eight days, enjoyed the wonders of Jerusalem, and helped my daughter milk cows on her kibbutz. I also visited old friends on kibbutzim all over Israel and visited many other youth-oriented centers in Israel for my own professional growth. A vacation in Israel is very special, and I certainly enjoyed all of them, but when they were over, I regarded returning to Yemin Orde as going home!

If I were to focus in on the one factor, above all others, that has made Yemin Orde the successful Youth Aliyah children’s village that it is, it would have to be the people who live there in peace and tranquility, operating the village for the good of the children. I have been involved in youth work in America since I was 16 years old. At summer camp and as a teacher in New York City, I have known and worked with wonderful people. But I have never encountered the high degree of selfless dedication to children that I observed this year in Yemin Orde. From the top to the bottom, every adult at Yemin Orde expresses, by his actions and mitzvot, a profound and abiding love for the children under his care. I have witnessed teachers spending endless extra hours educating the children, madrichim and metaplot staying up all night dealing with children’s problems, kitchen and maintenance workers taking children under their wing and loving them. I have seen psychologists and social workers, soldiers from Gadna, nurses and volunteer dentists from England, all doing far more than their jobs required for the children’s welfare.

In other words, this is a community that cares deeply for the children entrusted to it, that lives a rewarding Jewish life in Israel rearing the children of the Diaspora who have come home, out of necessity: starvation, revolution and contemporary persecution. Their goodness has made a better person of me and, although I came to serve, so have I been served. My life has been enriched by my year at Yemin Orde, by my association with such dedicated adults and such wonderful children.

I look forward to the day, three years from now, when I will retire from my teaching career in New York, and will be able, if Yemin Orde will have me, to return and spend another year in this unique community, giving to the children what I have to give and, at the same time, receiving so much happiness in return.

The Work of Martin Wolins: A Theoretical Foundation for Group Care
Philip E. Veeman

"Internats," as Wolins called them, "will always remain part of the social landscape. Closing of internats, then, is neither feasible nor efficacious. A more reasonable and more socially responsible approach is to modify and improve internats," Wolins wrote, simultaneously supporting organizational accountability and continuing evaluation of the changing needs of children. Throughout his 65-year lifetime, Wolins demonstrated a vital interest in residential education of all sorts. His research on a wide variety of settings clearly showed that institutional care (or residential care, in modern social work terminology) can be "good" and that

Martin Wolins presenting Group Care: an Israeli Approach to Bernice Tannenbaum and Rose Matzkin of Hadassah
institutions can be “benevolent” or “growth promoting.” And Youth Aliyah was one of his leading examples.

In his three books (“Group Care: An Israeli Approach”, written with former Youth Aliyah Director-General Meir Gottesman; “Successful Group Care; Explorations in the Powerful Environment” and “Revitalizing Residential Settings”, written with Yochanan Wozner) Wolins provided the tools needed to build a theoretical foundation for residential settings in general, and Youth Aliyah in particular.

The label “institution,” Wolins said, has linked residential settings to a connotation of undesirable and failing programs. In 1982, Wolins and Wozner therefore introduced the term “internat” to denote the genre of institutions, residential settings, boarding schools, hospitals, etc., and to provide a common label for successful and unsuccessful programs alike. In his research, Wolins wrote of the conditions of a good facility: “the one which moves its residents toward being the kind of person the internat and its society consider appropriate.” He also noted the outcome of an internat’s intervention, as intended by the larger society, “reclaiming.” And he defined two broad categories of internats: reclaiming internats (which aim to change their residents for their personal benefit) and non-reclaiming internats (which do not seek the residents’ well-being).

These theories were deeply affected by Wolins’ early and less publicized studies. Born in Soviet Odessa and educated in Pinsk, Mordechai Martin Wolins left Poland for the United States in 1938. There, his ability to read Polish allowed him to study the original works of Janusz Korczak (pen-name Henryk Goldszmit), a Polish-Jewish physician and educator. Wolins grew deeply inspired by Korczak’s work in his Jewish orphanage in Warsaw (1912-1942), whose wards he elected to accompany to the Nazi gas chambers.

which he conducted between 1962 and 1969 included ten categories of children from four countries — Australia, Israel, Poland and Yugoslavia. From 1961, Wolins also worked as a consultant for Hadassah, the Women’s Zionist Organization of America. And, in 1978, he was a leading figure at its Jerusalem conference on “Values and Limitations of Residential Care for Disadvantaged Youth.”

Wolins also worked as a consultant to the UNICEF child relief organization, the Government of India and another international child-care group comprised of Urine Bronfenbrenner, Julius Richmond, and Nancy and Helbert Robinson. This group’s work led to the publication of “Early Child-Care in the United States of America” (edited by Nancy and Helbert Robinson, London/ New York, 1973, Gordon and Breach).

Following his intensive study of Youth Aliyah in 1961, Wolins returned to Israel many times. More than 20 years later, after his retirement, Wolins made aliya with his wife Irene. They built the home in the Yemin Moshe quarter of Jerusalem in which Wolins died on November 19, 1985.

But Wolins did not regard Youth Aliyah without a critical eye. He warned Youth Aliyah “not to stand on one leg alone,” like many American internats, and thus place too much emphasis on psychological characteristics. Wolins recounted a particular incident:

“... when the children landed, the first concern was with the totality of material assets (the ‘physical field’). Those were severely deprived children, physically damaged. And there was a certain concern for their physical rehabilitation. However, Henrietta Szold’s concern expressed itself in the direction of the organization as a social instrument (the ‘social field’) and even greater in the direction of the system of values associated with the organization (the ‘cultural field’). She wanted to rear Zionists as a primary goal, but — being a good educator — she remembered that other things are important, too.”

In other words, Wolins was suggesting a return to earlier emphasis on the internat as a social instrument, and on its use to communicate a system of values.

His recommendations of and to Youth Aliyah would probably hold true today, more than ever.