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SIMON WOLFE ROSENDALE
A Biographical Sketch
BY G. HERBERT CONE

With the death, in Albany, New York, on April 22, 1937, of Simon Wolfe Rosendale, in his ninety-fifth year, the Jewish community of the United States lost one of its most picturesque figures, and the Publication Society one of its oldest and most revered members.

Simon Rosendale lived all his life in Albany, where he was born on June 23d, 1842. His parents had come from Germany in 1837. He was educated in the public schools, the Albany Academy and the Barre (Vt.) Academy. The writer of this sketch had the unique experience of accompanying him to Barre during the year of the eightieth anniversary of his graduation. A granite quarry had been opened at the place where the boys used to practice their orations.

Admitted to the bar in 1863, Rosendale practiced his profession for about sixty years. He was a successful lawyer, representing large interests in and around Albany, and enjoyed the respect of the bar throughout the State. Soon after he was admitted, he was appointed an assistant district attorney of the county. In 1868, he was elected Recorder, a judicial position, which he held for four years. Subsequently, he was corporation counsel of Albany for several terms. In 1891, he was elected Attorney-General of the State. That was a great distinction then, as he was the first Jew to be elected to office in New York by a statewide vote. Since then, there have been many others elected to state office, notably Benjamin N. Cardozo as Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, Abram I. Elkus and Irving Lehman, Associate Judges of that court, and the latter's younger brother, Herbert H. Lehman, as Governor of the State. Rosendale served as President of the State Bar Association.
Besides these offices in the line of his profession, he was honored by other offices. In 1899, Theodore Roosevelt, when Governor, appointed him a member of the State Board of Charities. He took great pride in performing the duties of that position and, through successive appointments, remained in it for seventeen years, ending up as vice-president of the Board. In the meantime, in 1900, he was chosen as the President of the Board of Governors of Union University, Schenectady, and, in the same year, member of the Board of Governors of Albany Medical College, of which he was successively vice-president (1898), and president (1904–1920). Union University conferred upon him the honorary degree of LL. D. In his home city, he took a prominent part in civic affairs. He also served as a director of the National Commercial Bank, president of the National Savings Bank, and a trustee of the Albany Hospital.

In his practice, he associated himself with Rufus W. Peckham, later an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and Albert Hessberg, under the firm name of Peckham, Rosendale and Hessberg. When, in 1883, Judge Peckham retired to take a judicial position, the firm continued for many years as Rosendale and Hessberg.

Always a devout Jew, Rosendale identified himself with practically all the movements in his active days that sought to advance Jewish interests and culture. He was President of the Court of Appeal of the B'nai B'rith, a member of the Executive Board of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, a generous supporter of the Hebrew Union College, in Cincinnati, and an intimate friend of Dr. Isaac M. Wise, its founder. In this connection, it may be of interest to note that when in 1850, Dr. Wise organized the first reform congregation in Albany, which was the first in the country, Mr. Rosendale's father was violently opposed. Rosendale was then a boy of eight, but later, saw eye to eye with Dr. Wise in his reform views. In 1888, Rosendale presided at the conference which resulted in the establishment of the Jewish Publication Society of America of which he was vice-president, either active or honorary, from that year until the day of his death. He was an organizer, in 1892, of the American Jewish Historical Society, a
trustee of the Congregation Beth Emeth in Albany, and on the boards of all the Jewish charitable institutions in Albany. He was also one of the organizers of the American Jewish Committee, in 1906. In the field of philanthropy he took a leading part and was a liberal contributor to both Jewish and Christian charities.

The foregoing recital of his activities will serve to indicate the wide extent of his interests. Living through the days when there was not a large Jewish population in any city, and during the formative period of many of the early projects connected with Jewish community life, his counsel and advice undoubtedly made a lasting impression on Jewish life in this country. At the same time, he was thoroughly grounded in the American tradition and was imbued with a deep understanding of, and an ardent attachment to, American institutions. He had the greatest solicitude that his co-religionists should yield to none in loyalty to their adopted country, without, at the same time, deviating from their religious teachings and traditions. That, it may be said, was his guiding impulse. He strove to make clear that the Jews are a religious sect and not a race or nationality. With all movements to segregate the Jews on a political or other than a religious basis he had slight patience. His voice was ever raised in protest against anything which, in his eyes, would detract from the duty which the Jew owed as a citizen of this country. In newsprints, in periodicals, and in speech he sought ever to inculcate what he regarded as the true distinctions.

His social contacts were wide, and, while Mrs. Rosendale lived, his home attracted to it many people of national and international prominence including, besides many others, Charles Dickens and the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. In politics he was a Democrat. I betray no confidence when I say that he looked askance at the present tendencies of the party under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Especially did he deplore the pending proposal to make radical changes in the Federal Supreme Court.

Rosendale admired Grover Cleveland’s rugged independence, and a close friendship sprang up between them while Cleveland was Governor, which continued during the latter’s life. Rosendale was a neighbor and intimate friend
of Daniel Manning who was Secretary of the Treasury in Cleveland's Cabinet. When, in 1887, Cleveland and his Secretary of the Treasury became estranged and Manning resigned, Mr. Rosendale had some worrisome times. Between him and Rufus Wheeler Peckham, his law partner and later a Justice of the United States Supreme Court (1896–1909), there was a lasting attachment. I can name but a few of the many outstanding Jews with whom he was on intimate terms. They included Louis Marshall, Isidor, Oscar and Nathan Straus and Adolph S. Ochs,—names to conjure with, when enumerating the prominent Jews in this country. When Judge Cardozo came to Albany as a member of the Court of Appeals, he and Rosendale became great friends. With the exception of Justice Cardozo, Rosendale lived to see all his friends and intimates tread the westward trail ahead of him. This is a penalty one pays in the twilight of an unusually long life.

Rosendale was a good-looking man, trim and neat in personal appearance, with a great deal of social grace and charm. His was a cultivated mind, well versed in the history and traditions of his religion, as well as in general history and literature. In 1870, he married Helen Cone, a native of Albany, and their married life was a long and happy one, extending as it did to 1922, when Mrs. Rosendale died, shortly after they had celebrated their fiftieth wedding anniversary. They had no children.

The Rosendales traveled extensively throughout the world. On their 20th, 30th and 40th wedding anniversaries, they went to Egypt and the Orient. Their home was filled with objects of art and curiosities they had collected on their travels. He was a keen observer with a deep understanding of the meanings of things in nature and the works of man. He led a simple life, remaining until the end moderate in all things and keenly interested in the world about him. He spent a great deal of time in fishing, and his fishing trips continued until he was well past his eightieth year. It was a delight to be with him on these trips. He was the true fisherman, content when the fish did not bite, and full of grateful enthusiasm when they did.

His was a long and useful life and, to the Jews of America, especially, it was a real blessing.
RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL
1862-1936
In April, 1925, Professor Richard James Horatio Gottheil was sent by Columbia University as delegate to the dedication of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus in Jerusalem. He bore with him a message from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia. After reading this in the Latin in which it was written, Professor Gottheil proceeded to translate it into Hebrew. No incident in his long career was a more accurate symbol of the interests of the great Semitics scholar and Jewish communal leader who passed away in New York City, May 22, 1936.

Richard Gottheil was born at Manchester, England, October 13, 1862, his mother being Rosalie Wollman, his father, the distinguished Rabbi Gustav Gottheil, then minister of the Manchester Congregation of British Jews. In “The Life of Gustav Gottheil: Memoir of a Priest in Israel” (The Bayard Press, 1936), Professor Gottheil has given many informative details regarding his own childhood and youth. He received his early education at Chorlton High School, England, and, on his father’s removal to this country in 1873 to become Rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, New York City, he continued his studies at Columbia Grammar School, which, many years later, was destined to come under the leadership of George Alexander Kohut, whose tribute to Professor Gottheil in the Columbia University Quarterly is one of the authoritative sources of our knowledge regarding him. In 1881, he was awarded an A. B. degree at Columbia College, the institution with which his name was to be linked for one year less than half a century. He continued his studies abroad at the Universities of Berlin, Tuebingen and Leipzig, earning his Ph.D. in 1891. "Professor Gottheil—An Appraisal at Seventy," June, 1933, pp. 136-145.
degree *summa cum laude* in 1886 at the last-named institution. During his European years he was in contact with Emil G. Hirsch, later Rabbi of Temple Sinai, Chicago, and Felix Adler, later the founder of the Ethical Culture Movement.²

Dr. Gottheil's doctoral dissertation, "A Treatise on Syriac Grammar by Mar (i) Elia of Sobha, Edited and Translated from the Manuscript in the Berlin Royal Library," grew out of his interest in the Syriac language and literature, of which he became an instructor at Columbia College, November 1, 1886, following his return to the United States. Throughout the early decades of his scholarly activity, numerous works came from his pen on themes relating to Syriac lexicography, legends, grammar, philosophy, folk-medicine, the textual criticism of the Peshitta, and allied themes. Miss Ida A. Pratt, long associated with Dr. Gottheil in the Oriental Division of the New York Public Library, has listed these Syriac items in her compilation of a "Selected Bibliography of R. J. H. Gottheil," an invaluable source of information regarding the Professor's literary contributions.³

Though he had devoted himself to Jewish studies at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, and at the Veitel-Heine Ephraim'sche Beth ha-Midrasch in Berlin, it was not, however with the intention of becoming a rabbi. Dr. Gottheil desired rather to enter the field of Jewish and Oriental scholarship, and accepted the chair of Rabbinic Literature, for the study of Hebrew and cognate languages, which was established at Columbia, October 7, 1887, chiefly through the efforts of Rabbi Gustav Gottheil with the cooperation of the Board of Trustees of Temple Emanu-El.⁴

In 1889, when Professor H. T. Peck retired, the leadership of the section of Semitic languages was transferred to Dr. Gottheil, first as instructor, and later, April 4, 1892, as professor, a post which he occupied until his death.

---

³ Published in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, volume 56, number 4; pp. 480–489.
Under his guidance, a complete curriculum of Semitic courses was organized, the Semitics Library at Columbia was greatly enlarged, and the Semitics Department came to occupy foremost rank in this country and abroad. In 1902, Professor Gottheil wrote concerning “Oriental Languages at Columbia University” (Columbia University Quarterly), and in 1911 we find a lecture on “Semitic Literatures,” reprinted from the Columbia University Lectures on Literature. These two items among others are evidence of the distinguished place to which Professor Gottheil brought Semitic and Oriental studies in the life of Columbia University as a whole, lifting them out of the realm of obscure technical research into general appreciation by the side of other branches of world culture.

The eminence of Columbia's Semitics Department attracted students from all parts of the United States and from other countries. Christian, Jewish and Moslem disciples of Professor Gottheil rejoiced to sit at his feet, and to partake of his gracious personality as teacher and friend. The scholarly contributions of these students, many of them from the Union, Jewish and General Theological Seminaries, from the Jewish Institute of Religion and other institutions, are recorded in the publications of the Columbia University Oriental Series, (1901–1928), consisting of more than 28 volumes in the field of Jewish and Oriental learning. Among the pupils of Professor Gottheil were the late Professor Max L. Margolis of Dropsie College; Professor William Popper of the University of California, one of the leading Arabists of our time; Professors Julius A. Bewer and Emil G. H. Kraeling of the Union Theological Seminary; Professors Israel Davidson and Louis Finkelstein of the Jewish Theological Seminary; Professor Louis H. Gray, Dr. Ralph Marcus and Dr. A. S. Halkin, now of Columbia; Professor Philip K. Hitti of Princeton; Professor Frank Gavin of the General Theological Seminary; Professor Carl H. Kraeling of Yale; Professor Stephen Langdon of Oxford; Dr. Joshua Bloch, Chief of the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library and author of a fine tribute to Profes-
sor Gottheil in the Journal of the American Oriental Society; numerous Christian ministers and lay scholars, and a considerable number of rabbis, among them Dr. Stephen S Wise of New York City, the late Martin A. Meyer of San Francisco, Baruch Braunstein of Philadelphia, Harry Cohen, the writer, and others; and Jewish scholars, including Israel Efros, Israel Eitan, Caspar Levias, Abraham S. Waldstein, Isaac Mendelsohn, Meyer Waxman and others.

On the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, a group of Professor Gottheil's pupils presented to him a Silver Candelabrum, especially prepared from a reconstruction of a design on the Arch of Titus. This Menorah is a rare and beautiful piece of workmanship, the only one of its kind extant. On the occasion of his seventieth birthday, under the leadership of the writer and the late George Alexander Kohut, a number of essays were written by students and colleagues of Professor Gottheil, which, because of the then depression, could not be published in the form of a Festschrift; several, however, were issued as individual essays in various scientific periodicals in honor of Professor Gottheil's birthday.

Professor Gottheil stood in close and friendly relationship to his colleagues. He contributed to tribute and anniversary volumes in honor of famous scholars, such as Israel Abrahams, Hartwig Derenbourg, Henry Drisler, William Rainey Harper, Abraham Harkavy, Moritz Steinschneider, Crawford Howell Toy, and (in 1934) George Alexander Kohut. In 1897, he wrote appreciatively of Joseph Jacobs. In 1925, he contributed to the Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society a necrology of Abraham Solomon Freidus, for many years curator of the Jewish Room at the New York Public Library; in the same issue he wrote a tribute to Morris Jastrow, Jr., despite the fact that he had disagreed with many of Professor Jastrow's views regarding the European and Near Eastern situation, particularly touching Zionism. In 1922, he penned a memorial to Professor Ignaz Goldziher, with whom he had corresponded for many years. Professor Gottheil was a great admirer of Professor C. Snouck Hurgronje, writing an introduction to the latter's "The Holy War—Made in Germany" and his "Revolt in Arabia."

\[^{6}\] Volume 56, number 4, pp. 472-479.
\[^{7}\] For a list of contributors and the titles of their essays, see Kohut, op. cit., p. 145.
Professor Gottheil’s library contains many folders of letters exchanged with distinguished Orientalists which have an important bearing upon the history of scholarship in this field, abroad and in this country.

Gottheil’s literary and communal interests cover a wide domain, which, for the purposes of this essay, will be divided into his activities in the fields of non-Jewish and Jewish learning respectively. Not only prestige as a Columbia Professor, but also the excellence of his literary style and his authoritative insight into problems of an academic and current character gained for his writings a welcome not only in the great scientific periodicals, but also in the weekly and monthly magazines and the daily newspapers with multitudes of lay readers. His audiences consisted of the most learned and little-informed together, of non-Jew and Jew alike. The scope of his activities was so varied and far-flung that he touched and influenced the life and opinions of great numbers in the most diverse fields. Moreover, his writings, both scholarly and popular, were never tendentious; they are as worthwhile read today, as when they were written; in many instances they constitute the source documents for historians, geographers, lexicographers, linguists, librarians, authors and students of many-sided interests.

As a librarian and bibliographer, Dr. Gottheil won distinction throughout his entire career. As early as 1888, he compiled a catalogue of the Barrow Library in New York City, which included an excellent collection of Orientalia and Judaica. He made important contributions to the Zeitschrift für hebraische Bibliographie, and in 1892 published a bibliography of the works of Paul Anton de Lagarde. In 1896, he was appointed Chief of the Oriental Division of the New York Public Library, a post which he occupied until his death. As director and custodial administrator, he helped upbuild the Oriental Division, making it a mecca for scholars of America and other countries. He gave valuable aid to A. S. Freidus and, in recent years, to Dr. Joshua Bloch, one of his pupils, in the development of the Jewish Room at the New York Public Library. In the Bulletin of the New York Public Library, he super-
vised the preparation, with the indefatigable help of Miss Ida Pratt, his assistant, of annotated descriptive catalogues of books and manuscripts relating to the cultures of Armenia, Arabia, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, ancient and modern, Persia and other Oriental lands. Columbia University's Semitics and Jewish collections were upbuilt through Professor Gottheil's influence, and his own library is one of the finest collections of Orientalia and Judaica extant. In addition to its printed volumes, magazines and manuscripts, it contains extensive correspondence with great Oriental scholars, Zionist leaders, and world-renowned personalities during the past fifty years. There are many valuable items concerning American Jewish history, the early chronicles of American Zionism, clippings and articles arranged with scholarly care and precision, and other data which, it is planned, will eventually be made available to research students.

As editor, Dr. Gottheil not only issued the Columbia University Oriental Series, but, also, with the collaboration of Professor John D. Prince of Columbia, the series of Contributions to Oriental History and Philology (1908–1927). Jointly with Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., he edited the Semitic Study Series (Leyden, 1902–1911), making Semitic texts available to students. He also edited two volumes of Persian Classics, for the Colonial Press. His book reviews were important not only for their value as interpretation of the books, but also for the inclusion of information corrective of material presented by the authors. In several encyclopedias, including Johnson's Encyclopaedia (2nd ed.), the International Encyclopaedia, the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History, Professor Gottheil wrote valuable articles on a number of themes.

We can best appreciate the scope of Dr. Gottheil's literary interests by describing his works regarding various countries and cultures. From 1887, when he prepared an article on the Arabic version of "The Revelation of Ezra," until

---

8 Miss Pratt's Bibliography of Professor Gottheil's writings was prepared for his seventieth birthday anniversary, and was issued in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 56, number 4, pages 480–489.
1936, when he wrote and spoke regarding the relationship of the Arabs to the Palestine Yishub, he gave steady consideration to Arabic literature and life: for example, his writings include the Arabic version of the Abgar-Legend (1891); Arabia before Mohammed (1894); an Introduction to “The Arabian Nights” in the *Library of the World’s Best Literature*; a review of a volume on the Arab conquest of Egypt (1903); Turk and Arab (1910); Arabic epigraphy (1911). He also wrote on Bar Ali, a work that was highly praised by scholars, including Professor Guidi. Dr. Gottheil’s foreword, in 1917, to Dr. Snouck Hurgronje’s book on the Arabian revolt was an indication of the attention he devoted to the Arabic renaissance, particularly in its relationship to Zionism. He wrote on the origin of the minaret; the beginnings of Islam (1914), and its history.

Persian literature engaged his attention, in a volume issued in 1900 by the Colonial Press; he wrote also on the Shahnameh in Persian as late as 1932; on Zoroaster, as early as 1894. As for Egypt, in addition to his historic works undertaken at Cairo, to which we allude below, he prepared the article on “Egypt in Medieval and Modern Times” for the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (1903). The Jews of Egypt, including the Karaites, were the subject of articles from his pen, and he occupied himself with a discussion of Egyptian political problems: in 1907, he wrote on Mohammed Abdu, the late Mufti, and in 1910, on Egypt and the Nationalist movement. Other items include a notable work dealing with a History of Egyptian Cadis (1908); Dhimmis and Moslems in Egypt (1908); Egyptian art in the Metropolitan Museum (1911, for the *Independent*), and reviews of books on Egyptian history by Hasenclever (1919) and Torrey (1923).

Turkey, also, proved a subject for Gottheil’s research and interpretation. He gained recognition as a leading American authority on the problems of this and other Oriental countries in transition. Beginning in the year 1908, he wrote numerous articles for newspapers and magazines on “The Young Turks and Old Turkey,” “The Regeneration of Turkey,” “Turkey After the Revolution,” “Turkey Under the New Regime,” “The Kaleidescope of Turkey,” “Turks
and Arabs," particularly in their relationship to Arabs in Egypt, Syria and the Arabian peninsula. In 1910, he wrote a number of articles on the international imbroglio regarding Crete, especially in relation to Turkey. In 1912 he discussed "Turkey and the Albanians," "Turkey at Bay" and the international situation. During the World War we find him writing (1915) on "The Holy War" (*Homiletic Review*) and an introduction to Dr. Snouck Hurgronje’s "The Holy War—Made in Germany." In 1916, for the *Columbia University Quarterly*, he wrote on "The Future of Turkey." Professor Gottheil’s desire to view the world situation in relation to Jewish life is reflected in his article for the *Independent* in 1908 on "The New Turkey and Zionism."

Armenian independence was the topic of an article for the *New Armenia* in 1918. Morocco also proved a center of Dr. Gottheil’s activities. In 1911, he wrote of "Italian Interest in Tripoli" (*Independent*); in 1934, "As It Is Today." In 1933 he was made Grand Officer de l’Ordre du Oissam Alaouite Cheréfien.

When Ethiopia became the cynosure of the world’s interest in 1933–36, Professor Gottheil offered a course in the language and culture of Ethiopia at Columbia. His articles on the history of geography, in 1890, and his translation of Bonvalot’s record of travels across Tibet gave him a place in the research in this field. In 1905, he wrote a series of travelogues "In Ancient Footsteps," (*New Era*), describing Alexandria, Cairo, Florence and Rome. Articles on Palmyrene inscriptions (1900), on the Judaeo-Aramaean Dialect (1892), on Syro-Hittite Art (1912), give further tokens of the great diversity of Gottheil’s academic and contemporary interests.

The World War drew from Dr. Gottheil’s pen articles not only of scholarly content, but also of current interpretation based upon authoritative historical knowledge. In 1915, he wrote a brilliant article entitled "The War from the Jewish Standpoint" which appeared in the *Menorah Journal*, a publication in which he was greatly interested as an expression of Jewish cultural interest of American Jewish youth in the university. In 1918, he wrote on
“What the War Means to America.” From the very first, Dr. Gottheil was an enthusiastic champion of the Allied cause, making this clear in correspondence with overseas scholars who besought him to use his influence on behalf of the Central Powers. His love for France found voice on many occasions, and in 1919 he was made a Chevalier de la Légion d’Honneur, in recognition of the services he had rendered, in his writings, to the French cause. In 1921, Dr. Gottheil served as Exchange Professor at the University of Strasbourg, where he carried forward important manuscript research. While at the University of Strasbourg, Professor Gottheil gave a course in French on Islam—Its Religion and Civilization. These addresses proved especial appeal to the French, because of their country’s citizens of the Mohammedan faith. Among the great throngs to attend the course were Professor Sylvain Lévi and officials of the French Government.

In the learned societies devoted to Oriental, Semitic and Jewish scholarship, Dr. Gottheil played an important rôle for many years. He was president of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis (1903), and a member of the Council of the American Oriental Society. He was one of the founders and first vice-president of The Judaeans. Before the War, he was a member of the German Oriental Society, and in 1909–10 served as director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. He was one of the founders of the Committee for American Lectures on the History of Religion, under whose auspices noted lecturers, American and foreign, in the field of religion, delivered addresses at Columbia and other American universities. He was an Honorary Fellow of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences, (1935); and esteemed member of the Jewish Historical Society of England. Whenever Dr. Gottheil accepted a post of leadership, he performed its duties in the thorough and conscientious spirit characteristic of him.

Within the field of Bible and Jewish scholarship, Dr. Gottheil won renown equal to his fame as Orientalist. In 1902, he wrote on Bible Editions and Bible Translations for the Jewish Encyclopaedia. In 1904, he wrote on Some Early Jewish Bible Criticism; in 1905, on Bible Manuscripts
in the Roman Synagogues; in 1913, on the Peshitta Text of Genesis 32:25. In 1915, he delivered an address on Isaiah before the Combined Religions Society of Teachers College, Columbia University, which was later printed in the Z. B. T. Quarterly. Jewish sects proved of great interest to Dr. Gottheil, among them the Samaritans, whose grammar (1902), and the dating of whose manuscripts (1905) were subjects of articles. He visited the Karaites in Egypt and wrote of his impressions. He wrote also on the works of Josephus, on the Book of Job, on an unknown Hebrew version of the Sayings of Aesop, and on allied themes.

Jewish communities throughout the world were vividly described by Professor Gottheil, many articles appearing in a monthly entitled Helpful Thoughts, which he edited jointly with Julia Richman and Rebekah Kohut. He wrote a series of articles on memorable days in the Jewish calendar and, in another series, he described the Jewish communities of Amsterdam, Worms, Prague, Jerusalem, Saloniki, Florence, Cairo and other centers.

Spain and Portugal also engaged Dr. Gottheil's attention. In 1901, he wrote "Gleanings from Spanish and Portuguese Archives;" later, "A Jewish Visit to Spain." In 1903, he wrote on "The Jews and the Spanish Inquisition (1622-1721)"; a year later, on "Some Spanish Documents." Dr. Gottheil interested himself greatly in the work of Dr. A. S. Yahuda, for a time Professor of Semitics at the University of Madrid. Near the close of his career, Professor Gottheil sought to arrange for a visit by Professor Yahuda to this country under the auspices of the Committee for Lectures on Religion. He was a Corresponding Member of the Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid, 1918. "The Jewish Archives of Florence" (1906), and other articles, testified to his interest in Italian Jewish history. He reviewed Leroy-Beaulieu's "Israel Among the Nations" (1896), and Israel Cohen's "Jewish Life in Modern Times" for the Yale Review (1915).

Jewish biography was another subject which enlisted his attention. Among the personalities about whom he wrote were the Family Almanzi (1893); Columbus (1894); Nathaniel al-Fayyumi (1896); Jehudah Halevi in the
Library of the World's Best Literature (1897); Joseph Jacobs, Benjamin Disraeli, Isaac M. Wise, Joseph Suess Oppenheimer (1906), Levi ben Gershon, and Ibn Ezra (for the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (1915), Abraham Solomon Freidus (1925); Morris Jastrow, Jr. (1925), and others.

“The Belmont-Belmonte Family: A Record of 400 Years” (New York, 1917), by Dr. Gottheil, is one of the finest available studies in Jewish family history. This volume of 250 pages with plates, and containing material garnered from original documents and archives in European libraries and from private sources, was printed for limited circulation only. As a study of a well-known aristocratic family, it is destined to take its place as a model for Jewish genealogical research.

Dr. Gottheil's biography of his father, “The Life of Gustav Gottheil: Memoir of a Priest in Israel” (1936) is a veritable treasury of information regarding American Jewish history during the past half century. It deals with personalities and movements of the generations just preceding our own, and reveals the beginning of American Jewish life as we today know and participate in it. Gottheil declared that he undertook the task of historian because he believed his father was “a tower of strength in every community in which he worked, and because he left his mark upon the development of the religious life of his day.”

Jewish literature and scholarship were also objects of Gottheil's interest. He translated “The History of Jewish Literature” by Dr. Gustave Karpeles (1887–1891). In 1899, he reviewed Leo Wiener’s “Jewish Literature in the 19th Century” for the Bookman, and in 1917 he wrote on the Yiddish press. In 1900, he wrote on “The Jewish Seminary of the Future”; in 1906, on “Jewish Scholarship in America”; in 1908, a similar article for the Rivista Israelitica of Florence. Dr. Gottheil was one of the close advisors of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise in the establishment of the Jewish Institute of Religion in 1922, and in its later development; he served as a member of its Board of Trustees, and, in 1932, received from the Institute the degree of Doctor of Hebrew Literature.

In the field of Jewish religion, Gottheil wrote (1896) on “Reform Judaism in America;” “Shall We Jews Celebrate
Thanksgiving?” (1903); “What Has Become of the Temple Vessels?” for the general periodical, the Outlook (1911); “The New Passover” (1917). The fate of the Jews under attack stimulated Professor Gottheil to express his opinions in Jewish and non-Jewish periodicals, and among his articles were “The Accused Jew of Polna” (1899); “Kishineff” (1903) for the Forum; “The Jewish Self-Defense” (1905); “Race Prejudice Against Jews” (1907).

For a long time and particularly in the closing years of his life, Dr. Gottheil occupied himself with the documents of the Genizah. Among his contributions in this field are the following: “Profane Literature of Cairo” (1923); a document of the 15th century concerning two synagogues of the Jews in old Cairo (1927); articles on astrology and astronomy in the Genizah (1927, 1929, 1930); “Tid-bits from the Genizah” in the Jewish Studies of Israel Abrahams, (1927); studies on Genizah medicine (1930, 1931, 1935); on science and pharmacy for the Jewish Quarterly Review, (1931). These articles were published in the great scientific journals of societies such as the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, American Oriental Society, Dropsie College, and others.

In 1927, with the collaboration of Professor William H. Worrell, Professor Gottheil edited a great volume called “Fragments from the Cairo Genizah” in the Freer Collection in the University of Michigan. This volume with more than 400 quarto pages and 300 plates, was published by MacMillan in the Humanistic Series of the University of Michigan Studies. Since the discoveries of the late Professor Solomon Schechter in the Genizah material, no American scholar has made greater contributions, particularly in the field of medieval literary history and science as revealed by the Genizah, than Professor Gottheil. Dr. A. S. Halkin of Columbia University, a student of Professor Gottheil, is continuing the latter’s researches in the field of Genizah documents, and will carry to a conclusion work that was interrupted by the death of his former teacher.

The American Jewish Historical Society was a particular object of Dr. Gottheil’s loyalty and cooperation. He was
one of its officials and leaders, and contributed important articles to its *Publications*. Notable among these were: "Columbus in Jewish Literature" (1894); a history of the Jews in Surinam, written in collaboration with Bernard Felsenthal (1895); the auto-de-fé at Seville, July 25, 1720 (1901), and other researches into the history of the Jews in America. He wrote on the first Jews in America (1905); he wrote on the Jews in America for the *Jewish Comment*, Baltimore, (1905).

Close to Dr. Gottheil's heart was the American Jewish fraternity movement. He was known as "the father of the Zeta Beta Tau" and eloquent memorial tribute has been paid to him in the *Z. B. T. Quarterly* for September, 1936. It has been said that the "Greek letters of a later date originally signified the Hebrew characters of a Zionist phrase "Through justice Zion shall be redeemed." (Zion B'mishpat Tipodeh), (Isaiah 1:27). From 1911 to 1920, Gottheil was the Supreme President, or Nasi, of the Zeta Beta Tau, presiding at the national conventions of the fraternity, which, since its inception, has established chapters in many universities throughout the country. In 1925, the Zeta Beta Tau established an annual award of a so-called Gottheil Medal to the American who, in the judgment of the trustees, renders the most distinguished service to Jewry during the year. Recipients of this medal have been President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Governor Herbert H. Lehman, Felix M. Warburg, Julius Rosenwald, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, John Haynes Holmes, and others. Dr. Gottheil was deeply interested in heightening the Jewish educational tone of the Z. B. T. work, writing on "The Jewish Fraternity in American Life" for the *Z. B. T. Quarterly*; in 1914, he wrote on the Z. B. T. Fraternity, for a course in "Judaism" for the report of the committee on religion and social service of the Fraternity. He gave an address on "The True Basis of Z. B. T." at the 1916 Convention; a greeting in 1919 to the members of the Z. B. T. Fraternity; in 1922, a "Message from the Other Side," seeking always to educate the Z. B. T. men in the problems of Jewish life. At the thirty-sixth annual national convention in Kansas City in 1934, Dr. Gottheil addressed
a letter to the members of the fraternity earnestly directing their attention to the tragic lot of Jews in Germany, Poland and in other lands of oppression, and bidding them, through Z. B. T., to bend every effort to relieve and help.

Professor Gottheil was also deeply concerned with the rôle of the university students in the World War, and wrote in 1918 on "The Fraternity in the Time of Crisis." He kept in close touch with the Jewish students at Columbia University, oftentimes dining with the undergraduates at the fraternity house. He maintained an intimate personal interest in the Jewish student activities both at Columbia and at Barnard College, aiding by personal guidance the activities of the Menorah and Zionist societies. He was greatly helpful in establishing the post of advisor to Jewish students at Columbia, which was for a time occupied by Rabbi Baruch Braunstein, and is now held by Rabbi Isidor Hoffman. Professor Gottheil assisted in the raising of money, for this and other purposes, from Columbia alumni of the Jewish faith, and gave his personal cooperation wherever needed. Professor Gottheil's articles in the Menorah Journal, of which he was an editor, were further tokens of his desire to be of assistance in developing the Jewish consciousness and a knowledge of Jewish culture among Jewish university men and women.

Gottheil was one of the pioneers of American Zionism, and one of its foremost literary exponents. In the chapter "Zionism," in the biography of his father (pp. 190–195), he gives a graphic description of the effect of the account of the First Zionist Congress at Basel, as described in the London Jewish Chronicle, of which Dr. Gottheil was an ardent admirer. "I remember as if it were today, our reading the account there of the meeting. I say 'our'—I mean my Father, Stephen S. Wise and myself. We were all three electrified; and my Father said to Dr. Wise: 'Stephen, have that report printed in pamphlet form, and I will stand the expense.'" Out of this enthusiasm grew a meeting, at which a Zionist Society was established, with Dr. Gottheil as president, and Rabbis Gottheil and Wise as vice-presidents. From this grew the Federation of American Zionists of which, Dr. Gottheil was first president from 1898 to
1904. He attended Zionist Congresses at Basel in 1898, 1899, and 1903, and at London in 1900. He was a profound admirer of Theodor Herzl, Max Nordau, David Wolffsohn, and other Zionist leaders. In 1893, he was a member of the Central Committee of the Zionist Organization, and traveled throughout the country advocating Zionism in circles which at first were distinctly hostile. His article on "Zionism" in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, (ii, pp. 666–686), was the first comprehensive chronicle of the movement to date for American readers; it was supplemented by many articles which appeared in newspapers, in magazines, in the Zionist and the general Jewish press. (See Pratt Bibliography). In 1914, the Jewish Publication Society issued a 250-page volume on Zionism from Dr. Gottheil's pen, which is one of the best summaries of the movement to the commencement of the World War. Though twenty-three years old, the book on Zionism is still considered a "classic" because of its succinct style. While, in later years, he was not active in the administrative affairs of the movement, his enthusiasm for Zionism remained unabated, and he wrote frequently upon developments of the movement, particularly in relationship to Turkish and British policy. Dr. Gottheil visited Palestine several times, and in 1909–10 was in charge of the American School of Archaeology at Jerusalem.

Dr. John Haynes Holmes, the distinguished minister of the Community Church in New York City, says: "Under the influence of his magic words, I became a Zionist at that moment, and through a full generation looked up to Dr. Gottheil in admiration and reverence for his work for the restoration of the homeland of the Jews."

Gottheil's writings on Zionism have played a significant rôle in the development of the movement in this country. Particularly in the pioneer days of the movement, his articles in the general non-Jewish press of the United States gave to the enterprise, which at the time was misunderstood by the non-Jewish community and regarded with scepticism by the majority of the Jewish community, prestige and dignity which only the son of the illustrious Rabbi Gottheil of Temple Emanu-El, and a professor at

---

*Z. B. T. Quarterly, Sept. 1936.*
Columbia University could furnish. In the non-Jewish press his major articles included: "The Second Zionist Congress at Basel" (1898), for the Outlook; "Zionism" in the Century and North American Review (1899); "Zion: the Capital of a Jewish Nation" for the Cosmopolitan (1903); "Zionism, a Retrospect and a Hope" for the Independent (1907); "The New Turkey and Zionism," (Independent, 1908); "Palestine under the New Turkish Regime," (Independent, 1910); and "Zionism" in the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge (1912). In 1918, following the issuance of the Balfour Declaration and the conquest of Palestine by Allenby, Professor Gottheil wrote for the Columbia University Quarterly an article entitled: "Gerusalemme Liberata" which was widely read by the academic public. In 1920, he wrote an important work on Palestine, Number 138 in the series on International Conciliation. The following year he wrote "The Mandates in the Near East" for the Asiatic Review.

He was a frequent contributor to the Jewish press, tilting many a lance with rabbinical and lay adversaries of the Zionist movement. Among his writings were "The Jewish Question: Zionism" (1899), "The Federations and the Congress," and "The Fifth Zionist Congress" for the Maccabean (1902); "British East Africa and Zionism" (1903), a discussion of the famous Uganda proposal of the British government; an article on Zionism in the Jewish Encyclopaedia (1906); "The Free Life of Palestine" for the Maccabean (1910); "Zionism" (1914), the book issued by the Jewish Publication Society of America to which we have already alluded. In 1918, he wrote on "What is Zionism?" contributing two chapters with Dr. Chaim Weizmann, with some material on the history of Zionism, to "Zionism and the Jewish Future," published by the Zionist Organization, London.

Dr. Gottheil’s library contains important letters, yet to be published, from Theodor Herzl, Max Nordau, David Wolffsohn and other Zionist leaders abroad and in this country. When made available in printed form, these letters will throw light upon the beginnings of Zionism in this country and throughout the world. The letters also are
vital in the history of the Hadassah movement, in the founding of which Mrs. Gottheil (whom Dr. Gottheil married in 1891), and her sister, Miss Eva Leon, in company with Miss Henrietta Szold, played leading roles. Miss Leon was chiefly responsible for sending the first unit of Hadassah nurses to Palestine in 1912, and in recent years has established and conducted the Ner Tamid Fund for Palestine children. Mrs. Gottheil was instrumental in establishing the Women’s League for Palestine which has as its special concern the support of the “Beth ha-Halutzoth,” the “House of the Pioneer Women” in Palestine. Mrs. Gottheil plans to issue many of the letters and unpublished documents of her illustrious husband.

The home of Professor and Mrs. Gottheil was a veritable salon where distinguished persons in the academic world, in the Zionist movement, in the Jewish and non-Jewish community foregathered, particularly on Sabbath afternoons.

Professor Gottheil’s passing has removed from Jewish life one of its most beloved and most respected personalities, who brought to every movement in which he participated the spirit of great-heartedness, dignity and sincere devotion. Eloquent tribute to some of Dr. Gottheil’s outstanding qualities was given in an editorial in the *New York Herald-Tribune*, on the day following his death:

“Rightness and distinction marked the long life and long career of Dr. Richard James Horatio Gottheil. His forty-nine years as a teacher in Columbia University richly deserved the eloquent tribute paid by President Butler. It was literally true that his scholarship was known and respected in every continent—not only in France, where his authority in the Oriental languages was an acknowledged fact, but in Asia and Africa as well.

“His internationalism was of the soundest sort, based on a staunch loyalty to his race and to his adopted country, America, and concerned deeply with that universal realm of the intellect which knows no national boundaries. His voice could not help but be a force for understanding wherever it was raised.
"He taught until within two weeks of his death, and as Dr. Butler well said, never lost his youthfulness of mind and sympathy. The passing of such a nature at the height of a noble career seems more transfiguration than an ending. In many lands and for countless hearts, his memory will long be green."

The funeral services for Professor Gottheil were held at Temple Emanu-El, and he was buried at Salem Fields Cemetery. His coffin was a simple pine box, adorned with the flag of the United States and the flag of Zion. Rabbis Stephen S. Wise, Samuel Goldenson and Louis I. Newman, President Nicholas Murray Butler and Cantor Moshe Rudinov took part in the services. The stone at Professor Gottheil's grave bears the words: "Scholar, Teacher and Zionist Leader," and the Hebrew inscription reads: "Mevasser Tov... Omer le-Tzion malakh Elohekhah." "One who bringeth good tidings, who sayeth unto Zion: Thy God reigneth." (Isaiah 52:7.)
JEWISH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
IN THE UNITED STATES*
An Outline of Types of Organizations, Activities and Problems

BY MAURICE J. KARPF, PH.D.
The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, New York City

I. THE JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS DISTRIBUTION

It is estimated that there are approximately four and a half million Jews in the United States. They constitute a little over 3½% of the total population. Curious as it may seem there is no exact information about the number of Jews, their age and sex distribution, and to what extent they are of native or immigrant stock. This lack of information is due to the fact that the United States Census, taken every ten years, includes no questions regarding religious affiliation. Nor does it take cognizance of racial groups except to differentiate between the white and colored races. Nor are the results of the enumeration by mother-tongue, included in the decennial Federal census since 1920, a clue to the Jewish population, since comparatively few

*This study was prepared for the second International Conference on Jewish Social Work held in London, July 8-10, 1936. It follows closely an outline prepared by the writer, as President of the Conference, which was sent to the participating countries. The material was gathered and the manuscript prepared in 1935 and 1936 for presentation to the Conference. It has since been enlarged, revised and brought up to date.

It was the writer's aim to produce a comprehensive, though brief, outline of organized Jewish life in the United States. Since the study was primarily intended for foreign readers explanatory notes were included which some American readers may think unnecessary. They have been retained because several people who read the original manuscript insisted that many readers in the United States will find them helpful and valuable.

The writer aimed to be as factual and objective as possible. Accordingly, every effort was made at verification and documentation. Illustrative and corroborative material was used wherever possible, not excluding the last section, which deals with current trends and tendencies and must, necessarily, reflect the writer's point of
Jews claim Yiddish or Hebrew as their mother-tongue, and there is no way of differentiating between Jews and non-Jews who claim German, Russian, Polish, Roumanian and the other languages representing the countries from which comparatively large numbers of Jews came to the United States.¹

However, those interested in Jewish life have need for accurate figures regarding the Jewish population. Attempts have therefore been made from time to time to secure the information upon which to base as reliable an estimate as possible. The most important of these consists of a study made in 1927, in connection with the decennial Census of Religious Bodies, under the auspices of the American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with the United States Bureau of the Census. This study, based on about 4000 inquiries sent to representative Jews in every city, town, and village that could be reached, indicated that there are about 4,230,000 Jews in the United States.²

Various other studies have been made in a number of cities to determine their Jewish population. In such studies, the method usually consisted of taking the absences in the public schools on the High Holy Days, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, comparing them with absences on other days and estimating the Jewish population on that basis.

view. In addition to serving the usual purposes the footnotes and references contain additional sources for further reading and study.

A great deal of the material to be found in the following pages is published here for the first time. It is based on research over many years, which the writer and his colleagues have conducted. It is hoped that this study will stimulate further research on some of the problems which stand in great need of scientific investigation.

The nature of the material and the desire for brevity precluded mentioning the names of even those who have played leading roles in the different activities outlined. The problem of selection and exclusion was formidable, hence no names were included. This, however, should not be taken to indicate a lack of appreciation on the part of the writer, of the time, thought, energy, and effort spent by numberless socially-minded lay and professional people on the problems facing Jewish life in the United States, toward which they devoted themselves so wholeheartedly and to the solution of which they made such substantial contributions.

The writer desires to acknowledge with gratitude and appreciation the help of Mr. Harry Schneiderman, Editor of the American Jewish Year Book, who read the manuscript and made numerous helpful and valuable suggestions. Mr. Abraham G. Duker, Research Librarian of the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, also was very helpful. Grateful acknowledgement is hereby made.

¹ For notes and references see pp. 138–148
This method, based on the assumption that all children, Jewish and non-Jewish, attend the public schools, is somewhat crude, for it is well known that a number of Jewish children attend school on the High Holy Days and therefore are lost in the count, and that non-Jewish children frequently take advantage of these holidays. The student of population figures will recognize a more fundamental difficulty in this method because it depends upon accurate knowledge of the size of families and age distribution. Since no accurate information with respect to the Jewish group is available on these items, the estimate must, of course, suffer.

Another method is based on Jewish mortality. The assumption here is that Jews, regardless of their affiliations in life, arrange for Jewish burials. This method too has obvious limitations, and is open to the same objections as the others. A number of refinements of these and other methods have been suggested and tried but none is entirely satisfactory. It is becoming increasingly clear that until an actual census of Jews is taken, there will be no accurate information as to the number of Jews in the United States. For all practical purposes, however, the estimate given above may be assumed to be correct.

On the basis of all of these estimates it is fairly well known that the Jewish population in the United States is mainly concentrated in the large cities. The 1927 study referred to above, indicates that there are about 10,000 cities, towns, villages, and rural areas containing Jewish residents. Jews live in every city of 25,000 or over; in about 90% of the cities of 25,000 or less; in about 30% of the villages of 2,500 or less; and in about 7% of the rural areas.

This study also disclosed the facts that approximately 11% of the total population in cities having populations of 100,000 or over, are Jews; about 3% of cities between 25,000 and 100,000; about 1.6% in cities of 25,000 to 10,000; about .84% in cities of 10,000 to 5,000; about .7% in cities of 5,000 to 2,500; about .5% in rural incorporated villages; and about .15% in unincorporated rural territories. Stated differently, this study might be said to show that out of every 100 cities nearly 90 have Jewish residents; out of every 100 villages only 30 have Jewish residents; whereas in the country districts only 7 in every 100 have Jewish residents.
The foregoing figures do not give an adequate picture of the concentration of the Jewish population in the United States. This concentration may be better appreciated if it is borne in mind that 11 American cities contain 2,911,000 Jews, or approximately 69% of the total Jewish population; also, that 68 cities of 100,000 or over, have 3,553,000, or approximately 84%; that 209 cities of 25,000 to 100,000 have approximately 379,000 Jews or 9% of the Jewish population; that 461 cities between 10,000 and 25,000 have 111,700 Jews, or \( 2\frac{1}{2}\% \); that 721 cities of 5,000 to 10,000 have about 42,000 Jews or 1%; that 1321 cities of 2,500 to 5,000 have about 32,400 Jews or 0.8%; that 12,908 rural areas of 2,500 or less have 43,500 Jews or 1%; and that the rural unincorporated areas have about 66,000 Jews or 1.5% of the Jewish population in the United States.

The table below, (Table 1), based on the 1927 study, compares the Jewish with total population in these different areas. The discrepancies are striking and significant. It makes clear that the Jewish population in this country is largely an urban population. It is to be expected, therefore, that it will be subject to all the problems arising in urban communities. Some of these will be traced and discussed in the following pages.

### Table 1

**Density of Jews in Cities and Rural Areas Compared with the General Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Place</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Jewish Population</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities 100,000 or over</td>
<td>31,988,375</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>3,553,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities 100,000—25,000</td>
<td>12,191,173</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>378,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities 25,000—10,000</td>
<td>6,942,742</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>111,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities 10,000—5,000</td>
<td>4,997,794</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>41,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities 5,000—2,500</td>
<td>4,593,953</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>32,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Incorporated Areas of 2500 or less</td>
<td>8,969,241</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>43,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Unincorporated Areas</td>
<td>42,436,776</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>66,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112,120,054</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,222,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From time to time efforts were made to bring about a better distribution of Jews in the United States. These were carried on by organizations which aimed at sending immigrants into the interior cities after arrangements were made for their employment there. The most important of these was The Industrial Removal Office, (I.R.O.) which functioned between 1901 and 1922. It was responsible for distributing about 79,000 people between the years of 1901 and 1917, the last year for which figures are available. The Galveston Movement was an attempt to divert part of the stream of Jewish immigrants from the Eastern port cities to the West by routing them to Galveston, Texas. This effort was organized in 1906 and was suspended in 1908 because of the depression at that time. It was resumed in 1910 but was definitely abandoned in 1914 because of the World War. A similar effort is now being made to distribute German Jewish immigrants in the interior, through the National Coordinating Committee for German Refugees. (See p. 118).

Students of Jewish population usually assume that the Jewish population is somewhat older than is the general population. This is due to the fact that the Jewish population has a large proportion of immigrants who have arrived since 1880. (See p. 68.) The differentials are unknown.

A city-wide study of the youth in New York City made by the Research Department of the Welfare Council of New York City, on the basis of visits to each hundredth residential address, a device which yielded interviews with 9,041 young men and women between the ages of 16 and 24, shows some very interesting results regarding the nativity of parents. Table 2, which is based on Table 1 of that study, is self-explanatory. Attention should be called to the comparatively small percentage of Jewish youth with both parents native (8.7%). It is also interesting to note that 82.1% of the Jewish parents came either from Russia, Poland, or Austria. But it should be borne in mind that New York City is not necessarily representative of the rest of the country.
### TABLE 2

**Nativity of Parents of New York City Youth**
*(Based on a study of every hundredth family)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nativity of Parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Catholic (Roman)</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,041</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>1,606*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>96.0b</td>
<td>98.9b</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80.9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents Native</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both parents born in a foreign country.</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*, or not reported</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 208 failed to report religious affiliation.
* Negroses constitute the difference between this and 100 per cent.
* Less than 1 per cent. born in any one country.

More or less reliable estimates have been made of the growth of the Jewish population in the United States as follows:

### TABLE 3

**Estimates of the Number of Jews in the U. S. 1818–1935**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Estimate</th>
<th>Number of Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>229,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>937,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1,508,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1,776,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>2,043,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2,933,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>3,388,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>3,604,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>4,228,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>4,450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. ECONOMIC DISTRIBUTION

There is even greater paucity of information regarding the vocational distribution of Jews than regarding their vital statistics. There are no studies available on the number of Jews in commerce, industry and the professions. It is generally assumed that they are represented in commerce in much larger numbers than their proportion of the population; and that they are represented in industry mainly in the manufacture of light industries. Until comparatively recently they dominated the clothing industry, both among employers and employees. In recent years, however, the situation has been changing very perceptibly. While accurate information is not available, the clothing industry, which was at one time almost wholly Jewish, now consists of between 40% and 50% Jewish workers and a much larger percentage of Jewish owners. The Jewish workers are gradually being displaced by the Polish, Italian, Spanish, and Negro groups. This is largely because the sons and daughters of Jewish tailors do not, as a rule, enter the same field and there has been no large Jewish immigration for almost two decades to replenish the losses.

A study recently published in one of the foremost American periodicals, Fortune, gives some interesting facts about Jewish participation in the commercial and industrial life of the United States. While the information is fairly accurate, it cannot be accepted as absolutely so. It may be summarized as follows: In domestic and international finance, American Jews play a relatively minor role. While there are a few important Jewish banks they are in no way to be compared in size or importance with the non-Jewish banks. Even the few Jewish banks have a considerable sprinkling of non-Jewish partners in them. There are very few Jewish employees in, or Jews on the boards of, non-Jewish banks. Jews are also sparsely represented in the following: on the controlling boards of brokerage houses dealing in stocks and bonds, and insurance companies; among owners and workers of heavy industry such as steel, automobiles, coal, rubber, oil, shipping and transportation; public utility boards controlling the sources of light and power. The situation is somewhat better in the light industries, such as
textiles, silks, clothing, the distilling industry, tobacco industry, etc. But even in these, with the exception of clothing and textiles, where the Jews are largely represented as manufacturers and middle men, respectively, they do not play a dominant role. Jews have a large share in merchandising, a number of important department stores being owned or managed by Jews; they are relatively unimportant in the control of the daily press, magazines, advertising, radio, and other media for shaping public opinion. Not even in the amusement field, except in the cinema, do they exercise a major influence. The author insists that in the legal and medical professions, despite popular impression and anti-Semitic claims to the contrary, Jews play by no means the role usually ascribed to them, especially if legal and medical "power" is considered instead of numbers of practitioners. He concludes that "Jews do not dominate the American scene. They do not even dominate major sectors of the American scene."  

The foregoing refers mostly to ownership. The problem of getting information regarding participation of Jewish labor in the different fields is very much more difficult. There is no exact information regarding the number of Jewish workers in any field. A study made in 1929 of 50 trade unions located in New York City, with a total membership of 392,000 indicated that 134,000, roughly about one-third, were Jews. Two facts must be borne in mind in this connection. One is that the study was in New York City, where the Jewish population is approximately one-third of the total population, and the second is that the trade union study included the United Hebrew Trades, which are very largely Jewish. It is for this reason that the range of Jewish membership in these 50 trade unions was from about 8% in transportation and communication, to 98% in the retail salesmen's union. The fields of industry studied were: food preparation and distribution with 54% Jewish membership; needle trades, 59%; leather trades, 66%; building trades, 24%; printing trades, 17%; amusement trades, 37%; jewelry and ornament trades, 35%; and miscellaneous, 24%. There can be no question that in cities where the Jewish population is less, proportionately, than in New York City these percentages would vary widely. Nor can there be
any question that for the country as a whole the percentages would be much lower. Unfortunately, there are no data for comparative purposes.

A study made in 1935 throws interesting light on the distribution of Jews in various occupations. This study comprised approximately 17,000 Jews listed in the New York City directory under five typically Jewish names (Ginsberg, Friedman, Goldberg, Goldstein, Levy) and was compared with a typically non-Jewish name (Smith), listed in the same directory.¹⁰

Table 4 compares the distribution of Jewish and non-Jewish males in 15 occupations on the basis of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Non-Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,618</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Retail and Wholesale</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brokers and Sales</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Skilled and Unskilled</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clerical and Sales</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Needle Trade Workers</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Professional Service</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Building Trade Labor</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Manufacturing Est.'s</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Domestic and Personal</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Transp. &amp; Communication</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Production—Managerial—General</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Unclassified</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Semi-Professional Service</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. City and Federal Employees</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Building Trades Contractor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 compares the occupations of Jewish and non-Jewish females taken from the same source.

**TABLE 5**

**OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH FEMALE RESIDENTS IN NEW YORK CITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Non-Jews</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clerical and Sales</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needle Trade Workers</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Brokers and Sales</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Retail and Wholesale</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Skilled and Unskilled</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Domestic &amp; Personal Service</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Unclassified</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production—Managerial—General</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Manufacturing Est.'s</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Semi-Professional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Transp. &amp; Communication</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. City and Federal Employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Building Trades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing two tables show some interesting variations. But it is impossible to say to what extent they are typical of the general population of New York City and of the entire country. A test was made in a comparison of the data secured from the city directory with the information available in the Federal census for the same area. The comparison is presented in Tables 6 and 7. But these data, too, while interesting and suggestive, are inconclusive, because the Jewish population is so large a factor in the census figures for this area. They do open up interesting possibilities and it is hoped that as a result of these and other studies we shall have more reliable and more revealing information on Jewish economic distribution in the United States than is now available.13

Table 6 compares the occupational distribution of male Jews with that of the non-Jewish population in New York City based on the Federal census. The deviations are too obvious to require comment.
TABLE 6

Occupational Distribution of Jewish Male Residents of New York City Compared with the General Population in that City Based on the Federal Census of 1930\textsuperscript{14}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>General Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,319</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Trade</td>
<td>4,594</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manufacturing and Mechan-</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ical</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clerical</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Service</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Domestic and Personal</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transportation &amp; Communi-</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Service</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Agriculture</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 makes the same comparisons for females.

TABLE 7

Occupational Distribution of Jewish Female Residents of New York City Compared with the General Population in that City Based on the Federal Census of 1930\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>General Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clerical</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ical</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trade</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Service</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Domestic and Personal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trans. and Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Service</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Agriculture</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Extraction of Minerals</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New York City Youth Study already referred to (Page 52, footnote 5) shows some interesting variations with respect to occupational distribution of Jewish and non-Jewish youth. Table 8 is based on Table A of that study. Here it should be borne in mind, in addition to the cautions mentioned above, that this table is based on the occupations of youth and that the figures must not be expected, therefore, to correspond with those in Tables 4 to 7 inclusive. The present table is interesting mainly because of the information it gives and the comparisons it makes possible between Jewish and non-Jewish youth.

### TABLE 8

**Occupational Distribution of Jewish and Non-Jewish Youth in New York City**

(Based on a study of every hundredth family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Occupation</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Non-Jewish*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clericals</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary and Managerial</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures are interpolated.

Of similar interest are the data presented in Table 9, based on Table 5 of the same study. This table is interesting primarily because of the comparatively slight differences between the Jewish and non-Jewish groups. Larger variations might be expected on the basis of popular impressions.
**TABLE 9**

TRAINING PREFERENCES OF JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH YOUTH IN NEW YORK CITY
(Based on a study of every hundredth family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training Preferred</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Non-Jewish*</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Non-Jewish*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Employed Young People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training desired</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vocational</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Unemployed Young People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training desired</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vocational</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures are interpolated.

The agricultural activities of the Jews in the United States date back about 50 years. Organized activity, however, began at the turn of this century. The foremost Jewish organization dealing with this aspect of Jewish economic life in the United States is the Jewish Agricultural Society, organized by the Baron de Hirsch Fund. In the thirty-six years of its functioning, it has spent about $3,800,000 in aiding Jewish farmers. It estimates that about 1,500,000 acres are owned by Jews, and that there are approximately 16,000 families devoting their time, in whole or in part, to farming. The aggregate loans made to Jewish farmers by this organization amounted to about $12,000,000, of which about $1,250,000 came out of interest paid on the loans. This represents a remarkable growth for there was a time when there were very few Jewish farmers in the United States. There are, however, no large Jewish agricultural enterprises. Jewish agricultural endeavor consists mainly of small farms, some of which cater to vacationists during the summer months. There is a Jewish school for farming which has been in existence for forty years. It
has not been outstandingly successful, for the majority of its graduates entered other occupations than that for which they were prepared in the School.\textsuperscript{16}

Among the professions, Jews are most heavily represented in medicine, law and accounting. Here, too, it is commonly believed that they exceed by far their numerical proportion in the population. This has, in fact, been one of the problems with which far-sighted Jewish leaders have been concerned. There is everywhere evident a feeling that wisdom dictates a better distribution in these fields. This is due mainly to a growing tendency toward limitation of Jewish applicants in schools of medicine and law and to ever-decreasing opportunities for Jewish practitioners in these two professions. It is common practice in the United States for graduates of a medical school to have a year or more of interneship in a hospital. In a large number of states, such interneship is a prerequisite for a license to practice medicine. Jewish graduates find it extremely difficult, and in some parts of the country practically impossible, to secure internships in non-Jewish hospitals. Similarly, Jewish physicians as a rule find it difficult or impossible to secure appointments to staffs in non-Jewish hospitals.\textsuperscript{17} There has been some agitation for Jewish medical schools. Thus far the preponderant opinion has been that it would be unwise to create such institutions.\textsuperscript{18}

The situation in the legal field does not lend itself to the same type of discrimination. But there are numerous evidences of fairly intense feeling in legal circles against the large number of Jews in the profession. Some of the better law schools in the country have an unofficial quota for Jewish students. Many Legal or Bar Associations, which frequently influence, if they do not dominate the examinations for license to practice law in the different states, directly or indirectly discriminate against Jewish applicants. From time to time statements appear which, though unofficial in character, are nevertheless significant because of their sources, that Jews in these professions engage in unethical practices. Although it must be obvious to any fair minded person that such unethical practices as exist are by no means limited to Jews, the charge is, nevertheless, leveled against them. Thus far, no concerted
effort has been made to prove or disprove such charges or
to deal with the problem from a long-range point of view.

The accounting profession is more or less similar to those
already discussed, but since the accountant usually functions
in relation to a business organization, which is his client,
there is an automatic and fairly effective check on the op-
portunities for Jewish accountants.

A profession which is becoming more and more restricted
for Jews is that of teaching in the primary and secondary
schools and universities. Though the primary and secondary
schools are financed from tax funds, there is a growing dis-
crimination against Jewish teachers. In the larger cities,
it is comparatively easy for Jews to secure positions in the
public schools, and considerable numbers are employed in
them. In the smaller communities, it is extremely difficult
and in some instances practically impossible for Jews to
secure teaching positions. This is due not only to discrim-
ination against Jews but to the fact that the teacher is
expected to participate in the religious life of the community.
Since the Jewish teacher cannot easily do this in a Christian
community, the situation becomes embarrassing and fre-
quently impossible for him. This is not an exclusively
Jewish problem since Catholics face similar situations in
many communities. There are many instances in which
Jewish young men and women fail to give their religious
affiliation or will indicate affiliation with non-denominational
religious groups, such as Ethical Culture, Quakers, etc., in
order to secure positions. But even such methods are no
longer effective, for among school boards, school superin-
tendents, and teachers' employment agencies, it is commonly
assumed that when one indicates "no religious affiliation"
or "Ethical Culture" etc., the applicant is very likely Jewish.

In university teaching, the situation is much more ag-
gravated. It is very difficult these days for Jews to become
full professors in the leading universities. In order to at-
tain such rank, they must have achieved distinction in
their respective fields of national and international char-
acter. While Jews constitute a considerable proportion of
the student bodies in the colleges and universities through-
out the land, certainly much more than their numerical
proportion, they represent but an insignificant proportion
of the faculties. This situation is very serious because Jews are gradually being eliminated from the educational field and will ultimately be charged with making no contribution to it.

Recently, largely due to the depression during the past seven years, economic opportunities for Jews have become progressively more restricted. Office work for Jewish stenographers, typists, bookkeepers and clerical workers is extremely difficult to obtain. There are large employers of such labor, especially the large corporations, which will not employ Jewish help. To make the situation worse, there are some Jewish firms which discriminate against Jewish applicants. In all of these fields, therefore, economic opportunities for Jews are constantly contracting.19

There is, of course, no official governmental restriction against Jews. They are to be found in considerable numbers among the civil service employees in city, state and national government, although it must be admitted that here, too, there is some under-cover discrimination. To the student of this problem, it is easily evident that the Jew faces difficulties in every field of endeavor. Newspaper advertisements for workers occasionally carry such statements as "gentiles only," although they are less frequent than commonly supposed. This is probably due to a policy on the part of the newspapers against them. The reasons for these attitudes are many and varied. They are frequently contradictory. Studies which have been made indicate that the reasons cover the entire gamut of undesirable characteristics which the Jewish employee is presumed to possess. Most often they are given as "aggressiveness," "overweening ambition," "radicalism," "trade-union activity," "unreliability," "loudness," "bad manners," etc.20

Jewish leaders have been concerned with this problem. Thus far, however, it is only in the discussion stage. While everyone seems to be aware of it, while some have given public expression of their uneasiness and feeling that something must be done about it, nothing of a concerted nature has thus far been undertaken. It requires the type of thinking, planning, and resources which are apparently not yet available in organized Jewish life in the United States.21 However, there is some evidence that communities are
awakening to the problem and are organizing themselves to meet it. Several communities have created vocational agencies. Although these have thus far concentrated their efforts on finding employment for the unemployed they are beginning to study the problems of vocational distribution as well as vocational and educational guidance.

III. JEWISH, NON-JEWISH RELATIONSHIPS

Although it has been estimated that there are about fifty organizations, large and small, whose dominant motif is anti-Semitism, there is no general or nation-wide organization for purely anti-Semitic purposes. Such organizations as do exist or have existed in the past, such as the Ku Klux Klan, the Silver Shirts, etc., usually include opposition to other minority groups in their program. Thus the Ku Klux Klan opposed Catholics and Negroes as well. The Black Legion, an organization similar to the Ku Klux Klan came into prominence in 1936. The state of Michigan was the main field for its activities which included a series of murders. Its hostile agitation was directed against all non-Protestant groups. However, from time to time, organizations and activities appear which do aim at the Jews. Such an organization was the Silver Shirts, with its various publications; the *Dearborn Independent*, financed by Henry Ford, the automobile magnate, who later retracted and apologized to the Jewish people; and a number of others. There are also other activities on the American scene which have an anti-Semitic tinge. The activities of Father Coughlin, the radio priest, and the successors to the late Senator Huey Long from Louisiana, who set up a virtual dictatorship in that state, and was aiming for the Presidency of the United States, may be included in this category.

Happily, these groups and activities have had no governmental support whatsoever. On the contrary, there is ample evidence that the American government, and in the vast majority of instances, the state and local governments, are opposed to any type of anti-Semitic activities just as they are opposed to any other activities tending to create racial strife. But it must be recognized that the racial and religious questions are latent if not active in the American scene.
One need only recall the Presidential campaign of 1928, when Alfred E. Smith, former Governor of the state of New York, the most outstanding Catholic layman and statesman at the time, was the democratic candidate for President, and the campaign of religious prejudice and bigotry on the basis of the Catholic issue which was waged against him, to appreciate what can be done. Similarly, one need only think of the situation of the Negroes in the South, the prejudice against them, the frequent acts of mob violence and lynching of Negroes, the social, economic, and political discrimination practiced against them in the South, as well as race riots in Northern cities, to realize that racial and religious antagonisms and conflicts are neither unknown nor impossible in the United States.

From time to time there appear pamphlets, articles, and books, which indicate that the Jewish issue is not far from the surface, and that it would require comparatively little provocation to bring it to the surface. On the other hand, a number of Jews hold prominent positions in American public life. In 1932, the Governors of the States of Illinois, New York, Oregon and New Mexico, were Jews. The first two states have large Jewish populations, but the number of Jews in the last two is negligible. Two of the outstanding liberal judges on the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest court in the land, are Jews, and they are universally respected for their legal scholarship, humanitarianism, and courage. There are now, and there have been almost from the beginning of this Republic, Jews in the Congress of the United States. Other Jews prominent in the judicial, diplomatic and other public services might be mentioned as proof that there is no official anti-Semitism in the United States.22

The provocation for bringing the anti-Jewish question into the open, in fact almost creating the issue, was unfortunately provided in the depression which has lasted for almost seven years. In all such situations, a scapegoat is sought, and any convenient one seized upon. Several attempts have been made to use the Jew and Jewish influence in governmental affairs, especially in the Roosevelt administration, as this convenient scapegoat. The situation in Germany and the Hitler propaganda in the United States:
and elsewhere have seriously aggravated the situation. The enormous publicity which has been given in the American press to the Nazi attitudes, programs, and activities against the Jews, has not strengthened the Jewish position in the United States, although there are innumerable gentiles who are incensed at what Nazi Germany is doing.²³

The national election campaign of 1936 was of tremendous importance from the standpoint of the fear and insecurity which it aroused in Jews and liberal-minded non-Jews, because of the anti-Jewish propaganda in which the opponents of President Roosevelt engaged. His remarkable victory left no doubt that anti-Semitism is not a safe campaign issue in the United States.

Various attempts have been made to deal with the situation. The propaganda against the Nazis and their regime; the identification of the type of discrimination against Jews, with discriminations either immediate or ultimate against other minority groups; the stimulation of labor and other liberal groups to the realization that Nazi Germany and its program represent a threat to them; the boycott against Germany, and especially the non-Jewish participation in the boycott; the coupling of the present German government's activity against the Jews with its war activities and threats to the peace of the world; all of these are aspects of the efforts at combating not only the German influence in this country but also the rise of anti-Semitism and intolerance in whatever guise.

It is impossible to estimate the results of these activities. Many believe that were the Jews to present a united front to the world in these and other efforts, however much they might differ internally, a great deal more could have been accomplished. Others view the situation differently and hold that a united front could be accomplished only through compromise and more can be achieved by each group pursuing its own program vigorously.²⁴

One of the safeguards in the Jewish position in the United States rests in the relationship between the different religious groups. While there can be no doubt that there is considerable antagonism between Protestants and Catholics, and between them and the Jews, there is also no doubt that,
insofar as the organized activities of these groups are concerned, there is every desire, both official and unofficial, for cooperation, understanding, and tolerance.

There are numerous inter-racial and inter-religious activities which aim at bringing about better understanding between the different groups, making up the body politic in American life. One organization in particular, The National Conference of Jews and Christians, might be mentioned in this connection. Others are doing no less important work.

Another safety factor in the situation is the fact that the United States, is a country where democracy is passionately believed in, and that although it is sometimes spoken of as "a Christian country," and occasionally even as "a Protestant country," it is, nevertheless, made up of many religious elements. This diversity in population prevents the type of homogeneity necessary for breeding racial, social, and religious bigotry which fertilize the soil for anti-Semitism. There is also an awareness on the part of at least the liberal and intelligent groups in American life that the greatness of the United States is not due to any one religious or cultural group but that all groups from all corners of the world have contributed to its development. There is an appreciation that would be difficult to find in other countries, of the contribution which each cultural group can make toward the sum total of American culture. Indeed there are those who think of American culture as a fusion of the world cultures which have gone into the so-called "melting pot" and which have created the America of today.25 In addition to these must be mentioned the fact that there is no tradition of Jewish persecution in this country. Americans cannot forget that their country was founded and developed by those who sought to escape from religious persecution abroad.

IV. IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION

The day when the United States had a wide open door for immigrants is, it is feared, gone forever. While in a sense there has been some type of restriction of immigration for almost 100 years, real restriction did not begin until the adoption of the Quota Law in 1921.26 Whereas originally
immigrant legislation aimed at protecting the immigrant, recent legislation aimed in the beginning, at selection and later almost exclusively at restriction. This new restrictive legislation had its origin in the social and economic conditions of the country. Today, largely as a result of the problems which arose during the World War and the economic crisis since 1929, immigration into the United States is very limited. Officially and unofficially the government has been opposed to large immigration. In fact such quotas as exist have not been filled and efforts are being made in the Congress, to reduce even existing limited quotas. Whether the restrictionist forces will be successful or not, there can be no denying the fact that large scale immigration into the United States is out of the question for the present and the immediate future. Despite this, government officials in the present administration have adopted a generous and liberal attitude regarding German refugees. Considerable numbers have come to the United States and are gradually adjusting themselves here. But opposition is heard from time to time and agitation has started against them. Occasionally one hears statements in the Congress of the United States to the effect that the traditional policy of this country being a refuge for those who are persecuted in other lands has been abandoned. No one who knows the situation can have much hope that the immigration policy of the U. S. will become less restrictive than it is now. On the contrary, the tendency is for more restriction, and it is likely that the next few years will see further restrictive legislation.

This is largely due to the attitudes of what are sometimes called "100 percenters," those who have at other times been called the "Know-nothings" because of their distrust of and opposition to others than native Americans. But even liberal groups, such as organized labor, are opposed to immigration. This is because they view the opportunities in America as constantly diminishing. They believe, therefore, that immigrants coming to this country take the places which would otherwise go to unemployed Americans. The fact that so many millions of Americans have been unemployed for a period of years, that even now, when the depression is easing, there are still between seven and eight million people unemployed, constitutes a powerful argument against
a liberal immigration policy. This the labor groups and others are not reluctant to use.

In the 45 years, between 1881 to 1935, there came to the United States nearly 28 million (27,787,792) immigrants, of whom almost two million (1,925,306) were Jews. Figures for the years 1908 to 1935, show that 4,339,244, or 34.33\%, of the total immigration left the United States whereas only 55,695 Jews, or 5.08\%, left the country in the same period. Studies of immigration and emigration proved conclusively that Jews came to the United States as permanent settlers and that they were but little influenced by economic conditions in this country either in their immigration or emigration. In recent years there was some emigration to Palestine, but the number of American Jews going there has been small.

During the period of heavy Jewish immigration, a number of organizations came into being for the purpose of facilitating the immigrants' adjustment in this country. Chief among these are the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society and the National Council of Jewish Women. Both organizations cooperate with similar groups in other countries, notably the HICEM, so as to be of maximum help to the immigrant before arriving in this country. Once he is here, he may be aided, if he needs assistance, by either of the above organizations or by the local social service organizations.

V. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES, EDUCATION AND CIVIC PROTECTION

1. For Religious Activities

At first glance it appears as if chaos reigns in religious activities in the Jewish communities in the United States. Such, however, is not actually the case. Roughly speaking, observant Jews in the United States may be divided into three groups with respect to religious affiliation and practice. In the ascending order of their numerical strength they are as follows: (1) Reform Jews, those who are members of reform temples where services have departed substantially from the traditional orthodox service, men and women sitting side by side, the men with bare heads,
with mixed choirs and organ music, and among whom Sabbath observance is the exception rather than the rule. Some of these temples hold their services on Sundays in an effort to attract the men who are usually in business on Saturday. (2) The Conservative Group, those who have departed in some measure from the traditional services but have not gone to the extent of the Reformed. One section of this group, now being referred to as the "Reconstructionists," revere traditional practices not so much because they are commanded by God, but because they are part of the Jewish folkways and mores, and hold that to adhere to them is to indicate one's connection with the Jewish people. (3) The third group consists of the Orthodox, those who adhere strictly to the traditional faith and forms of observance.

There are a number of Jews in this country who have no particular religious affiliation during the entire year. During the High Holydays many attend the existing synagogues and temples by purchasing seats for the occasion, while others attend services in improvised synagogues usually located in public meeting places and, occasionally, even in dance halls, rented for the period and the occasion as commercial ventures by individuals and organizations. The people attending these services are mostly Orthodox in background. Many of the religiously unaffiliated Jews use other means of identification with the Jewish people, such as membership in charitable organizations, cultural clubs, fraternal organizations, etc., and affiliation with Zionism or other Jewish movements.

In each of these groups may be found a large variety of divergent views, practices and forms of religious observance. The lines of demarcation between them are not always sharp and are at best arbitrary.

It is not definitely known how many synagogues, temples and other houses of worship there are in the United States. It is estimated that The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, representing the reform or liberal group, has approximately 290 temples, with a total membership of about 50,000. The temple brotherhoods, subsidiary organization of the Union, have a total membership of approximately 20,000. The temple sisterhoods, of which there are
about 350, have a total membership of about 70,000. The Union spends approximately one-half million dollars on its activities. This includes the budget of the Hebrew Union College, which trains reform Rabbis. The United Synagogue of America represents the conservative group. Approximately 250 synagogues affiliated with this organization, and about the same number of unaffiliated synagogues, have a total membership of about 75,000. It has a Women's League comprising 280 organizations, with a total membership of about 40,000. Its Brotherhoods have about 100 individual organizations with a total membership of about 10,000. There are approximately 250 organizations in its Young People's League, which is the youth organization, with a total membership of about 30,000.

The Orthodox groups are not nearly as well organized as are the other two, although they, too, have a central organization, The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations. It is almost impossible to get any definite information with respect to either the number of synagogues or their memberships. Moreover, they are much less united with respect to policy of religious observance and practice. Thus, whereas each of the other two groups has a central organization, with its representative rabbinical seminary and rabbinical conference, the Orthodox group has several seminaries and several rabbinical conferences.

There is no safe way of estimating the number of Jewish individuals who are affiliated with synagogues. On the basis of the above figures it might be said that no more than between 300,000 and 350,000 men and women are directly and actively connected with synagogues. However, since a member is usually the head of the family and the other members are assumed to have affiliation by virtue of such membership, it may be said that between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000 are associated with religious organizations and activity.

It should be added that a study of Jewish Congregations in the United States, made in 1927, showed that there were 3,118 permanent congregations in the U. S. The total membership was not reported, but 1,290 congregations reported a total expenditure during the previous fiscal year of $18,
001,771. Also, 2,348 of the congregations reported the total value of their buildings was $155,744,666.31 This is by no means the total expenditure for religious activity by the Jews in the United States.

Each of the three groups mentioned above, carries on its educational activities through its central organization. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations conducts educational activities of a national and local type. It has a close relationship with the Hebrew Union College which trains the reform rabbis, who have an organization of their own, the Central Conference of American Rabbis. It has a comparatively large organization for educational purposes in and outside of the temples, including preparation of textbooks for the Sunday Schools, Regional Conferences, stimulation of their temple brotherhoods and sisterhoods, etc. The United Synagogue of America performs similar functions for the conservative group, with the Jewish Theological Seminary of America as the educational institution for training conservative Rabbis, whose alumni are organized in the Rabbinical Assembly of America. The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America aims to perform the same services with the limitations noted above. Though not as intimately related to the organization, the Yeshiva College and the Isaac Elchanan Seminary trains Rabbis for this group. There are several other seminaries for training Orthodox Rabbis.

There is another, independent institution for the training of reform Rabbis, The Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City.

There are no central funds for maintaining religious institutions whether synagogues or seminaries. The former are usually supported by membership fees and donations of members; the latter, by endowment funds and special gifts. Each synagogue, able to afford it, usually maintains its own rabbi. Smaller communities sometimes have itinerant rabbis who conduct services and perform other rabbinical functions as necessary. Some of the very small communities have one person who serves in the capacity of rabbi, shohet (one who is empowered to perform the ritual slaughter of cattle and poultry), mohel (one who is authorized
to perform the religious rite of circumcision), and Hebrew teacher.

Some rabbis have created for themselves positions of outstanding leadership in their respective communities. In general, it may be said that the synagogue looks to the Rabbi to be not only its spiritual guide and to superintend the religious education of the children, to administer the affairs of the congregation, and to conduct the necessary rabbinical functions at births, marriages, deaths, etc., but to be its representative in the general community. Rabbis are, therefore, prominent in civic, religious, philanthropic, and other communal affairs, Jewish and non-Jewish. In a number of instances, rabbis have taken leading parts in social reform movements in their respective communities.

2. Education

A. Secular Education.—The Jews in the United States send their children to the public elementary, secondary and higher schools. There are comparatively few Jewish parochial schools. In this way, Jewish children are trained from an early date to feel at home with their non-Jewish neighbors and are brought up to full participation in American cultural life. As indicated elsewhere, the Jews have a relatively high proportion of attendance in all educational institutions, from the elementary school to the university and technical and professional schools.

A study, now in progress, by the B’nai B’rith, of the Jewish students in 1319 colleges and universities throughout the land, shows that of 1,148,393 students, 104,906, or 9.13%, are Jews. In other words, the Jewish population which constitutes 3.58% of the general population, contributes 9.13% of the students in the higher educational institutions. The Jewish students range from 1.2% in the mountain states to 49.6% in New York City, where the Jewish population is 29.6% of the total population.\(^{32}\)

There are no universities, technical or professional schools, outside of several seminaries, a college for Hebrew and cognate learning, and a school for social workers, under Jewish auspices.\(^{33}\) Various attempts have been made from
time to time to encourage the organization of such institutions but they have always met with such resistance that nothing came of them. About ten years ago the Yeshivah College was organized. But this is closely connected with the Orthodox Seminary and is in reality a parochial school.

B. Jewish Education.—Jewish education was always more or less informal, was always partly affiliated with the synagogue, and was always considered a responsibility of the community. The attitude of Jewish parents toward the education of their children, particularly their male children, is well known. Talmud Torahs were among the most favored organizations in the Jewish community and the education of poor children was considered a primary obligation on each community from time immemorial. In this country the traditional attitudes toward Jewish education, more or less religious, developed the traditional types of Jewish educational institutions, such as the Talmud Torah (a communal Hebrew School originally intended for poor children), and the Heder (a private Hebrew School). With the development of the public school and with compulsory universal education, the Talmud Torah and the traditional private teacher were seriously challenged. The dissatisfactions with these institutions were responsible, in part, for the creation of Sunday Schools connected with the synagogues. It became the practice of each reform temple and, later, of the more progressive conservative synagogues, to maintain schools which held classes on Sunday mornings for the religious education of the children whose parents were members of the congregations. Opinions differ as to the effectiveness of these schools, of which there are large numbers in the United States and which provide some kind of Jewish education for children who might otherwise receive none. It was not until 1910 that a movement, sponsored by a small group under the leadership of a few idealists, developed a modern Jewish educational program. This development was at a very rapid pace, so that practically every one of the larger Jewish communities had a fairly comprehensive program of Jewish education by the end of the third decade of the present century. As a result of this movement, the old Hebrew School and Talmud Torah, frequently located in dingy, dark, unattractive quarters, gave way, in many
instances, to modern schools, located in attractive, airy and sunny rooms, with college-trained men and women as teachers, with a curriculum which aims at transmitting to the pupils the Jewish cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{35}

These systems of Jewish education in the larger communities are usually part of the Federations of Jewish Charities. They are aided by boards of Jewish education which supervise and finance, in part or in whole, the Jewish educational institutions which aim to provide at least a minimum of Jewish education for Jewish youth. Hebrew schools, Hebrew high schools, teachers institutes, and colleges of Jewish studies, sprang up in the different communities. The old type *Melamed* (Hebrew teacher) is rapidly passing from the scene. Men and women born and educated in America, graduates of American colleges and universities, with graduate work in the best teachers colleges and universities, entered the classrooms and became the supervisors of the Jewish educational systems. A resurgence of, and a revival of interest in, Jewish education made themselves felt throughout the country and permeated the Jewish communities and Jewish community activity. Like every revival movement it has its friends and enemies. Some see in it a deviation from orthodox forms and practices and are, therefore, opposed to it. Others see in it an intensification of Jewish life which seems to them opposed to Americanization as they conceive it. They, too, are opposed to it. Between these two extremes, is a group of persons, usually the conservative elements in the Jewish community, who look upon it as a worthwhile movement from which will emerge the type of Jewish education best adapted to the American scene and which will meet the needs of American Jewry.

There is no exact information as to how many Jewish children receive a Jewish education. Estimates vary from 20\% to 40\%. A recent estimate,\textsuperscript{36} is to the effect that of 800,000 Jewish children of school age, only 25\% attend Jewish schools. Of these, 55\% attend week-day schools; 37.5\% attend Sunday Schools; 6\% attend private week-day schools; 1.5\% attend parochial schools. The same authority estimates that approximately $5,825,000 is spent annually on Jewish education. Of this sum, about 71\% comes from tuition fees; 17\% comes from local philanthropic funds.
such as Federations of Jewish Charities; 12% from central communal, national, or Seminary funds. A different study estimates that about one-third of the children enrolled continue until graduation.\(^{37}\)

The problems facing Jewish education in this country are: (1) inadequate funds, it having been estimated that adequate Jewish education would require almost as much money as all the other Jewish communal activities put together; (2) lack of time, since most of the pupils attend the public schools and there is very little time or energy left for Jewish education; (3) suitable curricula; (4) lack of a real and sustained interest on the part of leaders and parents in a comprehensive Jewish educational program; (5) lack of a universally acceptable philosophy as to the aim and content of Jewish education in the United States.\(^{38}\)

There are a number of institutions throughout the country for training teachers for the Jewish schools. Usually each large community has its own teacher-training school. The best known of these are the schools located in New York City, Boston, and Chicago. There exists a National Council for Jewish Education made up of the leaders of the Jewish educational movement throughout the country which issues \textit{Jewish Education}, a quarterly journal, and which holds annual meetings for the discussion of common problems. There are also several organizations of Jewish teachers and principals, somewhat in the nature of trade unions.

One very interesting enterprise in Jewish education is that comprising the Yiddish schools for children. The language of instruction is Yiddish and the point of view is liberal, in many instances, socialistic. They aim at training the children in what they term the language of their parents. This movement is about three decades old and has a great many useful and worthwhile achievements to its credit. It is estimated that there are more than 300 Yiddish schools in the United States and that they have a total enrollment of 21,000 children.\(^{39}\)

The depression, with the consequent shortage of funds and the urge to reduce expenditures where possible, has tended to focus attention and criticism upon the Jewish
education movement as one of the non-essentials and not belonging by right to the Jewish community as represented by the Federation of Jewish Charities. This is the situation in which Jewish education finds itself at the present time. Its progress has been halted. In many instances it has lost ground. Whether it will recapture its position, whether it will continue to develop along its former lines and rate of progress, only the future can tell.\textsuperscript{10}

3. Civic Protection

There are four organizations in the United States concerned with the problem of protection of Jewish rights in this country and abroad. They are: The American Jewish Committee, The American Jewish Congress, The Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, and The Jewish Labor Committee.

The American Jewish Committee was organized in 1906 with the avowed purpose "to safeguard the civil and religious rights of Jews, to combat discrimination and allay prejudice, to aid victims of persecution and calamity." Its activities cover all countries where Jews reside and where there are evidences of anti-Semitic activities. A large portion of its efforts are devoted to the dissemination of educational literature, aiming to combat anti-Semitism in the United States. More recently, its major activities have been concerned with exposing Nazi propaganda in this country and elsewhere and fighting anti-Jewish discrimination here. Because of its many and varied contacts with government officials here and abroad, as well as with civic organizations, individuals and religious bodies in other countries, it is enabled to carry on an effective world-wide activity. Its publications are widely distributed and it exercises important influence directly and indirectly on public opinion in this country and elsewhere. While in its Jewish orientation it is anti-nationalistic, it is definitely pro-Palestine. Some of its most prominent leaders are also leading non-Zionist members of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. The Committee as such is pledged to cooperate "with those who, attracted by religious or historic association, shall seek to establish in Palestine a center for Judaism.
for the stimulation of our faith, for the pursuit and development of literature, science and art in a Jewish environment, and for the rehabilitation of the land." Its financial support comes mainly from its members, donations, and appropriations from federations and welfare funds throughout the country.

The American Jewish Congress, a successor to an earlier body of the same name, was organized in 1922. The first American Jewish Congress was organized in 1918 for the purpose of naming a commission to the Peace Conference at Versailles. That Congress was a temporary body with which the American Jewish Committee and other national organizations were affiliated. It was set up on the basis of a written agreement which provided that it should go out of existence after the Peace Treaty was signed. Its commission played an important role in bringing about the inclusion of the minority rights clauses in the peace Treaties. This Congress adjourned sine die in 1920, in accordance with the written agreement reached before the Congress was convened, and after accepting the report of the commission which had been sent to the Peace Conference.

It was not until two years later that the present Congress was organized. Although its leaders claim that it is a "democratic organization," there is no record of a popular or democratic election since its organization. Its purposes are practically the same as those of the American Jewish Committee, except that, in its aims at dealing with the civic, political, economic and religious rights of the Jews in all lands, it is nationally motivated. Some of its leaders are also the most prominent leaders in Zionist activities. They are also the leaders in the World Jewish Congress movement. In general its form of organization is similar to that of the American Jewish Committee. It also has an executive committee and various other standing committees. However, there are branches of the Congress in a number of cities in the United States. It differs fundamentally from the American Jewish Committee in sponsoring mass activities, such as protests against the present German government, a boycott against German-made goods, and
mass meetings. Its funds come from its members, and from federations and welfare funds.

The B'nai B'rith, a fraternal organization with branches throughout the world, carries on its program of civic protection largely through its Anti-Defamation League. This League was organized in 1913 for the purpose of stimulating good-will and combating anti-Semitism. The League has concentrated its activities on watching the press, the stage, the screen, radio, school texts, etc. It carries on an educational program through the dissemination of books and pamphlets, and by providing speakers for suitable occasions. The income of the Anti-Defamation League comes from the exchequer of the B'nai B'rith, which in turn receives its income from membership fees. More recently because of its intensified activity and enlarged program, the B'nai B'rith has undertaken wider campaigns for funds. It also receives funds from the federations and welfare funds.

The Jewish Labor Committee, organized only in 1934, has in general the same purposes as the other three organizations. However, it differs from the others in its orientation and in its approach. Because of its contacts and affiliations with labor organizations, more particularly the American Federation of Labor, it has been helpful in furthering and effectuating the anti-Nazi boycott. It is maintained with funds coming from its membership and central labor organizations.

These four organizations, though having practically the same purpose, are responsible to different sections in the community, although there is some overlapping in the memberships. In general it may be said that the American Jewish Committee, made up as it is of the upper economic strata of the Jewish population, is responsible to them for its policies and procedures. The American Jewish Congress is made up very largely of representatives of the middle class and is responsible to them for its activities. The B'nai B'rith is composed mainly of the middle class and professional group and its policies are set by them. The Jewish Labor Committee has its own constituency. It is safe to say, therefore, that whereas the four organizations together probably constitute a cross-section of the entire Jewish population in the United States, no one organization is completely or fully representative.
The differences in orientation and methods of work which characterize these organizations give rise to frequent conflicts which, in the opinion of many, weaken the Jewish community. Demands are heard from time to time for unity or at least a united front. Many are of the opinion, however, that unity is neither possible nor desirable. There is a Joint Consultative Council made up of representatives from the different organizations, which discusses common problems and endeavors to formulate common procedures. In some instances, where all organizations cannot agree on a common policy, two or more may unite.

Mention should perhaps also be made here of two additional protective organizations. One of these is the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, of which a number of Jewish organizations and individuals are members. The other is a Jewish protective organization maintained by the Communist Party. But neither of these two organizations has the standing in the Jewish community that the other four have attained.


Before proceeding to discuss the different types of organizations functioning in the Jewish community in the social service sphere, it may be well to obtain a birds-eye view of the extent and cost of these activities.

It has been estimated that there are more than 4,000 communal agencies receiving financial support from central funds. These agencies spend approximately $50,000,000 annually in serving the sick; the poor; the widows; orphans; the maladjusted; the educational, cultural and recreational needs; needy Jews overseas; and the upbuilding of Palestine. Table 10 presents a distribution of these expenditures. It will be observed that about 85% is spent by agencies serving the needs in their respective localities or communities; about 5% is spent by national or regional agencies in this country; about 7% is spent by overseas agencies and 2½% is spent in the administration of the agencies which raise these large sums.
### TABLE 10

**EXPENDITURES OF LOCAL, NATIONAL AND OVERSEAS JEWISH SOCIAL AGENCIES IN 1935**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field and Type of Service</th>
<th>Number of Agencies</th>
<th>Disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Local and Regional Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$18,786,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service and Relief</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4,179,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5,422,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of Aged</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,322,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Homeless and Unattached</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Vocational Guidance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>237,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Loans</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>89,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation Service</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>270,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers and Settlements</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>5,825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Local Agencies</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,227,377</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Agencies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,477,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,251,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administration of Federations and Welfare Funds, Fund Raising, etc.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,157,038</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If to this sum of close to $50,000,000 is added the sum spent for religious activities (see page 71), and the sums spent for organizations and activities which are maintained by more restricted groups such as the unaffiliated societies, fraternal organizations, landsmanschaften, cultural agencies, etc., it is not too much to say that the Jewish people in the United States spend close to $100,000,000 each year on organizations and activities to serve their social, religious and educational needs.

With this introduction, we can now turn to a consideration of the more formal types of organizations which have been created to meet these needs. Before doing so, however, it may be well to explain that the more extensive discussion including the historical background in the section immediately following, that on poverty and dependency, is due to the belief that this type of social work is typical of and basic to the others. This is the reason also for the more detailed discussion of the problems faced by the family
agencies in the sections on trends and tendencies (p. 127ff.). For the same reason emphasis is laid on the developments in New York City. It would make the treatment much too complex and confusing if the developments in the other cities were to be described in any reasonable detail.

A. Poverty or Dependency

Great progress has been made in provisions for the care of the poor in the Jewish communities of the United States. There are many organizations, usually referred to as "family care agencies," for aiding Jewish families and individuals who need financial and other types of assistance in order to maintain themselves or reacquire an independent status. This type of social service, together with health care to be discussed later, frequently required the major portion of the funds collected by the federations of Jewish charities. So that this field of Jewish social work in the United States may be viewed in its proper perspective, and may serve as an introduction to the other fields to be discussed, it is necessary to review briefly some of the traditional attitudes among Jews regarding the care of the poor and needy which gave rise to this development.

The thoughtful and considerate care of the poor has ever been foremost in the attention of Jewish communities and their leaders throughout the ages. As a result of the attitudes in the Bible and the forms and practices of charity outlined in the Talmud, institutions and practices grew up in the Jewish communities which left an indelible imprint upon the Jew regarding his responsibility for his less fortunate brother. Charity became a living guide to one's relation to his fellow man and permeated and controlled one's daily life. In the Codifications, which are still the guides to Jewish social and religious practices with large portions of the Jewish population, charity and charitable acts hold a most important place. The Code of Maimonides, who lived in the 12th and 13th centuries, gives an interesting series of grades or values in charitable giving. The first and lowest degree of charity consists of giving to the poor but only after much pressure; the second is giving in a kindly spirit but less than one's means allow; the third consists of giving
directly to the poor after being solicited; the fourth is giving before one is asked and directly to the poor; the fifth, when the donor does not know the recipient but the recipient knows the donor; the sixth grade is when the donor knows the recipient but the latter does not know the donor; the seventh is that type of giving which makes it impossible for the donor to know the recipient or the recipient the donor; the eighth and highest type of charity is that which enables the poor to become self-supporting either through loans or business establishment or finding employment. Jewish social agencies in America today, though perhaps unconsciously, are striving to live up to the highest of the eight grades of charity. The self-support departments of family care agencies, which enable dependent families to become self-supporting through the purchase of businesses of various types are clearly engaging in the highest type of charity; Federations which make it impossible for the donor and recipient to know each other act strictly in accord, though perhaps for entirely different reasons, with the principles of sound philanthropic practice laid down by the famous Jewish philosopher more than seven hundred years ago.

In addition to this very rich and compelling background of Jewish charitable practice, there grew up the feeling on the part of the Jews throughout the ages that the welfare of the group is inextricably interwoven with the welfare of the individual. This was especially borne in on them during the Middle Ages when, because of persecutions, expulsions, and discriminations, it became necessary for the Jewish communities and individuals to protect other Jews insofar as possible. Jewish communities had to prepare themselves as best they could to receive wandering Jews. Shelters had to be established and arrangements made for meeting all of the other needs of the wanderers, since the Jewish poor could neither apply for nor receive aid from the general community. The self-government of the Jewish group also necessitated communal provisions for the complete care of the needy so that the seven branches of Jewish charity mentioned in the Rabbinic literature were, and still are, fully provided for. These are: feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, burying the dead and comforting the mourners, redeeming the captives, educating
the fatherless and sheltering the homeless, and providing poor maidens with dowries.

It would be difficult to over-emphasize the importance which the Jewish communities during the Middle Ages attached to the care of the poor, the orphan, the stranger and the captive. The Biblical and Talmudic admonitions were observed in spirit and letter with the utmost scrupulousness. Communities vied with each other in the generosity which they showered upon some of these unfortunates. To be an orphan or a widow was to be in a privileged position in the Jewish community. For they stood, in accordance with the Biblical teachings, under the special protection of God, Himself. The foremost Jewish humorist, Sholem Aleichem, who described Jewish life with rare skill and insight, epitomized the attitude of the Jew toward the orphan by beginning one of his most important books with the statement, “I am lucky, I am an orphan.” No less kind was the Jewish community to the Jewish wanderer. The age-old custom of “guest for the Sabbath” typifies the attitude in this regard. These attitudes and practices take on special significance when they are compared with the practices among non-Jews of the same and later periods. Compare, for instance, the degrees of charity of Maimonides and the solicitude of the Jewish community for the welfare of wanderers, with the English Poor Law which, in the middle of the sixteenth century, punished wanderers and vagabonds by branding them with the letter “V,” assigned them as slaves to those who would claim them, fed them with “bread and water and refuse meat,” branded them with the letter “S” on the cheek and enslaved them for life if they escaped during the first year, and put them to death as felons if they escaped again!49

It was the practice in Jewish communities, from time immemorial, for the best and most prominent people to interest themselves in charitable activities. Josephus tells us that, in the first century, when Palestine was stricken with a famine, Queen Helena of Adiabene sent shiploads of food to the foremost men of Jerusalem so that they might distribute it among the people. During the Middle Ages,
only the very finest members of the Jewish community were selected as "gabbai tsedakah" or overseers of the poor. So honored were these latter that a son of such an overseer was eligible to marry into a priestly family without the usual inquiry as to the purity of his descent.\(^5\)

This was the background for the development of Jewish philanthropy in the United States. Traditional practices of two thousand years were transported to these shores and became no less a part of the social practices of the early Jewish settlers on the new continent than they were in the Old World. In addition to this traditional heritage was the realization from the very beginning of Jewish sojourn in the new land, that the responsibility of Jew for Jew was to hold true no less here than in European countries. The very first group of Jews that settled in New Netherlands in 1654, the twenty-seven persons who came here on the "St. Charles," found that several of their number were to be held as hostages for the payment of passage by the rest of them. Similarly, the unwillingness of Governor Stuyvesant of New Amsterdam (now New York City), to let them remain here was directed not against any one of them but against the entire group. (It may be worth mentioning in this connection that the common belief, which has been frequently cited as the reason for the existence of separate Jewish charities in the United States, that these early settlers promised to take care of their own poor as a condition for being permitted to remain, is not quite true. Although the Dutch West India Co. named such a condition, there is no evidence that Stuyvesant tried to impose it or that the Jewish settlers accepted it.)\(^5\) When one fought for rights and won them, they were won for the group, even as discriminations against one tended to become practices against all.

It may be doubted, however, whether Jewish philanthropy would have developed as it has in the United States if there had not been the enormous increase in population during the nineteenth century. As we have seen, it has been estimated that by 1825 there were approximately only 6,000 Jews in the United States. In the following century the population grew to almost four and one-half million, an increase of over 700%. This increase was largely due to
immigration, mainly from Germany between 1825 and 1880, and from East-European countries between 1880 and 1925.

The hundreds of thousands of immigrants since 1880 made it necessary for the earlier settlers to create conditions and agencies which would facilitate the adjustment of the newcomers to the new environment. Those who came here before 1880, notably the German Jews, though at first considerably disturbed by the avalanche of Jewish immigrants from Russia, Poland and Roumania, soon recalled, directly or indirectly, their own experiences and their own trials and tribulations during their persecutions, thirty or forty years earlier, and quickly responded to the needs of the moment by creating the necessary facilities for meeting the problems which the newcomers faced.

Prior to 1800, Jewish communal activity in New York City and the rest of the United States was largely connected with the synagogue. In 1822, as a result of the request of a Jewish veteran of the Revolutionary War that he be visited in the hospital in New York City where he was confined, the Hebrew Benevolent Society of New York was organized. This society, ostensibly created in order to administer a fund of $300 left after the death of this veteran, later developed into the United Hebrew Charities, now the Jewish Social Service Association of New York City, the largest Jewish organization of its kind in the world. But even before this, stirrings were noticeable in the larger Jewish settlements, particularly in New York City, for the creation of organizations outside of the synagogue for meeting the needs in the Jewish communities which made themselves felt. In New York City, there were at the beginning of the nineteenth century such organizations as a “Female Hebrew Benevolent Society,” a “Society for the Education of Orphan Children and the Relief of Indigent Persons,” and an agency for the care of unemployed and the prevention of dependency, an agricultural society, and a number of others.

By 1853, The Hebrew Benevolent Society of New York City was aiding 1,200 applicants annually; in 1856 it aided almost 1,900 applicants. On these it spent approximately $5,000 a year. While this may seem a rather small sum today, it should be remembered that there were only between 15,000 and 20,000 Jews in New York City at the
time. All of the societies then existing aided between 4,000 and 5,000 persons annually. This, of course, makes the problem of dependency appear as much more serious at that time than it is today. For, even allowing for duplications, it may be conservatively estimated that between 10% and 20% of the Jewish population received assistance from one organization or another. Were this true today, all of the money collected by the Jewish Federation of New York City would not suffice for the needs of this one activity. This was, no doubt, due to the fairly recent immigration of German Jews resulting from the discriminations and persecutions which followed the Napoleonic wars and continued through the period from 1830 to 1848.

The German Jewish immigrants were no more satisfied with the administration of this organization, which was largely in the hands of the earlier settlers, the Portuguese, than were the Russian immigrants satisfied with the way the Germans conducted their organizations toward the close of the century. In 1844 "The German Hebrew Benevolent Society" was organized, no doubt as a protest against the methods of the Hebrew Benevolent Society. This Society seems to have been very popular. During the first year it had more than 200 members. Sixteen years later (1860) these two organizations combined as a result of public pressure against duplication and formed the United Hebrew Charities.

In 1881 there began the Jewish exodus from Eastern Europe which brought in its wake problems, the magnitude of which challenged the Jewish community of New York and other cities, as never before or since. It seemed to the leaders of the society that the United Hebrew Charities (and the same was true in the other port communities), would be diverted from its original purpose of "distributing relief among needy Hebrews in New York City to the care of Jewish immigrants." At first the organization was alarmed and stated that its function was "to care for the needy of New York City and not of the world." It more or less approved the protective immigration acts of 1882; it sent letters of protest to European leaders and to the press urging more discriminating and more careful selection of immigrants. As the immigration flow continued to increase, the
leaders of the Society and indeed of New York Jewry, realized that the time had come for constructive action. They placed an agent at Ellis Island, the port of entry in New York City, to help the immigrants; they opposed the deportation of dependents; they cooperated with the recently formed Union of American Hebrew Congregations, later the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society for the Care of Immigrants; they established a temporary shelter; and in other ways devised measures and facilities for adjusting the newly arrived immigrants.53

The extent of the work of the United Hebrew Charities, which is an indication of the magnitude of the problem faced also in other cities during the years that followed, may be gained from a few figures. In 1882, 300 people received transportation to other cities; in 1883, 1,040 people; in 1892, 4,030 people received transportation with an approximate annual expenditure of $25,000 for railroad fees. In 1882 the total expenditures of the Society were $55,000; in 1883, $90,000. But the work and expenditures continued to mount; more than 600 requests for assistance were received in a single day and more than 8,000 unemployed persons were helped by this organization in 1896. It organized industrial schools for boys and girls; it was largely instrumental in organizing a home for chronic invalids; it was the first to establish a visiting nurses service; it started an experiment for colonizing Jewish immigrants; it established a legal aid society; it organized the Central Russian Refugee Committee in 1890. It became, in a word, the prime mover of various communal activities to assist the residents as well as the newly arrived immigrants.54

These activities continued during the twentieth century so that in 1929, before the depression set in, this society spent more than half a million dollars in the care of dependent and maladjusted families. In 1932, it spent approximately a million and a quarter dollars, a substantial share of which came from the general community.

Professionally this organization and other similar organizations throughout the country developed just as significantly. From a relief society, with the poor coming to the office, standing in line for a mere pittance, it has developed into an organization where families are maintained on a
respectable level, are helped to self-support through vocational retraining, through establishment in business, through education and training of their children, and in various other ways. This Society and the other Jewish family societies have developed standard family budgets and provide their families with a monthly or weekly allowance, carefully calculated to meet their requirements. The attitude of these agencies, their approach and spirit, have developed beyond recognition. They strive as hard as they can to maintain the self-respect of the poor, now known as their "clients." Carefully trained staffs of visitors, usually college and university graduates, and in some cases graduates of professional schools of social work, supervise these families and aim to develop in them constructive forces. Since 1920, when the Jewish Aid Society of Chicago changed its name to the Jewish Social Service Bureau of Chicago, most of the larger Jewish agencies in the country, including the United Hebrew Charities of New York City, have similarly changed their names. Instead of Jewish charities and Jewish relief societies, one now finds Jewish social service bureaus or associations in every city with any substantial Jewish population. The change is not merely one of name; it is a change in outlook, point of view, method, and philosophy. Instead of "relief work" we now have "case work," the latter being placed more and more on the basis of fundamental scientific knowledge provided in the social and psychological sciences.

One of the major problems facing these agencies as well as the non-Jewish agencies functioning in this field, is how to utilize, in the case work process, the existing knowledge in the social sciences, and how to develop the necessary knowledge not yet available. It is generally recognized by social scientists that those working with human beings must be equipped not only with the general social sciences but also with an adequate knowledge of the cultural background of the people whom they desire to guide and influence. This is especially true with respect to the Jewish group. What is needed, therefore, is the development of a sociology and social psychology of the Jewish group. Unfortunately, this type of knowledge is not yet in existence.

There is a popular misconception regarding the functions and activities of family agencies. It is commonly believed
that they are mainly relief societies whose primary purpose is to provide financial assistance to those who are in need of such aid. Actually, financial relief is only a small although perhaps the most costly aspect of their work. Only between 4% and 40% of the situations dealt with by these agencies require or receive monetary aid. And even these present other problems which require expert treatment because, not infrequently, these problems are the real cause of the financial need. No situation or difficulty is outside their scope.

This was true at least until recently, when some of these agencies changed their policies with respect to the type of situations they would undertake to treat. But it is still true that most of the family agencies will accept almost all problems that human "flesh is heir to." Whether it is conflict between husband and wife, parents and children, children and their schools and other environmental agencies, industrial maladjustment, physical and mental illness, or just plain unanalyzed poverty, the family agency and the family case worker will most likely undertake to render service. In the larger communities there are special agencies for treating some of the more difficult problems requiring special skill or special equipment or both. But the family agency is frequently the hopper which first receives all the problems and difficulties which are then distributed by it to those agencies which are organized to deal with them.\footnote{59}

Some of these developments were in line with those that took place in the non-Jewish agencies. The contribution of the Jewish agencies, however, lies not so much in a different type of work although that is the case especially in the forms of self-support already mentioned, as in the quality, intensity and standards of work. Jewish agencies in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore, and in other cities maintain their families on a very much higher per capita allowance than do the non-Jewish agencies. Before the depression, they were much more discriminating in accepting public relief for their clients than the non-Jewish agencies because of the comparatively low standards of work in the public agencies. They also give greater recognition, implicitly and explicitly, to the differences due to culture, psychological makeup, and inherent potentialities of their
clients. In these ways they have made an important contribution to the development of general social work. While the quality of work is uneven among the different societies in the various cities, the better known Jewish societies are among the leaders in their respective cities.

Many of the agencies changed some of their policies and practices during the depression, and are, as a result, much more like the non-Jewish agencies than they were before the depression. This is borne out by figures recently published by the Russell Sage Foundation of New York City, based on information collected by the Foundation from 56 non-Jewish and Jewish family societies throughout the country over a period of more than 11 years. They indicate that such differences as existed between Jewish and non-Jewish family agencies before the depression, with respect to conditions and standards of work including family allowances and the basis for granting assistance, are rapidly disappearing. The effect of these changes will be discussed in a later connection (see pp. 127-135).

The depression, which began in 1929, and which has continued for seven years, placed an exceedingly heavy burden upon the Jewish family societies, of which there are approximately 100. In 1930, 39 of the largest Jewish family agencies in the country cared for approximately 25,000 Jewish families. In 1931 they took care of about 29,000. In 1932 and 1933 they cared for about 31,000 families. However, in 1934, because of the development of the state and federal relief programs, the load upon Jewish family societies was reduced to about 23,000. This reduction has continued until the current year, when because of a change of policy on the part of the Federal Government, Jewish societies are again called upon to care for larger numbers. But the problem has as yet nowhere reached the proportions of 1932 or 1933.

The expenditures during this period kept pace with the load. Thus in 1929, the 34 largest Jewish family agencies which supplied information spent approximately two million dollars. In 1930 they spent about $2,130,000; in 1931 about $2,900,000; in 1932 and 1933, about four million dol-
lars for each year; in 1934 about $2,390,000; and in 1935, $1,716,000. All of the Jewish family service agencies of which there is record, spent about $4,200,000 in 1935 (See p. 80).

In 1929 and 1930, the same agencies reported a clientele of between 4000 and 4500 families per month requiring financial assistance. In 1931 they aided about 6350 families per month; in 1932 about 9450 families; in 1933, 10,500; in 1934, 6300 families; and in 1935 about 4950. It required about 400 professional social workers to handle this load.60

Family Service agencies also care for various types of behavior problems, more especially among boys and girls. These problems are usually treated by the best trained workers. In New York City there is a special organization, the Jewish Board of Guardians, which has a large and especially trained staff for caring for these problems. It also maintains two institutions, one for problem boys and one for problem girls, near New York City. These are the only institutions of their kind maintained by Jews.61

In this connection it should be mentioned that there is no reliable information regarding Jewish juvenile and adult delinquency in the United States. Such limited studies as have been made indicate that Jews have less than their numerical proportion of criminals. It is also known that there are important differences in the number and kinds of crimes. Thus, Jews commit very few crimes against the person. Jews also have less than their proportion of juvenile delinquency. There are more delinquents among boys than among girls, and the sentences for girls are much more severe than for boys. But this is due to the greater protectiveness of parents of their daughters. It is only the girl that is absolutely unmanageable who finds her way into court.62

What the future of this type of Jewish social work is, nobody knows. It will depend entirely upon the programs of the Federal and State Governments with respect to relief and social security. These programs are at the present time being reconsidered and no one knows what the outcome will be.
B. Health Care

The care of the Jewish sick is in many respects dependent upon the developments in general health care. Methods for treating various types of diseases must be developed in the general field, especially since, with the exception of amaurotic family idiocy and Burger's disease, to which Jews are peculiarly predisposed, and diabetes, which has a greater incidence among Jews than among non-Jews, there seems to be no special Jewish health problem requiring special treatment. Even tuberculosis, which is commonly assumed to be a serious problem among Jews, has in reality a much lower incidence among Jews than in the rest of the white population. However, a number of Jewish hospitals have come to rank among the foremost in the country, and are doing a great deal, not only for the Jewish sick, but for the non-Jewish as well. Although many questions have been raised as to the need or desirability of separate Jewish hospitals, especially since they care for substantial numbers of non-Jewish sick and Jews frequently use non-Jewish hospitals, there is a large body of opinion that Jewish hospitals are essential for the Jewish patient as well as for the Jewish physician. It is fairly well agreed that the Jewish patient is nowhere as comfortable as in a Jewish hospital, whether it be "kosher" or not, and hence is best placed there. Similarly, Jewish physicians and Jewish graduates of medical schools need Jewish hospitals because they find it almost impossible to get internships and appointments in non-Jewish hospitals. Without hospital facilities the physician is not only helpless in the treatment of disease, but is bound to deteriorate as a practitioner. Inefficient and unethical practices on the part of Jewish physicians react unfavorably not only upon the Jewish patient, but upon the Jewish community as well. It is for these and other reasons that Jewish communities throughout the country have established Jewish hospitals, occasionally jeopardizing the rest of their social service program, because of the heavy drain which hospitals usually are on the community exchequer.

Jewish health care in the United States has in general kept pace with the growth of the Jewish population. The
largest Jewish hospital in the United States is admittedly
the Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York City, which was dedi-
cated as "The Jews' Hospital" in 1855 and, except for a
Jewish hospital in Cincinnati, Ohio, organized in 1850, was
the first large Jewish hospital in this country. The progress
which Jewish health care has made since the organization
of these two hospitals can best be appreciated by a consider-
atation of what the Mt. Sinai Hospital, now one of the largest
in the country, was in 1855. Although even at that time it
was far removed from the old Hekdesh, the traditional
ghetto hospital, it was almost as far removed from what the
Mt. Sinai Hospital is today. It had a 150 bed capacity,
cost $30,000 to construct, and admitted 271 patients during
the first five months. But it had only about 15 to 25 patients
at any one time. Its report for 1857 states that its patients
consisted of 110 Germans, 64 Polish, 5 native, and 1 Rus-

sian Jew. Out of the 285 patients handled during that
year, 200 were free. Twenty-eight patients were the largest
number at any one time during that year. There was only
one resident physician and one salaried surgeon. The
salaries of nine paid officials amounted to $1,684, and the
total annual expenditure was only $9,700. The hospital
owned a burial ground which was probably a convenience
and economy! It interested itself in the care of the patients
after they left the institution, thereby anticipating present
day medical social service.

The expenditure of $9,700 in 1857 should be compared
with an expenditure of almost $1,700,000 in 1935, to obtain
a proper view of the amazing growth which this hospital
has had. The other aspects of its work have had the same
kind of development. Thus, for instance, the 285 patients
treated in this hospital in that year should be compared
with 13,858 patients treated in 1935.

We get something of an idea of the enormous develop-
ment that has taken place in about eighty years when we
realize that today Greater New York alone has 18 hospitals
and sanitariums for the care of the Jewish sick, with a capacity
of almost 4,000 beds, spending annually about $9,000,000,
and that there are close to 70 Jewish hospitals in the United
States with a total bed capacity of about 9,000, with an
annual expenditure of approximately $19,000,000; that
Jewish hospitals throughout the country give a total of more than 2,750,000 days care to the Jewish and non-Jewish sick; also, that there are approximately 4,300 professional persons engaged in these different institutions.65

Some of the Jewish hospitals are among the foremost in the country. Hospitals like Mt. Sinai in New York City, Michael Reese in Chicago, Mt. Sinai in Cleveland, Beth Israel in Boston, Jewish Hospital in St. Louis, Cedars of Lebanon in Los Angeles, etc., would be listed among the leading medical institutions in the country. These and the other Jewish hospitals cater not only to the Jewish sick but to the non-Jewish as well. They are centers of research and training for physicians and nurses so that they make their contribution not only to the Jewish but to the general community as well. There are in addition, between 40 and 50 Jewish clinics and out-patient departments mostly associated with the hospitals. These institutions received 2,295,793 visits from Jewish and non-Jewish patients during 1935.

The problem of mental disease presents a somewhat different picture. Although it is now well established that Jews have less than their numerically proportionate share of psychoses, the problem of neuroses is fairly serious. Nevertheless, there is not a single hospital, under Jewish auspices, for the care of the mentally ill. They are usually sent to general hospitals for the insane which are maintained by the different states and their subdivisions. Another problem which has received scant attention in comparison with its importance, is that of chronic disease. There is only one large private Jewish hospital for chronic diseases in New York City, and none in the rest of the country. Indeed, there are no hospitals for chronic disease in the general community except those maintained by the City, County, or State. These latter are usually run on a rather low level and are little more than poor-farms which receive the broken-down dregs of society. The patient suffering from an incurable ailment may well abandon hope, not only of being cured, but of ending his days in a reasonably decent and satisfactory environment, once he is admitted to such an institution.

The problem is of increasing importance because with the lengthening of the span of life and the intensification of
the stresses and strains of modern civilization, more and more people break down only to find that the society which they served and which has developed such excellent facilities for caring for the acutely ill, has made little or no provision for them.

The reasons for this are many and varied. Among the most important are the following: (1) The average stay of patients suffering from acute diseases is about two weeks. The chronically ill require much more extensive care and therefore would reduce the hospitals' turnover were they to be treated in the general hospitals. (2) Chronic diseases are less interesting and less satisfying to the physicians who donate their time and skill to the hospitals. They prefer to treat those diseases and patients that offer the greatest promise for quick cures. They would lose some of their incentive if the general hospitals were to house many chronic patients. (3) Hospital costs and medical fees come very high. The average patient cannot afford a long drawn out illness. Neither the hospital nor the physician can expect the patient to continue to pay for services and treatment over the long periods required by chronic diseases. Since both depend upon fees for their income they necessarily seek to shift the burden to the community. It is because of these and other factors that the private hospital is said to be eager to discharge or transfer patients suffering from chronic diseases to the City hospitals.

The Jewish group faces a special problem in this respect because, as we have seen (p. 51), they are believed to constitute an older group due to the fact that there is so large a proportion of immigrants among them. Moreover, their problems of adjustment as immigrants, their struggle for existence and their stresses and strains because of social and economic discrimination, are probably much more severe than among the rest of the population. It may be expected, therefore, that they will have comparatively large numbers of people who will give way under their burdens. Whether this is so in reality, no one knows. Information regarding Jewish morbidity and mortality is practically non-existant. It is known that the one Jewish hospital for
chronic disease has a waiting list of several hundred who are eager to get in, and that many patients find their way to the public institutions to end their days in them.

The Montefiore Hospital for Chronic Diseases in New York City was organized in 1884 in honor of the hundredth birthday of the British Jewish philanthropist, Moses Montefiore. It was first conceived of as a "Home for Chronic Invalids." If not for the vision and courage of some of its founders and guiding spirits, it no doubt would have remained little more than a glorified infirmary such as may be found attached to most of the larger homes for the aged. It is due to them and their generosity that this hospital is spoken of by the Commissioner of Hospitals of New York City, perhaps the foremost hospital authority in the world, as "a pioneer in the scientific treatment of chronic disease, a leader whose sustained interest commands respect, an institution whose methods are an inspiration and a challenge to all who are charged with the care of the chronic sick."

This hospital has close to 1000 beds of which only about 60 are semi-private with a very nominal charge. The free beds are almost always occupied. With an annual expenditure of more than $1,250,000, only a very small fraction comes from patients; about 40% of its budget comes from the City government and an additional 25% is contributed by the Jewish Federation. Its buildings and grounds represent an investment of over $6,000,000; it has a medical staff of more than 200 physicians some of whom are among the leaders in their respective specialites; it is affiliated with Columbia University for teaching purposes, and carries on an extensive program of research in practically all types of chronic disease. In 1936 it provided about 330,000 hospital days to patients in its city institution and Country Sanatorium for the tuberculous.

One of the most significant aspects of its work is the manner in which it has been able to overcome the natural handicaps facing an institution for chronic disease. Its major problems in this respect, were the attitudes of the physicians, the patients, and the interest of the community. All of these have been greatly aided by the emphasis on research and the high quality of its work. From a custodial
institution it has been converted into a first class hospital for the scientific care of the type of patients who, but a short time ago, were abandoned to their fate. While this hospital has been fortunate in its leaders and sponsors who have made this type of work possible, it may not be too much to hope that other groups, institutions, and communities will follow its lead. There can be little doubt of the need for this type of work.

C. Child Care

The care of Jewish orphans and dependent children in the United States presents a similar picture. From the date when the first Jewish orphans' home in the United States was organized in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1801, this type of Jewish social work experienced great growth and progress. In New York City the first orphan home was opened in 1860, in a rented house which accommodated thirty children. Eight years later, the facilities were enlarged to accommodate 150 children. Today New York City alone has five organizations devoted to the care of dependent children with a total population of 5000 children. There are about 100 organizations throughout the country for the care of dependent children either in institutions or foster homes. They spent, in 1935, almost five and one-half million dollars. Approximately 10,000 Jewish children, of whom only a comparatively small number are full or half orphans, are maintained in these different institutions.

But it is not only in physical facilities for dependent children that enormous progress has been made in the last century. The old conception of child care, from the standpoints of the kind of care to be given, the discipline, the educational facilities, the selection of children, after-care, medical, psychiatric and vocational treatment, etc., has undergone profound changes. Communities now recognize that they have a unique responsibility for the care of the children entrusted to them. Many feel that children so unfortunate as to have been deprived of their parents or to be forced to face life with physical, mental or emotional handicaps, should be given the very best care and attention.
and such training as will best enable them to compete successfully for a livelihood. The better institutions send their more promising children to colleges and professional schools. Systems of after-care have been organized and every effort is made to help the children overcome their handicaps and to take their places as normal men and women in the communities into which they are discharged.  

Two significant developments in child care, departures from the traditional orphans' homes, must be mentioned. One is the cottage plan and the other is the foster home plan. In the first the attempt is made to recreate a family atmosphere for the children through small cottages housing about twenty children of various ages and both sexes, presided over by a "cottage mother" who aims to establish and maintain a spirit and attitude as nearly approximating the normal home as humanly possible. The earliest Jewish cottage home was that of the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society in Pleasantville, New York. More modern developments of this same plan are the Jewish child care institutions in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Cleveland.

A similarly important development is the foster home type of care for dependent children based on the principle that the child develops best in a small family unit. This principle was enunciated at the famous White House Conference of persons interested in child welfare, called by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909, to consider the best means of caring for dependent and handicapped children. Since that time the tendency has been to place more and more children in small families with foster parents. Theoretically at least the attempt is made to incorporate these children into the family unit and the foster children are supposed to take their places in the homes as do the sons and daughters of the families in which they are placed. The preferences as between institutional and foster care may be gleaned from the fact that whereas the percentage of children in institutions has decreased from 55% in 1929 to 38.7% in 1935, the percentage in foster homes increased from 43.3% in 1929 to 55.4% in 1935. These figures are based on reports of 28 child care agencies.
The controversy as to whether institutional or foster-care is best suited for dependent children has been bitter and acrimonious at times. Each type of care had and still has its strong adherents and opponents. Institutions have been charged with neglecting the emotional side of the child's development; as providing an unnatural environment for children; with inability to care for or to reckon with the individual nature and needs of the child; as poorly equipped to prepare the child for his return to his home or the community; as very expensive because of capital expenditures; etc.

Foster-home care has been criticised as providing poor homes; that foster-parents are interested in the compensation rather than in the children; as requiring frequent transfers and replacements thus imposing an emotional and nervous strain on the children; as unable to provide for joint placements of several children of the same family; as providing little or no opportunity for Jewish education; etc.

Child care workers, agencies, and communities have been striving to develop principles of allocation which would serve as guides for placing children in the type of care best adapted to their needs. Such principles are gradually emerging out of the accumulated experience of the various child care agencies. Some communities established “Clearing Bureaus” for the distribution of children. These bureaus are usually controlled by Boards of Directors composed of representatives of both types of child care to insure adequate consideration of the different interests involved. While these efforts have not always been entirely successful, the conflict and strife are gradually subsiding. Both sides are beginning to realize and admit that each kind of care has a contribution to make and is best adapted to certain types of children.

In a number of communities, Jewish and non-Jewish child-care agencies receive a subsidy from the government for each dependent child. These subsidies amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. In addition to these subsidies dependent children are aided by the State to remain in their own homes by granting a weekly stipend where the father has been removed by death or other
causes, through the system of Mothers' Pensions. Not infrequently children are enabled to remain with their relatives, in cases of loss of both parents, through the system of subsidies. In some instances family care societies and child care agencies keep a motherless home intact by placing housekeepers or caretakers in the home. 70

Neither the cottage plan nor the foster home plan is Jewish in origin. But Jewish Agencies have emphasized the notion that the community owes its dependent children the best care possible in order to prepare them to take their place in society. As a result, Jewish child care agencies have developed unusually high standards of work, and in this way have profoundly influenced the general child care field.

Jewish child care did not experience the large fluctuations in the last few years which characterized the work of the family societies. On the whole the years of depression made only a comparatively slight difference in the work of these institutions.

D. Care of the Aged

The care of the Jewish aged is a substantial although not a large problem. There are about 60 old people's homes which care for approximately 6,000 persons. 71 These institutions are maintained from the funds collected by the federations in the different cities. They spend approximately $2,300,000 annually. It is not yet known what the adoption of Old Age Pension provisions in many of the states of the Union will do to this activity. But it is certain that the extent of the problem will not increase.

VII. ADULT EDUCATION AND RECREATION; YOUTH MOVEMENTS

The recreational problems are dealt with in several ways. There are, first, the activities of the men's and women's clubs connected with synagogues and temples. Then there are various cultural organizations each of which has some type of recreational activity related to Jewish education, broadly conceived. There are, in addition, agencies directly
concerned with activities for adult education, such as the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations, Educational Alliances, Jewish People's Institutes, Community Centers, etc. There are also Young People's Leagues, devoting at least part of their energies to post-school education. Of all of these activities space will permit only the consideration of the more formal type of organization and its activities, namely, that commonly referred to as the Jewish Center.

The first organization of this type came into existence in 1874 in New York City as the Young Men's Hebrew Association, which is still in existence. Though ostensibly modeled after the Young Men's Christian Association and very largely influenced by the desire on the part of Jewish leaders to keep the Jewish youth from non-Jewish influences by creating similar recreational and educational facilities for them under Jewish auspices, the Jewish Center of today differs in some fundamental respects from its prototypes in the non-Jewish community, the nearest of which are the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations and the social settlements. It differs from the first two in the comprehensiveness of its program, in the non-theological approach to its work, in its efforts to meet the needs of all the members in the community, and in its development of a cultural program. It differs from the settlement in its more democratic form of organization, in the intensive and comprehensive Jewish cultural activities and programs, and in its aim at making its activities self-supporting although few "Centers" have thus far achieved this aim.

Some of the agencies are "community centers" in the broad sense of the term, catering to the needs of young and old, boys and girls, men and women; others limit their activities to only one or more of these groups, such as the Y. M. H. A.'s or the Y. W. H. A.'s, or to a restricted group such as is served by some of the Centers attached to synagogues and temples. But these are in the minority. The majority of these organizations aim to serve all sections of the Jewish population. Some of them have programs of religious, cultural, educational, artistic, vocational, physical education, and general recreational activities. The major problem facing these agencies is the development of programs
of recreation and education for character building and self-
development on as constructive a basis as possible, which
will at the same time be in line with the desires and wishes
of their members and clientele who are not always the best
judges of what the most valuable programs would be.72

The greatest development of Jewish centers in point of
numbers took place in the first two decades of the present
century. The World War gave a tremendous impetus to
these "Centers" by making communities conscious of the
need for recreational facilities for their youth. In 1921, the
Jewish Welfare Board, organized during the war to serve
the Jewish soldiers in the camps in this country and abroad,
became the national organization for Jewish Community
Centers.

It took over the work previously done by the Council of
Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations, and con-
tinued to carry on the activities which it had conducted
during the World War. It has become the central agency for
the development of Jewish Community Centers, Young
Men's Hebrew Associations, and similar organizations. It
has a membership of more than 300 such organizations,
which spend approximately $4,000,000 annually, (see p. 80).
and represent an individual membership of about 300,000.

The Jewish Welfare Board developed standards of pro-
cedure, principles and policies of operation. It has con-
ducted, for its local agencies, campaigns for buildings, for
membership and for maintenance. It publishes The Jewish
Center, a quarterly, various types of program material,
and cooperates with the National Association of Jewish
Center Executives. It has continued its interest in the
Jewish men in the United States Army and Navy, and also
conducts welfare activities for disabled veterans and their
families, and for young men in the Civilian Conservation
Corps, a recently organized activity by the Federal Govern-
ment for taking care of the unemployed youth. It has
stimulated and supervised the construction of buildings
throughout the country. Through publications, field service,
and conferences of regional and national scope, it has united
these centers into a strong group of organizations serving
hundreds of thousands of Jewish youth. It has been esti-
mated that between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 have been
spent by Jewish communities throughout the country in the last two or three decades on buildings to serve the needs of Jewish youth. The Jewish Welfare Board is maintained from the income of an endowment fund created during the War, appropriations from Federations and Welfare funds, (to be discussed later), and donations from private individuals. The “Jewish Centers” are maintained from membership dues, fees, donations of interested individuals, and in some instances by the federations in their local communities.\(^{73}\)

A number of other organizations are important in this connection. Among these is the B’nai B’rith, which, in its “Wider Scope Activities,” carries on a program of education among large numbers of Jews, including college students. These are served by student centers called “Hillel Foundations,” with branches on the campuses of about fifteen universities.\(^{74}\)

Young Judea, organized in 1909, as a nationalist youth organization, has as its purpose to perpetuate the ideals of Judaism in their relationship to American Jewish life. It aims to unite the Jewish youth and to interest them in the “history of the Jewish people, in a proper understanding of the role of Palestine in Jewish life and in active participation in its upbuilding as the Jewish National Homeland.” It has about 750 clubs for boys and girls throughout the country with a membership of approximately 20,000. The National Organization prepares educational material, suggests programs for the clubs and assists them in the selection of leaders. It is maintained from individual donations.\(^{75}\)

The Jewish Chautauqua Society was organized in 1893. Its activities include publication of textbooks for parents and teachers, arranging conferences for religious school teachers in order to develop an interest in Jewish education. It carries on an educational program by sending rabbis to summer sessions of the different universities throughout the United States to lecture on Jewish history, literature, and culture, before Jewish students and teachers in attendance during the summer. This organization is maintained by individual contributions.\(^{76}\)

There is no such thing as a Jewish youth movement in the United States, if by that is meant a coordinated, well-planned and directed activity. There are rather a variety
of organizations each aiming to attract the Jewish youth to its particular program. The Young Judea, discussed above, is one of these. There are about 20 other similar national organizations.

In 1934, when a study of these organizations was undertaken, it was estimated that their combined membership was between fifty thousand and seventy-five thousand. Of these 21 organizations, 13 place their emphasis on Zionist activities. One organization looks upon Palestine as the means for achieving a program of social justice and universal brotherhood. Five organizations use Palestine as a means of adjusting Jewish youth in America to the American environment. Although in general their program is similar to the 13 organizations mentioned above which have a frankly Zionist program, they emphasize the American rather than the Palestine scene. Two organizations aim at the advancement of Judaism.


Curiously, these organizations have not been much concerned with the problem of vocational guidance for American Jewish youth. They have rather been directing their activities at developing in the youth a Jewish consciousness and interesting them in Jewish activities. Each of these organizations is more or less independent of the others, has its own program, secures funds wherever it can, and is responsible only to its leaders for what it accomplishes.

VIII. CENTRAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR LOCAL AND NATIONAL NEEDS

A. Central Organizations for Local Purposes

The manifold activities of the Jewish communities already discussed, brought a realization to the leaders of these communities that better organization and coordination are necessary for the most effective work. Toward the close of the nineteenth century the Jewish Federation came into
existence, first in Boston in 1895, and in Cincinnati in the following year. At first, these federations and the others which followed, aimed primarily at a more effective collection of funds. Later, especially since the War, and more especially during the third decade of the present century, federations became communal agencies whose function it is not only to provide financial support for their constituent societies but to plan for the community needs along constructive lines. Today, with a few exceptions, the federations aim to support, coordinate, and control the needed social service agencies and activities in their respective communities. Some federations are beginning to shoulder also the burden of raising funds in the local communities for the support of nationwide as well as overseas Jewish activities. Whether directly or through welfare funds, (to be discussed later) national and overseas projects are included in annual drives for funds held in different communities.

There are approximately 70 federations of Jewish charities in the United States today. Practically every community of any significant size has a federation. They spend about $10,000,000 annually. In many cities they are the one central organization which represents all shades of opinion in the Jewish community. While they are not yet and may never be the communal organization that one finds in some communities in Europe, they usually have the support and good-will of the entire Jewish population.

It should not be inferred from the above that federations are not subject to severe criticism or that all Jews support the federations in their respective communities. On the contrary, there is a great deal of criticism of the philosophy and procedure of federations as we shall see later (see p. 136). Nor can it be said that federation support is widespread among the Jewish populations in the various federation cities. Many federation leaders are dissatisfied with the extent of community support from the standpoints of numbers contributing and the amount of their contributions. Attempts are being made to "widen the base of contributors."

Table 11 compares the Jewish populations in 28 cities, the number of contributors to federations and welfare funds, and the ratio of contributors to the Jewish popula-
tion. Since these cities have almost 60% of the Jewish population in the United States and raise almost 75% of the total amount raised by federations and welfare funds in the United States, they may be taken as fairly representative, especially since they represent also the different types of communities with respect to size and community chest affiliation.

### TABLE 11

**Comparison of Contributors to Federations and Welfare Funds in 28 Cities with Their Respective Jewish Populations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of City and Type</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish Population</th>
<th>No. Subscribers to Federation and Welfare Funds—1935</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Amount Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Large Federations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>6,735</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>$437,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>10,807</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>505,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,328,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (Man.-Bronx)</td>
<td>885,000</td>
<td>76,302</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4,047,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (Brooklyn)</td>
<td>797,000</td>
<td>10,714</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>449,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,185,000</td>
<td>113,188</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$6,768,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Small and Intermediate Federations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>36,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>8,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>75.</td>
<td>15,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>27,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,950</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>$89,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Welfare Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>21,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardmore</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>9,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>121,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>6,987</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>140,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>27,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>71,268</td>
<td>8,063</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>444,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>47,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>76.</td>
<td>19,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>33,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>19,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>131,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>4,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>182,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheboygan</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>11,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,563,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>150,988</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,080,055</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table is based, in part, on figures kindly supplied by Messrs. M. Freund and George Wolfe of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds.*
It will be observed from Table 11, that only about 6% of the total Jewish population may be said to contribute to federations and welfare funds. However, this figure is rather misleading, since it is usually the head of the family who makes the contribution which includes the entire family. Accordingly, the total Jewish population should be divided by approximately four (because wealthier families are usually smaller), in order to obtain the number of families represented. The resultant figure is much more encouraging. It indicates that out of about 640,000 families in these cities, 151,000, or about 25%, are represented among the contributors to federations and welfare funds. Bearing in mind that according to a study by the Brookings Institution in Washington, America's Capacity to Consume, for 1929, the most prosperous year in recent history, only about 35% of the urban families in the United States have an annual income of $3,000 and over, which might be assumed to be the minimum for voluntary charitable contribution, the number of Jewish contributors seems much more adequate. This is true unless one assumes that the Jewish population is differently situated with respect to income than is the general population. While there may be some ground for this belief because of the differences in occupational distribution, there are no data available to justify such an assumption in the present discussion.

A considerably different and in some ways more disturbing picture of the situation is obtained when the contributions are analyzed. Studies which have been made indicate that 85% of the funds come from about 14% of the contributors. What is worse, approximately 54% of the contributions come from about 1 1/4% of the contributors. A recent review of the situation by the Joint Distribution Committee, summarizing its 1936 campaign experience in 47 communities, in which 81,473 contributors gave almost $4,000,000, shows that 1 1/2% of the contributors gave 57% of the funds; 7% gave 23% of the funds; and 91 1/2% of the contributors gave only 20% of the funds.

The large contributors naturally exercise the greatest influence in the federation. Consequently, questions have been raised about the representativeness and democratic nature of federations. These items will be considered later.
in a critical examination of the Jewish social work situation in the United States. Here, it may be said that the federations and their constituent societies, those which are doing the day by day work in caring for the poor, the sick, the orphans, the widows, the aged, have brought a great deal of credit upon the Jews in this country.

Through the Jewish Federation, Jewish communities have made a contribution of incalculable importance and significance to the general community. The community chests, which serve the general community in the same way as the federations serve the Jewish community, and which are the pride of most of the cities throughout the country, are a direct outcome of the Jewish federations and were profoundly influenced by them. In many instances, the leaders of the general community chests were recruited from among those who were trained in leadership in communal affairs in the Jewish federations. In a number of cities, community chests would have fared badly if the leadership supplied by the Jewish communities had not been available. This is true, not only with respect to personnel but also with respect to the standard of giving. It is well known that Jews give more liberally, proportionately, to their federations as well as to the community chests than do non-Jews. Even today the community chests, in a number of cities, lag behind the Jewish federations in their plan of organization, the adequacy of their allowances to their constituent societies, in the coordination of the work of the societies, and in the responsibility which they feel for the development of organizations to meet new needs in the community.

Having stimulated the creation of the community chest movement, the federations were in turn greatly influenced by it. At first, community chests developed rapidly and made larger funds available to their constituent organizations. Toward the end of the third decade, however, there was a good deal of talk about the "saturation point in giving" having been reached, so that the community chests were much less successful in raising their quotas than formerly. Jewish organizations suffered in common with non-Jewish organizations and they were faced with the dilemma: to remain in the chest and suffer from inadequate financial support, falling behind in the progressive march
which characterized some of the non-chest federations; or to withdraw from the community chest, be charged with separatism, disloyalty, etc., but have the opportunity of developing their work as did the other cities. They chose to remain in the chests and sought other ways of meeting their special needs.

There are a number of problems which Jewish federations in community chests must face sooner or later. Some of these have already presented themselves in one way or another in the different communities. It is to be regretted that no one has thus far studied these problems in all their ramifications and implications. No one can say, therefore, that community chest affiliation is good or bad for the Jewish communities; that they should be continued, modified, or abandoned. No authoritative statement along these lines will be possible until the relationships will be thoroughly studied and conclusions drawn from an objective examination of the experiences to date. Partisan statements and arguments, for or against, have but little value other than to indicate the areas and type of questions to be studied.

Among the more important questions which should be considered in this connection the following may be listed:

1. What is the effect of community chest affiliation on anti-Semitism, either existing or potential? It is sometimes argued that such affiliation tends to refute the charge of Jewish separatism and clanishness, makes for better understanding between Jews and non-Jews, provides for more intimate contacts, gives each group insight into the other's problems, etc. On the other hand, it has been suggested that the differences in standards and requirements of Jewish agencies and individuals, which are not infrequently higher than the non-Jewish, are likely to cause friction, irritation, and possibly ill feeling. This because the funds coming from the same source should presumably be distributed on the same basis and in accordance with the same standards.

Some communities have already faced this problem and it was not easy to explain to those in charge of the distribution of community chest funds, why Jewish families
should have more liberal allowances than the non-Jewish families when the funds are derived from the entire community. The dangers of misunderstanding in such a procedure are obvious. It has been suggested, also, that one way of solving this problem would be for the Jewish community to raise supplementary funds for this purpose. But this, too, is open to misinterpretation. Some community chest leaders may assume that all available funds for local relief purposes should be given to the chest and that any funds collected by the Jewish community for supplementary purposes would have gone to the chest if there were no need for additional funds for local Jewish needs.

2. Another problem along the same lines arises from the possibility of the Jewish community receiving more from the chest than Jewish contributors give to it. In a sense this is a contradiction of the fundamental philosophy and principles of the community chest. For affiliation with the chest on the part of the Jewish or any other group should not be on a quid pro quo basis. Ideally every member of the community should give as much as he can afford. Others should receive as much as they need or the chest can afford. No one is supposed to know how much a given group gives or receives from the chest. In reality, however, the situation is quite different. Since the Jewish group has membership in the receiving-end of the chest through its social agencies or through the Jewish federation, it is not difficult to determine how much these agencies receive from it. And, although it is more difficult to determine how much is contributed by Jews, this is not impossible of accomplishment. Some people have had the feeling that subversive of the best principles of the community chest as such figures and comparisons are, they have been resorted to.

Jewish community leaders, especially those who are also leaders in the chest, are frequently uneasy about the matter. They realize only too well that such calculations are not only unfair but are likely to be injurious to the Jewish position in the community. They are no less dangerous for the community integration which should flow from community chest participation. The unfairness derives
from the fact that in such calculations no allowance is made for the non-Jewish work which Jewish agencies such as hospitals and settlements are doing. All of it is likely to be charged as going to Jews. On the other hand Jews are bound to receive less credit than is their due at the contributions end. First because not all Jewish contributors may be known as Jews; and second because contributions from large corporations where Jews are stockholders are never credited to Jews even though the contributions are ultimately paid for by the stockholders. It will be clear, therefore, that in any such comparisons, Jews would be debited with more than they receive and credited with less than they give. However this does not mean that the comparisons, unfair as they may be, may not be made. The awareness of the possibility is frequently a source of concern to the Jewish leaders with the result that they over-compensate at both ends; bringing pressure upon Jewish contributors for more generous contributions; and using their influence with the Jewish agencies for moderate budgetary requests.

3. A third problem relates to the effect which community chest affiliation has upon Jewish leadership. One of the arguments in favor of community chest affiliation is the opportunity which it gives Jewish leaders for activity in and contributions to broader fields. But these opportunities are not always an unmixed blessing so far as the Jewish community is concerned. They not infrequently result in diffusion of interest, dissipation of energy, and divided loyalty.

4. A similar problem is the influence upon Jewish contributors. As already indicated, Jewish standards of giving and receiving are higher, proportionally, than the non-Jewish. In the beginning it was hoped that Jewish standards will influence the non-Jewish standards. But experience proved otherwise. Whether it is because of the difference in campaign methods, indirectness of claim and appeal, or the lower standard of contributions among non-Jews, it is generally assumed that Jewish contributions to the chest are on a lower level than are their contributions to
distinctly Jewish causes. Nevertheless, their contributions to the chest are almost invariably more generous, in proportion to their wealth, than are the non-Jewish contributions.

5. The effect of community chests on the Jewish agencies can be surmised from the foregoing. But the struggles for higher standards, even though they may be defeated at times, are by no means the greatest disadvantage they face. Much more serious is the feeling, not infrequently expressed, that since the financial support comes from the same source and since the standards are or should be more or less the same, there is little justification for maintaining separate Jewish agencies. Proposals are occasionally made for merging Jewish with non-Jewish agencies in order to save administrative expenses; or to place Jewish workers in non-Jewish agencies to handle Jewish problems. Although such instances are still relatively few they come with greater frequency and greater insistence. Similarly, it is much more difficult to create new organizations for meeting new needs when the funds must be obtained from the chest than from the federation. This is not so much because it is more difficult to get appropriations from the chest than from the federation as it is due to the greater reluctance on the part of the Jewish leaders to seek the funds from the chest.

6. In addition to the foregoing there is some question whether chest support of Jewish agencies does not tend to weaken Jewish interest in and identification with the Jewish agencies and problems.

It has been pretty well established that the process of fund raising for community needs is one of the best means of educating the community to an intelligent appreciation of its needs and problems as well as some of the factors giving rise to them. Where the fund raising is done for the entire community there is less opportunity for emphasizing the specifically Jewish needs and problems. This is bound to result in a lessening of the sense of responsibility on the part of the Jews for Jewish needs. Although this has been offset in some degree by the welfare-fund movement which, as we shall see presently, raises funds for specifically Jewish causes, the problem nevertheless exists. It has become aggravated during the depression years by
governmental assumption of the responsibility for some of the activities formerly carried by private agencies.

Despite these and other limitations of the community chests there can be little doubt that they have been of great benefit to Jewish agencies at least during the depression. They have provided resources and stability which might otherwise not have been available during one of the most difficult periods of American history. It is estimated that in 1935 Jewish agencies in 63 cities, having a total annual expenditure of approximately $7,100,000, received $4,077,000, or about 43% of their funds from community chests. The extent of Jewish affiliation with community chests may be judged from the fact that out of 140 cities having chests, 83, or almost 60%, include the Jewish agencies. Out of 80 cities having Jewish federations and community chests, 52, or 65% of the federations, are in the chests.\(^8\)

In the last decade or so there has developed in the United States a central financial organization, commonly known as the "Welfare Fund," for the purpose of supporting non-local philanthropic services, such as the national and overseas agencies. The creation of the "Welfare Fund" was due in part to the fact that the federations were handicapped in their support of non-local activities because contributors occasionally insisted that their contributions were designed to assist local agencies. A more important factor, however, was the fact that many federations were affiliated with general community chests which are of a strictly local character. It was impossible for these community chests to support Jewish agencies whose activities were cultural or were outside the particular city. A means had to be found for enabling the Jewish community to collect funds for the support of those organizations, whether local or non-local in character, which could not be included in the community chest set-up.

At the present time there are about 30 welfare funds in the country. There are as yet no generally acceptable criteria for judging either the need for or quality of work of a given national or overseas agency or its eligibility to welfare fund support. The tendency, however, is in the direction of creating the necessary standards.
In the last few years the dissatisfaction with the representativeness of federations and welfare funds expressed itself in the demand for a more representative organization. Several communities have been experimenting with a "Community Council," which is made up of representatives from all the organizations interested in communal problems and activities. It is altogether too early to attempt to evaluate this experiment. In Cleveland, Ohio, where a Council was organized about two years ago, those who have been close to the work seem pleased with its achievements thus far, especially since it has been able to make some headway and achieve some success with difficult community problems, as for example, the aggravated problem of Kashrut (Kosher meat). But young as is this experiment, it is not without some critics. There are some who see in it another instrument for controlling community activity by the same people who now control the federations and welfare funds. Others see in such criticism a poorly veiled attempt on the part of the critics to seize control of this activity for their own purposes. To the non-partisan observer it seems to represent an interesting effort at democratizing American Jewish community organization.

B. National Agencies

The national organizations referred to in the preceding paragraphs in connection with welfare funds, constitute a large portion of Jewish communal work in this country. It is difficult to say how many such organizations there are, but it may be safely estimated that between 40 and 50 national organizations, spending about five and one-half million dollars annually, are partly supported by federations and welfare funds. A national organization may be defined roughly as an agency which serves no particular locality but the country as a whole. It may do its work in the United States or overseas, or both at home and abroad.

National agencies, for our present purposes, may be grouped under six headings. There are, first, the medical agencies. These are hospitals located mainly in Denver,
Colorado, and Los Angeles, California, for the care of tuberculous patients either while the disease is active or quiescent. Some of these agencies also care for the families of the patients. There are five such agencies spending approximately one million dollars annually.

A second group of national agencies may be said to consist of agencies doing educational and cultural work. Among these might be mentioned The B’nai B’rith in its “wider scope” activities; The Jewish Chautauqua Society; The National Farm School; The Jewish Publication Society; Young Judaea; The Menorah Association; etc.

A third group of National organizations includes the civic and protective agencies: The American Jewish Committee; The American Jewish Congress; The Anti-Defamation League of the B’nai B’rith; The Jewish Labor Committee; and the Jewish Telegraphic Agency. This agency is included among the organizations functioning for the protection of civic rights because without some such service as that rendered by it the work of the others would be seriously hampered. Its form of organization was changed recently from a private enterprise operated for profit to a communally owned agency with a responsible Board of Directors which determines its policies. This group expends approximately $500,000 per year.

The fourth group consists of a number of agencies concerned with community service and coordination. Among these may be mentioned: The National Conference of Jewish Social Service; The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work; The National Desertion Bureau, which though located in New York serves also other communities; The Jewish Welfare Board, already discussed in connection with adult education (p. 102); The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds; The National Coordinating Committee for Aid to German Refugees; The German Jewish Children’s Aid, Inc.; etc.

A fifth group may be said to consist of such agencies as the Conference on Jewish Relations; Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, primarily concerned with aiding immigrants and their relatives; The National Council of Jewish Women, which is also concerned with immigrants, especially immigrant girls and women. It also does other types of work
including granting assistance to poor students in obtaining an education, either through its own funds or through its auxiliary, the Council of Jewish Juniors, an organization of Jewish young women; etc.

The sixth group consists of agencies for overseas reconstruction and relief. Among these should be mentioned: The Joint Distribution Committee; The ORT; The American Palestine Campaign; The Jewish National Fund; The Hadassah; The American Friends of the Hebrew University; etc.

Space does not permit detailing the work of these agencies. Nevertheless a few should be briefly described in addition to those already discussed.84

Among the most important national agencies from the standpoint of social work is the National Conference of Jewish Social Service (recently changed to "Welfare"). As organized in 1899, it was composed of lay and professional persons. More recently, it has developed its activities along distinctly professional lines. In the last decade and a half, its annual meetings have been devoted to the development of a professionally conscious and technically trained group of men and women devoting themselves to professional problems. This Conference was directly or indirectly responsible for the establishment of several organizations of national scope, most important of which are the National Desertion Bureau, an organization already mentioned, which devotes itself to locating the husbands of deserted wives; and The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work. It has published proceedings of its annual meetings since 1900 and issues a quarterly journal, The Jewish Social Service Quarterly.85

In the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, organized in 1925, a facility was created for training young men and women to engage in Jewish social work as a profession. This School is a national institution, strictly graduate in character requiring the Bachelor's degree for admission, with a faculty consisting of some of the foremost Jewish social workers and scholars in the country. It is authorized by the Regents of the State of New York to give the Master's and Doctor's degrees. The course of study is two years. It has drawn its students from, and distributed them to,
all parts of the country. In the twelve years of its existence it has had an enrollment of about 1000 persons who have taken either part or the full course of study. It has undertaken various types of research on the different aspects of Jewish life in America. It has maintained its work on a level equal to the best general schools of social work. Since 1928 it has been a member of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, comprising more than 30 general schools of social work connected with American universities, and its Director was President of the Association for two years, (1932–1934). In this way it has materially influenced social work education in the United States.

Another important national agency from the standpoint of Jewish social work is the Bureau of Jewish Social Research. This organization, created in 1919, has conducted surveys of Jewish communal activities in most of the communities in the country. In this way it was instrumental in affecting the standards and activities of most of the Jewish social agencies. In 1935 it was merged with the newly-created National Council of Federations and Welfare Funds. This latter organization, (the word “National” in its name was dropped in 1936), aims to coordinate the work of the federations and welfare funds. It continues the field service by the “Bureau,” formerly conducted for the purpose of stimulating a wider participation of lay leadership in Jewish social work. It has annual and regional meetings for the purpose of considering current problems and recent trends and tendencies. Most of the federations and welfare funds are constituents of this organization. It publishes Notes and News, periodically, and, in 1935 and 1936, issued the Jewish Social Work Year Books for 1934 and 1935 respectively.

About three years ago there was organized in New York City, The Conference on Jewish Relations. Its purpose is to inquire into the social, educational, and economic problems of Jewish adjustment in America. This organization is still in the formative stage and it cannot yet be said what its program or future will be. Thus far it has emphasized activities which throw light on problems of economic adjustment and anti-Semitism. It aims to be scientific in its approach by undertaking and encouraging others to undertake studies and publications in the fields of its interests.
Recently, (June 1937), it announced the publication of a scientific quarterly journal, *Jewish Social Studies*, with the first issue scheduled to appear in the Fall of 1937. It has maintained itself and its program through membership dues, contributions from interested individuals, and the devoted services of a few of its leaders. Its membership consists very largely of professional men and women.

The National Coordinating Committee for Aid to German Refugees was organized in 1934, through the efforts of James G. McDonald, High Commissioner for Refugees from Germany, of the League of Nations. The activities of this organization are national and overseas in scope. It acts as a central registry and clearing bureau for all organizations interested in the refugee problem; refers to appropriate agencies cases of immigrants needing assistance; handles special problems for which no other agency is prepared to assume responsibility; organizes local committees for distributing refugees in the interior cities; explores possibilities for employment throughout the United States; deals with special immigration and deportation cases; cooperates with Federal and State labor departments on questions of passports and immigration procedure; subsidizes the transportation and other expenses for repatriation; secures information from abroad for those who have relatives there; etc.

The German-Jewish Children's Aid, Inc., chartered under the laws of the State of New York in 1934, has undertaken the education and placement of 250 German-Jewish children brought to the United States. Two hundred and thirty-six children have already arrived and are being cared for at the present time in private families in 58 cities in 19 states, under the supervision of professionally equipped child welfare agencies.

IX. PARTICIPATION IN JEWISH EFFORTS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

A. For Relief and Reconstruction

Among the national organizations engaged in relief and reconstruction in other countries, the largest and most important is the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, or as it is usually referred to, The Joint Distribution Com-
committee, or J.D.C. This organization was established in 1914, through the efforts of three organizations which were engaged in collecting funds to relieve the suffering Jewish victims of the World War. \(^8^9\) The J.D.C. has operated in more than 40 countries and has disbursed approximately $84,000,000. The largest sums were expended in behalf of the Jews of Poland, Russia, and Palestine. Prior to 1921, the J.D.C. extended emergency aid. Since 1921, the Committee's program has been largely devoted to economic and social rehabilitation. In the Soviet Union the J.D.C. developed a large land settlement program, strengthened and supported Jewish mutual aid societies, loan kassas, medical associations, workshops and courses for trade training. In Palestine it organized the Malaria Research Unit, established the Palestine War Orphans Committee, supported the Loan Bank, Ltd., organized the Central Bank of Cooperative Institutions, contributed to the Hebrew University, and turned over substantial sums to the Palestine Economic Corporation. The J.D.C. established the following permanent organizations for economic aid: the American Joint Reconstruction Foundation, which has promoted Jewish credit loan work throughout Eastern and Central Europe; the Agro-Joint (American Jewish Joint Agricultural Corporation), which has initiated and directed land settlement and industrial training activities in the Soviet Union; and the Palestine Economic Corporation, which has developed commercial, industrial, and agricultural undertakings and a large housing program in Palestine. Since the Hitler regime in Germany, the J.D.C. helped the Jewish leaders of that country organize a Central Committee for Relief and Reconstruction, and has subventioned and collaborated with that organization. The J.D.C. likewise participated in the establishment of the High Commission for German Refugees, and has granted substantial sums to refugee aid organizations. It has also cooperated with the Jewish Colonization Association, with the Central British Fund for German Jewry, with HICEM (an organization directing Jewish immigration), and with the major refugee aid committees all over the world. During the years 1933, '34, '35, the J.D.C. made appropriations for its programs abroad totalling $2,830,000. The J.D.C. receives its income from
various local campaigns, Welfare Funds, and federation drives. Those who are acquainted with the work and achievements of this organization view it, despite such criticisms as may be made of various phases of its work, as the greatest single effort on the part of the Jewish people of one country for the welfare of the Jews of other countries, recorded in Jewish history.  

Closely associated with the Joint Distribution Committee from the standpoint of interested personnel though independent in every other way, are two organizations especially designed to meet the needs of German refugees: The Refugee Economic Corporation and the Emigre Charitable Fund, Inc. These organizations aim to deal with the situation created by the Nazis as a result of the measures they took against religious and political minorities which deprived large numbers of the means of earning a livelihood and forced them to flee, frequently for their very lives. It became clear that relief alone was insufficient, especially since most countries, because of their own unemployed, sought to prevent competition by foreign labor. To meet the needs for new outlets, the Refugee Economic Corporation and the Emigre Charitable Fund, Inc. investigate and finance economic opportunities throughout the world. The Refugee Economic Corporation, (R.E.C.) is a stock company seeking to make its investments so as to safeguard its principal, wherever possible, while creating employment and other opportunities for refugees. The Emigre Charitable Fund, on the other hand, is ready to undertake expenditures without expectation of repayment. The two organizations have provided a number of loan funds in foreign countries with which independent enterprises are financed thus enabling refugees to make a fresh start. Large colonization projects are also being developed and financed by these funds.

Another organization also functioning overseas is the ORT (abbreviation for the Russian name:—Obshtchesvo Remeslenago Truda and the French:—Organisation de Reconstruction du Travail), founded in 1880. At the close of the World War, ORT began its work in Poland, Roumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Russia. The program of the ORT is to promote and support trade and vocational education
among the Jewish masses in Eastern and Central Europe; to maintain and encourage Jewish agricultural activities in the Soviet Union, Poland, Roumania, Latvia and Lithuania; to assist individual artisans in cooperative enterprises and raise the general level of Jewish work and handicraft. Since the Hitler regime it established a vocational school in Paris and an agricultural colony in the South of France, and is training young German men and women in an agricultural colony and in trade schools in Lithuania. The ORT has from time to time conducted its own campaigns for funds. In the main, however, it has secured its funds through special arrangements with J.D.C. It is also a beneficiary of federation and welfare fund drives.\textsuperscript{91}

There are a number of other organizations functioning abroad, such as the Federation of Polish Jews, aiming to aid the Jews in Poland; a similar organization for Roumania; and several organizations that are interested in promoting Jewish settlement in Biro-Bidjan.

B. Activities for Palestine

There are many organizations in the United States whose activities are exclusively directed to collecting funds and conducting educational work for Palestine. Little more can be done here than to enumerate the most important of them and to indicate briefly their nature and extent.

The most important is probably the Zionist Organization of America, which carries on a program of education and propaganda on behalf of Palestine. It has branches in most of the cities in the United States and a number of subsidiary organizations, all engaged in work for Palestine. Another organization, the American Palestine Campaign, created in 1931, now the United Palestine Appeal, is the fund-raising instrument in the United States for the Jewish Agency for Palestine, (\textit{The Keren Hayesod}), the Jewish National Fund, (\textit{Keren Kayemeth}), and the Central Bureau for the Settlement of German Jews in Palestine. The United Palestine Appeal is the successor to a series of fund-raising efforts for Palestine in the United States extending back to 1919.\textsuperscript{92}
A third organization is the Jewish National Fund of America, which collects funds for the purchase of land in Palestine. It is estimated that up to October 1, 1935, it raised approximately $5,000,000 for this purpose.93 A fourth important organization is Hadassah, the Women’s Zionist Organization of America. This organization, created in 1912, has almost 500 senior and junior chapters in 274 cities in the country, with a total membership of 45,000. It has thus far engaged primarily in health work in Palestine, its activities including the maintenance in Palestine of hospitals, clinics, research, medical social service, instruction in dietetics in schools, school hygiene, playgrounds, etc. It also conducts an active educational campaign in this country through publications and a speakers bureau for the purpose of interesting Jewish women in Palestine. Recently it undertook the task of building the University Hospital and Post-Graduate Medical School of the Hebrew University in Palestine, in conjunction with the American Jewish Physicians Committee.94

There are a number of other organizations for Palestine, such as the Palestine Economic Corporation, the American Economic Committee for Palestine, American Friends of the Hebrew University, the National Labor Committee for the Jewish Workers in Palestine, the Mizrachi Palestine Fund, the New Zionist Organization (Revisionists), The Jewish State Party, The League for Labor Palestine, Pioneer Women’s Organization, and many affiliated youth organizations.

While there is no way of determining exactly how much the overseas agencies collect, it may be safely said that on the average about $4,000,000 a year are contributed by American Jewry for purposes of overseas work. In the current year (1937) the J.D.C. and the United Palestine Campaign are each campaigning for about $4,500,000. In 1936, they each campaigned for about $3,500,000 but neither organization reached its goal. In 1934 and 1935 these two organizations conducted a united campaign. If they are successful in raising the $9,000,000 this year, it will be the largest sum American Jewry ever contributed for overseas work during one year. Since both organizations get a large
portion of their funds from federations and welfare funds, it was necessary to arrive at some arrangement for avoiding the competition and rivalry for appropriations which developed in the campaigns of 1936. Accordingly, an agreement was reached whereby the Joint Distribution Committee is to receive 60% of the funds raised for overseas work and the United Palestine Campaign, (comprising the American Palestine Fund, the Jewish National Fund, The Mizrachi Organization and the Zionist Organization of America) is to receive 40%. This agreement applies only to those cities where a welfare fund or a federation conducts the campaign.

**X. OTHER ACTIVITIES**

1. *Social.*—In addition to the organizations and activities outlined in the foregoing pages, there are a great many which are not usually included among social service agencies but which are, nevertheless, important for the cultural life and social organization of the Jewish people in the United States. A complete picture of organized Jewish life in this country would have to include the less formal organizations for social, cultural and perhaps even political activity.

In the first group of organizations,—those organized for social purposes,—might be mentioned the many unaffiliated organizations frequently referred to as "ladies societies," but not always limited to women, who carry on philanthropic activities. There are many such organizations in each Jewish community. They not infrequently interfere with the community-wide organizations, but many enlightened professional social workers have worked with them and have secured their cooperation for the advantage of all concerned.

The lodges and fraternal organizations are mainly organized for mutual aid purposes. While it is not known how many such organizations there are and how many members they have, eleven of the largest organizations report a total membership of more than 330,000. These and many other similar organizations perform educational, recreational and insurance functions. In many instances they pay sick and death benefit, maintain institutions to provide for the health
and recreation of their members, have a socialized type of medical assistance, maintain burial grounds, etc.96

Hundreds of thousands of foreign born Jews belong to Landsmanschaften, societies organized and named in accordance with the place of birth or old-world residence of the members. The number of these societies, which are found in all cities with a large Jewish population, is not known, although it is estimated that there are several thousand of them. Many of the individual societies are in turn members of one of the several central Landsmanschaften which were organized mainly for the purpose of rendering assistance to the respective Jewish communities abroad. The last decade and a half saw a diminution in the extent and activities of these societies. But the increasing Jewish misery abroad in recent years has given them a new lease on life. They are now very actively engaged in all types of relief work and diplomatic intervention. The Federation of Polish Jews, a central organization of Polish Landsmanschaften, is conducting its own campaign for funds for the relief of the Jews in Poland. The Roumanian Jews have a similar organization with similar activities, and a Federation of Galician Jews was organized as late as January, 1937. Most individual Landsmanschaften run joint campaigns with the respective branches of fraternal orders for the relief of the Jews in their native towns and cities. The extent of their activities and collected funds are unknown. The Landsmanschaften, the local branches of fraternal orders, and smaller American relief societies, are now being drawn into local American-Jewish community activities. Many of them participate in the community councils. A great many are active in the Jewish federations of charities and in the various protective organizations.

An interesting type of organization is the “family society,” composed of members of a given family and their relatives through marriage. There is no information as to how many there are, or what are their activities and programs. But it is known that there are a great many of them. They carry on many social, mutual aid, and philanthropic activities. The larger of them provide the same advantages as the lodges and fraternal organizations.97
A peculiarly American organization is the National Greek Letter Fraternity of college students and alumni. It began as an attempt to meet the need created by the discrimination against Jewish students by the general fraternities and sororities. It is estimated that there are almost 75,000 members in 36 such national Jewish fraternities.98

2. Cultural.—Among the organizations for cultural activities must be mentioned the libraries, publication societies, academic societies, theatres, the Yiddish and English-Jewish press, etc.

There are nine outstanding libraries largely devoted to the collection of Jewish books, periodicals, manuscripts and ceremonial objects. The leading library is that of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, which has the largest collection of Jewish books and ceremonial objects in the world. The library of the Hebrew Union College, in Cincinnati, is the second largest. Other important collections worthy of mention are those of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary and Yeshiva College in New York City; The American Jewish Historical Society and The Jewish Institute of Religion both in New York City; The Hebrew Theological College in Chicago; The Dropsie College in Philadelphia; The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work in New York; and the recently organized Central Jewish Library and Archives in New York. Mention should also be made of the Jewish collections maintained by the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library, Harvard University, and Yale University.

Scholarly activities in the Jewish field are conducted, and their results published, by a number of organizations. Among those worthy of mention are: the American Academy for Jewish Research; The American Jewish Historical Society; The Jewish Academy of Arts and Science; The American Section of the Yiddish Scientific Institute; the faculties of several universities, such as Columbia and Harvard; Seminaries, schools, and Rabbinical associations. The Jewish Publication Society of America has published a large number of volumes on various aspects of Jewish life. Its collection constitutes the most important contribution to Jewish literature made by a single organization in this
country. There are also several other publication agencies, but none can compare with the Jewish Publication Society. The Yiddish and English-Jewish press represents an important influence in Jewish cultural life. There are five Yiddish daily newspapers, about twenty periodicals, and ten or more periodicals using both English and Yiddish. It is estimated, that there are more than 100 English-Jewish periodicals. There are also about ten Hebrew periodicals and one Ladino weekly. The Yiddish theatres, too, are very important in this respect. A recent study (1933) of the Yiddish theatre in New York City showed that the season opened with nine Yiddish theatres in New York City but five were forced to close before the season was over. The Yiddish Art Theatre was the best known among them. Many of its performance such as “The Dibbuk,” “Yoshe Kalb,” “Green Fields,” etc., were seen by many non-Jews and were highly praised by the dramatic critics in the general press. It would seem, however, that the Yiddish theatre is not as prosperous today as it was a few years ago. During its heyday it contributed a number of very fine artists to the English stage.

3. Political.—There are practically no Jewish organizations for political purposes. Various attempts have been made from time to time to organize Jewish groups for political activity but these have been repudiated by the Jewish community and have, therefore, never made any real headway. During election campaigns, the political parties, in their efforts at obtaining votes, create Jewish organizations to sponsor their respective candidates, and individual candidates occasionally raise Jewish issues. But it is not long before the Jewish and general public become aware of the motivations and they are repudiated. The Presidential campaign of 1936 is a case in point. The major political parties, such as the Democrats and Republicans, maintain no Jewish organizations except during campaign periods, when they create special speakers' and information bureaus. The radical parties, such as the socialists and communists, do maintain Jewish sections which are more or less active all the time.
XI. PRESENT TRENDS IN JEWISH SOCIAL WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

The foregoing survey would be incomplete without a critical analysis of the present trends and tendencies in Jewish social work. While in general they are similar to the trends in general social work, there are some special problems which must be borne in mind in order fully to appreciate the existing situation.

Before embarking upon this analysis it seems necessary to caution the reader that since this is to be a critical analysis of the trends and tendencies, all of which implies interpretation, it may no longer be possible to be strictly objective. Something of the writer's point of view must necessarily find its way into the interpretation. However, the aim will be to reduce this to a minimum.

Until 1929, and especially since the World War, Jewish social work made enormous progress, qualitatively and quantitatively. It is safe to say that never before in Jewish history, either in this country or elsewhere, has comparable progress been made in Jewish community organization in a like period. It seemed, indeed, as if a golden age were to be inaugurated in this respect, for the Jewish communities in this country. Then came the depression. It brought a serious challenge to Jewish social work. At first it seemed as if Jewish social work were destined for unprecedented expansion because of the depression. As the needs became manifest greater funds were made available for meeting them. Gradually, as the funds from Jewish sources became more limited, additional and larger sums were secured first through non-sectarian drives and later through governmental subsidy. Expenditures grew by leaps and bounds. Staffs were increased to meet the avalanche of new cases. But Jewish agencies could no more meet the needs with a trained personnel and adequate work than could the non-Jewish agencies. Standards were lowered; untrained people were taken on so that in many instances they outnumbered the trained and experienced people; superficial work became the rule. Discouragement followed in the wake of these conditions.
Several other factors due to the depression must be mentioned here for they may be important influences in determining the future of Jewish social work in this country. These are: first the developing public social work program; second, the changed attitude of Jewish social workers toward Jewish social work; and third, the economic philosophy of some of the younger Jewish social workers.

The deepening depression made it clear that private philanthropy was unequal to the problem which the increasing unemployment brought in its wake. Many felt that even if private philanthropy were able to deal with the problem, victims of the depression who are able and willing to work but can find none through no fault of their own, should not be forced to apply to charity but should be aided by the government whose duty it is to care for its citizens. Jewish social workers were among the first to express themselves on this score in unmistakable terms at a time when the federal government was most reluctant to recognize that it had any responsibility along those lines.¹⁰⁰

Gradually municipalities developed means and set aside funds for caring for the unemployed. The soundness and logic of this development, the inadequate funds available to Jewish agencies from Jewish sources, the inherent dislike that most people have for becoming dependent on private charity, and a constantly diminishing income on the part of federations and community chests made it inevitable that Jewish agencies should welcome this development. Many of them turned over large numbers of their clients to the public agencies, irrespective of the type of care they would receive. In some communities the Jewish agencies were enabled, through a system of compensation and subvention from public funds, to continue to care for their Jewish clients. But this did not always prove to be a satisfactory arrangement, for it meant increases in numbers of clients and staff beyond the agencies' absorptive capacity. It played havoc with existing standards.

Whether Jewish agencies kept their clients at first, when the federal government subsidized some private agencies, and turned them over after the federal government decided, in 1933, to work only through public agencies, or whether they turned them over to the public agencies as soon as they
were created, it soon became clear that the Jewish agencies carried but a small portion of their problem. It became equally clear that without the aid of the public agencies the Jewish organizations could have carried the burden only with great difficulty.  

While, with some, the departure from traditional practice of the Jewish community caring for its dependent population raised questions about the wisdom and desirability of this practice, it seemed to fit in well with the aims and desires of others in the Jewish communities. The contributors saw in it a desirable release from burdens which they were unwilling or unable to carry. Some Jewish culturists, who had been finding fault with the Jewish community for spending so much of its substance on the old, the sick, the poor, in a word, the so-called "abnormal" members of the community, saw an opportunity for diverting the funds used for relief to cultural activities. The former, they argued, should be paid for by the state; Jewish funds should be used for "constructive" purposes. They did not realize that the Jewish people, or at least the contributing portion of it, had been mostly educated to give for charitable purposes and could not change their outlook overnight. They could not believe that if the state would meet the relief needs, Jews, like other voluntary contributors, would relax in their own giving. Nor did they stop to think that cultural activities had been carried along by campaigns for funds which had emphasized relief needs. If the latter lessened it was to be expected that giving would lessen. And this is precisely what happened. Smaller sums became available for communal needs. Relief activities did not suffer materially because they were supplemented from other sources. But educational, recreational, cultural and national agencies suffered severely. In many instances their inclusion in federation budgets was questioned, with the result that they were either eliminated or their allowances were drastically reduced. Having thrown in their lot with the federations during prosperous times they were in no position to strike out independently at a time when it was more difficult than ever to raise funds. They, therefore, accepted the inevitable, reduced their activities, frequently to the point of diminishing returns, and hoped for a better day.
This was not altogether due to a lack of funds, important a factor as that was. Much more important was the attitude of Jewish social workers, and the lay leaders whom they influence, toward Jewish social work. While, strictly speaking, it may be inaccurate to speak of an "attitude," for there is probably no single attitude that would be characteristic of all, since there is no formulated philosophy of Jewish social work that would be acceptable to all, any one who knows the situation from first-hand experience and observation knows that not all Jewish social workers are fired with any very great zeal for their work. Nor are they even thoroughly convinced about its necessity, purpose, goal, function, motivation, or future. Some there are who question its value, its justification, its efficacy, and the need for it. They look upon it as a hold-over from an earlier day when it had its justification and need in the isolation of the Jew and when it served also to aid in the survival of the group. Since group survival is not their aim and since isolation is no longer the case and may also be considered undesirable, they can see little justification for it.

Nor can they see anything distinctively Jewish in Jewish social work. This is particularly true of those who are doing the different types of case work. With the greater professionalization of social work and the greater interchange of views and experience between Jewish and non-Jewish social workers due to community chest and other influences, Jewish case workers became more professionally and less Jewishly conscious than their older colleagues were. This meant that they became more interested in the so-called "techniques" of treating their clients than in the "whys" and "wherefores" of their work or in developing the distinctive approaches to it. Jewish social work became "social work for," or at best, "with Jews." Challenging themselves and being challenged by their non-Jewish colleagues for a raison d'être of their work, they gradually abandoned the uncritical acceptance of the work, concepts, and philosophies they had inherited. Since no acceptable philosophies were available and since it was easier to do so, they accepted the view that Jewish social work is a hold-over, a vestigial organ, once of useful function, but becoming less significant and meaningful with the passage of time and greater Jewish
inter-penetration, co-mingling, and participation in the common life.

This view was strengthened by the influx of large numbers of college-trained men and women who were accustomed to think of social problems in general economic or sociological terms and who had neither the interest, knowledge nor inclination to seek out or develop for themselves a specifically Jewish point of view. It became fashionable to question the Jewish aspects or values of Jewish social work. The leaders sought contacts with non-Jewish social workers first, because it is the natural thing to do, second, because non-Jewish recognition means enhanced status in the Jewish group. A by no means negligible factor in this process was the fact that non-Jewish social work, because of its size, differentiation, and greater degree of professionalization, had something to offer which the Jewish group lacked—technical consideration of case work problems on a professional level. Hence they sought non-Jewish affiliation. The pace set by the leaders or executives was eagerly followed by staff members, for the same forces operated with them, plus the natural tendency to imitate and emulate one's chief. This was the ruling attitude among case workers except in the very few instances where the executive was interested in, or sought to develop, the Jewish aspects of case work. But these were so rare that their influence was insufficient to stem the tide.

The situation is somewhat different among federation executives. The very nature of their work forces them to think and speak in terms of "the Jewish Community." Although it may be doubted whether many federation executives have a very clear idea as to what they mean by "the Jewish Community" they constantly speak about and some undoubtedly come to believe in it. "The Jewish Community" is for them a sort of anthropomorphic being. They speak of it as if it possessed the human attributes of thinking, feeling and willing. It has wishes and desires, it approves and disapproves, it grants and withholds its bounty as it is satisfied or dissatisfied with given programs, procedures and practices. Jewish social work becomes to them an expression of this rather mystical "Community."
But even they, who are under constant pressure to think and formulate the larger and perhaps more fundamental purposes and values of Jewish social work, have produced little that may be considered a guide for those who may wish to develop a philosophy of Jewish social work in the United States. Whatever has been written is in the most general terms. Nothing has thus far come even from this group which the more specialized social workers might apply to their own work. There are instances where specialized workers who were not particularly known for their interest, zeal or advocacy of the Jewish phases of social work became active propagandists for a so-called Jewish emphasis when they became federation executives. On the other hand, there are some rather notable instances where federation executives, who argued in and out of season for a specifically Jewish social work and the application of Jewish values to it, abandoned all attempts at such applications on leaving the federation field.

More recently, within the past three or four years, a new factor has arisen in the field of Jewish social work, which threatened to become the most disorganizing of all—the radical activities of the younger group of Jewish social workers. These consist mainly in the organization of what amounts to industrial unions of all employees in Jewish social agencies and in carrying on a type of propaganda which characterizes radical groups and movements. The causes for this development may be found in the economic and social background, education, and experience of a great many of the workers; in the absence of a well-defined philosophy of Jewish life and of Jewish social work in the United States; in a loss of confidence in the lay and professional leadership; in the stresses and strains induced by social work during the depression; in a belief that much if not most of the maladjustment with which social workers have to deal has an economic base and can only be adequately treated through a readjustment or reorganization of the economic basis of society; and finally in a series of reductions of salaries of employees of Jewish social agencies since the depression. The last may well be considered the precipitating cause, for it was the opposition to salary reductions and efforts to obtain reinstatement of the original salaries that brought the move-
ment to the fore and gave the heterogeneous elements which composed it the feeling of common interest and purpose necessary for a successful movement. Members of this group look upon themselves as "workers." They secured a charter from the American Federation of Labor. Efforts to get them to view Jewish social work as a profession devoted to "social services," incompatible with the conflict philosophy and methods of labor organizations and especially the more radical ones, and the peculiar and special responsibility that rests or should rest upon Jewish social workers to act responsibly in order not to bring discredit upon the Jewish group, are scorned and ridiculed. Their interest is in the larger group. The Jewish problem, to them, insofar as they give it any thought at all, is an expression, a function, of the general economic problem and will be solved only when the problems of the total population are solved. Hence their emphasis on the larger scene. This movement is not limited to New York City, although the leading group is to be found there. Similar groups with similar interests and activities are to be found in other large cities.

Quite aside from the inevitable diffusion in interest and effort with respect to Jewish social work as such, which this movement means, it affects Jewish social work adversely in the loss of interest and good-will on the part of Jewish lay leaders. It has also induced unfriendly attitudes in non-Jewish social workers and their leaders toward Jewish social work and Jewish social workers. Although some of the most important leaders of the movement are non-Jews, the facts that it had its origin as an organized endeavor in the Jewish group, and that some prominent Jewish social workers are among its leaders, have served to identify the Jewish group with its activities.

In the past year or two, a new and in some respects oppositional group came into being among the younger Jewish social workers which bids fair to become popular, as its ideals and principles become better formulated and wider known. The basic philosophy of this group is that of Labor Zionism. While they support the trade-union interest and approach of social workers, they oppose what they consider the assimilationist tendencies of the more radical social
work group as well as other Jewish groups. They differ from the ordinary Labor-Zionists in their search for a program which would emphasize Jewish life in America without neglecting the upbuilding of Palestine. In ideology they are closely related to the adherents of the "Reconstructionist" philosophy of Jewish life.\(^{112}\)

These are some of the forces now at work. It is doubtful whether, with the exception of the last named group, they promise the most wholesome development of Jewish social work or Jewish life. They have in fact already served to weaken both in many directions, if not to undermine them. We need only look at the present status of some of the functional fields to see how true this is.

Enough has been said in the foregoing pages to indicate the seriousness of the situation for the family welfare societies and indeed for all case work agencies. Though this type of social work is in no immediate danger from the lack of a clientele that needs to be served, or even from a lack of funds, it faces grave dangers from within and without. In its failure to develop a distinctive philosophy and approach to its work, in its failure to discover and emphasize the Jewish or cultural aspects of its work; in its turning over to the public agencies large numbers of its clients to be handled by untrained or inadequately trained people with low standards of work; in the loss of many of its trained and experienced workers to the public agencies; in the radical attitudes and activities of some of its workers, Jewish family care or case work appears to be losing ground, prestige, and the compelling appeal it had for the Jewish public. Whether it is called upon to take back a large number of those who are now being handled by the public agencies, (not an impossible development in view of the known attitudes of important public officials and spokesmen of the large taxpayers and recently adopted policies regarding relief on the part of the Federal government) or whether it eventually settles down to the handling of only those who are ineligible to public funds, Jewish family work will probably have a more difficult time to justify itself in the future than it has had in the past. There will seem less justification for the maintenance of separate Jewish family societies because of what has transpired during the last few years. Unless they develop
a raison d'être that will be sufficiently compelling in word and deed to make a critical and unwilling contributing public realize that in supporting them they are maintaining a service that is essential and has a distinctive contribution to make to the general as well as the Jewish community, Jewish family case work agencies, and for that matter, all Jewish agencies, may suffer a severe set-back in their program and activities.

That the Jewish family care agencies are aware of some of these problems and are trying to deal with them, goes without saying. But it may be doubted whether they have thus far analyzed and faced them in fundamental terms. Such analysis would have to include not only the quantity and quality of their work and the adequacy of the support rendered them by federations, but also what their function and scope should be in a scheme of Jewish community organization. It should answer the questions how they are prepared to meet their problems as Jewish agencies, and how they differ from the general case work agencies, public and private, which may serve as large if not larger numbers of Jewish clients than do the Jewish agencies.

Unless they succeed in doing this and find a real justification for themselves, it is not impossible that they will be destroyed. In fact they now carry in themselves the seeds of their own destruction. For in addition to the factors already outlined, many case workers, case work executives, and board members have assimilationist tendencies. Some are convinced assimilationists. This is especially true of some of the Board members. They are frequently encouraged by the case work group to look upon Jewish agencies and their work as separatist endeavors which should be discouraged. It is but a step from the adoption of such a philosophy for general Jewish agencies to its execution in the agencies with which they are associated. Family agency executives holding such views do not see the consequences to their own work. But, here as everywhere, the tragedy is that it will not be they alone who will suffer from their blindness, but the entire Jewish community.

The institutional phases of social work, such as the agencies for the care of the sick, the aged, and children, are in a somewhat better position. While they were all effected by the
depression and the factors outlined, they suffered less, comparatively, than did the other types of work, especially the educational and recreational agencies. The latter were and, in some instances, still are in a most precarious state. They were the hardest hit of any of the fields of Jewish social work. They not only lost ground but had to fight for their very existence. And it cannot be said that the struggle is over. The same may be said of the national agencies. It will depend upon how long this depression will last and upon the rate of recovery whether these agencies, especially those that have a cultural program, will survive or not. If they survive it is likely to take a long time before they will reach once again the position they occupied, or the quality of work they did at the onset of the depression.

But it is the federations that are facing the greatest challenge and severest test. Many factors conspired to weaken them. Federations, as a rule, obtained their greatest power through the purse rather than from the sanctions resulting from constructive and representative leadership. With a more limited purse has, therefore, come a diminution of power and influence. Federations have been accused of being arbitrary, undemocratic, near-sighted, timid or cowardly, visionless, interested mainly in charity, leaderless, provincial, mechanical in their approach and method, dominated by an assimilationist point of view, being supported by and appealing to comparatively small numbers, and as having failed to develop the cohesiveness, organization, and other characteristics of an intelligent, wisely planned and representative Jewish community. While all these charges cannot be leveled at all federations, it must be admitted that most federations have some of these shortcomings, and that some of them would have to plead guilty to most or all of the charges if they had the necessary objectivity and insight to see themselves as they are seen by others.

There is some evidence that some of the more thoughtful lay and professional federation leaders are becoming increasingly aware of the shortcomings and dangers faced by federations. Some beginnings have been made in the direction of a re-examination of the purpose, function, scope, method, form of organization, and future of federation. While such soul-searching as is taking place in federation may be
expected to yield constructive results, one cannot expect too much since the patient, himself, does the examining, the diagnosing, the prescribing, and the treating. Indeed, the very factors responsible for their defects may easily prevent federations from viewing themselves as they are and may nullify, in large measure, the efforts at reorganization. But be that as it may, it is freely admitted that the federation is not the Jewish community, and that it would have to be fundamentally reconstructed if it were to become the Jewish community. The Community Councils, discussed elsewhere, represent one attempt at creating such a representative Jewish community organization. But they have some of the vices of their virtues and may perhaps even threaten the very structure of federations unless they are wisely planned and even more wisely conducted.

Nevertheless, when all is said and done, federation is the most important single organization in the Jewish community. It has in it elements of strength, at least potential strength, which no other organization in the Jewish community has. In its representativeness, unrepresentative as it is; in its community-mindedness, narrowly conceived as it may be; in its financial resources, limited as they are; in its leadership, one-sided and conservative as that may be; in its catholicity of interests, circumscribed as they are said to be; and in its status before the non-Jewish world, there lie possibilities heretofore unrealized and assuredly unequalled by any existing Jewish organization in the United States. How to tap these resources and how to convert the federation into the comprehensive community organization which seems to be the present need and which, better than any other existing organization, it can become, is the problem. Indeed, this is the greatest need faced by Jewish social work. In a sense it is the central problem of Jewish community organization in the United States.
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The "Reconstructionist philosophy of Jewish Life" refers to the philosophy formulated by Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan in his *Judaism As A Civilization*, and promulgated by *The Reconstructionist*, a weekly journal published by the group adhering to his point of view.


THE JEWISH WELFARE BOARD—TWENTY YEARS OLD
By Cyrus Adler

I

The Jewish Welfare Board was organized twenty years ago, three days after the United States declared war, and constituted the first united effort on the part of the Jewish community of America to function in behalf of the Jewish men in the army and navy.

Upon the outbreak of the war, the United States government resolved to call upon certain religious welfare organizations to cooperate with it in the building of the morale of, and the provision of normal community life, in so far as possible, for, the men in the armed forces. The Commission on Training Camp Activities was created as a branch of the War Department charged with these specific duties. The Commission, which was headed by Raymond B. Fosdick, invited the representative national religious organizations to unite in a joint welfare program.

The formation of a representative national Jewish agency was not easy. Despite over 250 years of Jewish life in America and the many organizations in existence, no single agency was generally acceptable. The difficulties arising from this situation had been made evident in 1916, when the United States sent a military expedition to the Mexican border. Three national Jewish organizations attempted to serve the Jewish men in the military services, and were unable to completely coordinate their activities. It was accordingly necessary to create a new body.

A conference was held in New York on April 9, 1917 at which it was agreed to form a new organization composed of representatives of the following bodies: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Central Conference of American Rabbis, United Synagogue of America, Council of Young Men’s Hebrew and Kindred Associations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, Agudath Ha-
Rabbonim, and the Jewish Publication Society of America. As the war progressed, the following national organizations were added to the original group: National Council of Jewish Women, Independent Order B’nai B’rith, Independent Order of B’rith Abraham, Jewish Chautauqua Society, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, New York Board of Jewish Ministers, B’rith Sholom, Rabbinical Assembly of America, and Women’s League of the United Synagogue of America. These various organizations were represented by the following persons: I. E. Goldwasser and S. A. Goldsmith, Council of Young Men’s Hebrew and Kindred Associations; Rabbis George Zepin and S. Swartz, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Dr. William Rosenau and Rabbi Isaac Landman, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Simon Miller, Jewish Publication Society of America; Rabbis M. Margolies and B. Revel, Union of Orthodox Congregations; and I represented the United Synagogue. All of these organizations have continued their affiliation with the Army and Navy Service Department of the Jewish Welfare Board up to the present time.

Meantime the question of the appointment of rabbis as chaplains of the army was actively taken up. With the exception of the appointment of chaplains for hospital services during the Civil War, no rabbi had ever regularly been appointed chaplain in the United States army. An enthusiastic member of the United States Senate introduced a bill on May 17, 1917, authorizing the appointment of Jewish chaplains for the army, but when I came to discuss this matter with the secretary of war, Newton D. Baker, it appeared that something more than this would have to be done in order to correct the situation which had been traditional in the United States army. It appeared that the chaplains had been regimental officers and represented the majority of a faith in a given regiment; in other words, if there were 49% Protestants and 51% Catholics in a regiment, it would be a Roman Catholic priest, and vice versa, if the proportions were the other way.

I recall that we sat down in Secretary Baker’s office and drafted a bill authorizing the appointment of chaplains of “faiths not now represented in the body of chaplains in the
army.” This made provision, of course, not only for rabbis, but also for minority Christian groups, like the Unitarians who had never had a chaplain, or the newer sects, like the Christian Scientists. I want to recall, at least, that it was in conjunction with our own body that this very liberal attitude was taken. The only other immediate step was based upon the fact that Elkan Voorsanger, a graduate of the Hebrew Union College, had gone over to France at the very beginning of the war in a hospital unit, and we made the endeavor to have him transferred to the service of the Board, although as a matter of fact he became the first rabbincial chaplain in the army.

The chief field chaplain of the British forces, Rabbi Michael Adler, tendered the services of his organization in taking care of Jewish soldiers in the American forces in France until such time as the American Board could make its own provision.

The complicated matter of the Prayer Book was finally settled by accepting the draft prepared by Drs. Drachman, Rosenau and Adler, embodying suggestions received from Professor Alexander Marx and from Rabbis Margolies and Revel of the Agudath Ha-Rabbonim. Permission was also received by cable from England to make use of the material in the English Prayer Book, for Jewish soldiers.

An abridged Bible also was deemed a necessity. The complete Bible, even on the thinnest paper, was too large to carry in a knapsack. It was necessary also to select passages of the Bible that would inspire the men and not deject them. In this connection, I ought to say that the Jewish Publication Society was most helpful, active, and energetic. All of its resources were at the disposal of the Board. It worked day and night and the little pocket Prayer Books and Bibles became very familiar in France and in America. Also its small Book of Psalms was reprinted in many editions, not only for our own men, but for those in the British Army, and recognition must be given to the chief rabbi of the British Empire, Dr. Joseph H. Hertz, for having made available to English-speaking soldiers his “Book of Jewish Thoughts” which was printed in a very small form and which was and still is, calculated to keep alive the Jewish spirit.
By June 25, 1917, I had come to the conclusion that I should not continue to act as chairman of this Board and it seemed to me that Colonel Harry Cutler of Providence, R. I., would be the most suitable person for the chairmanship. I based this view on the fact that the service was largely military, that he was a retired colonel of the National Guard, and he was beyond the age limit for a military service. Colonel Cutler had agreed to become chairman and I had gladly accepted the post of vice-chairman.

On August 8, 1917, we met at Washington with the secretary of war, Hon. Newton D. Baker, the secretary of the navy, Hon. Josephus Daniels, and Colonel Herbert H. Lehman, who was then connected with the War Department. Decisions were reached concerning the formal recognition of the Board as the Jewish agency for ministering to the Jewish enlisted men in the camps, the matter of furloughs for Jewish men on the occasion of the high holy days, making possible the observance of Kashrut, the appointment of a representative of the Board on Mr. Fosdick's Commission on Training Camp Activities, the appointment of rabbis as chaplains in the army and the navy, the recognition of the Board's uniformed representatives in the camps. I ought to add that although he was not a member of the committee at the time, Judge Julian W. Mack had accompanied us to Mr. Baker's office. Finally, a communication was sent to the President of the United States, reciting briefly to him the organization of the Board and requesting its recognition as the agency for social and religious work among the Jewish men in the army and navy.

The representative of the Board on the Commission on Training Camp Activities was the late Mortimer L. Schiff. The name Jewish Welfare Board was adopted shortly afterwards, when the original name, Jewish Board for Welfare Work, was found unwieldy.

An immediate problem was that of financing a program greater than any hitherto undertaken by the American Jewish community. Funds were obtained by joint campaigns with local Jewish Relief Committees, a percentage of the proceeds of these being allocated to the Board. In New York City, Jacob H. Schiff was chairman of the campaign. Late in 1918, at the request of the President of the
United States, the United War Work Campaign was conducted jointly by the seven agencies recognized by the War and Navy Departments for welfare work among the soldiers and sailors. The American public contributed $200,000,000 in a wholehearted desire to uphold the hands of their representative agencies.

The Board became the officially recognized Jewish agency to work with the War Department and the Commission on Training Camp Activities; it thus became for the first time in the history of America, an agency with the official endorsement of the government and the same time, that of the organized American Jewish community. In this dual capacity, the Board determined as a guiding principle to extend its service to soldiers and sailors without sectarian restriction, but at the same time to make provision especially for the needs of the soldiers and sailors of the Jewish faith, whose particular requirements could be met only by an understanding Jewish organization. In the fulfillment of the latter function, the Board did not impose any ready-made program of its own, but strove to meet the needs and desires of the uniformed men themselves.

It is impossible to describe in detail the wide scope of the countless services of the Board during the war days. Some of these activities included measures to help the Jewish soldier and sailor to become adjusted to entirely new surroundings; providing for religious needs; hospital visitation; recreation and entertainment; social contacts with neighboring communities. Even more important were the thousands of personal services such as the adjustment of family difficulties, providing aid for dependent families, the writing and transmission of letters, aid in military matters, advice in regard to insurance and pay allotments, the provision of material comforts, friendly understanding and guidance. In one year, from August 1918 to August 1919, over 300,000 personal service problems were handled.

To carry on this work, several hundred men and women were recruited as welfare workers. The worker was familiarly known as the "Star of David Man" and served as spiritual leader, teacher, counsellor and friend. His work included everything from leading a "minyan" to conducting an entertainment. In the larger cantonments, the Board
established its own quarters for administrative and recreational purposes. Forty-eight buildings were erected by the Board, and suitable facilities were provided in the smaller camps.

The religious work included Friday evening and Sabbath Services, Yahrzeit (memorial) services, daily services, and Holy Day services. The Committee on Religious Activities was headed by Judge Irving Lehman, the Committee on Chaplains by myself. Some thirty-five rabbis served as chaplains, wearing an emblem representing the tablets of the Law, surmounted by the Shield of David. The mere listing of the quantities of religious supplies distributed is impressive: matzoth, 282,423 pounds; Prayer Books, 285,546; Bibles, 181,515; Holyday Prayer Books, 60,500; Haggadahs, 93,500; Rosh Hashanah, Purim, Passover, and Hanukkah post cards, 713,000; and many thousands of Kinoth, Selikhoth, Megilloth (copies of the Book of Esther), Mezzuzahs, Talethim, Tephillin, Tzitzith, and Jewish Calendars. In addition to religious supplies, the Board distributed 20,000,000 letterheads, 10,000,000 envelopes, and hundreds of thousands of specially prepared books and pamphlets on patriotic and Jewish subjects, games and miscellaneous articles.

Educational work included the organization of classes for the teaching of English, French, American history and civics, Bible study and Jewish history. The recreational and social activities comprised the organization and conduct of literary clubs, discussion groups, entertainments, dances and celebrations of Jewish festivals. The Board also organized a special Hospital Service Division which provided regular visitation and service in over one hundred thousand wards and in ninety-three hospitals. Material comforts and aid were provided, regardless of creed, by the field representatives of the Board, and volunteer committees of its community branches.

A phase of the Board's work which was to have far-reaching and permanent results was the mobilization of Jewish communities for the purpose of serving the men in nearby posts, to enable them to maintain their normal contacts with the Jewish community and the community at large. Over 180 community branches functioned actively
and thousands of Jewish men and women participated in the conduct of their work. The program of these branches included cooperation in the conduct of religious services, hospital visitation, care for the dependents of the soldiers and sailors, maintenance of community centers with the aid of the Board, entertainments, hospitality, particularly on Holyday furloughs, and making available all the Jewish social and institutional resources of the community.

Overseas, a similar intensive program of activities was conducted. Just as the United States was slow in getting troops over, so were we slow in getting our people across, and the fact that we had no chaplains in the beginning handicapped us a great deal. Several rabbis, however, volunteered to go across even before chaplains were regularly appointed and I recall the care and anxiety which Mr. Schiff and I put into making the arrangements for the crossing of Rabbi H. G. Enelow, of Temple Emanuel; Rabbi Jacob Kohn, formerly of the Anshe Chesed of New York City and now of Los Angeles; and Congressman Isaac Siegel. It was Mortimer Schiff who went to Paris and arranged for the opening of a large and beautiful club building in that city, which I frequently saw and can testify that it was a great center for the soldiers. By the time of the armistice, we did have a fair body of chaplains scattered both in France and in camps in America and quite a host of workers of all types.

A total of 178 welfare workers, men and women, were stationed at 57 overseas centers. As was the policy in the domestic service, soldiers of all religious faiths were served without charge of any kind; and the same practice obtained in the distribution of supplies and the serving of refreshments. A few of the overseas activities deserve special mention. The overseas religious program included the conduct of 1,740 religious services, with an attendance of 180,000. In 1919, a total of twenty-four Passover Seders were conducted abroad, with an attendance of 30,000, including soldiers of the Allied forces. Colonel Cutler, Judge Mack, Mr. Louis Marshall and I of the Board went to Paris in 1919, during the Peace Conference, and we took part in two Seders, the first and second nights of the holidays, at which there were at least one thousand American officers
Welfare service was also extended to the Russian soldiers in France who found themselves in a strange environment and required many personal services. The Board supplied matzoth both to the French troops and to the Russian prisoners in Germany. In the overseas hospitals, a total of 40,000 wounded men were visited and served. Perhaps the most important personal service rendered overseas by the welfare workers was maintaining contact between the soldiers and the relatives back home.

The Jewish Welfare Board had a very fine group of people, both men and women workers, in France in the post-Armistice period and that really was the period more difficult than that of actual warfare. Under the stern necessities of war, things pretty well shaped themselves, but when the men had leisure time on their hands it was even more important that they should be kept occupied and engaged in wholesome diversions.

With the close of the war emergency, new problems had to be faced, both in the domestic service and abroad. A Troop Train Service and a Transport Service Division were organized to continue the same measure of service aboard ships, during the return of the men, and upon their arrival at ports of debarkation. The host of personal problems of the war period was greatly multiplied by the needs incidental to the return to civilian life. Reemployment, family, business and legal adjustments, retention or conversion of life insurance, all required the guidance of the Board. Vocational education, and naturalization and citizenship courses were organized in the United States, with faculties recruited from colleges. The men were placed in contact with the government vocational education classes and the United States Employment Service. The local branches of the Jewish Welfare Board were enlisted to provide employment for the returning men. The Board was also fortunate in securing the cooperation of the Young Men's Hebrew Associations and the B'nai B'rith in the conduct of employment activities. An Information Bureau published an average of twenty bulletins and pamphlets monthly on subjects of vital concern to enlisted and discharged men and their families.
Not the least of the services of the Board was the ascertaining of who, among the dead, were of the Jewish faith in order that their graves might be properly marked with the six point Star of David (Magen David). Through the cooperation of the Board, photographs of each grave were forwarded to the families of the soldiers.

The establishing of an authentic record of Jewish participation in the war was one of the important tasks towards which the Board lent its full assistance. Over half a million records were gathered by the Bureau of Jewish War Records of the American Jewish Committee through the active support of the Jewish Welfare Board. It is part of the national record that from 200,000 to 225,000 Jews were in the service, constituting 4% of the armed forces, although Jews constituted at that time but 3% of the total population. Of these, 40,000, or practically 20% of the total Jewish contingent, were volunteers.

The record of honors conferred upon Jewish soldiers for valor in action is notable. No less than 1,100 such citations are on file. Of these, 723 were conferred by the American command, 287 by the French, 33 by the British, and 46 by various other allied commands. Of the 78 highly valued Congressional Medals of Honor conferred to date, at least three were awarded to Jewish soldiers. The Distinguished Service Cross is worn by at least 150 American Jews, the rare French Medaille Militaire by four American Jews, and the Croix de Guerre by 174 Jews.

Nearly 10,000 Jews were commissioned officers in the several branches of the service. In the Army there were more than 100 colonels and lieutenant colonels, more than 540 majors, 1,400 captains and over 7,000 lieutenants. In the Navy 500 Jews were commissioned officers, the highest rank reached being that of Rear Admiral. In the Marine Corps, 60 Jews were commissioned officers, including one Brigadier-General.

The casualties among Jewish men numbers from 13,000 to 14,000, including about 2,800 who gave up their lives.

That is the record for the Great War. As in previous wars of the Republic, it is a record of devoted service and gallant conduct.
America may well be proud of the large-hearted and large-scale program of service which was developed for the spiritual and recreational well-being of the men who were torn from civil life and thrust into the hardships and dangers of war service. The part which we Jews were called upon to play was discharged honorably. Countless men, soldiers, sailors and marines, Jews and non-Jews, were heartened by the spirit of fellowship of our workers, and the cheer, comfort and warmth of the activities conducted in the name of the Jewish Welfare Board in camp, field and port. The significance of our army and navy program lay, and has continued to lie, not only in its intrinsic values to those who were reached by it, but also in the happy relationship which, through the Jewish Welfare Board, the American Jewish community has developed with our government and with other religious groups that are similarly concerned with the welfare of men under colors.

How the government regarded our war program is indicated in the following communication which President Wilson wrote on November 22, 1918:

MY DEAR COLONEL CUTLER:

"The annual meeting of the Jewish Welfare Board affords me an opportunity to express my personal appreciation of the admirable work which this organization has been carrying on with our troops at home and abroad. It has provided generously for soldiers and sailors of all faiths, and Secretary Baker and Mr. Fosdick have both spoken of the value of its work in maintaining the morale of our fighting forces.

May I not, therefore, express in this brief note my wish for its continued success?

Cordially and sincerely yours,

(Signed) WOODROW WILSON

In the soul-stirring enterprise of the World War, we derived strength from, and, we trust, gave strength to our association with six other organizations that were mobilized for service in support of the morale program of the govern-
ment. These were the Y. M. C. A., the National Catholic War Council, the American Library Association, the War Camp Community Service, the Salvation Army, and the Young Women's Christian Association. The joint participation of these agencies prompted Colonel Cutler to say: "I can't help thinking that the fences have disappeared, the sectarian lines have vanished, and this work that has been carried on has not been carried on as Jewish work, or Protestant work, or Catholic work; it has been fundamentally American work, carried on for all the troops in the camps without regard to faith."

II

As previously described, the Jewish Welfare Board found itself compelled immediately upon its establishment to organize Jewish communities all over the country for the primary purpose of giving assistance to the Jewish men in the army and navy services. In the majority of instances, existing communal buildings were used for this purpose, and activities were participated in by the community at large. Community Branches composed of outstanding representatives of all groups in the communities, were organized. These communities were better organized than they had ever been before the war emergency, and represented in many cities the first successful effort to unite all groups in a common program. The Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations which had been organized in 1913, cooperated with this work in many communities, and at its 1920 Triennial Convention, Felix M. Warburg was able to report: "Since the last Triennial Convention, all of you have undoubtedly been aware of the great growth in the movement toward instituting in each community wherever possible a Jewish community center. These associations represent a decided effort in the direction of working with the community as a whole; of giving to the community, through the association, a machinery for community welfare for the entire Jewish population. Through these centers only can real Jewish unity be attained."
As a result of the activities of the Community Branches of the Jewish Welfare Board and the wide-spread interest which developed in the Jewish Community Center movement, a demand arose that this cooperative effort be continued on a permanent basis. A Joint Conference Committee of the Jewish Welfare Board and the Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations was appointed under the chairmanship of Judge Irving Lehman, president of the latter organization. The committee was set up "to undertake a careful study of the entire situation with respect to the Board's responsibility for soldier and sailor work and to the Jewish community, as such, during peace time." The members of this committee were: Judge Irving Lehman, Felix M. Warburg, Mrs. Israel Unterberg, Charles Hartman, Colonel Harry Cutler, Carl Dreyfus, I. Edwin Goldwasser, and Cyrus Adler. The problem faced by the conference and the results of its deliberations are described in the statement issued in September, 1920:

"Many of the Community Branches of the Jewish Welfare Board and prominent Jewish leaders, fully impressed by the success of the cooperative war effort of the Jewish national organizations represented in the Jewish Welfare Board, expressed the desire that the results of this united harmonious effort should not be lost in peace-time. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy expressed themselves similarly, and both Departments requested that the Jewish Welfare Board, in common with the other welfare organizations, continue the conduct of community activities in behalf of service men.

"The Committee on Post-War Program concluded that in order to offer to ex-service men and members of the Jewish community in general full opportunity for self-development and social activity, and to the uniformed men now in the service appropriate recreation and entertainment when on leave in the communities, suitable Jewish Centers must be made available. The Executive Committee of the Jewish Welfare Board has therefore decided that in addition to the continuance of its work.
in so far as the same may be permitted, in Army and Navy camps, it would undertake the work of developing such Centers in various parts of the country. These Centers should be based on no particular form of Jewish religious point of view and should be restricted to no particular group of members, but should furnish a common meeting ground for all the Jews of the community and maintain those activities which would contribute to their welfare and development and to the strengthening of their Jewish consciousness as a constructive force in American life.

"In consonance with this plan, a conference was recently held of committees representing the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations and the Jewish Welfare Board, at which it was agreed that the work now being conducted by the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations should be continued by the Jewish Welfare Board, but upon the express condition that all constructive accomplishments of the Council should be preserved, and that each Center be assured full autonomy. It is also planned that the Centers be given a voice in the election of members of the governing committee of the Jewish Welfare Board."

The merger of the Jewish Welfare Board and the Council was agreed upon at a joint meeting of the two organizations held on October 24, 1920, and took effect July 1, 1921. Colonel Harry Cutler had served as chairman of the Jewish Welfare Board until his untimely death, August 28, 1920, when I became acting chairman. Judge Irving Lehman became president of the Jewish Welfare Board in 1921, upon its becoming a permanent national Jewish agency. Harry L. Glucksman, who had served on the administration of the Jewish Welfare Board since December, 1917, has remained its executive director up to the present time.

As a first task, the Jewish Welfare Board directed its efforts not towards expansion in the number of centers, but rather towards building up the existing organizations into effective instrumentalities for the service of the community. Although there were 370 societies listed on the records of
the Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations in 1921, over one-third of this total were Young Women's Hebrew Associations, the majority of which met in the same quarters as the Young Men's Hebrew Associations, while others were merely potential Jewish Centers or social clubs struggling along without a regular meeting place or a sustained program. These organizations had grown in large numbers, but the name Y. M. H. A., Y. W. H. A., and the like, frequently indicated only a goal, not a reality.

Under the leadership of the Jewish Welfare Board, mergers of Young Men's Hebrew Associations, Young Women's Hebrew Associations and other organizations with similar objectives took place with great rapidity. The conditions of a number of these were found, upon examination, to be such as to render their continued existence inadvisable, if not impossible. In many instances several organizations in the same community were engaged in the same activities. With the goal of a Community Center in mind, it was highly desirable that each community effect as quickly as possible the amalgamation of these various local units. Within two years such mergers were effected in fifty-three communities, resulting in the establishment of active centers of Jewish life in accordance with the ideals of the movement. This process continued, and as the revitalized organizations grew in strength and became community-wide in scope, with respect to both program and purpose, they enlisted the support of the more representative people in the community. The process of constructive development continued.

The program was widened to include all age groups and both sexes and the provision of educational and recreational activities to meet the varying needs of all members of the Jewish family. The objective of the movement became the development of a consciously Jewish life, which at the same time is properly integrated in the life of the community at large. In 1921, but eight organizations used the words "community" or "center" in their names; today, the vast majority, 208 have approximately such titles. Although a number of societies retain such names as Y. M. H. A., Y. W H. A., and the like, for reasons of tradition or provi-
sions in their corporate charters, yet they function with very few exceptions as Jewish Community Centers for men and women, boys and girls.

There has not been a mere change in nomenclature, but also a broadening of the guiding philosophy of the Center movement, a natural shifting of emphasis in the objective of the Jewish Center, from a type of organization which was founded originally in many cases for the purpose of accelerating the Americanization of our recently arrived immigrant brethren, or of meeting social needs of young men and young women, to that of an all-embracing, community-serving agency whose primary function is to serve as a reservoir of Jewish life and influence in the community, and more particularly to help bring our youth nearer to Jewish life in sentiment, thought and action.

The Jewish Community Center does not limit the scope of its interests and activity to any particular segment of Jewry, but consciously attempts to reach all elements in the community, from the point of view of age, sex and Jewish outlook. It has served as a common meeting ground, habituating those who have come within the sphere of its influence to think in community terms, to be prepared to submerge narrow, group interests in behalf of the larger group welfare. It has focused attention upon common tasks, opportunities, and responsibilities, and has contributed towards the solution of problems affecting the Jewish community as a whole.

The Jewish Community Center achieves its objective by promoting an all-inclusive program, which embraces every type of activity calculated to satisfy the diversified needs and interests of its membership and clientele,—cultural and recreational, spiritual and physical, intellectual and social. The Jewish educational element constitutes an integral part of the Center program, occupying a central position, touching, influencing, and growing out of, all phases of the program.

For, in its ultimate objective, the Jewish Community Center aims, as do the synagogue and the Hebrew school, to contribute towards the perpetuation and development of Jewish life in America, towards Jewish survival on the highest plane. This implies the integration of the individual
Jew into the life of the group about him, involving his harmonious adjustment to the general environment and his equipment for active participation in the various phases of Jewish community life. Thus the Center has become a unifying, integrating factor in communities throughout the land.

The membership in the 325 constituent societies of the Jewish Welfare Board has grown from 100,000 in 1921 to 370,000 in 1937; the number of buildings owned by Centers has increased in the same period from 75 to 233; the number of Centers with executive staffs grew from 47 to 171, with professional personnel including over a thousand workers. The value of the buildings is today $35,000,000 and the annual operating expenditures total $4,600,000.

This growth took place very largely from 1921 to 1929. It is a significant and most heartening fact that the integrity and fundamental soundness of the Jewish Center movement was sustained and maintained throughout the period of the economic depression that followed and from which we are but now emerging. The local Centers functioned without interruption and rendered a most valuable service in sustaining morale and Jewish spirit, particularly among the youth.

It is not the purpose of this article to catalogue the numerous and varied activities conducted by Jewish Centers. The program has grown in content and quality to significant proportions. The character and scope of the activities naturally vary depending on local needs and conditions. In general, however, it may be said, as Mr. Glucksman expressed it in his recent annual report, "There is hardly a field of cultural endeavor, a subject of Jewish interest, a form of physical recreation, a sharing in group activity or opportunity for communal participation, that does not find expression in some phase of the program of the Jewish Center. Life in the Center has for many thousands of children, young people and adults become a rich experience in the unfoldment of personality and a valuable training for purposeful living."

Although the most marked development has taken place in the educational and cultural program, Jewish Centers have continued to emphasize and provide opportunities for
a rounded development. Physical training, sports, improvement of health and physique, wholesome enjoyment of leisure in games and social activities, are all elements in the program that are valuable for normal growth of children and young people. With the increase in leisure available to so many, the youth as well as adults, activities of this character have added significance. Even a cursory examination of the programs of local organizations reveals a great wealth of opportunity for acquiring Jewish knowledge, the pursuit of cultural interests, participation in forums, discussion groups, and lyceums, attendance at concerts, lectures, art exhibits and motion pictures. The Center stimulates interest in Jewish subjects and encourages the establishment and growth of organizations with a Jewish purpose. Many of these organizations conduct daily or Sabbath schools for Jewish instruction and some provide religious services. All of them emphasize the observance of Jewish festivals and anniversaries of historic significance. In many communities the Center is not only the meeting place of Jewish communal groups, but is also the principal agency for mobilizing Jewish effort and participation in fund-raising and other undertakings on behalf of Jews in other lands. Often too, the Center is called upon, in the person of its professional director or of lay committees, to perform many social services for those in need of material aid or adjustment of some personal problem.

Perhaps one of the most significant services of the Center is its ability to cultivate Jewish leadership. Many opportunities are offered in the clubs, special interest groups, youth organizations and in the conduct of mass activities for planning and management by the young people themselves. Life in the Center is for many of the youth a rich experience in the sharing of responsibility, in cooperative endeavor and in the exercise of leadership in socially useful projects. Thus leadership qualities of value in a democratic setting are discovered and cultivated. Youth leadership in the Center is directed towards Jewish goals, based upon understanding of Jewish life, and rooted in loyalties to Jewish values. Increasingly, Centers encourage young people of demonstrated ability and interest to serve on committees and boards of management. Since the Center aids in many
ways in community-wide Jewish and civic enterprises, it offers a constantly expanding area of constructive service to those of its members who have developed leadership abilities.

The leadership training function of the Center is not, of course, limited to the youth. Judge Lehman recently described its larger scope in this way: "It is estimated that about 10,000 men and women serve as members of local Boards of Directors and on committees. There are many more who are helpful in various volunteer capacities on an occasional or permanent basis. They take part in policy-making, management, supervision and finance. But what is of especial interest and value is that in many instances their interest is not limited to budgetary and governmental considerations. From a community standpoint, it is encouraging that increasing proportions of those included in the advisory or contributing group actively participate in the life of the Jewish Center. They enjoy activities in comradeship with the young groups. Such sharing of experiences cannot but make for the democracy of the Jewish Center and for the democracy of the Jewish community."

The Jewish Welfare Board has had a vital part in the growth of the Jewish Center movement. In 1921, when the Board assumed the role of parent body, it faced a pioneering task. There was at that time little experience to guide it in the development of a national program. It had to create and organize all of the services that were essential to the establishment and conduct of Jewish Center work.

A field staff was formed to visit communities, deal with the building up of existing societies, and enlist needed support for them. Later on, when buildings were erected, the field personnel devoted itself to problems of management, finance, staff, program, membership and community relationships. In order that Centers might serve constituencies intelligently, the Board established a department of studies which made surveys of resources and needs and outlined programs for meeting these needs. Incidentally these community studies, made in over 100 cities, contain data regarding Jewish population, Jewish institutions and organizations which have proved valuable beyond their immediate purposes.
Because of the sensitivity of the Center to changing needs, and the necessity of altering policies and program to meet them, Centers constantly seek guidance from the national organization in planning for adjustments. To meet the situation the Board carries on continuous research and evaluation of the experience of local organizations, through a department of Jewish Center administration. Such service proved particularly valuable when rapid and radical changes had to be made to meet the effects of the economic depression, which brought in its wake a shrinkage in income and a simultaneous increase in demand for free service. Fortunately, the Center movement had established itself firmly in the communal structure and had achieved recognition as a needed instrumentality in Jewish life. With skillful aid afforded by the Campaign Department of the Jewish Welfare Board, which had been established at the very outset, financial support was secured to enable Jewish Centers to meet the challenge of the financial crisis. Seldom was there a more heartening display of loyalty and deeply rooted appreciation of the significant role of the Center. In scores of communities, people responded most generously to the need for maintaining, without harmful curtailment, the program and service of local Jewish Center organizations. It is undoubtedly true that communities placed a particular value upon the Jewish Center because, in those distressing years, Jews sought more than ever the sense of security that could be found in association with their own kind and under the hospitable roofs of their cherished institutions. This need for sustenance of the spirit was intensified by the impact of the tragic events that befell Jews in Germany and Eastern Europe. In common with the Synagogue and the School, the Jewish Center appeared to offer an anchorage for the troubled Jewish soul, and the Jewish Center was not found wanting or inadequate.

Within the walls of the Jewish Center, there breathed a vitality, zest to participate in normal activity, and a calm approach to the perplexing problems of the day that were veritable anodynes for lowered morale. The Center sought to provide opportunities for learning about the significance of current events of Jewish interest, comprehending their underlying causes, and rallying Jewish sentiment for con-
structive action. A new emphasis was given to the educational purpose of the Center in its endeavor to help people to apply intelligence and objectivity in analyzing the currents of Jewish life. All those elements in the pattern of Jewish communal life that contributed to an intensification of Jewish loyalties and to Jewish group survival took on a new significance. Among these forces the Jewish Center represented to many of its constituency values of an essential nature. It symbolized the striving for unity of Jewish purpose, the emphasis on the kinship and fellowship of the Jewish people. At a time when American Jewry felt most the need of dealing with the problems of Jewish life in their totality, the Center seemed to point the way in many communities, giving direction to the organization of Jewish communal resources on a broad community-wide basis. It has contributed to a new understanding of the purpose of communal organization and to an enlarged vision of the good that may come from a communal program in which limited organizational loyalties and interests are merged in the interests of the community as a whole.

The expanding concept of the Jewish Center as a community organization has been crystallized on the basis of actual experience of local organizations. In the process, the program of the Center has grown in scope and content far beyond its form twenty years ago. Indeed, when the Board became the national agency for the Jewish Center movement in 1921, it was most difficult to trace in the then existing activities of the local organizations, with but few exceptions, the barest outline of a common program. Very little of the experience had been recorded in printed form. It became necessary to create program materials that could be utilized in developing activities. A Department of Jewish Center Activities was established at the outset, which undertook to organize the content of basic cultural, educational and recreational work, and to outline methods of planning and conducting the essential activities of the Jewish Center. Manuals and bulletins were written and widely distributed. In order to satisfy the lack of specifically Jewish content, a bureau of Jewish Extension Education was established. Materials of Jewish interest were systematically collected, collated and arranged for use by
groups of children and young people. Experiments and demonstrations in the use of Jewish subject matter have been conducted as one means of stimulating members of Jewish Centers to broaden their interests and to add to their knowledge and understanding of things Jewish.

In addition to program publications, periodical literature has been developed. A quarterly magazine, *The Jewish Center*, has been published regularly since 1922. It has proved a valuable medium of interpretation of the movement and a record of the significant achievements in the field. Professional workers particularly are afforded opportunities through this periodical for recording experiences and the results of study and research. It has become the official organ of the Jewish Welfare Board and of the Jewish Center movement generally. In more recent years a Supplement to the quarterly, written in a more popular vein, has been issued periodically, which contains brief articles and descriptions of activities that have an exceptional interest.

The published material has reached notable proportions, comprising over 100 program bulletins, manuals, texts and plays, in addition to the periodicals, and has been extensively used not only by Jewish Centers, but also by Synagogues, Schools and other Jewish educational and cultural organizations. Naturally, being largely of a technical character, the published material had value only if it could be intelligently utilized, by social workers trained for the Jewish Center field. Relatively few of the organizations had the benefit of professional direction in 1921. Indeed, one of the first functions of the Jewish Welfare Board was to recruit and prepare men and women for the challenging tasks of leadership and guidance of Jewish Centers. As in other aspects of the work, the development of competent personnel was one of pioneering. There were no facilities for the specialized training of Jewish workers for this field, nor had criteria been established for determining qualifications for Jewish Center work.

A systematic program of recruiting and training was undertaken, and a personnel service evolved. Standards of selection have emphasized definite Jewish interests, education and affiliations, advanced academic preparation, maturity and leadership qualities. Professional training
was provided at first by the Board itself and subsequently, when the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work was organized, the two organizations cooperated in the task of training. This procedure still prevails and, in addition, the Board continues to provide special preparation for individuals who, for various reasons, cannot enter the school. The Board has also concerned itself with the problem of training volunteer leaders of clubs and other groups and with recruiting and placing specialists in a variety of skills and techniques.

Mindful of the crucial position of the professional worker in the structure of the Jewish Center, the Board has given encouragement to the building up of a professional body of Jewish Center workers and has stimulated professional interests. The National Association of Jewish Center workers, whose membership includes the executive heads of local Centers and a number of assistants, has had the fullest cooperation in the planning of its activities and the publication of conference papers and reports. A few years ago, the Board instituted a plan of group life insurance for employees of Jewish Centers, and in many other ways has indicated its concern with the professional status and employment practices affecting Jewish Center workers.

The personnel program of the Board has resulted in the creation of a virtually new profession, comprising hundreds of intelligent Jewish men and women of fine idealism, devoted wholeheartedly and loyally to the service of the Jewish people. This homogeneous and like-minded body, growing from year to year, has demonstrated a capacity for leadership and an integrity of purpose that constitutes a definite asset of the Jewish community.

When the Jewish Welfare Board became the parent body it numbered among its constituents not only the various local organizations affiliated at the time with the Council of Young Men’s Hebrew and Kindred Associations, but some regional organizations or Federations as well. The regional bodies came into being because of the common purposes of Jewish Centers in the several geographical areas and because of the advantages of inter-organizational relationships that could be capitalized for mutual growth and development. Such regional bodies, known for the most
part as Federations of Y M H A's and Y W H A's, existed in New England, New York State, the Metropolitan area of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and in the Middle Atlantic States, comprising Virginia, the District of Columbia, Maryland and Delaware. They were composed of the local organizations in the respective territories and functioned through lay committees and delegates. As was the case in their constituent societies, the dominant leadership of these regional federations consisted of interested young people, who could give but limited time to the program. Unaided by the professional service of a full-time field staff, it was difficult to maintain sustained contact among the organizations, and the regional bodies exerted little influence in the constructive development of the movement.

The Board was mindful of the need for helping the regional bodies to become effective units in the structure of the national organization. The chief task, and in this, the Board is still engaged, was to bring into Federation work men and women of outstanding experience and leadership. A close relationship was established through the field staff and a more meaningful program of regional activity gradually evolved. Reorganizations were effected in the Pennsylvania and Middle Atlantic States resulting in a merger of these Federations, and the Metropolitan League of New York was reconstituted as a Section of the Jewish Welfare Board, and other changes were made to effect a better integration with the national body. The Federations conduct a variety of inter-organizational activities of an educational, cultural and social character for the individual members of the local groups. The government is entirely in the hands of lay people and the program is definitely of lay interest. Although the Federations are still in the developmental stage, yet they have served a unique purpose in bringing together people of different communities in a varied program that has promoted Jewish fellowship and an awareness of belonging to a movement that transcends purely local interests.

The Federations are increasingly concerned with projects of a cooperative nature, from which a number of communities may benefit. Among these is the establishment of summer camps, of the self-supporting type, on a district
or regional basis. They serve organizations that individually could not successfully maintain these enterprises, now regarded as an essential feature of the year-round program of the Jewish Center. The Federation camps were established largely through the efforts of the national office, which maintains a Department of Health and Camping Activities. One of the distinctive contributions of the Jewish Welfare Board in this field has been the development of the Home Camp that provides many children unable to go to country camps with opportunities in town, to enjoy some of the values of organized camping. In its camping program, the Board has emphasized the possibilities of employing modern educational methods and of conducting projects of a Jewish nature that include all of the attractive health and recreational features associated with an enjoyable vacation. An extensive advisory service is maintained dealing with problems of organization and management of 86 country camps and 57 Home Camps, which last summer had an enrollment of 40,800 children. In addition, the Board provides opportunities for training of counsellors and makes recommendations for their placement.

Limitation of space does not permit of a full description of the many other services which the Board renders in the discharge of its responsibility to Jewish Centers throughout this country and Canada. The evidence of its usefulness must, in the final analysis, be sought in the records of growth and effectiveness of work of the local organizations themselves. From small beginnings, a notable movement has developed under the aegis of the national organization, a movement not only of immediate value to Jewish life, but one that has contributed and will continue to add to the cultural and civic forces of the country. The worth of the Jewish Welfare Board has been recognized by government agencies and many organizations outside of the Jewish field. The Board and its constituent organizations have cooperated extensively in the various relief programs of the emergency government agencies during recent years. Centers have been encouraged to make available their resources of facilities and personnel by creating opportunities for socially useful employment to thousands of young
people and adults through the Works Progress Administration and the National Youth Administration. Cooperation has been extended to other government bureaus, to Community Chests and Councils, the National Education and Recreation Council, and to various social service organizations of a private and public character. It has for a number of years been interested in the development of the Boy Scout movement, through the Advisory Jewish Committee on Scouting, with which it has been my pleasure to be associated.

The Board has continued, as a permanent policy, to provide for the religious and welfare needs of the men in the military service and those confined to Veterans Hospitals. The work which we carry on today differs in both extent and character from the activities conducted from 1917 to 1920. Naturally, the conditions of peace time and the individual problems growing out of war service have necessitated modifications of program.

The spirit in which we serve, however, has not altered. The hand of fellowship reaches out to our co-religionists in every camp in this country, in the isolated areas of the Canal Zone and Hawaii, to the wards of our government in Veterans' Hospitals and Soldiers' Homes. There is still a small but loyal and conscientious contingent of workers enrolled in the humanitarian service of the Jewish Welfare Board that maintains sustained contact with all of these men, and ministers to their needs in the countless ways that have become the recognizable pattern of the distinctive program of the Jewish Welfare Board. That program is bound by no narrow limitations. We are always only too eager to extend our work wherever the need exists.

Thus the most recent undertaking of the Board has been the inauguration of service to the young men in the camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), and to members of Veterans' Camps. At the request of the Board and upon its recommendation, rabbis have been appointed to serve in the CCC camps, two of them on a full-time basis. Our regular full-time and part-time personnel and volunteer workers also serve the camps in their localities. Thus we have been able to make direct, periodic contact with many of the Jewish boys.
As for the men in the regular army and navy and disabled veterans, our activities in their interest continue along well established lines. Religious services are provided for them and for the young men in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and Citizens' Military Training Camps. Current attention is given to the personal problems of the men. Disabled veterans, their families and dependents, and beneficiaries of deceased veterans of the World War, are aided in securing government benefits to which they are entitled.

Jewish holidays and festivals are appropriately observed. In 1936, approximately 2418 soldiers, sailors, veterans and members of the Civilian Conservation Corps participated in observance of the High Holydays, and 3604 were served during Passover.

It is of special interest to point out that the work of the Board, particularly in Panama and Hawaii, has values for Jewish life that extend beyond the program for the men in the service. A constructive contribution is being made to the religious and communal welfare of the civilian Jewish population as well. In Hawaii the civilian population was actually devoid of any Jewish influence until the Jewish Welfare Board inaugurated the program of Jewish welfare and religious activities, shortly after the war. In 1921, Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz of England wrote, after a pastoral tour of the British Dominions: "On June 26 we came to Honolulu, where there is a far larger number of Jews than at Suva. The American Jewish Welfare Board looks after the Jewish soldiers, at this important American naval base, otherwise there is no Jewish life in the Hawaiian Islands. The Jews there originally came from every corner of the globe, but they are all alike in the abandonment of Judaism. Even the old Jewish cemetery has been given up." In 1924, three years later, he wrote: "This was in 1921. It is gratifying to learn that the miracle of Ezekiel xxxvii is repeating itself in Honolulu. The very following year the Spirit began to stir that valley of Dry Bones." Rabbi Hertz referred to the establishment in 1922 of the Aloha Jewish Center, by the Jewish Welfare Board, on which occasion Princess David Kawanukoa voluntarily loaned a Sefer Torah, which had been kept as a family heirloom.
In Panama, a somewhat similar influence has been exercised also by the Jewish Welfare Board. During the war period, quarters were maintained, in Panama City, for the men in the service. The native Jews took part freely in the activities and visited the rooms. A room was appropriately furnished for religious services, and when the emergency was at an end, it was turned over for the use of the local congregation. The local community had no religious leader or teacher until the Jewish Welfare Board worker undertook to conduct a Sunday School. He also organized a Jewish relief society, and was instrumental in establishing a B'nai B'rith lodge. The cooperation of the Jewish Welfare Board has made it possible for the local congregation to engage the services of an American-trained, English-speaking rabbi, and the community two years ago dedicated a well-appointed new structure to house its religious, cultural, and social activities.

These contributions which the Jewish Welfare Board has made in these remote localities are not the less significant because they are by-products of our work in behalf of American soldiers and sailors. They serve to emphasize the broad spirit in which the Board meets its responsibilities.

The army and navy welfare work is carried on by an employed staff of sixteen representatives and sixty-six who volunteer their services. In addition, rabbis in the Officers Reserve Corps assist at hospitals, CCC camps and Citizens' Military Training Camps. The Board continues to exercise the function of certifying qualified rabbis for membership in the Officers Reserve Corps. There are at present seventeen Jewish Chaplains in the Corps, three of them with the rank of major. Twenty-one rabbis have government appointments as chaplains at Veterans Hospitals and in the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Briefly, this is the record of the Jewish Welfare Board since it was established twenty years ago. After twenty years we are able to evaluate that experience in its larger significance to the Jewish community. The machinery then created for effective work on behalf of the men of Jewish faith in the service of our country, and the welfare program that was established have continued in their essential elements as a permanent part of the total structure of Jew
ish communal service in this country. The work of the Board has also contributed to an understanding of certain fundamental principles of government policy in relation to the status of soldiers and sailors of our faith. The welfare and religious program inaugurated during the war emergency took into account the special religious needs of the men of the various denominations. It was recognized that these men could best be served by organizations that understood their needs. In consonance with this policy, the Jewish Welfare Board was authorized to minister to the Jewish men. A number of policies established from time to time by government departments and bureaus have reinforced this principle. The distribution of Jewish bibles and prayer books; the securing of furloughs to enable men of Jewish faith to go home to observe Passover and the High Holydays; the appointment of Jewish chaplains to the regular army and navy, during the war, and to the Reserve Corps, in peace time; the approval of special insignia for Jewish chaplains; the authority during the war, to construct and operate Jewish Welfare Board buildings; provision for Magen David markers over the graves of Jewish soldier dead; elimination of distinctive religious symbols in the interdenominational chapels—all are acts growing out of the recognition of special religious needs of men of Jewish faith in the military service. The contacts which the Jewish Welfare Board has always enjoyed with government agencies have likewise promoted general understanding and good will.

Recently, reviewing the work of the Jewish Welfare Board, Judge Lehman said: "We have looked backward upon twenty years of evolution. Two decades are but as a moment in Jewish history. Yet, in the history of the Jewish people of America these decades have been tremendously important. Since the outbreak of the war in 1914, American Jewry has been faced with new and ever-growing responsibilities. More than ever, world Jewry has been looking to our community for leadership and assistance. Parallel with these problems have been those which call for the sound development of our own community life through institutions which bring Jews of varying attitudes and interests together in enterprises of mutual helpfulness derived from common
ideals and directed toward common obligations. Among the agencies that are proving effective in these great tasks confronting our people none has been more potent or shows greater promise for the future than the Jewish Center. Starting out and continuing as an expression of the natural and spontaneous desire of Jewish young people for Jewish fellowship, the Jewish Center is engaged definitely and constructively in developing healthy Jewish personalities, sensitive to Jewish tradition and Jewish ideals and prepared for the problems of modern life. Through such personalities, the Jewish Center can make its finest contributions to the character and moral value of our citizenry. In broadening its program to embrace all elements in Jewish life, the Jewish Center is actuated by the conviction that a harmonious group life upon a broad cultural and religious basis offers the best hope for the permanence and the happiness of Jews in America as an integral element of American life."

The Jewish Welfare Board has been fortunate in its leadership, and this account of its activities would be inadequate indeed if I failed to record the share that its illustrious founders and workers had in its progress. I have told of the inspiration that we derived from the encouragement given by Jacob H. Schiff and from the untiring efforts of Mortimer L. Schiff; of the sagacity and forcefulness of Louis Marshall; the able and ceaseless application of Harry Cutler, the president of the Board during the war emergency. These and others who gave freely of themselves, for no one that was asked to serve declined to do so, contributed mightily to the Jewish Welfare Board, in war and peace. The traditions of harmony, cooperation and singleness of purpose have been creditably maintained under the wise leadership of Judge Lehman, who became President of the Jewish Welfare Board sixteen years ago.
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1.

In their spiritual life the Jewish people have been guided by two ideas: Bible and secular knowledge, religion and science. In the days of the Prophets as in the days of the Talmudists these were indeed the only aims towards which the Jews strove. Neither the Bible nor the Talmud differentiates between the Jew as a member of the Jewish people and the Jew as a human being. "They spend their time in research and experiments in the natural sciences," was written of the Talmudic scholars by one of the early Fathers of the Christian Church.

During the Middle Ages and down to the present day the Jews continued to be interested in every branch of knowledge, even while they were engrossed in specifically Jewish law and the study of the Bible. Since then times have changed. While, at one time, science was deemed unimportant in comparison with religion and Bible knowledge, and secular knowledge was nothing but the "cookery and chemistry" of religion (ancillae theologiae), later, nothing but Jewish lore was taught in the "Yeshiva," and the Jews who wished to study science were compelled to do so from Gentile books, or at the Universities. A gulf began to appear between Jewish study and science; not having been derived from the same source, they did not develop parallel with each other. In Italy, two isolated attempts were actually made to create an entire Jewish university, one in 1466 and the second in 1564; the experiments failed, partly for lack of comprehension by the Jews and partly because of Catholic opposition.

The idea of establishing a Hebrew University to serve the Jews was not revived until the days of "Hibat Zion,"
with the national revival for the repeopling of Palestine. The suggestion was first made by Dr. Zvi (Hermann) Schapira, professor of mathematics at Heidelberg University from 1882 to 1884. Fifteen years later, in 1897, about the time when Herzl first came upon the Jewish scene, Reuben Brainin wrote on the idea of the Hebrew University in the Berlin monthly Zion. At the first Zionist Congress, the matter was again brought up by Professor Schapira and by Dr. M. Ehrenpreis. Finally, in 1902, soon after the Fifth Zionist Congress (1901), there appeared in Berlin the first of a series of German pamphlets entitled "The High School of Jewish Learning," and propaganda began to be made for the realization of this idea under the leadership of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Dr. Martin Buber, and Berthold Feiwel. In 1908, they were joined, in their efforts to found a Hebrew University, by the Anglo-Jewish scholar Israel Abrahams.

At that time, when the numerus clausus had been introduced in the Universities of Tsarist Russia, on the one hand, and the first Hebrew Secondary School had been established in Jaffa, on the other, the plan of the University received further stimuli. There was now a definite need for a place where Russian Jews and young Palestinians, who left the Hebrew gymnasium, might obtain higher education. Some three years later, in 1911 and 1912, Dr. Joseph Klausner pointed out the necessity to found, at the very least, a Faculty of Humanities, as the first beginnings of a University. At the Eleventh Zionist Congress (1913) addresses advocating the establishment of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem were made by Menachem Ussischkin and Dr. Weizmann, and the Congress decided to appoint a committee to study the subject. The World War, which broke out less than one year later, caused the suspension, for the time being, of all work on behalf of the University. But, on July 24, 1918, before the Armistice and soon after the British Army had entered Jerusalem, Dr. Weizmann had already laid the foundation stone of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. Seven years were to pass, however, before the University became more than a brave idea, and began to take on material existence.

The next stimulus came in 1922 when Sir Ronald Storrs, then Governor of Jerusalem, took up the idea of establish-
ing an English University in the city. A Hebrew University Committee was founded which counted among its members Menachem Ussischkin, Ahad Ha-am, Dr. J. L. Magnes, Elieser Ben Yehuda, appointed Secretary to the Committee, Norman Bentwich, David Yellin, Dr. Joseph Klausner, Dr. L. A. Mayer and S. Ginzberg. After three years of work a beginning was made, when, on the first day of Hanukkah, December 22, 1924, the Institute of Jewish Studies was opened by Dr. Magnes, who was devoting himself entirely to the University and was largely instrumental in bringing the project to life. Four months later, on April 1, 1925, the formal opening ceremony of the University on Mount Scopus was performed by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, in the presence of Lord Balfour, who had come to Palestine for this purpose. It would be impossible to enumerate all the distinguished guests who attended the gathering; they included Jewish and non-Jewish scholars and other persons of distinction from every part of the world. One thing we may remember: it was the first time in many thousands of years that the nations gathered to do homage to the spiritual heritage of the people of Israel.

2.

Since then, the development of the Hebrew University has been gradual but steady, through a period now of some twelve years (1925–1937).

What has the University achieved during this relatively short period?

The intention of the founders of the University was that it be a purely research institution, to provide a home for the tradition of science and learning among the Jews, to study the sources of Judaism in their entirety, to create a scientific atmosphere in Palestine, and to help to solve some of its practical problems, to give an opportunity for graduate and specialized training to local professional men and women, and to contribute to the revival of the Hebrew language. So great, however, was the demand for undergraduate teaching, from students from European countries as well as in Palestine, that it was necessary to add new
departments and extend the teaching facilities. Undergraduate instruction is now based on a four year course leading to degrees of M. A. (Master of Arts), and M. Sc. (Master of Science).

The first Institutes were the Institute of Jewish Studies and the Institute of Chemistry, established in 1924. The School of Oriental Studies followed in 1926. A Department of Parasitology was organized in 1925; the Institute of Palestine Natural History and the Department of Hygiene and Bacteriology, in 1926; and the Institute of Mathematics, in 1927.

There are now two faculties at the Hebrew University: the Faculty of Humanities, and the Faculty of Sciences. The Faculty of Humanities, now comprising three separate institutes, the Jewish, the Oriental, and the Arts, was established in 1928; the Faculty of Sciences, comprising ten main Departments, was established in November 1935.

The Institute of Jewish Studies offers courses in the following subjects: Bible, Talmud, Literature of the Gaonic and Rabbinic periods, Mediaeval Hebrew Literature, Modern Hebrew Literature, Hebrew Language, Jewish History, Palestinology, Jewish Philosophy, Cabbala, Jewish Sociology, and Jewish Law.


In the third Institute, that of the Arts, the following subjects are taught: History of Greece and Rome, Mediaeval History, Modern History, Greek Language and Literature, Latin Language and Literature, Romance Philology (French, Italian and Spanish); Philosophy, Practical Pedagogy, General and Palestinian Archaeology, Agrarian Economy and International Relations.

It is clear from this list that many of the branches of knowledge studied at other universities are still lacking here, and among them some of great importance. Thirty subjects are being taught already, however, and these include the vital ones. As regards the Institute of Jewish Studies, it may already be said that there is not another institute,
either in Europe or America, which is making so complete
and intensive a study of the subject as is being made here.
Oriental Studies are also receiving more and more concen-
trated attention here than at any European University.
The general and classical studies, finally, which are pursued
by the Jewish student here, parallel to his specifically Jewish
studies, will surely also bear valuable fruit in the future.

The Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences is
divided into ten main Institutes, among them those devoted
to Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Botany, Biblical and
Talmudic Plant Lore, Zoology, Geology, Meteorology and
Climatology, Parasitology, Hygiene and Bacteriology, Phy-
siology and Cancer Research. Research is also being carried
on in Pre-History into the Ethnology of the Oriental Jews,
and many other subjects; Archives of Oriental Music have
been founded as well as a valuable and interesting Archae-
ological Collection, and a Museum of Biblical, Talmudic
and Arab Plant Lore.

The following departments (both teaching and research)
now at the University, under the Faculty of Science, will
constitute the nucleus of the Faculty of Medicine which it
is planned to establish when the Hospital and other build-
ings, now in course of construction, are completed:
Hygiene and Bacteriology, Parasitology, Physiology,
Cancer Research and Gynecology (Hormone Research).

Very special importance is also to be attached to the
great Jewish National and University Library, with its col-
lection of 325,000 books in every known language—the
largest library in the Near East. The Library is an integral
part of the University, and with the aid of the University
publishes the biographical quarterly *Kiryat Sefer*. Dur-
ing the 13 years of its existence this periodical has earned
a distinguished reputation in the scientific world for the
accuracy and completeness of its bibliographical material.

Another very important part of the University’s activi-
ties bears fruit in the publications of the Hebrew University
Press, which has for some seven years been publishing the
scientific quarterly *Tarbitz*, as well as a complete series
of scientific books, edited with a view to the immediate
needs of the students at the Hebrew University. Most
important of these are the translations into Hebrew of the writings of some of the greatest philosophers including Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Locke, Hume, Leibniz, Kant, Fichte, John Stuart Mill, and others.

The academic and financial policies of the University are directed by the Board of Governors, of which Dr. Chaim Weizmann is chairman, composed of representative Jews from all parts of the world. The Board of Governors is represented in Palestine by the Executive Council of the University of which Mr. Salmann Schocken is chairman; he serves also as Honorary Treasurer.

Academic matters are in the hands of the Senate, composed of faculty members and the faculty boards, which elect the Rector of the University from among their number. The office of Rector is held this year by Professor Hugo Bergmann.

* * *

Three degrees are offered to students by the University. Graduates of the Faculty of Humanities may obtain an M. A. (Magister Artium), Master of Arts, roughly equivalent to the similar degree obtained elsewhere, and later the Ph. D. (Doctor Philosophiae), Doctor of Philosophy. Students of the Faculty of Natural Sciences may obtain an M. Sc. (Magister Scientiarium), Master of Science. Up to the present a total of sixty-six students have been awarded the M. A. of the Hebrew University; the M. Sc. has been obtained by only twenty-five students so far, the Faculty of Science having been open for only five or six years.

The language of instruction in all subjects at the University is Hebrew.

A minimum period of four years of study is required in both the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Science, and final examinations must be passed in one major and two minor subjects, and a thesis in the major subject is required to receive the degree of M. A. or M. Sc.

In the Faculty of Humanities the student may choose from the following as either major or minor subjects:

Archaeology, Arabic Language and Literature, Classics, Hebrew Language, Hebrew Literature, History,
Islamic Culture, Jewish History and Sociology, Jewish Philosophy and Mysticism, Palestinology, Philosophy, Semitic Philology, Talmud.

The following may be taken as minor subjects only:
Archaeology of Palestine, Archaeology of the Near East, Agrarian Economics, Bible, Egyptology, Education courses, English.

In the Faculty of Science the following may be taken as either major or minor subjects:
Bacteriology and Hygiene, Biochemistry, Botany, Chemistry, Mathematics, Zoology.

The following may be taken as minor subjects only:
Geology, Physics.

Holders of the master's degree of Hebrew University or equivalent degrees of other universities who are equipped for research in their subject may be admitted as research students. On the completion of a period of at least two years of work and the submission of a thesis dealing with an original research project, together with the passing of an examination, research students may receive the Ph. D. degree. Last year the University bestowed a Ph. D. for the first time. The total number of research students now at the University is 48.

Like all other universities, Hebrew University has made provision for helping indigent students. Of the total annual income from tuition fees, 7% is devoted to this purpose; in addition, there are prizes for outstanding students, work is obtained for those desiring it, and students preparing for graduation may obtain loans.

Most of the graduates of the University are engaged in teaching, either in Palestine or in other countries; some have found employment in public institutions, in industry, journalism, or allied fields; others have joined the academic and administrative staffs of the University.

The students of the University have gathered here from every part of the world. Of the total enrollment, the
largest contingent of roughly 450, during the scholastic year 1936–37, was provided by Poland; students from various parts of Palestine itself number some 150, those from Germany, 50. The rest come from Lithuania, England, Austria, Latvia, Persia, Roumania, Russia, Hungary, America, Egypt, Iran, Turkey, Switzerland, and even Manchukuo. It would be difficult to find another so varied and so colorful a group at any other University. When the institution opened in 1925, a total of 130 students were registered. The number has been growing steadily, approaching 800 during the past academic year. The female students comprise about one-third of the total. There is every reason to suppose that the number of students will be counted by thousands in the not too distant future.

The number of members of the teaching staff at the University is also growing steadily, having increased from 33 to over one hundred. Of these, twenty-six are professors, thirty-two lecturers, and the rest instructors, assistants, and research workers. The University is proud to be able to record that over twenty Jewish professors and lecturers from Germany have found refuge within her walls, after having been dismissed from similar positions in the country of their birth, because of their Jewish descent.
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There are two sources from which the Hebrew University draws her strength: from the troubles of the Jews in Eastern and Central Europe, and from the troubles of the Jews all over the world.

On the one hand, Jewish students and teachers in Germany, Poland, Roumania, Austria, Hungary and other countries are suffering oppression which gives us reason to fear that, in another generation, the Jews, now perhaps over-intellectualized, will have become a people entirely made up of manual workers.

On the other hand, the Jewry of Eastern Europe is on the decline, as a result of economic and political factors, and, with it the heder and the yeshiva, the old places of learning, from which Jewish knowledge spread over the world.
For both these problems the Hebrew University is trying to provide a solution. In welcoming the excluded students and ousted professors from Germany and other countries, the University becomes the refuge of Jewish learning as well as of Jewish scholars; in replacing the yeshiva, the University will preserve from oblivion the traditional study of the Bible and the Talmud.

The University is, however, even more eager to serve the Jewish people. It would be difficult to explain briefly the immense significance and importance of the mere fact that, here and now, two very different factions, so to speak, have been brought together to cooperate under one roof. The Hebrew University is teaching the Talmud and Chemistry, Hebrew Literature along side of Greek and Latin, Jewish Philosophy and General Philosophy, Cabbala and Physics. This conjunction will one day bear great fruit, and bring about a synthesis between “Jewish” studies and the Humanities, between Natural Science and the study of spiritual matters, between religion and every-day life.

Another noteworthy fact is that both the professors and the students come from countries all over the world, bringing with them something of every kind of culture and knowledge. Work at the University may be rendered more difficult by this fact, in the beginning, but in the end there will be an unparalleled fusion of all the civilizations which the world has ever known; out of this will emerge the living character of the Jewish people. All the world will have stood god-mother to this rebirth, and surely it will be something to glory in.

It is also significant that there are some two hundred women students among the eight hundred students now registered, and that they do not restrict themselves to the general studies, but are taking their part in keeping alive traditional Jewish knowledge. It was not so very long ago that Jewish women possessed nothing, or next to nothing, of the spiritual heritage of their people, and when it was said “What does a woman want with Talmud and Torah?” Here, again, the University is performing a valuable task in affording complete equality of treatment to her men and women students.
Students are accepted at the University without any discrimination as to creed or race: the number of Christian students is not negligible and, prior to the beginning of the current disturbances, lectures were also attended by a number of Moslem students. At present, there is even one Christian research student, a woman, who is preparing a Hebrew thesis entitled "The Influence of the Bible on Modern Hebrew Literature." It is our sincere hope that the time will never come when the Jewish students of the Hebrew University will not welcome Christian and Moslem students, who wish to study in Hebrew and at the Hebrew University, either the Bible or the Sciences.

A small but valuable contingent among the students are those who come mainly from America, not for a full course, but for one or two years study of Hebrew and conditions in Palestine. These young men and women can learn much here that no other non-Jewish university can teach them, and are able to spread knowledge of the real character and aims of the Hebrew University, and of the subjects taught there.

The Hebrew University is very closely bound up with the people and the country of Palestine. The Department of Microbiology, for instance, is carrying on meticulous research into the insects which transmit malaria, diphtheria, typhus fever, dysentery, etc. This Department also investigates the effect of climatic factors on the physiological functions, nutrition, and the susceptibility of the body to infectious diseases. With the support of the Agricultural Department of the Government, it investigates diseases of fowl and, particularly, spirochaetosis, which is widespread in Palestine. A Malaria Research Station is maintained at Rosh Pinah near the Huleh Swamps for the study of the epidemiology of malaria and kindred problems. The Chemistry Departments are investigating the minerals and various other substances to be found in Palestine, and the structure and composition of the soil; the Geology Department is engaged in the scientific study of the geological structure and formations
of Palestine, in the preparation of geological maps, and in the study of its water and mineral resources. The Laboratory of Meteorology and Climatology conducts research into climate and rainfall; the Department of Palestinology inquires into the Jewish settlements of the past and what may be learned from them.

In this way, the research work of the University establishes a close contact with the work of the people living in Palestine,—in agriculture and industry, in the improvement of the health services, in the investigation of the natural wealth of the country and its exploitation, and in many other directions.

Professors and other teachers at the University also come into direct contact with the population. University Extension Courses have been established in Tel Aviv and in Jerusalem, and there is now practically no scientific or literary work in Palestine in which the academic staff of the University has not a part. Furthermore, members of the faculty broadcast regularly over the recently erected broadcasting station. One member of the faculty heads the Hebrew Language Committee of Palestine, whose task is to create the Hebrew terminology necessary to make the language a workable medium for the expression of all activities and phases of modern life.

* * * * *

At present the University is housed in ten buildings:

1. The Chemistry Building which contains a lecture hall, chemistry laboratories for research and for students, the departments of parasitology, hygiene and bacteriology and zoological and physiological laboratories;

2. The Wattenberg Building which accommodates the Einstein Institute of Mathematics;

3. The Moness Shapiro Building of the Einstein Institute of Physics, which houses also the departments of physical chemistry, botany and geology, the Davis Botanical and Zoological Laboratories for students, and the zoological collection;
4. The David Wolffsohn House accommodates the Jewish National and the University Library, the School of Oriental Studies, and the archaeological collection;

5. The University Club House contains the Solow Hall and the Refectory;

6. The Minnie Untermeyer Memorial Open Air Theatre and Stadium which seats an audience of 2200; the hall below the stage houses the Museum of Biblical Botany;

7-10. The Administrative Building, the Power House, the workshop for mechanical work and glass-blowing, and the Animal House.

By special arrangement, the University uses the facilities of a bioclimatological research station which has been erected on the University grounds.

Societies of Friends of the Hebrew University have been organized in various countries to assist the University financially and to spread widely knowledge of its program and its needs. There are now such Societies in the following countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, England, Finland, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Jugo-Slavia, Luxembourg, Latvia, Palestine, Poland, Roumania, Switzerland, United States, and Union of South Africa.
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But is the University in Jerusalem complete? Indeed not. Although much exists, there is more that is lacking.

One important department which it is hoped to establish is the Faculty of Laws. The Legal Courses arranged by the Government of Palestine are entirely utilitarian, and are not intended to include legal research. When established, the Faculty of Laws of the Hebrew University will delve more profoundly into law in general, and particularly into Jewish Law, comparing it with Roman Law and with the legislation of various peoples in the past and the present.

The present teaching of pedagogy, psychology, Bible, modern languages, and political economy, all in the Faculty
of Humanities, is still insufficient, while in the Faculty of Sciences the departments of Physics, Chemistry, Scientific Geography, and Practical Mathematics await further development.

The Institute of Agriculture is still a dream, although Palestine, an agricultural country, stands badly in need of it. The sons of the country are still forced to go abroad in search of agricultural knowledge, because their own University is unable to teach them scientific farming.

The building of the University Hospital has been begun, and this will be followed by the erection of a medical institute for Jerusalem; in fact, a complete Faculty of Medicine is planned. This suggestion is often countered with the argument that there are already too many physicians in Palestine. Although this may be true today, it must be considered that the majority of the physicians in Palestine are advanced in years and that there may be a shortage of trained medical aid in Palestine in the future, if many of the universities abroad continue their policy of not admitting Jewish students. Circumstances force us to prepare for the future and not to wait till it is too late.

All this work at the University and the scholarships for specially gifted students require what has become a considerable budget.

The expenditure budget of the current year is well over £80,000.* The income of the University is not assured, as it receives almost no support from public funds and is entirely dependent on private sources of income. Endowments offering an assured annual income are also few; and the greatest part of the budget is covered by annual and casual contributions. The sums needed to meet this can be obtained only if understanding of the great value of the Hebrew University to Jewry as a whole is spread among sufficiently wide circles. Jews must realize that the University is one of the instruments for establishing the Jewish National Home.

* Approximately $400,000.
For it was not purely a local and Palestinian University that was established on Mount Scopus thirteen years ago, but a great intellectual centre for the Jews scattered all over the world, a shield and defense against the spirit of ill-will against Jews, which has arisen and which is trying to rob them of their especial spiritual heritage, and turn them into a people without knowledge or tradition, or cognizance of the world.
The story of the Hebrew University in Palestine would not be complete without mention of the various American Jewish individuals and groups who played an important part in the establishment of the University, and whose interest, sponsorship and financial support, during the twelve years since its inauguration, have been indispensable to the development of the first University of the Jewish people.

Foremost among American Jews who interested themselves in the establishment of Hebrew University is Dr. Judah L. Magnes, former Rabbi of Temple Emanu-El of New York and now President of the Hebrew University. He chiefly was responsible for awakening the interest of American Jewry in the project and for organizing the group, whose cooperation he enlisted, into a society which eventually adopted as its name the American Friends of the Hebrew University. As early as 1912, after a trip to Palestine, he worked actively for the establishment of the University and, since its inauguration in April 1925, has devoted himself exclusively to its development, first as Chancellor and now as President. Without his inspired zeal, in the years when the creation of Hebrew University seemed to many an impractical ideal, it would have been difficult to secure the measure of support from American Jews which was obtained. From the University's inception, his was the guiding spirit in all phases of its activities. From the beginning, he shouldered an increasing burden of work and responsibility, and it was only in 1935 that part of the burden was distributed among other members of the administration. The value of his guidance, encouragement
and inspiration to all those associated with Hebrew University is inestimable.

The American Friends of the Hebrew University was officially organized in June 1925, as the American Advisory Committee, headed by Mr. Felix M. Warburg, one of the first Americans to respond enthusiastically to the proposal to create a Hebrew University, and one of its most active advocates and generous benefactors all along.

At the time of its organization, besides Mr. Warburg, who was chairman, the following were officers and members of the American Advisory Committee: Dr. Cyrus Adler, Jacob Billikopf, Alexander M. Bing, Frederick L. Brown, Dr. Abraham Flexner, Bernard Flexner, Dr. Elisha M. Friedman, Louis J. Horowitz, Dr. David J. Kaliski, Dr. Emanuel Libman, Judge Julian W. Mack, James Marshall, Walter E. Meyer, Dr. Nathan Ratnoff, Samuel J. Rosensohn, Bernard Semel, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, the late Cyrus L. Sulzberger, the late Israel Unterberg, Eugene Untermyer, Frederick Warburg, Dr. Israel S. Wechsler, and Maurice Wertheim.

In 1931, the organization changed its name to American Friends of the Hebrew University. Its present officers are: Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, president; Dr. Solomon Lowenstein and Judge Julian W. Mack, vice-presidents; Maurice Wertheim, treasurer; Alice R. Emanuel, secretary. Officers of the Council are: Felix M. Warburg, chairman; James Marshall and Walter E. Meyer, vice-chairmen; Dr. Elisha M. Friedman, secretary. In addition to the officers, members of the Executive Committee are: Dr. Cyrus Adler, Dr. Jacob Billikopf, David M. Bressler, Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo, Mrs. Charles Heming, Mrs. Edward Jacobs, Dr. David J. Kaliski, Arthur M. Lamport, Justice Irving Lehman, Dr. Emanuel Libman, Edward A. Norman, Dr. Nathan Ratnoff, Harold Riegelman, Charles J. Rosenbloom, Mrs. Sol Rosenbloom, Roger W. Straus, Mrs. Roger W. Straus, Sol M. Stroock, Eugene Untermyer, Edward M. M. Warburg, Dr. Israel S. Wechsler, Joseph Willen, and Dr. Stephen S. Wise.
The American Friends set up as its purposes:
1. To receive and maintain a fund or funds and apply the principal and income thereof to aid in the development and progress of the Hebrew University Association of Jerusalem, Palestine;
2. To disseminate information concerning the University and its activities;
3. To assist and facilitate in the making of contacts between the University and institutions of learning in the United States and Canada;
4. To encourage and facilitate the affiliation with the University of students, research workers, and members of the teaching and learned professions;
5. To provide American representation on the Governing Board of the University.

Since the inception of the University, American agencies have contributed approximately 59% of the total annual administrative budget of the University. The American Friends has sought continually to widen the base of support for the University in America and Canada, and is bringing increasing knowledge of the University, its progress, and its needs to American Jewry. A number of chapters of Friends have been established in various cities as a means of furthering its aims, and other chapters are now in process of formation.

The funds of the American Friends are secured from individual contributions, trust funds, bequests and legacies, and from subventions from local welfare funds or collections. At present, Hebrew University is a beneficiary of either local funds or independent campaigns in about 125 cities.

* * * * *

Hebrew University has been greatly aided by several other American organizations which raise funds for specific activities or departments. Foremost among these is the American Jewish Physicians Committee, headed by Dr. Nathan Ratnoff, who is also a member of the Executive Committee of the American Friends and a member of the Board of Governors of the University. This Committee was organized in 1921, when Professor Albert Einstein and
Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the latter a classmate of Dr. Ratnoff, came to America to interest the Jews of this country in Hebrew University. It was the first organized group to collect funds for the institution. The Committee has assumed as its task the establishment of the medical departments of the University, and with the first funds collected purchased the land on Mt. Scopus on which the Hadassah-Rothschild-University Hospital and the Ratnoff Medical Building are now being erected.

Before the University was formally inaugurated, the Physicians Committee established the present Institute of Microbiology in Grey Hill House on Mt. Scopus, and arranged to contribute a substantial sum annually for five years to an Institute of Chemistry. The Committee has continued to provide the funds for the Institute of Microbiology and contributes to the medical department of the Library.

At present, together with Hadassah, the American Jewish Physicians Committee is providing for the erection of a Medical Center on Mt. Scopus which will consist of the Hadassah-Rothschild-University Hospital, the Pauline Ratnoff Maternity Hospital, the Henrietta Szold Training School for Nurses and the Ratnoff Building of the Graduate School of Medicine.

Besides the American Jewish Physicians Committee, the University enjoys the cooperation of the following bodies:

Mailamm (Palestine Institute of Musical Science), of which Mrs. Charles Zunser of New York is President, which has endowed a fellowship at the University for research in Biblical Cantillation, and has provided for a laboratory for deciphering and recording the musical material of the Bible;

The School of Education Committee, of which Mr. A. P. Schoolman of New York is Chairman, which contributes to the Department of Education.

* * * * *

Hebrew University has a wide and enthusiastic following in America. Its broad aims and objectives and their close relationship to the problems which are of great concern to all Jews, have found a response in American Jews
of all shades of opinion and affiliation. A considerable number of American Jews have made important contributions to the development of the University, providing funds for the construction of buildings, endowing professorial chairs, creating scholarship funds, and extending aid in other directions.

Four of the existing ten buildings of the University have been erected through the generosity of Americans. In memory of his wife, Mr. Samuel Untermyer provided the funds for the building of the Minnie Untermyer Open Air Theatre and Stadium on the eastern slope of Mt. Scopus. The dedication ceremonies of the Hebrew University were held in the Open Air Theatre, and many of the concerts, meetings and other public functions of the Jewish community of Jerusalem are held there. The late Mr. Philip Wattenberg and Mrs. Wattenberg of New York provided for the Wattenberg Building, which houses the Einstein Institute of Mathematics. Funds for the erection of the Moness Shapiro Building of the Einstein Institute of Physics were donated by Mrs. Dora Shapiro of New York.

The J. Montagu Lamport Botanical Gardens at the University are the gift of members of the Lamport family of New York.

Mrs. Sol Rosenbloom of Pittsburgh and New York is providing funds for the erection of a building on Mt. Scopus in memory of her late husband, to be known as the Rosenbloom Memorial Building. This building will house the institutes of the Faculty of Humanities, which includes the Institute of Jewish Studies, and will contain an auditorium seating 400. Through this gift, Mrs. Rosenbloom is continuing the generous contributions of her late husband, who established a trust fund which provides for the Chair of Jewish Philosophy and the Chair of Palestine Research, both in the Institute of Jewish Studies.

Other Chairs which have been endowed by Americans are the Chair of Hygiene and Bacteriology by Mr. Jacob Epstein of Baltimore, and the Chair of Talmudic Philology, established by the late Israel Unterberg of New York.

Mention has already been made of the buildings of the Medical Center now in course of construction, under the
combined auspices of Hadassah and the American Jewish Physicians Committee.

Scholarship funds have been established at the University both by individuals and organizations in this country. These funds are especially helpful in view of the limited financial resources of the majority of the students.

America is now represented on the Faculty of the University by Dr. Alexander M. Dushkin and Dr. Israel J. Kligler. Dr. Dushkin, formerly head of the Board of Jewish Education in Chicago, is Professor of Educational Method and Administration in the Department of Education; Dr. Kligler, who was associated with the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in this country, is head of the Department of Hygiene and Bacteriology. Another eminent American, Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan, has recently been appointed to the Chair of Principles of Education, and will begin his teaching in the forthcoming academic year. Dr. Kaplan is head of the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, professor of Homiletics at Jewish Theological Seminary, and dean of its Teachers Institute.

An increasing number of Americans are attending Hebrew University, either as students for the full course of study or for special courses, some of which are given nowhere else. At the present time, 25 American students are registered. The University welcomes warmly American students, believing that their viewpoint constitutes a valuable contribution to the general student body.

* * * * *

The Hebrew University has friends and well-wishers among America's foremost non-Jewish educators and publicists, a number of whom have hailed the establishment of the institution and have foretold for it a bright future. Professor John Dewey of Teachers College, Columbia University, expects Hebrew University to be a force for promoting inter-cultural understanding. "While Zionism, as a political issue, has never interested me," he said, "I am impressed with Palestine culturally, for the stimulus it is giving to Jewish thought. I think the Hebrew University is doing remarkable work. Especially devoted to the cultivation of Jewish thought and to maintaining the
spiritual tradition of the Jewish people, it is also going to facilitate the better understanding of that thought by the world at large. It will start a current that will carry it, not only among the Jews themselves, but to others, and in this I see the best medium the Jews have for bringing better understanding between the races.”

Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, Chancellor of New York University, regards Hebrew University as “an essential agency of civilization with which the world cannot afford to dispense.” Dr. Chase rejoices that Hebrew University is, “like all real universities, not limited to a particular race, or to a particular sect or to a particular outlook on life, but it takes the field of knowledge to be its problem, it goes forward objectively in the spirit of science, attempting to do its task, the task of finding the truth, of disseminating the truth among the people concerned, convinced that the truth is that which carries people further.” On another occasion, Dr. Chase said: “Hebrew University is a modern university in the best sense of the word. It expresses, on the highest cultural level, the aspirations of a forward-looking people. It deserves the support and encouragement of those in America and everywhere who are interested in the cause of freedom and the advancement of the people whom it serves.”

In 1935, when Hebrew University was ten years old, Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes and Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick hailed it respectively as “one of the great universities of the world” and “the crowning achievement of the renaissance of Judaism in Palestine.” Both also paid tribute to the services of Dr. Magnes. “In ten years,” said Dr. Holmes, “it [the Hebrew University] has enlisted the support of world Jewry and has captured the imagination of mankind. Under the wise and heroic leadership of Dr. Chancellor Magnes, it has gathered a great faculty and a devoted student body, and stands as the center of learning for the near eastern world.” Dr. Fosdick said he regarded “Dr. Judah Magnes, as one of the supreme hopes of the situation in Jerusalem today.”

“The recent foundation of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem recalls the foundation of Harvard University three hundred years ago,” said Dr. Alfred North White-
head, Professor of Philosophy at Harvard University, who went on to say: "There is in each case a group of heroes upholding ideals amid every discouragement of physical difficulty. The history of American culture during 300 years and the history of Hebrew culture during three thousand years bear witness to the force of ideas in creating, preserving and transforming the higher life of humanity."

* * * * *

A great deal has been accomplished by Hebrew University in the brief span of its existence, and its progress is all the more remarkable because it has been made with limited funds and during a period of great stress and unrest in Jewish life. Tribute is due to the officers and the faculty of the University whose ability and devotion have made these achievements possible, and who have interpreted so faithfully the plans, hopes and ideals of the University's founders.

But only a beginning has been made; much remains to be done. The University's present budget is inadequate for its pressing requirements. The outstanding need of Hebrew University is for an adequate and stable income. In his address at the opening of the academic year of 1935, Dr. Magnes said: "A yearly budget based so largely, as is ours, upon yearly contributions is not safe, and an effort must be made to establish a larger number of endowments."

These words suggest the next important task of all the organizations of Friends of the University, especially the American society. If the University is to meet its present needs adequately and to develop as it must, large endowment funds must be raised, and it is the hope and plan of the American Friends to raise such funds in the near future.

Speaking before the Executive Committee of the American Friends, Dr. Hugo Bergmann, the Rector of Hebrew University, who visited America recently, expressed the hope that American Jewry would continue to play its proper rôle in bringing to realization "the great vision which we have before our eyes, a vision for the future of Hebrew University, great and grand, co-ordinating all educational efforts which are being made in Palestine; a University connecting us with the non-Jewish world, a
University which has great human values, and tries to bring those human values to Palestine and from Palestine to the whole Jewish world."

Those associated with the American Friends of the Hebrew University and who share this vision have every confidence that the Jews of America will do their full share in helping to make the University financially secure so that it can with confidence and dignity take and keep its rightful place in the world.