reported to have attended the Chapter meeting in the fall, 1963 is strong evidence of the concern about the issue. This number in attendance stands as the largest single event in the Chapter's history. The Chair's belief that well-known

people should be the featured speakers may have influenced the attendance. Regardless of why members attended, the Chapter moved to involve members in the issue beyond those who worked on one special committee within the Chapter devoted to civil rights issues.

Visiting elected federal officials was identified by the Chapter as one of its civil rights strategies. This made obvious sense since the target of the Chapter's concern was federal legislation, the Civil Rights Act. Yet, it is impressive that the Chapter leaders were able to quickly get meetings with their representatives in the United States Senate. Today such meetings with the officials rather than staff is difficult to arrange. Whether such meetings were easier in 1963 or whether special connections were available to NASW to help arrange the meetings is unclear.

One of the Senators visited requested that NASW help in securing the federal legislation by collecting petitions from New York City citizens. This request might have been awkward for NASW leaders if they felt they would have difficulty fulfilling the request. Despite NASW being a large membership organization in which an activity such as collecting signatures would make logical sense, such an activity is time consuming and requires enough volunteers to implement it. Nonetheless, the Chapter responded positively to the request and was able to be credited for achieving significant results by collecting 15,000 signatures. Together with the educational meeting involving 1,000

members, NASW involved a large number of people in the civil rights issue.

The successful campaign earned the Chapter the opportunity to present the signatures on the steps of the United States Capitol and obtain coverage in the major print media in New York City. In addition, the petitions became the basis of additional political activity in the form of notifying all of the elected federal representatives in New York State and requesting to know their positions on the proposed legislation. More than half of these officials were reported to have responded.

Even while these activities were underway, the Chapter was able to target the legislative body right in its own backyard, the New York City Council. The Council passed a resolution calling upon the U.S. Congress to pass the civil rights legislation. Given that there were many civil rights organizations in New York City and many citizens who were concerned about civil rights, it is noteworthy that the Council was prompted to consider such a measure as it was to adopt as a result of the New York City Chapter of NASW. The Chapter undertook a series of steps in communicating with the Council, from the initial raising of the idea to drafting wording for the resolution. What was finally adopted was close to what the Chapter submitted.

NASW took a leadership role on civil rights in New York City despite the fact that it was not primarily a civil rights organization. This leadership role was further

extended by virtue of the Chapter being a part of a national membership organization. While national NASW eventually became a burden for the Chapter when it prepared to introduce legislation on legal regulation and the Chapter found that it had to limit its certification proposal, with civil rights the Chapter was able to amplify its concerns through the national organization.

This may have been facilitated by the Chapter's close ties to the leadership of national, which at the time was based in New York City. Several Chapter leaders also came to hold positions on the national Board of Directors. It was quite likely that when the City Chapter called upon national to get involved in working for the civil rights bill in Congress, it had the potential of getting a positive response from the national organization.

This potential within the Chapter for influencing National to make civil rights a priority issue of its own was subsequently given an opportunity for expression. National NASW developed an activity in Washington, D.C. in which the New York City Chapter played a major role. Chapter efforts resulted in no less than a meeting with the country's President as well as news coverage of that meeting and lobbying the foremost opponent to civil rights in the United States Senate. Not only could the Chapter extend its activities through its national organization, it enhanced its reputation as an actor in the political arena.

This study did not attempt to assess NASW's reputation

in New York City, but responses to efforts suggest that it had substantial respect. The New York City Council, United States Senators and the President of the United States met with Chapter leaders and considered Chapter concerns. Similarly, when the Chapter presented its views in writing to New York City school officials criticizing the Board of Education for moving too slowly to integrate the public schools, the response was an invitation to meet to discuss the matter further. With a large number of organizations as well as individuals vying at any one time to get the attention of public school officials, it is significant that the New York City Chapter would receive such an invitation, especially when it was being critical. This recognition by the Board of Education suggests that there was something about NASW that required that it be responded to. What this might have been is not known, but the Chapter's involvement in civil rights, the publicity given to the Chapter about this, as well as the responsiveness of federal officials to the Chapter, could have made the Chapter seem to be an important organization to officials at the Board of Education.

The Chapter's effort on civil rights over a one year period stands as an outstanding example of political activity within the social work profession. This is certainly the case within the New York City Chapter during the period studied and is probably true if one extends the Chapter's history through the present. Although the goal to

be achieved, the passage of the federal civil rights bill before the Congress in 1963 and 1964, was well beyond the reach of any one organization, no less a social work membership Chapter in New York City, the efforts of the New York City Chapter demonstrate how a contribution can be made to a large, broadbased set of activities carried out by many organizations.

Despite this effort, social workers found reason to be critical with the Chapter on civil rights. One area of criticism regarded the lack of participation of social workers and a need among the members of the profession to better understand the issues relating to civil rights. This criticism came despite 1,000 members attending an educational meeting. Barring an inaccurate perception about the Chapter, which could have been partly or wholly the case, it is possible that more might have been done to involve members and to provide information.

The validity of this criticism probably increased over time. As the Chapter entered its second year of activity, the concerns among social workers about civil rights shifted from passage of federal legislation to other areas. One was the murder of three young civil rights workers in Mississippi. That one of these victims was a social worker and a Chapter member might have become the focus of Chapter activity, but a group of social workers outside of the membership organization took up the initiative instead. In another development, also very close to home for the

Chapter, was the riots in Harlem in the summer of 1964. There is little on record to suggest that the Chapter reacted to this significant race related event with anything reflecting the energy or concern of its first year's activities on civil rights.

It appears that when the Chapter was confronted by its critics about the need to involve more members, the Chapter reacted initially in a defensive manner. This took the form of raising issues about limited Chapter finances and staff time and competing demands emanating from other pursuits already committed to. On the one hand this suggests that the Chapter was reluctant to do much more than it had already done on civil rights. On the other hand, the issue of limited resources and competing priorities is a very real issue for an organization. There is a point beyond which it can be very difficult to go even when one's stated commitments suggest it would be logical to do otherwise.

Despite the Chapter's apparent defensiveness and reluctance to respond more positively to its critics in this situation, a new activity arose that could be characterized as involving social workers in a very full way. A second educational meeting was developed that attracted 500 members. In addition, the content itself was on both social work and the delivery of social work services, and the relationship to racism. Perhaps some of the Chapter's leaders had planned to focus on such an event all along, but this is not clear from the records available. Whatever

these leaders intent might have been, what the Chapter had done, in effect, was respond to its critics but did not allow them to determine which activities would be developed.

Basically, the Chapter's leaders relied upon the individual contributions of a few members to carry out its civil rights program, as was true with the pursuit of legal regulation. When the point was made that more social workers should or would get involved, little was done to change the basic way of operating. Related to this was the important role of member relationships with important actors on the issue of civil rights. Broad based member involvement was secondary as a concern to making use of the connections that selected members could use with other organizations and officials.

As with legal regulation where relationship played an important role in choosing a legislative sponsor and working with the head of the welfare department, the relationship of the Chair of the Chapter's Committee on Civil Rights as the spouse of a national civil rights organization was very significant. Given the Chair's ability to develop position papers and to invest energy in NASW, she was in a unique position to bring to her work special knowledge of issues and activities. This relationship also suggests that the Chapter was aided in obtaining meetings with otherwise difficult to reach officials. This was certainly the case with the meeting with the United States President.

Public Welfare

As with the issue of civil rights in the Chapter, the pursuit of public welfare issues relied upon selected members. Five of the members who comprised the first special committee to address the Mayor's report on the city's Department of Welfare were, or were going to become, chairs of the Board of Directors. If one were to measure the commitment of leaders of an organization by where they put their time and energy, then public welfare emerges as the choice of the Chapter's leaders in the early years of NASW in New York City.

Two of these future chairs were also to become commissioners of the Department of Welfare. In addition, two other members of the committee worked at the national level addressing public welfare issues. That the Chapter developed a position paper in response to the Moreland Commission report that was generally well received, not only locally and statewide, but nationally, was the result of the expertise represented on the committee.

The Chapter did not trust its members to understand the issues behind public welfare, no less to participate with its select members. For example, when opposing contracting out services to voluntary agencies, attention was given to how the position could be made understandable to the membership. Instead of focusing on concerns about what was believed to be proper use of the tax payers' money, the

Chapter's leaders instead limited the issue to the impact on the family, which was also a valid concern. Given this lack of trust, it is not surprising, that there were no referenda or Chapter meetings requesting member input on the pursuit of public welfare issues.

Once again relationships among Chapter leaders and policy makers, or those very close to policy makers, played an important part. When the Moreland Commission released its report, the public was not treated to what could have been a counter argument to Newburgh's welfare policies. Instead, the report was very much a document relating to the place of social work in public welfare. To look at the possible influence of the Chapter, one can examine the Chapter's response to the Moreland document. However, it is likely that there was more influence being extended even before the Commission wrote a single word.

When the Commission started its work, it hired a consultant who had been the last Chair of the Board of the New York City Chapter of the AASW. The Chapter already had a paper addressing the desired state pattern of public welfare organization which was developed in response to the earlier, short lived committee set up by the legislature prior to the incident in Newburgh. For whatever reason, the consultant requested the Chapter report as he started his work with the Moreland Commission. Although the Chapter's Board of Directors decided not to release the report once the legislature discontinued its committee's

work, one person was given the Chapter's report, the consultant to the Moreland Commission.

One of the outcomes of the consultant's work was that an organization was hired at his recommendation to conduct a survey of conditions in local public welfare in New York State. This organization was headed by a social worker who later responded to the Chapter's position paper and acknowledged the extent to which his own firm's recommendations had been incorporated into the Moreland Commission's report. He acknowledged much agreement between the Chapter's position and that of his firm. This suggests that those involved at the formation of the Commission had influence on the Commission's recommendations and that the Chapter might have influenced this process through the consultant. It is also possible that the consultant influenced the Chapter's position, as well.

The issues that the Chapter addressed are of significance. While it was not clearly reported on in the media, a major issue in the Mayor's Committee on Inquiry into the City's Department of Welfare was not fraud as the public would have thought but contracting out services to the public sector. Fraud was seen as the reason for the Mayor's initial concern, and even after the recommendations had been made to the Mayor, the issues around contracting out were still relatively imperceptible. Someone as knowledgeable about public welfare as the deputy commissioner made just this point after receiving the

Chapter's paper. He expressed appreciation that the Chapter had clarified the issues.

There were few organizations, if any, other than NASW, calling attention to the problem that contracting out might cause. NASW made it very clear that the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act called for a strong public welfare service, and the Chapter's paper went on to highlight the reasons such a strong public service was desirable. Having this viewpoint enabled, or compelled, the Chapter to describe the idea of establishing an advisory committee on public welfare to the mayor comprised of leaders in voluntary agencies as a conflict of interest.

Despite the ability of the Chapter to develop its point of view and to get an audience with the city's mayor, there appears that little was accomplished to influence contracting out. While the evidence available in this study did not reveal the outcome of the meeting with the Mayor, it is clear that the Mayor had already made his decision before meeting with Chapter representatives. The media carried his decision to set up an advisory committee the very morning that he met with the Chapter.

One of the interesting aspects of the Chapter's position on contracting out is that it reflected a position of opposing agencies which are often run, and frequently staffed, by social workers. Yet, there is no record of the heads of voluntary agencies contacting NASW to protest or at least discuss their differences.

That the Chapter was supportive of strengthening public welfare services raises from another vantage point the question of the relationship between the Chapter and the City's Department of Welfare. Clearly, there was disagreement between the two organizations about pursuing legal regulation. Questions cannot be fully answered in this study but can be raised. Were the Chapter's leaders who were most involved with public welfare issues in agreement with the Commissioner that limiting title of "social worker" would be detrimental to public welfare? If the answer was yes, then it credits even further the ability of the leaders on legal regulation to have their view prevail since so many of the chairs of the Board of Directors were associated with issues of concern to public welfare.

There is reason to believe that the Chapter's leaders actually disagreed with the Commissioner on this issue. It might be that the very relationship with the Commissioner on exclusively public welfare issues enabled the Chapter's leadership to persuade the Commissioner to ultimately support legal regulation once it assumed the more limited form of "certified social worker". Based on the lobbying efforts of one of the Chapter's Chairs for legal regulation, one who was also active in public welfare, it seems that this best describes the situation between the leaders of the two organizations.

As with civil rights, the Chapter's activities on

public welfare eventually drew criticism from members. With the issue of public welfare, the Chapter's reluctance to get involved beyond the writing of a press statement on behalf of Mobilization for Youth disappointed a significant number of members. While the Chapter supported the establishment of a strong public welfare service, there was an increasing recognition and belief among social workers that public welfare was the problem that had to be addressed. When Mobilization for Youth implemented a program that manifested that belief through organizing community residents, the City of New York and the media cracked down on the agency. Both an innovative program and social work staff became targets of public wrath.

Despite impressive work addressing the formal delivery of services by government agencies, the Chapter appeared unable to implement even its own decisions to act, even when those decisions suggested moving slowly and cautiously. The situation illustrated, as with civil rights, that some of the Chapter's leaders believed that the Chapter had other more pressing matters to attend to. While the attention given to Mobilization for Youth may represent the greatest public exposure for the social work profession in the city's history, the New York City Chapter took a low profile and allowed independent, ad hoc groups to form and take the lead. Many members believed that the Chapter should have been in the lead as the professional organization.

Dissent

This study shows that the New York City Chapter of NASW engaged over a 15 year period in a number of activities directed at government decision makers in order to make the social work point of view known and to influence public policy. In each issue examined in this study, the Chapter's response met with some dissent among members. The case study of the development of Members For Action Now focused special attention upon one instance in which members expressed their disagreement with Chapter leadership.

Chapter leaders, including the Chair of the Board of Directors, the Executive Director, Board members collectively, and committee chairs all had varying degrees of influence on which issues the Chapter became involved. The case study of Members For Action Now shows that members who were not in leadership positions had opportunities to influence direction, as well. In fact, the study shows that under certain circumstances, members can take control away from the officials of the organization and replace the leaders as well as the policies and programs.

As has been seen, history played a role in a number of ways on the selection of Chapter priorities. It gave force to both taking up legal regulation as well as public welfare. But from the point of view of many members, the leadership that had the greatest history with the Chapter were not making way for new members to take part at least to

the extent to change the way some things were done.

The historical perspective also brings out the difficulty posed by the need to address issues in the governmental arena over a prolonged period of time. This requires organizations and its members to have a sustained effort or be removed from the arena. This was clearly seen with legal regulation and the number of years required to obtain legislation. With civil rights a great deal of energy was invested over a shorter term, but expectations among members did not abate when the committee's activities did. And with public welfare a lull in activities eventually emerged, probably reflecting differing interests among Chapter leaders. In addition, what had been at one time an innovative and important approach to dealing with poverty, the creation of a public welfare system, itself came under attack. A new innovation came into being as manifested in Mobilization for Youth. Chapter leaders were more committed to the innovation of yesterday than the one emerging.

As Members For Action Now emerged, social problems in New York City continued to loom large with each crisis. Racism continued to be a problem but there was no longer that spurt of energy that was manifested in the pursuit of federal civil rights legislation. As communities attempted to address the impact of racism on their children's education, conflict broke out with teachers in those communities. At the same time, an increasingly unpopular

war in Southeast Asia was seen as draining the promise of resources brought out by the declaration that there would be a war on poverty.

For many people the times demanded responses, and Members For Action Now expressed what many social workers felt. For social workers, the professional association should have a great deal to express about the social problems in New York City. As the literature from Members For Action Now stated, the Chapter was seen as looking at long term issues and not responding at the point where crises were unfolding.

From this perspective, the Chapter, like other institutions, was working on issues from an era that was being relegated to the past. In addition, this unacceptable situation was not about to change. The leaders, regardless of who they were, held a similar view about what the Chapter should be doing, and there was no room for social workers who wanted to change things.

Although the eventual leaders of Members For Action Now were given the opportunity to organize a series of Chapter meetings, it was not their intent to simply be embraced by the current leadership. Their proposal to create a task force that would not answer to the Board but, instead answer directly to the membership, points to a radical restructuring of decision making. It was inevitable that the outcome of the Chapter meeting would be substantial conflict between the Board of Directors and those

individuals who were about to organize Members For Action Now.

The mechanism utilized by Members For Action Now are interesting because they demonstrate what tools are available to members who are interested in organizational change. One tool was communication. The Chapter had a virtual monopoly on communicating with members through position papers, newsletters and its own Chapter meetings. But members have opportunities to communicate with each other, although the resources are usually limited to do so. Members For Action Now apparently used what is available to anyone, word of mouth communication. They also put their viewpoints into "statements of purpose" and into newsletters. One potent vehicle for communicating was the use of an advertisement in a human service newspaper to get their message across.

A second tool was utilization of what is legally proscribed. When the Chapter refused to make its mailing list available, which would enhance Members For Action Now's ability to communicate, a lawyer was brought in. That the list was subsequently turned over suggests that there was a legal basis for having access to the list. Even more importantly, an organization's by-laws are legally binding documents, and these were effectively utilized by Members For Action Now. Given the provisions in the Chapter's by-laws for petitioning to call Chapter meetings that have binding force on the organization, as well as the provision

for amending the by-laws, the nominations process for selecting candidates to run for Chapter office was reformed. This worked for Members For Action Now and they eventually succeeded in getting their own supporters elected to Chapter leadership positions.

A third tool was the message itself. Social workers have many beliefs about social issues and the profession, and Members For Action Now characterized NASW as representing an unacceptable message. Combined with the communication mechanisms that were available or made available through legal means, Members For Action Now was able to organize a large membership in support of its efforts.

Ultimately, members who desired change in the way NASW dealt with issues of the day, and these were essentially political issues, were able to have NASW become the vehicle for their cause. To "play" politics in the governmental arena can require "playing" politics in the organizational arena as a prerequisite.

Part II. The Literature on Social Workers in Politics

The case histories developed in this study provide vivid examples of the types of activities described in the social work literature. In a number of instances this study extends the current level of understanding. A number of concepts were derived from the preceding analysis and are discussed in detail below (see in Table 3). They are useful in drawing out the variables that impinge on social workers becoming involved in politics, including becoming involved through the collective efforts of a social work membership organization.

TABLE 3

Concepts Derived From The Study

1. The Passing of Time
 2. The Push from the Past; The Pull of the Present
 3. Entering Different Political Arenas
 4. Information and Expertise
 5. Using Connections
 6. The Extent of Activities; the Limits of Influence
 7. Organization and Social Workers
 8. The Relative Importance of Member Volunteers
 9. Turning Dissent into Action
 10. From the Politics of Membership to the Politics of Government
 11. The Unique Characteristics of the Profession
-

The Passing of Time

One of the most important contributions of this study

is the emergence of the dimension of time as a variable in political activity. That this would emerge is not surprising since the study was designed to review the history of NASW over a 15 year period. Nevertheless, much of the literature on social workers in politics barely touches upon this variable.

Patti and Dear (1975) acknowledge it in terms of anticipating that it often takes more than one legislative session to get a measure adopted. And Mahaffey (1972) makes the point that even once a bill has been passed into law, it will often fall short of the ideal that it was hoped to be. Thus, attempts need to be made over time to incrementally bring the law into greater conformity with the desired goal.

This study brought out other dimensions about time as a factor. One involves the short-term aspects of political activity. For example, the Committee on Civil Rights engaged in one year of work on behalf of legislation in the United States Congress in which a wide assortment of activities were pursued. This effort could be characterized as intensive. In contrast to the short-term, intensive activity in the political arena is the lengthy process that can be required to move into, and then through, the political arena. This aspect of political activity has not been discussed in the literature.

The concept of time as it relates to possible requirements for political activity calls attention to the need for perspective and vision in strategizing, as well as

commitment. Not only can the achievement of a goal take many years, and not simply a few legislative sessions, there is a great challenge in sustaining effort over a prolonged period. Such a prolonged period, as seen in this study, can equal a decade and even longer.

The Push From The Past; The Pull of the Present

Related to the concept of time and the fact this study was historical in nature is the dynamic between the past and the present on political activity. Neither individuals nor organizations are always free of decisions and commitments made in the past as situations arise in the present that may be of compelling concern. Commitments made in the past may assure that certain situations that arise will be responded to, or activity may be stifled.

The case of legal regulation demonstrates how decisions made even years before NASW formed influenced the future direction of the organization. Similarly, the early interest in the development of a quality public welfare institution drove the Chapter in a particular direction to achieve that goal. The time came, however, when new trends emerged and the Chapter was not responsive. And with civil rights, many members expected the Chapter to be involved more fully around issues such as community control or race riots in the City. The Chapter, however, was having trouble

sustaining its efforts begun at an earlier date on the civil rights issue.

Entering Different Political Arenas

This study covered Chapter activities that targeted a number of different government arenas: city, state, and federal, as well legislative and administrative branches of government. While the literature differentiates between entering the legislative and administrative arenas, as pointed out by Haynes and Mickelson (1986) and Albert (1983), there has not been any study identified in the social work literature contrasting what is involved in these two branches at each level of government.

While it is difficult to discern the differences, a few things emerged from this study. While the Chapter was intensively involved in pursuing civil rights legislation in Congress at the federal level, it is apparent that the impact of one local organization is at most slight. That national NASW was able to get a meeting with the President of the United States was remote but occurred because of the relationship between the President and the spouse of the Chair of the Chapter's Civil Rights Committee. Initially, the President had refused a request to meet.

On the other hand, the Chapter was in a much smaller field at the local level. This was true whether attempting

to get the City Council to pass a resolution supporting federal civil rights legislation or in working on public welfare and collaborating with other organizations to arrange a meeting with the Mayor. In between, activities at the state level, whether targeting the legislature on legal regulation or the administrative branch of government in the form of the Moreland Commission, was complicated by the fact that the broad jurisdiction of government at this level went well beyond the jurisdiction of the Chapter. As a result, there was the necessity of working with the State Council of Chapters. This made the development of consensus within the profession much more difficult and time consuming. In the case of the Moreland Commission, the New York City Chapter eventually abandoned the State Council and proceeded to work on its own, leaving open the possibility the social work profession would not be representing a unified position.

Information and Expertise

Patti and Dear (1975), as well as Mahaffey (1972) and Specht (1968), all stress the importance of information for work in the legislative arena, and Haynes and Mickelson (1986) as well as Albert (1983) stress the same basic point in relating to monitoring how legislation is implemented. The activities depicted in this study show a great concern about the quality of the information presented through

position statements and in testimony. For example, tensions arose when the quality of testimony before the Moreland Commission did not achieve a certain standard. Such reactions had the effect of keeping members who were not expert out of selected phases of the process.

There was great emphasis on presenting one's position within the framework of being an expert, and that required certain standards being met. The Chapter's position statement were often recognized for their quality, and this appeared to be a factor for getting across the social work point of view. This is not to suggest that only experts in specific areas of practice or service delivery, or experts in public policy, can or should be involved in the political arena. But it underscores the value placed on the form in which information is presented.

Using Connections

It has become common to hear that social workers can utilize their special skills in working with people to enter the political arena. This focus is especially upon the opportunities available to develop relationships with one's own elected representatives. Patti and Dear (1975) discuss the need to also develop relationships with legislative aides and administrative staff.

This study underscores a more common sense understanding of the use of relationship, that is using

one's personal connections. This point seems to have eluded discussions on social workers in politics, but such connections were crucial at times for NASW. On the one hand, it does not require special social work skills to understand this point nor to cultivate such connections. On the other hand, social workers will often have special opportunities because colleagues are often found in relevant administrative or policy making positions. Commissioners, consultants and at times legislators themselves, are social workers who share many of the profession's values.

This study adds one dimension to the point noted in several writings that the abilities special to social work practitioners in forming relationships should be an asset in working with policy makers. While such abilities are inherent to social workers who are trained to be competent in this area, relationship played a critical role in ways that did not necessarily require professional skill. Personal connections, either through family members of social workers, or through connections to social workers in influential policy positions, worked to advance the social work position. Such connections were at times the difference between a successful outcome and one that would have been quite different.

The Extent of Activities; the Limits of Influence

One of the points to emerge from this study is the

amount of activity that may be required in order to participate in the governmental arena. Just as it may be necessary to sustain activities over an extensive period of time, a great deal of effort may be required at any one time. This point is implied in many of the writings through listings of activities that comprise political action in either the legislative or administrative arena. This study makes explicit the extensiveness of required activities.

Related to this is Patti and Dear's (1975) exhortation about the need to be aware of and accept the limits of influence because of the impossibility of anticipating, let alone controlling, all contingencies. This was brought out in several ways. In the pursuit of legal regulation, dissent from public welfare workers emerged despite earlier attempts to anticipate and address potential opposition. The subsequent decision to virtually ignore this group was ultimately responded to through the national Delegate Assembly as it became a vehicle for putting limits on the profession's legislative initiative in New York State.

In another context, the Chapter attempted to influence the City to prevent the establishment of a policy which would result in public services being contracted to voluntary agencies. While not succeeding, Patti and Dear give a context for this activity, suggesting that the Chapter's efforts should be seen in terms of how close it came to achieving its goal. In both examples, a great deal of activity was invested, yet the influence on outcomes was

limited.

Organization and Social Workers

While this study confirms and extends the profession's understanding of how social workers can participate in the political arena, it goes further by bringing the variable of the organization, and specifically member participation in politics through the organization, into the picture. In doing so this study relates to the work of Olson (1965) and Moe (1980) on the collective activities of membership organizations.

It was a basic assumption of this dissertation that much of the literature on social workers in politics deals with the involvement of individual social workers. The problem often acknowledged has been the perception that few social workers actually get involved in politics despite several roles that social workers can play in this important arena. While this appears to be true, most social workers are members of their professional organizations which are frequently involved in the political arena.

The Relative Importance of Member Volunteers

Through collective activity, the leaders of NASW in New

York City, along with a number of active members in each issue area, worked to pursue their political objectives. While there was some amount of staff assistance, including limited utilization of a professional lobbyist, the contributions of volunteers was a resource that was relied extensively upon.

Beyond the most active members who contributed the most to collective action, less active members were able to gain information about issues through the Chapter's dissemination of position papers, articles in the newsletter, and membership meetings. At times, large scale activities were undertaken that involved the general membership in letter writing and in collecting petitions. The general membership was even able, at times, to participate through attendance at membership meetings or in referenda in the basic decision making of the organization.

On the other hand, there were numerous instances in this study in which the general membership did not play a role in the political activities of the organization. In fact, the study suggests that the inclusion of members in such activities was likely to have been the exception, and not the rule. Nevertheless, its occurrence demonstrates how rank and file members can be involved most directly in collective action.

That members are not involved as the organization proceeds in the pursuit of its priorities may very well be acceptable to many. In the New York City Chapter, most

members were concerned most about practice issues, and were attracted to events that addressed such issues. Political issues frequently failed to attract practitioners. This is what Olson described in his analysis of membership organizations.

Olson (1965) deduced that members do not join organizations for collective action but are attracted for the material benefits that they receive as a result of membership. Social workers stood to benefit from the success of obtaining legal regulation, for example, whether they were members or not. However, only members could participate in practice oriented committee meetings. Such a benefit results from the membership in the Association.

With most of the members involved in the practice oriented committees of the organization, the leadership was left to pursue a political agenda quite on its own. Olson described such a disparity between members and leaders. Leaders can pursue their political interests with the surplus resources obtained from members. This is what he called the "by-product" of having members and their paying dues.

Turning Dissent into Action

As Olson's critics point out, most notably Moe (1980),

one should not assume that members are uncaring about the political agenda of organizational leaders. According to Moe, people do not simply join organizations for the benefits that only members receive. There are often concerns such as to what collective purposes the organization is directed.

While NASW was able to pursue its various issues for extensive periods of time without apparent criticism of its positions and activities, it did not mean that some members were not in disagreement. As was demonstrated in repeated instances, dissent occurred, and when it did, a number of things happened. While the study did not show in detail the reaction of members, for example whether they left the organization when they found the organization not representing their concerns, some opportunities existed that did show a variety of reactions.

The most vivid of these was the organizing by NASW members to form a subgroup within the organization, Members For Action Now, so that the resources and potential influence of individual members could be pooled and brought to bear on the entire organization. These resources included knowledge of the organization, an understanding of social work issues as they related to the current events in society, as well as the ability to articulate their concerns, including their disappointment with the Chapter. These resources, coupled with the knowledge and ability to organize people for collective action, resulted in

significant organizational change.

While this study showed that organizational leaders and members selected by the leaders were the social workers to be most directly involved in the political arena through NASW, other members had options available to become involved. In general terms, to become involved through the organization requires assuring that one gains recognition of the organization's leaders. This could include demonstrating that one has expertise, writing ability, political connections, or time to spend lobbying.

On the other hand, one can demonstrate that there is a constituency for pursuing the issue at hand, or bargaining to be included lest the organization itself finds that it becomes blocked in its pursuits. When such mechanisms as these are not effective, influencing other arenas that can in turn influence the organization can be useful. This is what happened when public welfare representatives used the Delegate Assembly process to determine the policy proposals that could be pursued in New York State. Alternatively, dissenting members can enter into open conflict with organizational leaders and bring the type of pressure that Members for Action Now leveled on the New York City Chapter.

From the Politics of Membership to the Politics of Government

This study has brought out, not only how one organization gets involved, but how members, whether leaders or rank and file members, can participate. A major point is that the rank and file members may not find an unimpeded avenue for participation. That avenue can be transversed when there is understanding and skill to influence the process. This understanding and skill in many ways parallels what is needed to participate in the political process of government, and one can be a step toward the other. On the other hand, an organization can create structures and mechanisms for rank and file members to participate. Participation in decision making, education, and lobbying can be the rule, and not the exception, if the leadership believes in its value.

At bottom, the social work membership organization, like government, involves a political process of its own. Both have decision making structures, rules that are legally binding, and require setting limits on the number of issues that can be pursued at one time. Also, they both operate on principles of influence as well as on rational approaches to issues of importance.

The Unique Characteristics of the Profession

In much of the literature on social workers in politics, the unique nature of social work as a profession, that is, what is specific to the profession, is either not considered or is secondary. Even in this study, specific issues for the profession were secondary to the examination of political activity and the involvement of members. Nevertheless, the case histories focused specifically on the actions of a professional social work organization, not just on any group of political actors.

As Freidson (1986) points out in his discussion on the politics of professions, there are a number of concerns that are common to professions that differentiate these groups from others. A major point is that professions, including social work, are concerned about bringing highly specialized and technical knowledge, developed over years through systematic inquiry and accumulated experience, into an environment in which practitioners apply their craft. Because of numerous factors in the environment, including scarce resources, bureaucratic dilemmas, and individual differences among members in a profession, the application of the craft may only partially reflect the relatively ideal form of knowledge that rests at the foundation of the profession.

This inevitable transformation of knowledge through its application into practice, moves professions to gain as much

control of the work environment as they can. How professions do this, to what extent they achieve their objectives, and to what extent consensus is achieved within a group, is the subject of Freidson's inquiry. This dissertation provides evidence about such efforts of professions, and social work, in particular. In an important respect, much of the data appears to lend itself to such analysis, and this adds to the understanding of social workers in politics beyond what has so far been discussed.

The Chapter's attempt to restrict social work practice, or at least who can be called a certified social worker, to individuals who have graduate degrees from schools of social work accredited by the Council of Social Work Education is an example of what Freidson meant by gaining control of the workplace. In effect, professional schools are repositories of the theoretical and accumulated knowledge upon which professions depend, and one way to assure that this knowledge is understood and disseminated to students as they become socialized into a profession is to limit through the setting of standards which schools can legitimately develop practitioners.

Requiring schools to be accredited by a body such as CSWE achieves this purpose, and making graduation from such schools a prerequisite to certification is underscored by it being written into the certification statute. Not only is the social worker credentialled, the educational program

from where s/he came is credentialled as well.

This concern about control underscores a great deal in the study, even beyond the direct issue of obtaining legal regulation. Related to this was the apparent concern in academia that the creation of a state board for social work would compete with the schools for determining standards for practice. And the opposition from public welfare to legal regulation was to ultimately avoid a restriction about who could fill positions in that setting. Even the involvement on a broader scale with public welfare, such as with the Moreland Commission, involved qualifications for commissioners as well as issues relating to the work of direct service practitioners.

With Mobilization for Youth, the lack of involvement by the Chapter was believed by some who were interviewed to have been motivated by disagreements about the hiring of indigenous workers instead of graduate level social workers.

While control of the workplace is evident in these activities, a question can be raised about its relevance to other activities, for example in civil rights or in the actions of Members For Action Now. In pursuing such activities as civil rights, there is a concern about values that relate more directly to social issues than to practice. In situations in which values about social issues predominate, control of the workplace will not be the concern. The concern is likely to be about control over what values the professional association expresses. This

was a central concern of Members For Action Now. Their efforts can be seen as the attempt to take control in order that a different set of values could be expressed.

Part III: The New York City Chapter Today: A Comparison to the Findings in the Study

This dissertation focused on the first 15 years of the New York City Chapter of NASW. Based upon a pilot study conducted in 1989, the history of the NASW Chapter was divided into three periods, the first one, 1955 through 1970, being the focus of this study. The possibility of generalizing beyond the first period is limited by the fact that there was no systematic sampling of events in the second period, 1971 through 1982. However, since the investigator in this study was in the position of Director of Public Affairs from 1982 through 1990, when he became the Executive Director of the Chapter, there is a basis for a brief discussion of the relevance of this study to the present in the context of the period 1982 through 1991.

It would have been desirable to compare the findings of this study with the political activities and member involvement of the period following the changes brought about in the Chapter through the efforts of Members For Action Now. It would have been interesting to determine how the objectives of that change effort were implemented and sustained over time. That comparison will need to wait

until time is available to extend this study.

One of the developments of the second period that became a central focus in the beginning of the third, in 1982, was a Chapter structure called "The Educational Legislative Action Network" or ELAN. ELAN was originally formed by national NASW to involve and mobilize the membership to utilize knowledge from direct social work practice with clients and bring it into the legislative arena. It was conceived on the basis of Congressional districts so that social workers would become part of a vast NASW network extending across the country.

In New York City, ELAN became the central part of the Chapter's political program. It not only related to Congressional districts, it also focused on the state legislature and the development of relationships among social workers with their representative in the two state houses. This idea was based in part upon the notion, as previously discussed, that social workers could bring their skill in developing relationships into the legislative process.

Basically, ELAN centered around three activities: membership meetings to strategize and learn about lobbying and issues; organizing neighborhood meetings with legislators; and holding a membership "lobbying day" in the State capitol once a year. In a real sense, ELAN represented the form of democratization that Members For Action Now had aimed for at an earlier period. One did not

need to be an expert to participate in ELAN, it was an opportunity for all social workers to become involved in politics. In another sense, the ELAN concept recognized that each social worker is an expert based on his/her own area of practice and experience.

By 1982, such issues as the size of the public assistance grant, mental health services, and housing, were among the issues deemed priorities by ELAN. Position papers delineating issues in these and many additional areas of concern were developed and disseminated to policy makers. When legislative proposals were introduced or coming up for a vote, ELAN members were often contacted by mail or telephone and urged to contact their elected representatives.

The major thrust, however, became the annual lobbying day. A great deal of the time and energy of the steering committee went into organizing it. This was done in conjunction with the New York State Chapter, which came into being as part of a national NASW restructuring effort to do away with local Chapters and only have Chapters representing entire states. The only Chapter that remained at the local level is the New York City Chapter.

Following 1982, and continuing through 1984, changes occurred within ELAN. One was the exodus of several of its members who moved on to form the Chapter's political action committee, called NYC-PACE, which stands for Political Action for Candidate Election. The second development was

the analysis by the remaining and newly recruited steering committee members that social workers were not actively participating in ELAN activities, at least not the requests to contact legislators. Attendance at educational meetings was considered adequate, but the main activity, the lobbying day, was attracting fewer experienced practitioners and proportionately more social work students. While this latter development was seen as positive for its educational value to future practitioners, student inexperience was considered a shortcoming toward being effective in communicating with legislators.

As a result of this development, ELAN evolved into a smaller committee than its name as a network implied. Its members invested time becoming more informed about a few issues. Eventually, by 1988, it was concentrating exclusively on attempts at each level of government to reform the welfare system. In this sense, ELAN was continuing the earlier tradition of attending to public welfare.

At the same time as ELAN underwent changes in its operations, Chapter leaders examined the ability of the rest of the organization to participate in the political arena. A prevalent perception was that ELAN was addressing issues, but questions were not usually raised as to which issues were actually included. There appeared to be a tendency to assume that ELAN was handling whatever might be of concern.

In responding to this state of affairs, Chapter leaders

began to put new attention into selected committees, and some new committees were formed. There was concern that some of the most expert, active members of the Chapter were not being called upon to help the organization address issues, and many important social work issues were not being addressed at all. This was true, for example, in the area of services to families and children.

Based on the analysis of the research findings from the first period, the subject of this study, it can be surmised that the Chapter was moving away from the democratic, member participation form of involvement that ELAN represented toward an expert oriented approach that characterized the Chapter before 1970. That such a trend was developing was perhaps an accommodation to compensate for the inability of ELAN to fill certain needs. In effect, it appears that ELAN's activities were sustained for a significant period of time, but its effectiveness or utility to the Chapter eventually declined.

It would be a mistake, however, to simply conclude that the Chapter was abandoning its involvement of members. For example, in 1986, when school social workers were threatened with a loss of jobs through attrition, representing 33% of the nearly 500 positions held with the New York City Board of Education, the Chapter put resources of staff and selected volunteers into helping mobilize school social workers to head off this policy decision. As a result of mobilizing school social workers, enough funds were raised

to hire an attorney to represent the profession in court and to stop the proposal from succeeding.

One response among members to the outcome for school social workers was that the Chapter succeeded in investing the level of resources and expertise to properly represent a significant segment of the general membership. To many, the success represented the way the Chapter should be functioning overall. On the other hand, many social workers expressed another point of view. Members, including some leaders of the Chapter, questioned why many resources were being invested into one field of practice when there are many other areas needing attention, perhaps even more central to the concerns of the profession. This criticism was not against the demonstration of effectiveness in the decision making arena. It was an expression of the desire to see such effectiveness in other areas of social work.

The study focuses attention on possible consequences of concentrating resources into the school social work effort. Despite agreement about the success this effort represented, members disagreed about where resources were being placed. In fact, a group of social workers emerged to focus energy upon social issues not being addressed by the Chapter. If resources were not ultimately shifted from school social work, it is possible that this new group could have organized in a manner reminiscent of Members For Action Now. Dissent had already been turned into action. If the Chapter had not changed its focus, that action might have focused on

the Chapter's leadership.

In another development, the organizing of NYC-PACE, the Chapter moved into the political arena in a new way. Through members joining PACE for a small sum of money, PACE was able to select candidates for public office and to contribute to their campaigns. In this way, the Chapter was able to develop relationships with elected officials, at least the ones who gained social work support, by intervention at the time of election when politicians are most receptive to the public.

One early outcome of PACE activities was involvement, along with schools of social work, in the campaign of a candidate for governor. When the candidate won, a social worker was selected to become a high official in state government. Today, nine years later, this social worker is one of the governor's top staff. Social workers moving into involvement in elections was a significant reason for this individual's appointment. Another outcome of PACE activity was the early endorsement and mobilization of NASW members for a candidate for Mayor of New York City. The candidate won the election and the Chapter found itself in a better position than in the past to relate to the City's administration.

The organizing of PACE, as with going into court, represented new arenas for ultimately addressing governmental decisions. In the period studied, the arenas were limited to the legislature and the executive branch of

government. With the school social work issue, the third branch was entered. With PACE, however, it was not a matter of which branch of government was being entered. The arena was electoral, where candidates for office rely upon constituent support, and when public officials are most vulnerable and amenable to assistance. By making endorsements and giving financial contributions to selected candidates, the New York City Chapter has been making "connections" through its new political arm.

This brief comparison between the present period of the New York City Chapter and the findings in this study demonstrates the utility of the findings. The findings help frame a set of activities in an organization and make them understandable in terms of political activity and membership involvement. It seems reasonable from this that there will be utility in applying the framework to analyzing the collective activities of social workers in other Chapters of NASW, the national organization overall, and other social work membership organizations. One caution about this is that it would be a mistake to assume that these findings could anticipate what occurs in membership organizations. At best it provides opportunities for comparisons and raising questions requiring further inquiry.

Part IV. Conclusion

The importance of this study is its adding an empirical dimension to the discussion in the social work literature about how public policy is influenced. While only some social workers are involved in the political arena, many are members of professional associations. The study was based on five objectives which framed the examination of how such organizations are vehicles for social workers' political involvement, including variables that facilitate or impede political involvement.

The first objective was to develop a history of the political activities of the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers that are external to the organization and directed toward influencing policy makers in government. The second was to understand the role of active members and Chapter leaders who participated in the internal development of the organization's political activities. The case histories, which were at the center of the study, make clear that both the external politics and the internal operations of the organization are intertwined. The effort to influence government decisions depends on how the leaders and active members of a social work membership organization come together to jointly develop their political agenda and strategy, and then develop the requisite activities that are brought to bear in the policy arena.

Related to the second objective, the study also set

out to learn what NASW leaders have done to manage conflict within the organization. As was seen, the potential for disagreement to impede the complex efforts involved in addressing public policy creates a need for leaders to be prepared for this eventuality. How decisions are made, what priorities are chosen, and which members are engaged in activities can vary according to the choices leaders make. Consensus or disagreement can be the result. When it's the latter, the organization might choose to ignore dissent or to engage in some form of bargaining and compromise. The study demonstrates that the potential exists for disagreement to result in rivalry and even significant organizational change.

The fourth objective of the study was to develop from the case histories a set of concepts that frame the understanding of collective action by social work membership organizations. Based on the empirical evidence, the concepts synthesize a substantial amount of material and make the most salient features of moving from participation in a professional membership organization to participation in the political arena available to social work practitioners.

Two of these concepts, which involve the dynamics and dimensions of time, emerged as an essential feature from this historical study. Along with the requirements of social work membership organizations for developing mechanisms for participation and members contributing to a

collective effort, the concepts of time bring to the understanding of social workers influencing political systems variables barely examined before this study.

Another of these concepts, which has been referred to as "the unique characteristics of the profession", emerged out of the fifth and final objective of the study. This was to determine some of the underlying themes behind the particular issues chosen by the social work profession for political action. Many discussions on social workers in politics assume the particular reasons members of the profession become interested in politics and concentrate on the mechanisms of influence. The case histories in this study reveal that one basic theme underlying the issues that social workers address in politics is control. Gaining control of the conditions in which social work is practiced, whether through limiting who can be called a social worker or through defining the dimensions of the workplace, occupied a considerable amount the time addressed to public policy. Such control was not always predominant, however. In contrast, more directly addressing the needs of clients and their communities was also an underlying theme.

Social workers who are interested in being involved in the political arena can utilize the knowledge gained from this study to see social work membership organizations such as NASW as vehicles for their political involvement. Active members of these organizations can utilize the knowledge from this study to understand the opportunities and

impediments that exist in organizations in order to assess how one's expertise, abilities, and commitment can be adapted to the needs of the organization. And finally, leaders can utilize the knowledge to maximize fulfilling the political objectives of their organizations by awareness of the interest and obstacles facing members who will potentially contribute to the broader effort. In other words, the need for social workers to be involved in politics can be advanced by paying attention to how collective action takes place.

This suggests a logical next step for further inquiry. It would be interesting to study the benefits of training social workers, both affiliated and unaffiliated with social work membership organizations, and leaders of such organizations, about the internal dynamics of collective action. A comparison between simply providing training on the mechanisms of lobbying and providing this type of training in conjunction with the internal dynamics of collective action could prove meaningful.

Bibliography

Abrams, H.A. and Goldstein, S. "A State Chapter's Comprehensive Political Program", in Mahaffey, M. and Hanks, J.W. Practical Politics: Social Work Political Responsibility, 1982, National Association of Social Workers, Silver Spring, MD.

Albert, R. "Social Work Advocacy in the Regulatory Process", Social Casework, V. 64, No. 8, Oct. 1983, pp. 473-481.

Barbaro, F. "Social Welfare Interest Groups: An Underutilized Resource", Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, Vol. V No. 3, May 1978, pp. 418-434.

Barbaro, F. "School Social Work: The Politics of Professional Survival", Social Work In Education, 1980, pp. 5 - 17.

Bentley, A.F. The Process of Government, 1908, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Cohen, W.J. "What every social worker should know about political action", Social Work, Vol. 11, July, 1966, pp. 3-11.

Dolores Delahante. Forward to Harriett Bartlett, Analyzing Social Work Practice By Fields, 1988, Silver Spring: National Association of Social Workers, Revised Edition, pages v to vi.

Dempsey, D. J. "Establishing ELAN in a State Chapter", in Mahaffey, M. and Hanks, J.W. Practical Politics: Social Work Political Responsibility, 1982, National Association of Social Workers, Silver Spring, MD.

Fitch, J.G., " Social Action", Social Work Year Book, 1939 NY: Russell Sage Foundation, p. 398.

Form, W H. "Social Power and Social Welfare" in Robert Morris ed., Centrally Planned Change, 1964, NY: NASW, p.87.

Freidson, E. Professional Powers, A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge, 1986, University of Chicago Press.

Gilb, C. Hidden Hierarchies: The Professions and Government, 1966, Harper and Row.

Haynes, K. and Mickelson, J. Affecting Change, Social

- Workers in the Political Arena, 1986, White Plains: Longman.
- Hefferman, J. "Political Activity and Social Work Executives", Social Work, Vol. 9, April, 1964 pp 18-23.
- Hill, J.G. "Social Action", Social Work Yearbook, 1951, NY: NASW, pp. 456-458.
- Keith-Lucas, A. "An Alliance for Power", Social Work, Vol. 20, March 1975, pp. 95-96.
- Khinduka, S.K. and Coughlin, B. J. "A Conceptualization of Social Action", Social Service Review, Vol.49, No. 1, March 1975, pp.1-14.
- Kleinkauf, C. "Analyzing Social Welfare Legislation", Social Work, 34 (179-70, March 1989.
- Lause, T. "Professional Social Work Associations and Legislative Action 1974 to 1977", Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, Vol.VI, No.2, March 1979, pp. 265-273.
- Lehman, K. L. and Tierney, J.T. Organized Interests and American Democracy, 1986, Harper and Row, New York.
- Levy, C. "The Social Worker as an Agent of Policy Change", Social Casework, Vol. 51, Feb., 1970, pp. 102-108.
- Luttberg, N. and Zeigler, H. "Attitude Consensus and Conflict in an Interest Group: An Assessment of Cohesion", The American Political Science Review, Vol. 60, 1966, No. 3, pp. 655 - 666.
- MacRae, R.H. "Social Work and Social Action", Social Service Review, Vol. XL. 1966, pp. 1-7.
- Mahaffey, M. "Lobbying and Social Work", Social Work, Jan. 1972, pp. 3-11.
- Mahaffey, M. and Hanks, J.W. Practical Politics: Social Work Political Responsibility, 1982, National Association of Social Workers, Silver Spring, MD.
- Manzer, R. "Selective Inducements and the Development of Pressure Groups: The Case of the Canadian Teacher's Associations", Canadian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1969, pp. 103-117.
- Marsh, D. "On Joining Interest Groups", British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 6, 1976, pp. 257-271.
- Mintzberg, H. and Waters, J.A., "Tracking Strategy in an Entrepreneurial Firm", Academy of Management Journal, Vol.

25, No. 3, 1982, 465-499.

Mintzberg, H. "Patterns in Strategy Formation", Management Science, Vol. 24, No. 9, May, 1978.

Moe, T. The Organization of Interests: Incentives and the Internal Dynamics of Political Interest Groups, 1980, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Moss, W. "Oral History: An Appreciation", in Dunaway, D, and Baum, W. (eds) Oral History, 1984, American Association for State and Local History.

Olson, M. The Logic Of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. 1965, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Patti, R. J., and Dear, R.B. "Legislative Advocacy: A Path to Social Change", Social Work, Vol. 20, No. 2, March 1975, pp. 108-114.

Pray, K. "Social Work and Social Action", Proceedings, 1948, National Conference of Social Work.

Reeser, L.C. and Epstein, I. "Social Workers' Attitudes Toward Poverty and Social Action: 1968-1984", Social Service Review, Vol. 61, No. 4, December 1987, pp. 610-622.

Ribicoff, A. "Politics and Social Workers", Social Work, Vol. 7, April, 1962, pp. 3-6.

Roberts-DeGennaro, M. "Building Coalitions for Political Advocacy", Social Work, 31(4), 1986, 308-11.

Rossi. P. H. "Power and Politics: A Road to Social Reform" Social Service Review, Vol. XXXV, 1961, pp 359-369.

Rothman, J. "Three Models of Community Organization Practice" in Strategies of Community Organization, Cox, F. et al (eds), 1970, Ithica, Ill.: F.E. Peacock, pp.52-54.

Salcido, R.M. "Social Work Practice in Political Campaigns", Social Work, March-April, 1984, pp. 189-191.

Salisbury, R. "An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups", Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1969, pp. 1-32.

Salisbury, R. "Interest Representation: The Dominance of Institutions", The American Political Science Review, Vol. 78, No. 1, 1984, pp. 64-76.

Schorr, A.L. "Social Work and Social Policy: A

Perspective", The Jewish Social Work Forum, 24, Spring, 1988, pp. 1-9.

Selznick, P. Leadership in Administration, 1957, Harper and Row.

Smith, V.W. "How Interest Groups Influence Legislators", Social Work, Vol. 24, No. 3, May 1979, pp. 234-240.

Solendar, S. "Social Action", Social Work Yearbook, 1957, NY. NASW, p. 517.

Specht, H. "Casework Practice and Social Policy Formulation", Social Work, Vol. 13, Jan. 1968, pp. 42-52.

Teitelbaum, M.D., "Social Workers in Social Action: A Report form Maryland", Social Work, Oct. 1964, pp. 100 -107.

Thurz, D. "Social Action", in Encyclopedia of Social Work, vol. 2, 1971, NY: NASW, p. 1189.

Thurz, D. "The Arsenal of Social Action Strategies, Options for Social Workers", Social Work, Vol. 16, Jan. 1971, pp. 27-34.

Thurz, D. "Social Action as a Professional Responsibility", Social Work, Vol. 11, July, 1966, pp. 12-21.

Truman, D. The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion, 1951, Knopf.

Van Gheluwe, B. and Barber, J.K. "Legislative Advocacy in Action", Social Work, 31(5), 1986, pp. 393-95.

Wade, A.D. "The Social Worker in the Political Process", The Social Welfare Forum, 1966, Columbia University Press: New York, pp. 54-67.

Wade, A.D. "Social Work and Political Action", Social Work, Oct. 1962, pp. 3-10.

Jack L. Walker. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America", The American Political Science Review, Vol. 77, No. 2, 1983, pp. 390-405.

Weisbrot, R. Freedom Bound, 1990, Penguin Books, New York, page 72.

Wilson. J. Political Organizations, 1973, Basic Books, New York.

Wolk, J.L. "Are Social Workers Politically Active?", Social Work, July, 1981, pp.283-288.

Zweig, F. "The Social Worker as a Legislative Ombudsman",
Social Work, Vol. 14, Jan. 1969, pp. 25-35.