

Communal

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

THIS REVIEW of Jewish communal organization is concerned primarily with the major developments in the organization of the various types of local and national programs and in their inter-relationships during the period under review.

Developments in National Organization

During the year under review no national organization coordinating all local interests and national activities existed and none was in the process of being established. Efforts to build such a national organization had been made in the past, and temporary organizations had been established for emergency purposes. The most recent was the American Jewish Conference which was founded in 1943 to coordinate American Jewish efforts in behalf of Israel and toward solution of the political and economic problems of overseas Jewry. In 1948 that body attempted to project the organization of an American Jewish Assembly to be its successor and to function in the area of domestic problems as well.

The American Jewish Conference voted to discontinue operations on January 19, 1949, when the plan for an American Jewish Assembly was rejected by several major organizations, including B'nai B'rith, which had been an active supporter of the Conference. At this final meeting, the chairman of the executive committee of the Conference called attention to the fact that the creation of the Israeli state required serious consideration of the relations between Israel and the Jewish communities throughout the world, and of the inter-relationship and internal organization of those communities.

There was general agreement on the desirability of a coordination of Jewish effort, but the structural organization necessary to achieve such a goal raised many basic questions which were difficult to resolve.

DISCUSSIONS OF THEORIES OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATION

During the year these and other questions of a national Jewish community organization received some attention in the Jewish press and at meetings of Jewish organizations in the United States. Some of these discussions were devoted to the question of whether a national organization of American Jewry should rest primarily on a religious basis and exclusively for religious objectives.

Thus, the suggestion was made by Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan in the

Reconstructionist of February 18, 1949, that "organic" communities be established where "all Jews who wish to live as Jews, and have their children raised as Jews should be registered as members." Similar in nature was the proposal made by Henry Hurwitz in *Menorah Journal* of Autumn, 1949, in which Hurwitz advocated the establishment of a Jewish assembly consisting of representatives of the religious congregations. This organization would establish various "commissions" consisting of independent experts: a commission on higher learning and letters, one on colleges and universities, one on foreign relief and rehabilitation, and one on interfaith relations. The plan called for the abolition of existing individual agencies. Programs would function directly under the aegis of the proposed organization. David Petegorsky in the *Congress Weekly* of December 20, 1948, urged the creation of a "mass movement" of individual Jews, "launched by an integral merger of the memberships and facilities of the groups that share common principles." This mass movement would be concerned with all major aspects of Jewish life but would neither function directly "in areas of work in which the groups that create it are functioning" nor "coordinate the activities of those groups."

COORDINATION AND COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Though no such bodies were created in the United States, there were active attempts on the part of national agencies and national and local communities to coordinate their efforts and develop more satisfactory relationships. Thus, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) established a Committee on Stable and Unified Fund Raising in 1949 to consider various proposals for a closer integration of local community fund-raising efforts with those of national agencies operating in the overseas and domestic fields.

Problems studied by this committee, which was to report to the General Assembly of the CJFWF in December, 1949, included multiple appeals, the competition which resulted in wasteful promotional efforts and the need for a greater participation by local communities in national and overseas programs.

In 1948 ten welfare funds operating in the larger cities (Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Newark, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and San Francisco) organized a "Large-City Budgeting Conference" to review cooperatively the finances and programs of the agencies benefiting from their funds. Various meetings were held in 1948 and 1949 with representatives of the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, Jewish Labor Committee, the Joint Defense Appeal, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, and the National Jewish Welfare Board. The conference projected a program calling for more intensive study of the work of these public relations organizations.

Among the questions raised were several concerning the structure and operations of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA). At a meeting of its board of directors in September, 1949, the JTA decided on some basic changes in its corporate structure. Expressing dissatisfaction with the administrative practices and policies of the JTA and its affiliates, a number of members resigned from the board and called for "a thorough impartial study of management practices, the value of the services of JTA and its affiliates, and the relation-

ships of the JTA with its affiliates." The Large-City Budgeting Conference planned to review these developments with representatives of the JTA in October, 1949.

A step forward in the rationalization of national organization was the establishment in 1949 of the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA). Until then, the United Service for New Americans (USNA) had served Jewish immigrants both in New York City and nationally. NYANA assumed responsibility for immigrants remaining in New York City. Both NYANA and USNA were to continue to be financed by the United Jewish Appeal (UJA).¹

Efforts were made during the year to coordinate national and overseas immigration service activities of the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), and USNA. In October, 1948, a partial agreement was reached concerning services by JDC and HIAS to the displaced persons (DP's) coming from Central Europe to the United States. However, with the increase of immigration to Israel, difficulties arose early in 1949 when HIAS attempted to negotiate with the International Refugee Organization (IRO) concerning its participation in the voluntary agency responsibility for moving DP's to Israel—a responsibility which had previously been borne largely by JDC, which was cooperating with the Jewish Agency. This controversial problem was finally resolved when IRO decided to continue its former relationship with JDC alone.

Attention was also given to the procedure for achieving greater participation of local community organizations in the UJA. In 1947, community representatives had been given equal representation with JDC and the United Palestine Appeal (UPA) in the administration and executive committees of the UJA which were established annually to conduct the UJA campaign; improved procedures had been devised to secure direct community representation in the annual UJA meeting, which decided programs and campaign goals. In 1948 and 1949 the Committee on UJA of the CJFWF requested further and more direct participation in the actual planning, and an involvement equal to that of JDC and UPA. The 1949 UJA accepted procedures which would give this committee a formal place in the course of JDC and UPA negotiations and planning.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL (NCRAC)

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) had decided at its 1948 plenary session that there was need for further coordination among the national civic defense agencies on matters of clearance, joint decisions on policy, and utilization of available resources in the community relations field. The possibility of allocation of functions among the various agencies was also studied during the year. At the plenary session of the NCRAC held at the end of April, 1949, there was agreement on procedures for clearance, on the setting up of a service to report on methods for arriving at policy decisions, and on assignment of work among the constituent agencies to implement policies on which there was agreement. No definite action was

¹ See p. 196.

taken on the functional division of responsibilities among the various national organizations for service in the community relations field.

Zionist Organizations

During the period under review, the functions and structure of national Zionist organizations also became the subject of major interest. With the creation of the state of Israel, it was felt in many quarters both within and outside the Zionist movement that the primary goal of Zionism had been achieved. Hence, the question was raised whether it was necessary to continue the various American Zionist groups and philanthropies in their existing forms.

Among the proposals made was the suggestion that "although Zionist groups had rendered historical services to the Jewish people and Jewish destiny . . . their role in American Jewish life is becoming less creative [and] they are inadequate both for the specific tasks they are now performing and for the larger and long term needs of American Jewry." (David Petegorsky, *Congress Weekly*, December 20, 1948.) It was suggested that these tasks be transferred to "a democratically organized and administered" Jewish community.

The fifty-second annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) heard a report from its Commission on the Future Program and Constitution of the World Zionist Organization. Asking no radical proposals for the reorganization of the ZOA, the Commission's report welcomed the participation of non-Zionist groups in fund raising and in the support of Israel and noted the desirability of coordinating all efforts in behalf of Israel. As a first step it recommended the formation of a consultative body representing all Jewish groups and interests. The ZOA convention decided that the recommendations of this committee required further study and referred the report to its incoming national administrative council and national executive committee.²

ORGANIZATION FOR FUND RAISING

Questions concerning the structure and function of the Zionist movement in this country were also reflected in the discussions leading up to the continuation of UJA for 1949. The UJA was regularly constituted on an annual basis by joint agreement between the JDC and the UPA. In the Fall of 1948, a Committee of Contributors and Workers challenged the structure and the activities of the UPA and its two constituent member agencies, the Keren Hayesod and the Keren Kayemeth. After protracted negotiations and discussions in which a committee of the CJFWF served as conciliators, a final settlement was reached by the board of the UPA on February 28, 1949.³

The announcement of a 1950 UJA was made in July, 1949. JDC and UPA agreed to continue joint fund raising, leaving for a later settlement the allocation of funds and other details involved in the annual contract.

² See p. 169.

³ See pp. 168 and 182.

MULTIPLE FUND-RAISING CAMPAIGNS

The growing needs of the state of Israel had stimulated independent fund raising by many established and new Jewish agencies. This was a problem of concern to the local welfare funds, the UJA, and the Jewish Agency. Following resolutions and discussions of this subject at the annual meeting of the UJA, the General Assembly of the CJFWF, and at various regional and local meetings, representations were made to the Executive of the Jewish Agency meeting in New York City in February, 1949. Agreement was reached that a plan of procedure was necessary to reduce multiple campaigns and simplify the organization of appeals in behalf of causes in Israel. A special office established by the Jewish Agency to deal with multiple campaigns in the United States made considerable progress in reducing duplication of the various appeals in behalf of Israel.⁴

UNIFICATION OF FUND RAISING

A further development in this area took place at the meeting which was called by the Jewish Agency and held in Israel at the end of July, 1949. The desirability of a single unified campaign within the UJA for all Israel agencies and causes was advanced and supported by some Jewish Agency leaders, Israel government officials, and representatives of American fund-raising agencies, but was not adopted. Although recognizing the prime importance of the UJA, several of the other fund-raising agencies, including Hadassah and Histadrut, insisted on continuing their independent campaigns. However, it was agreed that an attempt would be made to improve such campaigns and to introduce a licensing system in Israel which would control and regulate the fund-raising programs of the many agencies conducting campaigns for Israel. Discussions were also begun on the extension of JDC services to the unemployed and disabled among the new immigrants to Israel and on the centralization of the aid being given to the religious educational institutions in Israel. Later in the year it was announced that agreement had been reached among the JDC, the Jewish Agency, and the government of Israel for the establishment of a new program under the combined auspices of these three bodies for the "hard core" of the new immigrants. A fund of \$15,000,000, of which the JDC was to distribute \$7,500,000, was established to operate this service, which was scheduled to begin in November, 1949.

Community Organization—Local Developments

Progress continued both in the organization of central communal agencies and in the raising of the standards of local community fund raising and the planning of programs and services. The record amounts that had been secured in 1948 by the organized central fund-raising campaigns made more funds available for national agencies and for local needs as well. In many cities attention was directed to expansion of programs for health and welfare services, and an increase in the planning to secure the necessary capital resources.

⁴ See also p. 181.

FUND RAISING IN 1949

However, at the time of writing there were indications that the high level of 1948 would not be reached in 1949. It was estimated that totals for 1949 would be approximately 20 per cent below those of 1948. Nevertheless, amounts raised would not be less than those raised in 1947 and larger than those raised in years previous to 1947.

The victorious conclusion of World War II, the memory of the six million dead of European Jewry, and the emergence of Israel were considered factors which had stimulated American Jewish interest in communal work in the period between 1945 and 1948. Some observers sensed a growing apathy in certain segments of the American Jewish population toward their continuing communal responsibilities both in the United States and abroad during the period under review. However, it was recognized that real gains in communal participation had been achieved and that a large part of these gains would probably be maintained during the years when the emergencies were considered to be less acute. Energetic efforts in community organization would be required to conserve the gains of the previous decade for the benefit of continuing communal needs and programs.

The inability of local welfare funds, with few exceptions, to repeat their 1948 fund-raising record is explained largely by economic factors and by a possibly growing complacency on the part of contributors. Fund-raising agencies reported a lessened ability to reach all of their potential contributors, and a slight decline in the total number of contributions was anticipated. A number of cities reported marked reductions, in a few instances by as much as 30 to 40 per cent, in the contributions made by their largest donors. This loss was only partly made up by increased donations from contributors in the middle brackets.

The decline in contributions intensified many of the problems faced by local communities because there was no appreciable decline in the demands made on the Jewish community in the United States for the support of overseas, national, and local causes. The questions of priority among these causes and competition among the leading agencies for what they considered to be their legitimate share of the funds became more acute.

Communal Structures and Functions

Having achieved a basic form of central communal organization, almost all the centers of Jewish population during the period under review were engaged in the consolidation of gains in organization and improvements in structures and service programs. Additional communities reorganized their central communal planning agencies to allow broader representation from all communal groups in the community. The Detroit Jewish Federation, for instance, enlarged its board to include representatives of communal agencies, of the trades and professions, of youth and women's divisions of the campaign, of councils of group organizations, as well as individuals at large. In some communities, such as Danbury, Conn.; Elmira, N. Y.; Sacramento, Cal.; and Denver, Col., constitutions were revised to enable the development of a democratic com-

munity body, in some instances as a successor to a more informal type of welfare fund organization. Several communities, including Lynn and New Bedford, Mass.; Waco, Texas; and Spokane, Wash., were organized to include year-round community planning rather than to be concerned exclusively with fund raising.

Changes were made to permit existing fund-raising organizations and social service or other central agencies to be merged in a single unified fund-raising and planning federation for the entire community. Chicago successfully merged its federation and welfare fund campaigns in 1949, and Baltimore, where local federations and overseas agencies had previously held separate campaigns, was planning a single combined campaign in 1950. Buffalo, N. Y.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Worcester, Mass.; South Bend, Ind.; and Little Rock, Ark., combined or integrated their local federations and their welfare funds. Central Jewish organizations were also developed in Bangor, Maine, and New Britain, Conn.

Studies were being made in a number of cities with the aim of improving communal structure and functions—among them, Akron and Cleveland, Ohio; Atlantic City and Paterson, N. J.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Portland, Ore.; Rochester and Troy, N. Y.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Pittsfield, Mass.; and Seattle, Wash.

POPULATION SURVEYS

To provide a basis for local communal planning, Memphis and Nashville, Tenn.; Miami, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and Norfolk, Va., completed Jewish population surveys in 1949; population studies were in process in Springfield, Mass., and Trenton, N. J.

OFFICE FOR POPULATION RESEARCH

A new development in population research was the creation of the Office for Population Research, initiated as a joint project by a number of Jewish organizations. The aim of the Office was to establish a permanent program for Jewish population studies and for assembling of Jewish demographic data. The project had been initially discussed at the Conference on Jewish Demography held in December, 1945, and recommended at a second conference in April, 1949. The organizations represented in the conferences included: the American Association for Jewish Education, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Historical Society, the Anti-Defamation League, the Conference on Jewish Relations, the CJFWF, the Jewish Statistical Bureau, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the National Jewish Welfare Board, USNA, and the Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO).

It was hoped that the project would aid local communal agencies and national organizations to develop and plan their programs on the basis of concrete information about the trends and characteristics of the American Jewish population. At the end of 1949 the structure of a permanent organization was being planned, and methods for securing financial support were being explored.

LOCAL CONFERENCES AND COMMITTEES ON ORGANIZATION

For the first time in the history of American Jewish community organization, a conference was held of cities too small, for the most part, to organize central communal efforts employing salaried personnel. Held in St. Joseph, Mich., on June 17, 1949, under the auspices of CJFWF many small communities from the midwestern area, ranging in size from 100 to 500 families, participated. The conference was devoted to defining the needs of the Jews in small communities, the relationship of a central organization to programs of Jewish education, community relations, and social planning, and to the role of the synagogue and the rabbi in the small community. The possibilities of developing communal organization in sparsely populated areas on a wider geographical basis were described in the report of the results achieved by the Southern Illinois Federation, consisting of almost 100 separate towns containing approximately 3,000 Jews. At the time of writing the Maine Jewish Council was studying a possible state-wide organization to meet the needs of a widely scattered Jewish population.

The three largest federations—in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia—held their fourth annual meeting of federation directors and pooled their views on the need of the large-city federation to adjust its organization, administrative procedures, fund raising, and public relations programs to the changing problems and conditions of the Jewish populations in large cities.

A Committee on Community Organization was established by the regional division of the CJFWF to assist in the development of central planning organizations in the local communities, and to help define the scope and structure of local Jewish community organizations. A study of the structure and function of central organizations in the twelve largest cities was completed, and a study was being conducted under the Committee's auspices, of the structure of federations, welfare funds, and community councils in intermediate communities and of their relationship to the local functional agencies.

In recognition of the increasing role which women were playing in fund raising and social services, a Committee on Women's Participation in Community Service was set up by CJFWF to stimulate the participation of women in all aspects of community service and to gain recognition for them on policy-making committees and boards of community organizations.

Many annual planning and promotional conferences in a number of fields of Jewish activity were continued by the major organizations on national, regional, and area scales.

In addition, various conferences and institutes for professional workers were held. The Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service continued its educational program for executive leadership, conducting several institutes and short courses for special groups and placing its basic course, the Institute for Advanced Study, on a unit basis, thus permitting greater student utilization of its educational services. Most of the conferences apparently met with sufficient success to warrant their continued use as a means of disseminating the ideas of their sponsors and gaining support for them.

PERSONNEL

While it was generally felt that there was a continued shortage of prepared and experienced professional personnel in Jewish communal service, agencies reported less difficulty in filling vacancies. Personnel departments reported some unemployment in certain categories and a decreased turnover in executive, sub-executive, and specialized positions. A decline in the foreign service of the JDC and a general stabilization in domestic programs of national and local agencies in the United States may have been some of the factors responsible for the limited personnel opportunities. On the other hand, the National Jewish Welfare Board reported many unfilled vacancies in professional center and group work services; Jewish casework agencies experienced a similar difficulty in filling vacancies with qualified personnel, though it was somewhat less acute than in previous years.

The need for qualified lay leadership as well as for professional personnel was also felt and expressed on various occasions. Some organizations were seeking to enlist youth and young adults in organizations and to train them for potential leadership.

Economic factors were held largely responsible for the increasing difficulties in securing lay leadership and their assistance in fund-raising campaigns, in agency administration, and in central boards, and for the inability of many volunteers to continue to devote as large a part of their time to communal service in 1949 as they had previously. Inadequate planning to secure the best lay leadership was also considered a factor by some observers. The problem would require concentrated attention in the years ahead.

HARRY L. LURIE

RELIGION

THE EMERGENCE of the state of Israel brought into sharp focus a problem that had been of concern to Jewish theoreticians, both secular and religious, for many years: the nature of the distinctive character of the Jewish group.

The State of Israel and the Character of American Jewry

That Jews constituted a unique religio-cultural-ethnic group, to be described not as a race, a nationality or a religious sect, but by the less technical Hebrew term *am*—meaning “people”—had been maintained by some participants at the “Conference on Reorienting Zionist Education Today,” convened by the Education Committee of the Zionist Organization of America on February 21-22, 1948. In varying forms, this view was reaffirmed and its implications were explored at the “Conference on the Jewish Community,” convened by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation on February 1, 1949, and at the convention of the Young Peoples League of the United Synagogue on April 9, 1949. The Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox) stressed the same view, as did the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Con-

servative), the latter dedicating its 1949 annual convention to "The Demands of the New Diaspora."

Only the numerically insignificant American Council for Judaism persisted in its campaign to interpret Zionism as antagonistic to American loyalty. Its efforts, however, were hampered by the resignation of several of its important rabbinical members, who saw in the American Council far greater zeal against Zionism than active concern for Judaism.

A noteworthy development was the acceptance of this point of view by many intellectuals and other community leaders who had previously been indifferent to the religious emphasis. Thus Rabbi Barnett A. Brickner of Cleveland, Ohio, called for a conference of intellectuals "to clarify the direction of American Judaism." The need to organize American Jewry, or at least those elements which would accept the centrality of the religio-cultural elements of Judaism, was urged by Henry Hurwitz, editor of the *Menorah Journal*, in a series of articles and public addresses. In a similar spirit, Rabbi Robert Gordis, past president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, urged the group at its annual assembly to take the initiative, together with the representative bodies of Reform and Orthodox Jewry, to create "a voluntary community dedicated to the organic view of Judaism" and presented a ten-point Platform of Principles upon which most Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Jews, as well as many unaffiliated individuals, might agree.

Efforts for Religious Revival

Due in some measure, at least, to the emergence of the state of Israel, the synagogue groups put forth increased efforts to stimulate religious observance and adherence. Ninety members of the Reform rabbinate participated in the third annual "Jewish Cavalcade" by addressing meetings throughout the nation. The Rabbinical Council of America initiated a similar project in its "National Torah Tour," during which fifteen Jewish communities in Pennsylvania were visited on behalf of Orthodoxy. This experiment was so successful it was decided to continue it.

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations continued its efforts to introduce new ceremonies into the Reform synagogue through such occasions as *Shabbat Shalom*, dedicated to the ideal of peace, and *Shabbat Todah*, associated with Thanksgiving Day, as well as by determined efforts to revitalize traditional customs that had been discarded in the earlier period of Reform. There was no disposition to overlook the difficulties facing an enterprise of this character.

The enormous challenge facing Jewish religious leadership as a whole was highlighted by an article by Robert Brunner in the *International Review of Missions* (April, 1949), which sought to discover new methods for proselytizing Jews since "the Jew, for the most part, has ceased to be a Jew in the religious sense." The need for grappling realistically with the growing problem of intermarriage, and with the possibility of winning the non-Jewish partners for Judaism, was beginning to win increased attention. Less important quantitatively, but qualitatively at least as significant, was the quest of some American Jewish young people for a living religious faith. The need for

setting up "Information Centers on Judaism," properly staffed and easily accessible, was increasingly discussed at local and national rabbinical conclaves.

All in all, the recognition was growing in religious circles, and to some degree elsewhere as well, that the meaningful survival of American Jewry could not depend upon the strength of anti-Semitism or even upon the resurgence of the state of Israel. The future of American Jewry hinged upon its religious vitality, broadly conceived and interpreted.

Religious Authority and Freedom in Israel

The emergence of the state of Israel gave to the Chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem a measure of official recognition and prestige enjoyed by no other rabbinical office in the world. The Rabbinical Council of America, through its president, Rabbi Israel Tabak, accordingly called on American Jewry "to recognize the authority of the Chief Rabbinate." Some of the implications of this recognition were indicated in the statement made on May 25, 1949, before the Rabbinical Council of America by Rabbi Jacob Goldman, secretary to Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog: "As Roman Catholics look to the Pope, the Rabbinate throughout the world should be unified through the establishment of a Chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem." This reference to the institution of the Papacy aroused widespread misgivings on the score that the outlook expressed was at variance with Jewish tradition and that no recognition, however limited, was being contemplated under the plan for the non-Orthodox Rabbinate. On his visit to the United States under the auspices of the United Jewish Appeal, Rabbi Herzog established no official contacts with Reform or Conservative religious agencies and institutions of learning and invited only the American Orthodox rabbinate to send delegates to a contemplated rabbinical conference in Jerusalem.

That even this limited objective of a unified Orthodox rabbinate would not prove easy to achieve, became clear from the protests lodged by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis against Rabbi Herzog's recognition of the Rabbinical Council of America, representing for the most part the younger, American-trained rabbis of Orthodox persuasion.

Meanwhile, the exclusive jurisdiction in matters religious granted by the Israeli government to official Orthodoxy, began to arouse misgivings in America. Rabbi Abraham Feldman, in his presidential address before the Central Conference of American Rabbis in June, 1949, warned against "theocratic tendencies in Israel" and protested "the refusal to give religious freedom to liberal Jewish communities in Israel." The Conservative rabbinate, because of its own adherence to traditional Judaism and consistent loyalty to the Zionist cause, was more restrained in its reaction. It sent a delegation to Israel in the Summer of 1949 with instructions to report back its findings on various matters, including the problem of religious freedom. Though the Feldman statement and similar utterances were violently attacked in the pro-Orthodox Yiddish press, it seemed clear that this was only the opening round in a long struggle.

Religious Belief

The implications for American Jewry of the state of Israel took precedence during the year over abstract philosophical and theological considerations. Nonetheless, the ferment in Christian theological circles had its repercussions in Judaism. Will Herberg, writing in *Commentary*, declared that "nationalism, culture, social service and anti-defamation" were only "ersatz faiths," inferior substitutes for the Jewish religion. In his more technical papers, Herberg continued to develop his theological position, for which he was greatly indebted to Reinhold Niebuhr, whose brilliant synthesis of a re-interpreted theological Orthodoxy and an advanced social outlook is one of the most influential factors in contemporary Christian thought.

Interest in Jewish religious values was reflected not only in the columns of such religious journals as *Conservative Judaism* and the *Reconstructionist*, but also in the pages of *Commentary*, *Menorah Journal*, and *Jewish Frontier*, general periodicals which published the work of Jacob B. Agus, Milton Steinberg, Robert Gordis, and other exponents of a modern approach to Jewish tradition. On the popular level, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations reported that its series of "Popular Studies in Judaism" had achieved a circulation of 60,000. Orthodox groups became more active in the publication of materials on the idea of the Jewish day school, Sabbath observance, *kashrut* and the laws of "family purity."

Observance

In Judaism, credal adherence, generally taken for granted, has never bulked as large as concrete observance, whose relaxation was a particularly acute problem for both Orthodoxy and Conservatism. The decline of the domestic observance of *kashrut*, due in some degree, at least, to the rising prices of kosher meat, began to attract attention and evoke demands for action. The Rabbinical Alliance of America, an extreme Orthodox group of younger rabbis, considered a resolution requesting Mayor William O'Dwyer of New York City to investigate the subject of kosher meat prices. This resolution was ultimately tabled, because of possibly "embarrassing consequences." In the Rabbinical Assembly, the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards, headed by Rabbi Morris Adler of Detroit, Mich., devoted serious attention during the year to the possibility of liberalizing some phases of traditional Jewish law, as part of a campaign for increased observance of the fundamental *mitzvot* by Conservative Jews.

The Rabbinical Seminaries

With the exception of Dropsie College, a postgraduate nonsectarian institution of Semitic learning in Philadelphia, Pa., and the Yiddish Scientific Institute in New York, higher Jewish education in the United States was concentrated largely in the rabbinical seminaries. Reflecting the widespread feeling that religion should become increasingly central in the pattern of Jewish

life in America, the principal rabbinical schools all proceeded to expand the scope of their work.

YESHIVOT

The Yeshiva Rabbi Isaac Elchanan of New York City, its secular departments now organized as Yeshiva University, announced plans for a \$6,000,000 medical school. The first step was the introduction of pre-medical courses in the liberal arts college. Four new buildings were dedicated and a School of Education and Community Administration was scheduled to begin functioning in the Fall of 1949. In addition, the Yeshiva announced the appointment of the eminent Talmudist, Rabbi Avigdor Cyperstein, former Chief Rabbi of Lida, Poland, to head an Institute for Advanced Rabbinic Research. This Institute would offer a select number of promising young scholars, whether refugee or native-born, the opportunity to carry on the advanced Talmudic study and dialectic characteristic of the famous yeshivot of Lithuania before World War II. Similar institutes were established in recent years in Lakewood, N. J. and in Spring Valley, N. Y., the latter under the auspices of the Yeshiva Torah Vodaath of Brooklyn, N. Y. Yeshiva University also announced a gift of \$50,000 from a New York businessman, Morris Morgenstern, for an annual award to be made to "an outstanding personality."

JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Jewish Theological Seminary found that its recently established University of Judaism in Los Angeles, Cal., designed to serve the needs of the rapidly growing Jewish community on the West Coast, was winning wide community support. The various departments on the West Coast—the Teachers Institute, the Graduate School and the Extension Department—had an enrollment of nearly 1,000 students, taught by distinguished visiting scholars from the East, as well as by a permanent resident faculty. In New York, Professor Saul Lieberman, the famous Talmudic scholar, was appointed Dean of the Seminary's Graduate School, to coordinate and intensify the work of the Summer Session and other courses leading to higher degrees.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) was united as a single institution under the presidency of Dr. Nelson Glueck, who was installed as president of the latter school on October 29, 1948. It announced the establishment of the Joshua L. Liebman Department of Human Relations, under whose imprint a pamphlet entitled *Man's Place in God's World—A Psychiatrist's Evaluation* by Sol W. Ginsburg appeared. In New York a School for Jewish Religious Education was opened by the Hebrew Union College and Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to prepare teachers for Reform Sunday Schools. In addition, the HUC sponsored a School for Jewish Sacred Music, which opened its doors in New York City. Its stated purpose was to prepare cantors for all branches of the American synagogue, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. In Los Angeles, the Hebrew Union College of Jewish Studies was opened. It reported an enrollment of 197 students for courses conducted by nine volunteer instructors.

SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS AND COURSES

The Hebrew Theological College of Chicago, Ill., announced the appointment of Rabbi C. David Regensburg as Dean of the Faculty to succeed the late Rabbi Jacob Hirsch Greenberg, who had served from 1922 until his death on January 31, 1949.¹ As part of its expanded program, it empowered the "first two American-born shoetim" to exercise their calling, a perhaps minor symbol of the coming-of-age of American Jewry. It also gave advanced rabbinic ordination (*yadin yadin*) to two of its graduates.

Graduate courses for rabbis during the summer proved increasingly popular. Several hundred men enrolled in the courses given by HUC-JIR, the Jewish Theological Seminary, and the Yeshiva University, all in New York City.

There was an important scholastic exchange between Israel and America. Israeli scholars who came to the United States included Ernst Simon, who taught education at the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Gershon G. Scholem, who lectured on Hasidism at the HUC-JIR Seminary.

ERRATUM

Page 151, line 14—Solomon Buber *should read* Martin Buber.

The Board of Trustees and Chairman of the National Planning Campaign Committee of the Jewish Theological Seminary and its affiliated institutions, announced on May 1, 1949, that \$1,972,000 had been set as the irreducible minimum for the campaign and called upon American Jewry not to neglect their "own religious and educational institutions" because of their legitimate concern with overseas aid. The same warning was sounded by the leaders of Reform Judaism. Abba Hillel Silver, the Zionist leader and past president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, called upon American Jews to strengthen their spiritual roots at home.

Social Justice

Both the emergence of the state of Israel and the unclear pattern of American economic life in the postwar period, tended to relegate the concern of the synagogue with social questions temporarily to the background. The

¹ See Obituaries.

life in America, the principal rabbinical schools all proceeded to expand the scope of their work.

YESHIVOT

The Yeshiva Rabbi Isaac Elchanan of New York City, its secular departments now organized as Yeshiva University, announced plans for a \$6,000,000 medical school. The first step was the introduction of pre-medical courses in the liberal arts college. Four new buildings were dedicated and a School of Education and Community Administration was scheduled to begin functioning in the Fall of 1949. In addition, the Yeshiva announced the appointment of the eminent Talmudist, Rabbi Avigdor Cyperstein, former Chief Rabbi of Lida, Poland, to head an Institute for Advanced Rabbinic Research. This Institute would offer a select number of promising young scholars, whether refugee or native-born, the opportunity to carry on the advanced Talmudic study and dialectic characteristic of the famous yeshivot of Lithuania before World War II. Similar institutes were established in various parts of the United States.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) was united as a single institution under the presidency of Dr. Nelson Glueck, who was installed as president of the latter school on October 29, 1948. It announced the establishment of the Joshua L. Liebman Department of Human Relations, under whose imprint a pamphlet entitled *Man's Place in God's World—A Psychiatrist's Evaluation* by Sol W. Ginsburg appeared. In New York a School for Jewish Religious Education was opened by the Hebrew Union College and Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to prepare teachers for Reform Sunday Schools. In addition, the HUC sponsored a School for Jewish Sacred Music, which opened its doors in New York City. Its stated purpose was to prepare cantors for all branches of the American synagogue, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. In Los Angeles, the Hebrew Union College of Jewish Studies was opened. It reported an enrollment of 197 students for courses conducted by nine volunteer instructors.

SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS AND COURSES

The Hebrew Theological College of Chicago, Ill., announced the appointment of Rabbi C. David Regensburg as Dean of the Faculty to succeed the late Rabbi Jacob Hirsch Greenberg, who had served from 1922 until his death on January 31, 1949.¹ As part of its expanded program, it empowered the "first two American-born shohetim" to exercise their calling, a perhaps minor symbol of the coming-of-age of American Jewry. It also gave advanced rabbinic ordination (*yadin yadin*) to two of its graduates.

Graduate courses for rabbis during the summer proved increasingly popular. Several hundred men enrolled in the courses given by HUC-JIR, the Jewish Theological Seminary, and the Yeshiva University, all in New York City.

There was an important scholastic exchange between Israel and America. Israeli scholars who came to the United States included Ernst Simon, who taught education at the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Gershon G. Scholem, who lectured on Hasidism at the HUC-JIR. Solomon Buber, the eminent philosopher, was scheduled to arrive at the Jewish Theological Seminary during the coming academic year. Particular interest was attached to the appointment of the famous rabbi and theologian, Rabbi Leo Baeck, as Visiting Professor of Jewish Philosophy at the HUC.

These new activities highlighted the regular day-to-day work of these institutions—not merely the training of rabbis and teachers for the Jewish community, but the creation through various general and extension schools of the nucleus of a literate Jewish laity.

Finances

Both the normal activities of these schools and their projected plans for expanded service, however, were being hampered by financial problems of growing urgency. Increasingly, the leaders of religious and cultural institutions protested the comparative neglect by American Jews of their spiritual needs in the raising and allocation of communal funds. Maxwell Abbell, prominent Chicago businessman and Chairman of the National Planning Campaign Committee of the Jewish Theological Seminary and its affiliated institutions, announced on May 1, 1949, that \$1,972,000 had been set as the irreducible minimum for the campaign and called upon American Jewry not to neglect their "own religious and educational institutions" because of their legitimate concern with overseas aid. The same warning was sounded by the leaders of Reform Judaism. Abba Hillel Silver, the Zionist leader and past president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, called upon American Jews to strengthen their spiritual roots at home.

Social Justice

Both the emergence of the state of Israel and the unclear pattern of American economic life in the postwar period, tended to relegate the concern of the synagogue with social questions temporarily to the background. The

¹ See Obituaries.

Rabbinical Assembly of America at its convention went on record as favoring the exploration of the possibilities of a joint commission on social justice for the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbimates. The Commission on Social Justice of the Central Conference of American Rabbis continued its practice of issuing statements on matters of social concern.

Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, leader of the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, addressing the convention of the Rabbinical Assembly, urged the creation of a "common religion of American democracy," with the American holidays as the holy days of the new creed. He called for the strengthening of a free pulpit in the American synagogue and for the practice of democracy in American Jewish communal life. Eisenstein also asked for active participation by American Jewry and by the synagogue in contemporary social issues. Through its membership in the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the Synagogue Council of America was representing religious Jewry in some of these areas.

Interfaith Activities

Interfaith work was carried on during the year, as in the past, by numerous agencies in Jewish life, many of which were not specifically religious in character. However, religious agencies continued to play a large role in this area.

The "Eternal Light" program, created and sponsored by the Jewish Theological Seminary, continued to win many awards as one of the most distinguished religious programs on the air, with a weekly listening audience of several million.

The radio sermon series "The Message of Israel" sponsored by the National Jewish Laymen's Committee and conducted by Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, also brought the message of Judaism to millions of men and women on a national hook-up.

A sign of the times was a television program over CBS in New York called "Lamp Unto My Feet."²

The HUC-JIR continued its practice of organizing one-day Institutes on Judaism for Christian clergymen in communities throughout the country. The Institute for Religious and Social Studies in New York, Boston and Chicago sponsored by the Jewish Theological Seminary, offered lecture courses by outstanding leaders in religion, government, the arts, industry, and labor. Its published volumes constituted a library of thought on the problems of contemporary life, particularly as viewed from the vantage point of religion. The HUC-JIR announced graduate fellowships for Christian ministers, two awarded by the Louis J. and Mary E. Horowitz Foundation, and three by the Department of Interfaith Activity of the American Jewish Committee.

The National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, which sponsored the Jewish Chatauqua Society, reported that 180 rabbis had lectured on Judaism in 421 colleges and universities during the year, particularly during the summer sessions. In twelve colleges they served as instructors, giving accredited college courses in Jewish religion and culture.

The essential spirit of American democracy was dramatically symbolized

² See also Radio and Television, p. 238.

at the inauguration of President Harry S. Truman on January 20, 1949, at which a prayer was offered by Rabbi Samuel Thurman of St. Louis, Mo. Though it was not, as announced, the first instance of a rabbi taking part in a presidential inauguration, since Rabbi Gershom Mendez Seixas had participated in George Washington's first inaugural, it testified to the vitality of the American ideal of interfaith amity.

Brotherhood Week in February, 1949, was generally observed with widespread Jewish participation. Other interfaith projects in local communities were initiated on Thanksgiving, Memorial Day, and other occasions. However, there was a growing tendency to demand proof of the tangible benefits derived from these traditionally accepted patterns of interfaith work. The subject was discussed by Rabbi Benedict Glazer at the Central Conference of American Rabbis, which had expressed strong criticism of several good-will agencies which were supported in large measure by Jewish funds. Representing the Orthodox point of view, Rabbi Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, issued a statement on "Religion and Group Relations" in which he declared that the prevalent practice in many synagogues and churches of exchanging pulpits was "doing Judaism more harm than good."

Religious Organization and Consolidation

During the period under review, the problem of strengthening the organizational character of Jewish religious life remained acute, both within Orthodoxy, Conservatism and Reform, and in their mutual relations.

ORTHODOX ORGANIZATION

The basic problem for Orthodoxy remained the internal competition and lack of unity which affected virtually every phase of its active program. William B. Herlands, newly elected president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, issued a plea for a League of United Orthodoxy to include all Orthodox Jewish agencies—but thus far it remained unheeded. Moving in the same direction, Yeshiva University announced in November, 1948, the formation of a Council for Community Program Coordination in cooperation with the Rabbinical Council of America and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations. Its stated purposes included the creation of a men's club movement and an organized program of adult education. Thus American Orthodoxy was following the organizational patterns previously fashioned by Reform and by Conservatism.

Even if successful, however, this body would not include all Orthodox groups. The position of the Rabbinical Council of America, which consisted largely of the graduates of the Yeshiva Rabbi Isaac Elchanan (Yeshiva University) in New York and of the Hebrew Theological College in Chicago, was challenged not only by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, the organization of the older European Orthodox rabbis, but also by the Rabbinical Alliance of America, most of whose members were ordained by the extreme Orthodox yeshivot Torah Vadaath and Rabbi Chaim Berlin in Brooklyn, N. Y., and Tiferet Jerusalem in New York.

When the Rabbinical Alliance was invited to merge with the Rabbinical

Council of America, it set as a preliminary condition that there be dropped from the roster the considerable number of Rabbinical Council members occupying pulpits of synagogues in which men and women were not segregated. When the leadership of the Rabbinical Council of America declared that it could not accede to this demand, negotiations for the merger were suspended. On the other hand, the Rabbinical Alliance reported that it was exploring a basis for a quasi-autonomous affiliation with the Union of Orthodox Rabbis.

REFORM AND CONSERVATIVE ORGANIZATION

Reform and Conservatism were not beset by these difficult internal problems and were able to concentrate on organizing and strengthening new congregations. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations gave substantial aid to new congregations on the West Coast as well as in the large metropolitan centers in the East, and thus brought new accessions to the ranks of Reform. The United Synagogue rendered field service to many new congregational units but gave no financial subsidies.

At the end of the year under review, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations numbered 392 congregations, the United Synagogue of America 365, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations 500, though there remained an undetermined number of unaffiliated Orthodox synagogues.

Zealous efforts to enhance the quality of Jewish congregational life were made in all quarters. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations sought to stimulate synagogue singing in order "to infuse life and warmth into the services by the singing of Hebrew responses and hymns." Through phonograph records it sought to re-introduce religious observances into the home.

The National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs of the United Synagogue sponsored Jewish Laymen's Institutes in various parts of the country. They generally took place on a week end and included a Sabbath with religious services, Jewish music, lecture courses on the Bible, Talmud and religious ideals, and discussions of current problems. The Young Peoples League of the United Synagogue and the National Federation of Temple Youth, which had declined during the war years, sought to strengthen their organizations and to intensify their services to their local affiliates, particularly in the field of religious participation and cultural activity—always the Achilles' heel of American Jewish youth groups.

COOPERATIVE ACTIVITY

While the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform groups were naturally concerned with strengthening their own specific interpretation of Judaism, they were all constituents of the Synagogue Council of America, which Rabbi Robert Gordis served as president. The function of the Council was to speak with united voice on behalf of the religious household of American Jewry wherever agreement was possible, and in general to stress the elements held in common by the various wings of American Judaism. In conjunction with its first public installation of officers, the Synagogue Council conducted a seminar-conference on "Revitalizing the Synagogue" with Orthodox, Con-

servative, and Reform rabbis participating. The Synagogue Council of America delegated Rabbi Isaac Klein of Springfield, Mass., to serve as Adviser on Jewish Religious Affairs to the American Military Government in Germany.

The suggestion originally advanced by the Synagogue Council that the Tenth of Tebet be observed by world Jewry as a day of mourning and commemoration for the millions of Jews exterminated during the Nazi holocaust, already approved by the Chief Rabbis of France, England and Italy, was adopted by the Chief Rabbinate of Israel. The Synagogue Council of America continued energetically to seek consideration from colleges and universities for the religious scruples of observant Jewish students in fixing the dates of examinations. It urged Jewish organizations on the national and the local level to maintain the public observance of the Sabbath and the dietary laws, and secured widespread promise of cooperation.

Because of lack of adequate support, many of the Synagogue Council's activities were conducted not independently but in cooperation with large secular Jewish organizations. Particularly significant for the future was the establishment of a Joint Committee with the National Jewish Welfare Board to study the relationship of the synagogue and the center and to establish a code of procedure for these agencies, so as to minimize friction and enrich their contributions to a vital Jewish program. The Synagogue Council also cooperated with the Training Bureau of Jewish Communal Service in planning an institute for rabbis on community problems to be held in the Summer of 1950.

During the period under review, the Synagogue Council sought to lay the groundwork for a World Council of Synagogues. Considerable attention was given to the project of establishing synagogue councils in local American communities to represent religious groups, but the plan still lacked the unanimous approval required by the constitution of the Synagogue Council. Nonetheless, several local communities were proceeding independently with such an organization.

Rabbinical associations, cutting across denominational lines of Orthodoxy, Conservatism, and Reform, were actively functioning in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago, as well as in some smaller communities. In New York and Philadelphia, the rabbinical associations received the bulk of their support from the central philanthropic chest of the Jewish community, which recognized the value of their work, particularly in such areas as chaplaincies in hospitals and institutions of correction.

The Synagogue Council of America expressed the almost universal sentiment of American Jewry in opposing the efforts being made to break down the separation of church and state. It was associated in the Vashti MacCollum case before the United States Supreme Court which invalidated "released time" for religious instruction in the public schools. It continued to oppose released time in New York, where the project was actively supported only by the extreme Orthodox League for Jewish Religious Education, an offshoot of the Lubavitcher Yeshiva movement.

Publication

Jewish scholarship continued to be an integral element in Jewish religious activity.³ Similarly, the publication of text books and other educational material continued to be a prime undertaking of religious groups.⁴ All three wings of American Judaism continued the publication of periodicals. The Reform monthly, *Liberal Judaism*, and the Orthodox bi-monthly, *Jewish Life*, followed the popular format of *Reader's Digest* and were intended for the general public. The quarterly journal, *Conservative Judaism*, was concerned with problems of theology, ethics, and Jewish problems on a more specialized level. Technical material of religious and scholarly interest continued to appear in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* and the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. The *Reconstructionist* served as a meeting-ground for diverse points of view, while general periodicals like *Commentary*, *Menorah Journal*, the *Jewish Frontier*, and the *Jewish Spectator*, and news weeklies like the *National Jewish Post*, gave a large amount of space to material concerned with Jewish religious life and its underlying traditions.

Religious Functionaries

The personal problems of religious functionaries were directly dependent upon the character of Jewish religious life in America, since the recruiting of personnel was considerably influenced by such factors as personal effectiveness, social position, tenure and old age security. The pension plans established by the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Rabbinical Assembly for their members were becoming recognized as a natural condition of employment for rabbis. Steps were taken by the Cantors Assembly of the United Synagogue to extend the plan to cover its membership. The Orthodox Rabbinical Council of America had a similar plan under consideration. Similar provisions for religious teachers were still not universally accepted, but the idea was gaining ground. Life contracts for rabbis were not yet the norm, but were increasing, and one cantor, Myron Glass of Indianapolis, Ind., attained such status in his congregation.

Thus the Jewish year 5709, not distinguished by any outstanding achievement, nevertheless was marked by an increasing tempo of activity in the field of religion. The struggle to make American Jewry worthy of its opportunity was on in earnest.

ROBERT GORDIS

³ For a discussion of Jewish scholarship, see p. 218.

⁴ For a discussion of educational texts, see p. 165.

JEWISH EDUCATION*

TWO CONTRADICTIONARY developments took place in the field of Jewish education during the past several years. On the one hand, there was a continuous expansion of educational activity and an increasing Jewish school enrollment; on the other hand, a shrinking supply of qualified teachers and administrative personnel.

Enrollment

The total enrollment in all Jewish schools (Sunday, weekday afternoon, all-day, Yiddish, and released time) in the Spring of 1949 was 255,865. Of this number the Sunday schools had 128,719, or 52.3 per cent; the weekday schools, 122,109, or 47.7 per cent. The 1949 enrollment represented an increase of 6.9 per cent over that of 1948. Both the Sunday and weekday schools shared in the increase. The Sunday schools augmented their enrollment by 6.5 per cent from 120,896 in 1948 to 128,719 in 1949; the weekday schools by 3 per cent from 118,502 to 122,109.

TABLE 1
ESTIMATED JEWISH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, 1948 AND 1949 ^a

Year	Weekday Schools		Sunday Schools		Combined Enrollment
	Enrollment	Per Cent	Enrollment	Per Cent	
1949	122,109	47.7	128,719	52.3	255,865 ^b
1948	118,502	49.5	120,896	50.5	239,398

^a The 1949 enrollment estimate is based on reports from 107 communities distributed over thirty-five states, comprising a Jewish population of 3,680,225, or 81.2 per cent of the total Jewish population in the United States.

^b Includes enrollment on released time.

Teacher Shortage

Simultaneously with this trend of growing school enrollment, a growing shortage of qualified teachers was observable.

A survey of 107 communities revealed that 74 were in need of teachers, 11 reported no shortages, and 22 failed to indicate whether they had a shortage. Of the 74 communities which reported teacher shortages, 54 indicated that they needed 255 qualified teachers and principals. On the basis of these figures, the total shortage of qualified teachers in the country may be estimated at over 700. In 1946, a similar survey revealed a shortage of about 600 teachers.

As a consequence of this situation, the schools with the less intensive programs, which traditionally relied to a considerable degree on untrained teachers, were benefiting from the increasing interest in Jewish education. To this group belonged most of the Sunday schools, many of the congregational

* Prepared with the help and cooperation of the American Association for Jewish Education.

schools, and the kindergartens and the early grades of the all-day schools. The latter, though part of the most intensive type of Jewish school, had been enrolling increasing numbers of children, despite the fact that adequate provision for teachers could not be made. Of the nearly 5,000 children enrolled in the Jewish all-day schools outside of New York City in the Winter of 1948, over one-third (33.5 per cent) were concentrated in the kindergarten classes.

On the other hand, the more intensive type of schools, both under congregational and non-congregational auspices, such as the four- and five-day-a-week schools, as well as the high school departments of the weekday afternoon schools, recorded considerable declines in enrollment in the period under review: the combined enrollment in the four- and five-day-a-week schools declined 10.6 per cent; in the high schools, 5.8 per cent.

A comparative study of enrollment data for forty-four communities for the past two years offers additional data bearing on this development (*see* Table 2). The combined enrollment in the congregational and non-congregational four- and five-day-a-week schools in these cities declined sharply during the past year. However, the non-congregational schools recorded a larger decline, 9.1 per cent, while the congregational schools declined 6.5 per cent.

The only type of weekday schools (except the all-day school) which recorded increases in registration were the two- and three-day-a-week afternoon congregational schools. The former recorded an increase of 18.1 per cent; the latter, of 28.9 per cent. On the other hand, the enrollment in the non-congregational two- and three-day-a-week schools declined. The relatively large increase of enrollment in the three-day-a-week congregational schools was aided by the official educational policy of the Conservative congregations which for the past few years had been advocating a school program based upon six hours of instruction a week with classes meeting not less than three days a week.

TABLE 2

ENROLLMENT IN KINDERGARTENS AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF WEEKDAY AFTERNOON AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS FOR 1948 AND 1949 BY TYPE OF SCHOOL ^a

<i>Type, by Days of Attendance</i>	<i>Congregational</i>			<i>Non-Congregational</i>		
	<i>1948</i>	<i>1949</i>	<i>Per Cent Change</i>	<i>1948</i>	<i>1949</i>	<i>Per Cent Change</i>
Two-day	1,583	1,869	18.1	707	173	— 75.5
Three-day	7,605	9,802	28.9	1,072	915	— 14.6
Four-day	4,474	4,266	— 4.7	1,655	1,441	— 12.9
Five-day	3,125	2,841	— 9.1	8,552	7,833	— 8.4
TOTAL WEEKDAY ..	16,787	18,778	11.9	11,986	10,362	— 8.6
Sunday	37,246	40,973	10.0	3,719	4,622	24.3
TOTAL	54,033	59,751	10.6	15,705	14,984	— 4.6

^a This survey covers 44 communities.

The All-Day Schools

In 1935 there were sixteen all-day schools in New York City and two outside of New York, with a total enrollment of about 5,000 pupils. During the last

decade, the Jewish all-day school movement was taken over by militant sectarian groups which came to the United States in the wake of World War II. These carried the all-day school to many American Jewish communities which had previously been uninfluenced by it.

There were, at the time of writing, 126 complete and incomplete all-day schools in 46 cities distributed over 17 states and the District of Columbia, with an enrollment of 18,654 pupils who formed 15.3 per cent of all children attending weekday schools and 7.3 per cent of the combined registration in all Jewish schools. Of the 58 all-day schools outside of New York City, only 8 were complete, each with 8 grades, and 2 with 7 grades each.

TABLE 3
ALL-DAY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT IN THE UNITED STATES, 1948

Department	Total		Boys		Girls		Per Cent Sex Distribution Within Each Department		
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	Boys	Girls	Total Per Cent
Kindergarten and elementary	16,160	86.6	11,266	84.0	4,894	93.3	69.7	30.3	100.0
High school	2,494	13.4	2,140	16.0	354	6.7	85.8	14.2	100.0
TOTAL	18,654	100.0	13,406	100.0	5,248	100.0	71.9	28.1	100.0

In the rest of the schools the number of grades varied from one (kindergarten, or kindergarten and first grade) to six, with the majority having four grades or less.

Most of the existing 106 all-day school departments (kindergarten, elementary, and high school) outside of New York City were established recently: one in 1917, three in the thirties, 44 between 1940 and 1944, and 54 in the last four years.

Yiddish Schools

The total enrollment in all Yiddish schools in 1948 in the United States was a little over 17,000. Of this number, the Workmen's Circle schools had 5,500; Sholem Aleichem schools, about 1,500; those of the Jewish National Workers Alliance, almost 4,600; and the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order schools, about 6,000.

The Workmen's Circle schools celebrated their thirtieth anniversary in 1948. They were first organized in 1918 as Yiddish Socialist schools, cosmopolitan in outlook and labor-centered. They deliberately excluded all teaching of traditional Jewish values or subjects from their curriculum with the exception of the Yiddish language which was also the medium of instruction. Their textbooks, especially those that appeared in the twenties, contained no references to Jewish religion or culture and no mention of Jewish holidays or customs. During the thirties and forties, the Workmen's Circle schools altered ideologically. Their curricula included, at the time of writing, the

teaching and celebration of Jewish holidays, the study of the Bible in Hebrew and in Yiddish, Jewish history, and the study of Hebrew. The total budget of the Workmen's Circle schools in 1948 was \$450,000. Of this sum, the Workmen's Circle national education committee contributed \$100,000; local welfare funds, \$75,000; tuition fees netted \$150,000; and special fund-raising campaigns, \$125,000.

Released Time

By and large, Jewish communities were making very little use of released time for carrying on Jewish educational programs. Of over 110 respondent communities, only 14 reported that they had conducted some sort of a Jewish educational program on released time, and in only one community (Buffalo, N. Y.) were the released-time classes integrated into the wider Jewish educational program of the community. The reports seemed to indicate a lessening interest in the use of released time. In New York City, the enrollment in the classes conducted by the Jewish Education Committee declined from 5,000 in 1946 to 2,911 in 1948; in Los Angeles, Cal., classes which were conducted in the past on released time were discontinued in 1948, and in Boston, Mass., they were to be discontinued in 1950.

Teacher Training

The number of teachers who were graduated from the ten leading teachers seminaries in the country in 1947-48 was 83; in 1948-49, it was 85. The number was probably insufficient to replace the teachers who left the field during the year through retirement, death, or for other reasons.

During the past few years only five or six teachers a year applied for teaching licenses at the Board of License for Hebrew Teachers for Greater New York. In the period under review, thirty-three men and women took the examination.

In some of the larger communities, such as Los Angeles; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Buffalo, N. Y., the problem of the teacher shortage was being partly met by the organization of emergency teacher training programs in conjunction with summer training institutes conducted by accredited institutions. On the whole, the steps taken by communities or by national organizations to alleviate the shortage of teachers and other educational personnel by attracting young men and women to teachers colleges, were insufficient, to judge by the almost total absence of scholarships for aspiring young teachers.

Hebrew in the Public High Schools and Colleges

The number of students studying Hebrew in the public high schools grew steadily during the forties. In 1939, Hebrew classes had an enrollment of 2,400; in 1949, 3,970—an increase of 65.4 per cent. During this same period the number enrolled for all foreign-language courses in the New York City public high schools decreased from 150,000 to slightly over 88,000. Hebrew was being taught in nineteen high schools, five junior high schools, and two evening

high schools. These schools offered a total of 137 classes taught by 37 licensed high school teachers. A special committee on the "place and function of foreign languages in New York City schools," headed by Henry C. Olinger of New York University (NYU), reported in 1948 that Hebrew was among the best-taught languages in the city. In order to attract capable teachers to the field of Hebrew teaching in the public high schools, the University of the State of New York made available a grant to Brooklyn College and Hunter College for special graduate courses leading to the degree of Master of Education in Hebrew.

Outside of New York City, Hebrew was offered in 1948-49 only in the Salden-Blewett High School in St. Louis, Mo. Several communities (Boston and Worcester, Mass.; Newark, N. J.) were planning to introduce the study of Hebrew in the public high schools during 1949-50.

Interest in Hebrew literature and culture extended beyond the Jewish students of the city schools. More than 1,000 students of all faiths and races participated from 1944 to 1948 in the annual contests, "Hebrew Culture and its Contribution to American Life," conducted by the Hebrew Culture Council in conjunction with the Board of Education of the City of New York.

In a study published in June, 1949, by A. I. Katsh, it was disclosed that 206 colleges in the United States were offering 524 courses in Hebrew; 414 of these courses treated Hebrew as a biblical study, while 110 taught Hebrew as a modern language. All but 199 of 1,021 colleges polled by Katsh accepted Hebrew as a satisfactory language to meet admission requirements.

In New York City, 1,500 graduate and undergraduate students were to be found in the Hebrew Departments of Brooklyn College, City College, Hunter College, and NYU.

Influence of the State of Israel

The influence the emergence of the state of Israel would have upon Jewish education could not be foretold. The consensus of Jewish educational thought foresaw two important developments: one, an increasing spiritual and cultural relationship between American Jewry and Israel; the other, a more optimistic attitude on the part of Jewish educational workers.

There were no important curricular revisions during the period as a result of the emergence of the state of Israel. Yet significantly, there was news from a number of the larger communities (Los Angeles, Cal.; Chicago, Ill.; Baltimore, Md.; Duluth and St. Paul, Minn.; Buffalo and Syracuse, N. Y.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Philadelphia, Pa.; Memphis, Tenn.) of local and regional teachers conferences and special assemblies at which the problem of revision of the Jewish school curriculum in the light of the new position of the Jewish people in the world was the main theme of discussion.

Some concrete influences could already be discerned. Of the 107 communities canvassed, 54 reported an increase in the study of Hebrew which was stimulated by the nascent Israeli state; in 42 of these communities interest was manifested by adults in conversational Hebrew, intended for prospective visitors to Israel. In a few cities this interest extended to Bible and modern Hebrew literature in the original.

A number of schools reported increased interest in Israeli geography and history, the United Nations, and the social problems of the new state. This interest was expressed in current events sessions and at assemblies; in Minneapolis formal courses dealing with the state of Israel were introduced into the Hebrew high school.

Confirmation and graduation orations in many schools were based on Israel's struggle for independence, and in 79 out of the 110 communities reporting, Israeli themes were used for assembly programs.

In St. Paul, introduction of the Sephardic pronunciation of Hebrew was planned in all Jewish schools; the East Midwood Jewish Center of Brooklyn, N. Y., was experimenting with the use of the Sephardic pronunciation in the upper grades.

The events in Israel stimulated the use of audio-visual material in most schools. Over 75 per cent of the respondent communities indicated increased use of film strips, movies, record discs, and the preparation of exhibits bearing on life in Israel. In many schools the arts and crafts projects were based on Israeli motifs.

Evidences of inter-educational relationships between Israel and the United States were also apparent. Several educational workshops and seminars for American students and teachers were held in Israel. Among the more important ones was the accredited workshop on "Palestine Life and Culture" under the auspices of the NYU School of Education in cooperation with the Katzenelson Institute of Social Studies of Kfar Saba, Israel and the Jewish Culture Council. The workshop consisted of formal classes, lectures, and tours. More than seventy students participated. A seminar for more than fifty American teachers and principals was held in Jerusalem during the Summer of 1949, under the auspices of the Hebrew University and the World Union for Jewish Education. The seminar included intensive courses in the Hebrew language, literature, and methods of teaching Bible and history. The studies were supplemented by observation of Israeli schools and guided tours to all parts of the country. In addition, the Jewish Agency's youth department and the Hebrew University co-sponsored a summer institute in Israel. The institute included three weeks of work on Israeli farm settlements and one month of attendance at classes at the Hebrew University.

Another educational influence attributable to the rise of the state of Israel was the inauguration of the "Jerusalem Examination" in Hebrew by the Hebrew University and the World Union for Jewish Education, patterned after the "Cambridge Examination" in English. The examination was given on December 30, 1948. The aim of this examination, which was to be an annual event, was to encourage the study of the Hebrew language and literature. The examination was based on excerpts from the Bible, Mishnah, Liturgy, the Mishnah Torah of Maimonides and selections from modern literature. Forty-eight persons took the examination in the United States.

Parent-Teacher Associations

A significant development in Jewish education was the growth throughout the country of parent-teacher groups of Jewish schools. In an increasing num-

ber of communities, parent groups of Jewish schools have been forming for the double purpose of parent participation in the Jewish education of their children, and their self-education as well.

In 83 communities 446 schools reported parent-teacher associations in 1948-49, with the majority centered in the large metropolitan centers of New York City, Philadelphia, and Boston.

A study of the functions of these associations showed that they ranged from helping to decorate the school and serving refreshments to children, to the sponsorship of educational projects for the improvement of both parent and child.

In cities with central agencies of Jewish education, the activities of the parent-teacher associations were more sustained and meaningful. They included parent education in child problems, as well as parent education in Jewish living through Jewish holiday institutes and workshops whose aim was to carry the teachings of the school into the home.

In a few cities parent groups were affiliated with a central organization of Parent-Teachers Associations (PTA's). There were such associations in New York and Baltimore, sponsored by the local central agencies of Jewish education.

Los Angeles had a United Parent-Teachers Association for all the East Side schools. It contemplated forming similar organizations for the other sections of the city. In Philadelphia an association of PTA's of Conservative schools was sponsored by the Board of Jewish Education.

In Detroit there was a Council of PTA's covering the schools affiliated with the United Hebrew Schools.

In Schenectady and Syracuse the local central organizations of Jewish education sponsored a city-wide PTA.

The PTA's were moving in the direction of a national organization. At the week-end annual conference of the American Association for Jewish Education in Atlantic City, on Decoration Day, 1949, a National Organization of PTA's was officially launched. At the same time, the PTA's affiliated with Jewish all-day schools held their first national conference under the auspices of Torah Umesorah in Hartford, Conn.

Allocations for Jewish Education

In 1935 Samson Benderly estimated the cost of Jewish education at some \$4,900,000. In the fifteen years since it more than quadrupled and was still mounting. American Jewish leadership was coming to realize that the financing of Jewish education was a community responsibility and could not be borne by the parents alone, nor even by the congregations alone, and that it must be borne by all the elements in the community. A concrete expression of this awareness was the increasing number of Federations and Welfare Funds which were allocating funds for Jewish education annually. In 1936, twenty-nine cities reported allocations by Federations and Welfare Funds for Jewish education; in 1947, fifty-three cities reported such allocations. In 1936 the Federation subventions for Jewish education amounted to \$523,749, or 6.13 per cent of the total sum spent by the Federations for all local needs. In 1947

the amount subvented for Jewish education by the Federations was \$2,181,417, or 8.79 per cent of the total budgeted by Federations for all local needs. The amount of money allocated for Jewish education through Federations and Welfare Funds increased proportionately more rapidly than the amount of money allocated through the same channels for "all local needs."

A major part of the Federation funds for Jewish education was spent in communities which had central agencies for Jewish education. In 1948, thirty-five of the thirty-seven existing central agencies for Jewish education reported a total budget of \$2,854,053.65. Of this sum, \$2,125,072.63, or 75 per cent, was contributed by Federations and Welfare Funds, and \$728,981.02 was derived from other sources.

TABLE 4
ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS FOR "ALL LOCAL NEEDS" AND
FOR "JEWISH EDUCATION," BY FEDERATIONS AND
WELFARE FUNDS, 1936-1947

Year	Cities Reporting (Number)	Amount Budgeted for All Local Needs ^b	Allocation for Jewish Education	Per Cent
1947	53	\$24,806,661	\$2,181,417	8.79
1946	50	20,661,511	1,875,320	9.08
1945	54	17,429,647	1,532,246	8.79
1944	56	14,718,393	1,132,150	7.69
1943	51	12,820,330	892,165	6.96
1942	49	12,724,666	817,973	6.43
1941	40	11,971,317	706,469	5.90
1940 ^a				
1939 ^a				
1938	28	8,754,222	504,555	5.76
1937	29	9,711,139	528,831	5.45
1936	29	8,547,372	523,749	6.13

^a Data not available.

^b Amounts given under "All Local Needs" include, in all cases, allocations for Jewish education and for recreational and cultural activities.

Conferences

The Rabbinical Assembly held its third annual conference on Jewish education in New York City on January 11 and 12, 1949. The theme of the conference was "Implementing a Program of Intensive Jewish Education in the Synagogue Schools." Intensification of Jewish education in all types of schools was the theme of the national conference of the Mizrahi National Education Committee held on Thanksgiving week end, in 1948, in New York City. The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education organized eight regional conferences during the period under review, and the Torah Umesorah held two regional conferences in which teachers, administrators, and lay leaders of all-day schools participated.

The Hebrew Union School of Education and Sacred Music, an affiliate of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, held a conference on religious school administration in cooperation with the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues. The conference resulted in the formation of a

permanent Association of Religious School Boards, whose aim was to coordinate the work of the forty-seven Reform religious schools in the metropolitan area. The American Association for Jewish Education held a special conference on the occasion of its tenth anniversary. The conference was held in conjunction with the National Council of Jewish Education and the Federation of Hebrew Teachers. At this conference held in Atlantic City on Decoration Day week end, 1949, the groups involved in the Jewish educational process in America were represented, including laymen, administrative personnel, and teachers as well as representatives of all the ideological shadings: Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Yiddish groups.

The problem of Yiddish education was an important subject of the World Yiddish Congress which met in New York City from September 16 to 20, 1948. The Congress organized a central committee for Yiddish schools.

Educational Events

During the period under review the Jewish Education Committee in cooperation with the Histadruth Ivriith of America organized a Hebrew section of its "Theater for Children" which held its premiere on April 10, 1949, with the play, *Ha-Otzar Bamearah* ("Treasure in the Cave"), especially written by the Israeli playwright Michael Alma.

Community graduations of elementary schools were becoming more and more the vogue. Such celebrations were reported held in Los Angeles; Rock Island, Ill.; Pittsfield, Mass.; Schenectady, N. Y.; and in Chicago, Ill.; where the twenty-fifth anniversary of such public graduations was celebrated.

Cleveland celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Bureau of Jewish Education; Memphis, Tenn., the ninety-fifth anniversary of the Temple Israel School. In Philadelphia, tribute was paid to William Chomsky, teacher and author of important works in Jewish education, for his twenty-five years of service to Gratz College.

The Beth Hayeled of New York City, a pioneer experimental school in early childhood education based on the principle of an integrated bi-cultural program, celebrated its tenth anniversary.

Jewish Educational Literature

Only two books dealing with the history, philosophy, and theories of Jewish education in America appeared during the period under review. Rabbi Louis Katzoff's *Issues in Jewish Education: A Study of the Philosophy of the Conservative Congregational Schools* discussed the rise of the Conservative school in America, and analyzed its structure and curriculum. The study was based on inquiries made among more than 50 per cent of the Conservative synagogues which conducted schools.

The Yiddish volume of essays, *A Shul-Pinkes*, was published in 1948 by the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary in 1946 of the Chicago schools. The volume was edited by Yudel Mark, S. Berkowitch, M. Bronstein, and J. H. Pomerantz. It represented a valuable collection of articles on the development, history, and philosophy of the Yiddish

schools in America. The second volume of *The Jewish People: Past and Present*, published in 1948 (Jewish Encyclopedic Handbooks, Central Yiddish Culture Organization), contained nine articles on the history and problems of Jewish education in many lands, two of which dealt with the United States: "Yiddish Secular Schools" by S. Yefroikin, and "Jewish Education in the United States" by Leo L. Honor.

A new curriculum was prepared by Louis H. Ruffman of the Jewish Education Committee of New York for the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education. This curriculum presented a graded program for the elementary school based upon the "objectives and standards for the congregational school" as officially formulated by the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education. In addition, the Board of Jewish Education of Philadelphia—the local branch of the United Synagogue of America—reported the publication of a curriculum for the first and second years of the congregational school. A curricular development in the making was the experimentation with a uniform program of studies for a group of intensive afternoon schools in New York City which was carried on by the Jewish Education Committee of New York.

Several new Hebrew and English texts were published during the year for the weekday afternoon and Sunday schools. The more significant ones were: *Modern Jewish Life in Literature* by Azriel Eisenberg, and *Fifty Assembly Programs for the Jewish School* by Samuel Sussman and Abraham Segal. Both of these books were published by the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education.

The United Synagogue also published a book on intercultural education. *America's Triumph* was intended for the use of children in the upper high school grades. It was the first book of its kind produced for general use by a Jewish organization.

Among the more important Hebrew texts published during the period under review was *Hebrew Reading the Picture Way*, a Hebrew primer by Leah Klepper, illustrated by Jessie B. Robinson and published by the Jewish Education Committee of New York. *Yisroel B'artzo* by Ben Zion Toback was intended for use by children with some knowledge of Hebrew. The text followed the requirements formulated by the Hebrew Principals Association of New York. A more advanced text, *Modern Hebrew Literature*, a literary anthology edited by George L. Epstein and Max Zeldner, was intended for high school classes of the public high schools and colleges.

The Baltimore Hebrew College began the publication of a series of booklets presenting classic stories from modern Hebrew literature in abridged form. In 1948-49 it published two booklets based on stories by Ibn-Zahav and Judah Yaari, condensed and edited by Louis L. Kaplan and Zevi Tchack. The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education continued its *Oneq* series of Hebrew literature for children, and published three original stories by William Chomsky, Mrs. L. C. Chomsky, and Ben Aronin. In addition, the Histadruth Ivriith of Philadelphia published several "easy" children's books in Hebrew.

Personalia

Alexander M. Dushkin, executive vice-president of the Jewish Education Committee of New York, resigned his position to accept the post of dean of undergraduate studies at the Hebrew University and of adviser to students from the United States. His place was filled by Azriel Eisenberg, former executive director of the Council on Jewish Education of Philadelphia. Israel S. Chipkin, formerly executive director of the American Association for Jewish Education, accepted the position of vice-president of the Jewish Education Committee, for research and experimentation and as consultant to the Board. He will undertake a long-range study of Jewish education in New York City. Judah Pilch was appointed executive director of the American Association for Jewish Education. His position as head of the Jewish Education Association of Essex County, N. J., was filled by David Rudovsky, who resigned his affiliation with the Jewish Education Committee of New York.

There were several changes in position of directors of central agencies of Jewish education. A. P. Gannes, director of the Bureau of Jewish Education in Miami, Fla., was appointed executive director of the Council on Jewish Education in Philadelphia, and Louis Schwartzman, director of the Board of Jewish Education of Atlanta, Ga., was appointed director for Miami. Mark Krug, director of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Buffalo, took the position of assistant superintendent of the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago, his place in Buffalo being filled by Elzar Goelman, principal of Haar Zion Hebrew School in Philadelphia. Alexander S. Kohanski, former director of the Maine Jewish Council, was the new head of the Jewish Education Society of San Francisco, and Israel T. Naamani was appointed to head the Bureau of Jewish Education of Louisville, Ky. Noah Nardi, psychologist, formerly with the Jewish Education Committee of New York, was appointed head of the department of research of the Ministry of Education in Israel.

URIAH Z. ENGELMAN

ZIONIST AND PRO-ISRAEL ACTIVITIES

THE ESTABLISHMENT of the state of Israel was quickly reflected both politically and culturally in Jewish organizational life among Zionist and non-Zionist bodies.

The decision of the American Zionist Emergency Council to change its name to the American Zionist Council was an indication of the easing of the four-year-old Zionist emergency. On June 17, 1949, the Council announced that Abba Hillel Silver would be succeeded by a presidium of four, composed of Benjamin G. Brody of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA); Mrs. Judith Epstein, Hadassah; Baruch Zuckerman, Poale Zion; and Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, Mizrachi. Thus, the Council continued to be constituted by proportional representation of the largest of the American Zionist parties. In view of the continued anti-Zionist activities of the American Council for

Judaism, it was felt necessary that the American Zionist Council continue as the political and public relations spokesman for the official Zionist movement in the United States.

ZOA and the United Jewish Appeal

The rift in the ZOA between the administration headed by ZOA president Emanuel Neumann and Abba Hillel Silver on the one hand, and the Committee for Progressive Zionism (CPZ), led by such Zionist veterans as Louis Lipsky, Louis E. Leventhal, Stephen S. Wise, and Charles I. Rosenbloom on the other, continued after the fifty-first annual convention in July, 1948, when the administration won a complete vote of confidence. Never ideologically very clear, the conflict was ascribed to CPZ charges that the ZOA was reactionary, both in its political and economic program. It assumed national significance when it was extended to the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), where the controversy between Abba Hillel Silver and Henry Montor became the cynosure of the entire American Jewish community.

Henry Montor's resignation as executive vice-chairman of the United Palestine Appeal (UPA), submitted on September 10, 1948, was accepted by the executive committee on October 21, 1948. In his letter of resignation, Montor charged the ZOA with using UPA funds for political purposes. Israel Goldstein, chairman of the UPA, wrote in reply: "The United Palestine Appeal has the support of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the highest authority in the conduct of its affairs." This statement was corroborated by a cablegram sent on November 6, 1948, to the UPA convention in Chicago by Berl Locker, chairman of the Jerusalem Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

Displeased with the results of the Chicago conference, the Committee of Contributors and Workers, a body close to the CPZ, announced on November 10, 1948, that it would hold a conference of fund-raising leaders to map out an independent campaign with three major objectives: all American Jews were to share in the responsibility for raising funds for Israel in 1949; all funds raised in the United States were to be remitted directly to Israel; and final authority for allocation and disbursement of funds remitted to Israel from the Jews of America was to rest with the Executive of the Jewish Agency in Israel.

On December 9, 1948, Edwin Rosenberg of New York, chairman of the conciliation committee of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), which conducted negotiations between the two groups, announced a settlement of the differences. Ostensibly, the agreement healed the rift. But conflict broke out again at the Atlantic City conference of the UJA on January 12 and 13, 1949, when the UPA rejected the return of Henry Montor as executive vice-chairman of the UJA campaign. The conflict was sharpened when Henry Morgenthau, Jr., chairman of the 1948 campaign, made his 1949 chairmanship contingent upon Montor's return.

The proposed intervention by the Israel section of the Jewish Agency led to the passage of a resolution of objection on January 23, 1949, by the national executive committee of the ZOA.

However, the full Executive of the Jewish Agency, including the Israel section, decided in favor of Morgenthau, who was asked to head the 1949 drive with the assumption that he would ask Montor to work with him. This precipitated the resignations of Silver and Neumann from the Executive.

ZOA CONVENTION

The struggle between the two groups in the ZOA continued until the eve of the organization's fifty-second annual convention, held in New York City from May 27 to May 30, 1949. A peace settlement led to an endorsement of Daniel Frisch as the compromise candidate for the presidency to succeed Neumann. The outgoing administration, however, passed a resolution vindicating the resignations of Silver and Neumann from the Agency Executive.

Repercussions from the resignations of Silver and Neumann from the Jewish Agency were still felt at the sessions of the Zionist Actions Committee in Jerusalem from May 5 to 15, 1949, although they did not attend. Acceptance of the resignations meant in effect endorsement of the position taken by the Agency Executive in support of Morgenthau and Montor, and also was an implicit rejection of any unwarranted intervention on their part in the American scene. At the closing session the resignations were accepted after exhaustive deliberations. A motion was also passed replacing the two Americans by Yitzhak Gruenbaum, former Minister of the Interior in the provisional government of Israel, and an American who was to be selected.

RIFKIND COMMISSION REPORT

There was much interest in the *Report of the Commission on the Future Program and Constitution of the World Zionist Organization*, published by the ZOA on May 23, 1949, which laid particular emphasis on the functions of the Zionist movement in America and elsewhere. The American Zionists were urged by the Commission headed by Judge Simon H. Rifkind:

To generate among the Jews of America a climate of opinion favorable to Israel; to perform the practical tasks necessary for the firm establishment of Israel; to promote in the general body politic of America an understanding of the aims and ideals of the Zionist movement; to build a two-way bridge between America and Israel for the free movement and exchange of men, materials, and ideas for the common enrichment of both communities; to facilitate the immigration of the Jews into Israel, encourage *halutz* movements among the youth, provide for the training of the migrants and their economic absorption in their new home; to promote agricultural, industrial, commercial, and scientific development so as steadily to enlarge the capacity of the land to receive new increments of population; to enlarge the means at the disposal of the central funds of the movement; to encourage the investment of capital and talent in useful enterprises in Israel; to foster among the Jews of America self-awareness and a sense of kinship with Jews everywhere and stimulate Jewish cultural creativity; to encourage the spread of the Hebrew language and of Jewish culture among the Jewish youth and the Jewish population generally; to cooperate with other organizations in defense of Jewish rights and other matters of common concern.

Other Zionist Organizations

The need for a reorientation occupied the attention of almost all Zionist groups, with the possible exception of those engaged primarily in social welfare. The establishment of the state of Israel and the influx of immigrants intensified the social services of Hadassah. On November 8, 1948, Mrs. Samuel W. Halprin was unanimously re-elected national president by delegates representing 265,000 members. A budget of \$6,535,000 was voted to provide \$3,000,000 for the Hadassah medical program in Israel and \$2,100,000 for the Youth Aliyah program.

At their convention on June 13 and 14, 1949, the Pioneer Women likewise emphasized social service projects and adopted a two-year quota of \$2,000,000 to aid women and children immigrants reaching Israel. Attending this convention was Golda Meyerson, Israeli Minister of Labor and Social Insurance, who spoke unofficially to the convention as a member of Mapai, the Labor Zionist party in Israel. She urged the immediate unification of Labor Zionist activities in the United States, declaring that the recommendation "had come directly from Prime Minister David Ben Gurion, also a member of Mapai." However, her recommendation was rejected.

The Mizrahi movement at its convention on June 22 to 24, 1949, was also concerned with its future structure, particularly on the world scene. Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, chairman of the Mizrahi national administrative board, called for the establishment of an autonomous world federation of general Mizrahi organizations to pursue a comprehensive program of action. This suggestion was to be taken up at the world Mizrahi conference to be convoked in Jerusalem in August, 1949. Rabbi Jacob Hoffman, president of the Mizrahi National Education Committee, recommended that American Jews recognize the chief rabbinate of Israel as "the final authority in Jewish religious life."

Labor Zionism

The Labor Zionist movement in America reported in its semi-monthly publication, *The Labor Zionist* (March 18, 1949), that four central committees were engaged in a study of the following proposals for reorganization:

1. The amalgamation of all Labor Zionist organizations into an organization with a fraternal department which would have complete autonomy in benefit matters and an autonomous women's section;
2. The retention by each Labor Zionist organization of the structure and autonomy for inner organizational matters but the establishment of an over-all body to which the individual members of the respective organizations would automatically belong and pay dues and which would act in behalf of the entire movement;
3. The creation of a Labor Zionist federation, with equal status for existing Labor Zionist organizations, to coordinate certain specific activities through permanent standing committees;
4. The coordination of specific cultural and political activities by committees composed of representatives of the Labor Zionist organizations, each

organization retaining its autonomy in organizational and fund-raising fields.

The Labor Zionist organization also announced the establishment of Ha Oved, an organization to render service to those who wished to be workers in Israel but were past the *Hechalutz* age of twenty-five and had no large financial means at their command.

Seeking to broaden its base of operation, the Labor Zionist organization also sponsored the first national "Assembly for Labor Israel," which met on June 22 and 23, 1949. The assembly stressed the responsibility of the entire Jewish people to provide the necessary finances and skills for developing Israel, and laid particular stress on American governmental aid through implementation of Point Four of President Harry S. Truman's program.

Activities of Non-Zionist Organizations

Interest in Israel was not confined to official Zionist organizations. This was perhaps most emphasized by the visit made to Israel in April, 1949, by a delegation from the American Jewish Committee headed by Jacob Blaustein, newly elected president, and John Slawson, executive vice-president, at the invitation of the government of Israel. The visit was preceded by an earlier "Statement of Views" with respect to Israel which was adopted by the American Jewish Committee on January 23, 1949, during its annual meeting.¹

Many Zionists resented the rapport between non-Zionist organizations and the government of Israel. On the other hand, dissatisfaction with the official Zionist organization came to the surface when David Petegorsky, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, proposed the dissolution of the ZOA. Writing in *Congress Weekly* (December 6 and 20, 1948), Petegorsky found that "the Zionist movement evokes the disciplined loyalty of a proportionately decreasing section of American Jewry. The full and effective mobilization of political action for Israel in this country can be achieved today only by a much more inclusive and all-embracing body than the Zionist Organization of America."

The National Council of Jewish Women, which in the past had concentrated its efforts in the United States, began to display its concern for Israel. In April, 1948, the Council held a conference in New York City on "Critical Problems of Education in Israel." The Council undertook as one of its main projects sponsorship of the department of education at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Of considerable interest during this period was the concern for Israel shown by the non-Zionist Jewish Labor Committee (JLC) and organizations ideologically sympathetic to that organization. Several delegations went to Israel where they initiated projects to be supported by the JLC and affiliated organizations. A chair was established at the Hebrew University in honor of Abraham Cahan, editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward* of New York City, and the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), which contributed \$250,000 to the United Jewish Appeal, also gave \$100,000 to the Trade Union Council of Histadrut to build a cooperative center in Israel.

¹ See Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee, at the end of this volume.

Anti-Zionist Activities

Three subjects bulked large among the arguments used by the anti-Zionists: the plight of Arab refugees, the fear that the establishment of the state of Israel would result in increased anti-Semitism in the United States, and the desecration of Christian shrines and holy places by the Israeli armed forces. At public and private meetings, the American Council for Judaism, through both Jewish and non-Jewish speakers, reiterated the fear that the position of the American Jew was becoming increasingly precarious because of the suspicion by other Americans that the loyalty of American Jews was divided between Israel and the United States.

Outstanding among the Protestants who expounded these arguments were Henry Sloane Coffin, president emeritus of Union Theological Seminary, and Henry Smith Leiper, associate general secretary of the World Council of Churches. They also expressed their concern for the Arab refugees, especially the Christian Arabs who were stated to be the "victims of persecution and ruthless extermination by Jewish extremists in Palestine," and called upon American Jews to take a public stand against these persecutions. Similarly, *Christian Century* (March 1, 1949) called attention to the fear and hatred incurred by Israel among the Arabs, in part as a result of the expansionist ambitions of the Israeli government but mainly as a result of the conditions of Arab refugees. Similar opinions were expressed by members of the Committee for Peace and Justice in Palestine, headed by Virginia Gildersleeve, James Shotwell, Kermit Roosevelt, and Henry Sloane Coffin, as well as such churchmen as Richard Niebuhr, professor of Christian ethics at Yale University; Millar Burrows, professor of biblical theology at the Yale University School of Divinity; John S. Badeau, president of the American University in Cairo, and Stephen Penrose, president of the American University in Beirut. Both Jewish and non-Jewish sources, outstanding among whom were the members of the American Christian Palestine Committee, denied these charges in both the daily and periodical press and from lecture platforms.

The charges that Israeli forces were guilty of deliberate vandalism in the damage of Christian shrines and Holy Places, and of frequent indignities to the religious personnel connected with these shrines, were made in the Catholic press. The appointment of a joint Catholic-Israeli commission to inspect damages and to agree on reparation, as well as the testimony of a large number of witnesses—most notable among whom was Monsignor Thomas J. McMahon, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association—that the damage was largely the result of the exigencies of war, helped to reduce these charges to a minimum.

Communist Organizations

Following the reversal of the American Communist attitude toward Zionism, the *Morning Freiheit*, Yiddish Communist newspaper, on March 29, 1949, indicated its intention of embarking on an intensive campaign against "Jewish bourgeois nationalism." Moshe Katz, a staff member who had taken issue with

Ilya Ehrenburg's statement on Zionism in *Pravda* in September, 1948, issued a statement of recantation and acknowledged the justice of Ehrenburg's analysis.² This proved to be a springboard for further attacks on Zionism. The *Freiheit* also published a lengthy editorial stating its plan "to begin a new educational campaign to enlighten the Jewish masses about bourgeois nationalism. We believe that this is in the interest of the Jewish people of the United States as well as in the interest of a truly democratic and independent Israel."

But the Jewish organizations associated with Communist ideology, such as the Jewish People's Fraternal Order and the American Jewish Labor Council, continued to raise money for Israel. However, at a conference of the American Jewish Labor Council, a resolution was adopted that "Jewish unions and organizations could make their contribution to the progressive powers by sending aid only through the American Jewish Labor Council." On July 5, 1949, the Jewish People's Fraternal Order announced a campaign to raise \$250,000 "to aid progressive elements who do not share in the millions collected in the United States."

Fund Raising for Israel

As in previous years, the UJA was in the forefront of all fund-raising campaigns for Israel. On February 28, 1949, the UJA announced the opening of its campaign for \$250,000,000, and during the first half of 1949 Israeli officials, including President Chaim Weizmann, Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog, and Minister of Labor and Social Insurance Golda Meyerson, came to the United States to spur the drive.

The advocates of local needs challenged what they termed an over-emphasis on overseas philanthropy. At a dinner on May 20, 1949, sponsored by the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues, Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, pointed out that only .4 per cent of the monies raised for American Jewish welfare funds was being allocated for religious, cultural, and educational purposes. "We may be destroying the very soul and heart, and, in time, the body, too, of American Jewry in the process of saving Jews elsewhere," he asserted. A similar position was taken by an Orthodox spokesman, Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, who warned that UJA contributions should not be "at the expense of our educational institutions in the United States."³

UNAUTHORIZED FUND RAISING

Concurrently, a plethora of "unauthorized and illegitimate" fund-raising campaigns challenged the dominance of the UJA as the central fund-raising agency on behalf of Israel in the United States. To eliminate this confusion the Jewish Agency for Palestine appointed a committee headed by Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the American Section of the Agency, to check multiple fund-raising campaigns. The committee was instructed to take note of the authorized traditional collections of the Jewish National Fund (JNF), as well

² For a discussion of Ehrenburg's article, see p. 336.

³ See also p. 151.

as the campaigns of Histadrut and Hadassah which were authorized by the World Zionist Congress. Particular attention, it was believed, would be devoted to the numerous fund-raising campaigns of the Revisionist party, including the Palestine Pioneers Foundation, the American Committee for the National Sick Fund of Israel, and the League for Jewish National Labor in Palestine. [See also p. 181.]

The Institute on Overseas Studies of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds announced that it would study the question of the American Jewish communities' responsibility for Israel in the light of the economic trends, the developing welfare needs and services of Israel, foreign governmental loans, private investments, and local resources.

That the Council proposed to play a greater role in the future in the budgeting and central planning of the UJA was adumbrated in a statement by Stanley C. Myers, president of the Council. Though commenting favorably upon the action the Jewish Agency was taking to eliminate needless duplication, Myers criticized the Agency for permitting its own favorites to initiate \$10,000,000 campaigns. This was a reference to the nationwide campaign by Histadrut to raise \$10,000,000 during 1949.

At the three-day JNF conference which opened in New York City on March 3; 1949, Abraham Granovsky, world chairman of the JNF, announced that the program for 1949 proposed "to double the national land holdings of the Jewish people in Israel by acquiring the second million dunams of land [250,000 acres] which is an essential prerequisite to the founding of 200 new agricultural settlements planned for this year in Israel."

Private Investment

The stress on fund raising of a charitable nature was balanced during this period by an encouragement of private investment. Efforts in this direction were made by the three investment corporations operating in the United States: AMPAL—American Palestine Trading Corporation, the Israel Corporation of America, and the Palestine Economic Corporation. Robert Nathan, director of the economic department of the Jewish Agency, speaking to the delegates of the National Assembly for Labor Israel on June 20, 1949, declared: "If the people are to become self-supporting, large amounts of private capital are essential to Israel. The absorption of 225,000 immigrants a year is impossible unless private capital and 'know-how' come in. Incentives must be provided to bring in private capital."

To encourage such investment the economic department of the Jewish Agency published a monthly economic digest whose first issue was distributed to 12,000 persons.

Cultural Relations

The term "cultural bridge" was a constant refrain heard at many meetings of Jewish organizations. Some 300 Jewish scientists, educators, scholars, and cultural leaders attended the first American Conference for Hebrew Language and Culture held in New York City (May 1 and 2, 1949). A comprehensive

program was adopted for the widespread dissemination of the Hebrew language and culture in the United States.

Writing in *The National Jewish Post* on March 18, 1949, Rabbi Herbert Weiner suggested that the *Beka-half shekel* for the support of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus be revived as an instrument for cultural unity between the Jews of Israel and the Diaspora. As coordinator of the summer institute for the youth department of the Jewish Agency, Rabbi Weiner announced on April 7, 1949, that the Jewish Agency and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem would sponsor a course of study in Israel for 120 selected American college students, irrespective of religion.

In addition, various Zionist organizations granted scholarships to forty-four Jewish youth leaders from the United States and Canada for a year's study and training in Israel, to enable them to assume leadership in the Zionist youth movement.

A number of Jewish educators left America for Israel to assume educational posts. Alexander M. Dushkin was appointed director of undergraduate studies to reorganize the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Noah Nardi was designated director of the department of research for the Ministry of Education. Benjamin Akzin, who had served as political secretary for the American Zionist Council, was named associate professor of political science at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

It appeared that the celebration of the anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel would be added to the calendar of Jewish holidays. Throughout the United States, large meetings were held to celebrate Israeli "Independence Day" on May 4, and the Synagogue Council of America disclosed that it was preparing a ritual for observance of Israel's Independence Day.

LOUIS SHUB

OVERSEAS PROGRAMS

THE ESTABLISHMENT of the state of Israel, followed immediately by Arab attack and invasion, formed the background for the overseas activities of American Jewish agencies as the year 1948-49 opened. Largely in response to the infant state's war of defense, the contribution of American Jews to Jews overseas reached its peak in 1948—exceeding the historic levels of 1946 and 1947.

After victory had been achieved and even during the period of armed conflict, Israel began to fulfill its major immediate mission—the "ingathering of the immigrants." From the proclamation of the state on May 14, 1948, to the end of June, 1949, Israel received 250,000 immigrants. The problem of the absorption of so large a volume of immigration in so short a time affected every aspect of overseas services and planning. It was reflected in a substantial reduction in the Jewish population of the displaced persons (DP) camps in Central Europe which had in the past several years been a major area of concern for overseas agencies.

United Jewish Appeal

The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) was the major channel through which American Jews made their contribution to Jews overseas. In 1948, the UJA raised an estimated \$150,000,000—the greatest sum realized in any of the ten annual campaigns which it had conducted since 1939.¹

On the basis of the formula for distribution of funds prevailing in the 1948 agreement, of the \$150,000,000 total the United Palestine Appeal (UPA) was to receive about \$71,800,000; the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) \$63,900,000; and the United Service for New Americans (USNA) \$10,400,000.

In 1949, the UJA adopted a goal of \$250,000,000—the same goal which had been set in 1948. No valid prediction could be made by July, 1949, as to what would actually be raised, but it was clear that the UJA would receive less than it had obtained in 1948 since most local community campaigns fell below their 1948 performance. The 1949 net funds, after campaign expenses and USNA allocations, were to be distributed as follows: Of the first \$100,000,000, JDC was to receive 45 per cent and UPA 55 per cent; of the next \$25,000,000, JDC 30 per cent and UPA 70 per cent; of all sums over \$125,000,000 JDC was to receive 15 per cent and UPA 85 per cent. This percentage formula, which gave larger shares to the UPA than it had received formerly, reflected the growing needs of Israel and the relatively declining requirements in Europe.

European Programs

JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE

The JDC appropriated \$70,600,000 for its world-wide operations during the calendar year 1948. This represented a slight decline from the \$73,400,000 appropriated in 1947. A sharper decline was evident in June, 1949, when appropriations were being made at an annual rate of about \$62,000,000.

JDC activities, as in prior years, covered a wide range of services including emigration aid; relief supplies; welfare programs for aged, children and other dependent groups; economic reconstruction; and educational, cultural, and religious programs. Emigration aid was of growing importance, accounting for appropriations of \$11,000,000 in 1948 and rising to a rate of \$2,000,000 per month in 1949. While part of these costs were reimbursable through payments for the movement of displaced persons made by the International Refugee Organization (IRO), JDC was carrying the costs for other migrations, primarily from Eastern Europe and the Balkans and from Moslem countries to Israel. The JDC reported that it aided 125,000 Jews to leave Europe in 1948.

At the end of 1948, it was estimated that 110,000 displaced Jews remained in Central Europe and Cyprus. By July, 1949, Cyprus had been emptied and about 50,000 to 60,000 remained in Central Europe.

JDC appropriations for the DP areas declined from over \$13,000,000 in 1948 to \$2,385,000 in the first six months of 1949. Emigration was proceeding

¹ The result of the 1947 UJA campaign was originally estimated at \$125,000,000. Actual 1947 pledges, recorded as of December 31, 1948, totaled \$117,500,000.

at a rapid pace, particularly to the United States under the DP immigration act. It was anticipated, however, that JDC would have a continuing responsibility beyond 1949 for perhaps several thousand ill and incapacitated people unwilling or unable to emigrate immediately and representing the "hard core" of the Jewish DP problem.

Eastern Europe and the Balkans were the single major area of JDC operations, accounting for appropriations of over \$16,000,000 in 1948 and over \$5,000,000 in the first six months of 1949.² JDC aid consisted of emergency relief, health and welfare programs for dependent groups, as well as economic aid in helping the Jewish population to adjust to the new social and economic structures in Eastern-European countries. The intensified trend toward nationalization in those countries and the hardening of their relations with the West affected JDC operations. In March, 1949, Rumania nationalized all welfare programs, closing the offices of JDC, ORT, and OSE. In Hungary, where JDC was still able to operate, greater emphasis was being placed on reconstruction activities, primarily in the form of vocational training and producers' cooperatives, which were designed to help Jews adapt themselves to the nationalization and industrialization programs being pursued in those countries.

In Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Poland emigration of Jews was still permitted. JDC terminated its Bulgarian program in the Spring of 1949 after virtually the entire Jewish population had left. It was expected that continued emigration would remove or at least drastically reduce the need for further JDC aid in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia by the end of 1949.

Improving economic conditions in Western Europe made it possible for JDC to reduce its appropriations in that area from \$6,300,000 in 1948 to \$2,300,000 in the first six months of 1949. In such countries as France and Belgium, continuing responsibilities were being carried for the Jewish refugee populations rather than for the permanent indigenous Jewish groups.

Reflecting the increased production of consumer goods in Europe, JDC reduced its supply program substantially, and the SOS (Supplies for Overseas Survivors), a supplementary campaign for gifts in kind which had been organized in 1946, was finally terminated in April, 1949.

On the other hand, there was a growing program of aid for Jews in Moslem lands, chiefly North Africa. Following the establishment of the state of Israel, there was a wave of persecution in Moslem countries, and large numbers of Jews began to emigrate from North Africa. Programs to facilitate migration and to provide medical care and other services in preparation for resettlement were established in Algeria and Marseilles. In addition, JDC medical and educational surveys began to establish a more permanent program of assistance for an area of Jewish population which had been largely ignored in the past as representing a chronic rather than emergency need.

OTHER AGENCIES

The declining scope of European operations was reflected also in the programs of other agencies such as ORT and the Hebrew Sheltering and Immi-

² These figures exclude supplies.

grant Aid Society (HIAS). The World ORT Union reached its peak of activity in the calendar year 1948, when it spent \$2,891,000. Of 23,000 students enrolled at the beginning of 1948, more than 13,000 were in the DP camps. During 1948 and in the early months of 1949, total enrollment decreased, reflecting the emigration of the DP's. By March 31, 1949, the total was 13,937 of whom 6,093 were in DP countries. The enrollment in Eastern Europe grew from 4,485 on January 1, 1948, to 7,424 on January 1, 1949, but declined to 3,096 by March 31, 1949, because the ORT schools in Rumania, with an enrollment of 4,200, were nationalized on March 8, 1949.

Although ORT had attempted since the war to emphasize short-term courses for adults in need of retraining in order to prepare them for new occupations or to prepare them for emigration, its program still reached the younger people primarily. In March, 1949, half of the enrolled students were under twenty years of age. Most of the courses were concentrated in traditional Jewish occupations. Expansion into other fields was limited by problems of equipment, qualified teaching personnel, and the desires of the students themselves.

In the United States, ORT had not conducted its own campaign since 1947, but obtained subventions from JDC. In 1949, the grant was \$1,500,000, compared with \$1,800,000 in 1948.

HIAS appropriations for the overseas aspects of its work (as distinct from immigration services in the United States) were \$1,575,482 in 1948, compared with \$1,899,025 in 1947. HIAS reported that in 1948 it assisted 22,370 persons to move from various European countries to the United States, Canada, Latin America, and other lands, excluding Israel.

The Jewish Labor Committee and the Labor Zionist Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation continued their special efforts on behalf of ideologically affiliated groups overseas, each spending about \$700,000 on these programs in 1948.

Coordination

Some gains in the coordination of overseas programs were made in 1948. The JDC, HIAS, and USNA concluded an agreement in October, 1948, whereby they were conducting a joint operation in Germany, Austria, and Italy on behalf of Jewish DP's entering the United States under the DP act. They continued to operate separately in regard to all other phases of their programs. Rescue Children, an Orthodox agency which had been rendering financial support to Orthodox child care institutions in Europe, was absorbed by the JDC in 1948. Similarly, JDC took over support of Orthodox educational institutions in North Africa and the Middle East which had been receiving grants from Ozar Hatorah. As a result, the Committee for the Forgotten Million, a group raising funds on behalf of Ozar Hatorah, went out of existence. The Central Orthodox Committee continued to function as an advisory group in regard to the special needs of Orthodox groups and institutions in the areas of JDC operations. Although the Vaad Hatzala continued to function independently in that same field, its program declined sharply.

Shift of European Agencies to Israel

A trend developed at the end of 1948 in which agencies which had previously operated mainly in Europe undertook projects in Israel. On the initiative of authorities in Israel, JDC was invited to discuss the possibility of participating in the care of new immigrants. It was estimated that almost 10 per cent of the immigrants entering Israel were not immediately employable and required long-term care because of age, illness, physical or mental handicaps, or other chronic problems. These "social cases" required a type of care considerably outside of the major program of economic absorption and called for the development of special services and institutions. JDC was invited to consider assuming this responsibility on the basis of its long experience with rehabilitation services. By July, 1949, no satisfactory agreement had been reached between JDC and the Jewish Agency, but discussions were continuing.

ORT began to operate in Israel in 1949 and reported that it was giving vocational training to 550 persons by March of that year. These activities were not being financed out of the JDC grant to ORT, but expenses were being met temporarily by grants from the Jewish Agency and other bodies in Israel. HIAS was negotiating with authorities in Israel in order to share in providing services to the immigrants, and the Jewish Labor Committee and National Council of Jewish Women had undertaken limited projects of a cultural character in Israel.

International Refugee Organization (IRO)

One of the noteworthy developments of the past year was the success achieved in obtaining a larger measure of public aid for Jewish overseas needs. Basic maintenance of displaced persons in the camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy was provided, as in the year before, by the International Refugee Organization (IRO). The Jewish voluntary organizations, however, found it necessary to expend large sums on supplementary feeding, medical care, vocational training, and other services. Furthermore, the IRO, after establishment of the state of Israel on May 14, 1948, adopted a policy of refusing to pay for the transportation of all displaced Jews to Israel. After prolonged negotiations led by the JDC and intensive public discussion initiated by the Institute on Overseas Studies of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), the decision was finally reversed in April, 1949. At that time, the IRO agreed to reimburse JDC for the transportation of 120,000 DP's to Israel at a cost of \$10,550,000.

The severely limited budget of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund made the assistance available for Jewish children through that source negligible. Other possibilities of aid to Jews in Europe through the Economic Cooperation Act (ECA) and governmental resources within Europe were being explored.

Programs in Israel

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

The establishment of Israel as a state made it necessary to clarify the functions of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which had formerly acted as a quasi-governmental agency, although it had no power of taxation and was dependent on voluntary financial resources. Until August, 1948, for example, the Jewish Agency had been responsible for financing the defense and security needs of Israel.

As of August 1, 1948, the Jewish Agency discontinued all contributions to the government of Israel, and full responsibility for all military and political affairs of Israel was assumed by the government. The functions of the Jewish Agency were defined further at meetings of the Zionist Actions Committee in September, 1948, which assigned to the world Zionist movement, through the Jewish Agency, the following tasks: Care and support of immigrants, housing, agricultural colonization, trade and investment, development of Jerusalem, fostering of Hebrew culture among the Jewish people of the world, and similar functions to be continued under voluntary auspices. In regard to immigration, the government was to issue visas, but it was left to the Jewish Agency to organize immigrant groups, prepare them for life in Israel, receive and care for them upon arrival, and help them to adjust in the new country.

In the first six months of 1949, the Jewish Agency for Palestine borrowed heavily from banks in Israel and spent almost \$50,000,000, the bulk of which was for the direct reception and maintenance of immigrants. This left little resources for other aspects of Israel development which had originally been projected for Jewish Agency financing, such as industrial enterprises and the building of Jerusalem. The Jewish National Fund (JNF), which was the other major beneficiary of United Palestine Appeal (UPA) income, restricted the scope of its traditional land-buying program and used a larger measure of its income to provide funds to the Jewish Agency for the agricultural settlement programs.

OTHER AGENCIES

Other important established organizations raising funds in the United States for Israel expanded their traditional programs. Hadassah, the largest organization outside the UJA, raised \$9,579,848 in 1947-48, compared with \$6,218,398 in 1946-47. Its largest expenditures were for its medical program, which was adjusted to the emergencies of the war in Israel, and payments to the Jewish Agency to cover part of the cost of the care and training of immigrant children and youth through the Youth Aliyah program.

The National Committee for Labor Israel, raising funds on behalf of the Histadrut, experienced a similar expansion; it raised \$3,953,421 in 1947-48, compared with \$2,252,139 in 1946-47. The goal for 1948-49 was set at \$10,000,000. This campaign paralleled, in many respects, the larger programs of the Jewish Agency on behalf of housing, agricultural colonization, and aid in absorbing immigrants. It represented the traditional interest of

Histadrut in making a distinct contribution, within its ideological framework, to the building of the Jewish state.

These two organizations, together with nine other agencies coming under the regular reporting procedures of the CJFWF (e.g. American Friends of the Hebrew University, American Fund for Israel Institutions, etc.), raised about \$17,200,000 in 1948, compared with \$12,260,000 in the previous year. They projected goals totaling over \$28,000,000 for 1949.

MULTIPLICITY OF CAMPAIGNS

The total amount of activity in the American community on behalf of Israel was, however, much greater than these figures indicate. A vast number of separate and distinct efforts on behalf of Israel began to emerge after the establishment of the state.³ Many of these were small in scope and of questionable validity. Sponsorship of these campaigns varied from small groups of self-appointed individuals to branches of the government of Israel. Of particular importance was a series of mass commodity drives initiated by the Israel government's supply mission, which was seeking materials for the defense needs of the state. Almost all of the important membership groups in the American Jewish community—whether or not they had had a previous role in aid to Israel—developed special projects; and each branch of the Zionist movement sought to make a special contribution. Organizations which had operated traditionally in Europe began to shift parts of their program to Israel.

This lack of planning and resultant confusion in regard to fund raising for Israel became a matter of great concern to the Jewish welfare funds and to the UJA which were faced with diversionary competition in their efforts to mobilize maximum funds for the basic institutions in Israel. After months of discussion and negotiation, in March, 1949, the American Section of the Jewish Agency established a Committee on Multiple Appeals which undertook to pass on the merits of organizations raising funds for Israel. This committee, having no police power, relied on negotiation and public opinion to bring greater order into fund raising for Israel. The question of what further steps might be taken, both in the United States and in Israel, to establish more effective planning and controls was still under discussion at the end of the period under review. By that time, however, mass commodity campaigns had been discontinued, agencies of the Israel government had removed themselves from philanthropic fund raising, and the problem seemed less aggravated, despite the continuation of a large number of separate campaigns.

PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The pressing needs of the immigrants for food, shelter, medical care, and other immediate necessities were the major claim on Jewish philanthropic contributions. To absorb the immigrants economically, Israel needed, in addition, capital for expansion of agricultural and industrial activity. Only a small portion of philanthropic funds was available for these developmental purposes.

³ Between August and November, 1948, the CJFWF received inquiries in relation to 100 separate fund-raising efforts on behalf of Israel.

A major contribution to this need was the loan of \$100,000,000 advanced to Israel by the United States Export-Import Bank.⁴

Difficulties were encountered, however, both in the development of projects within Israel and in the mobilization of additional capital. The credits made available through the Export-Import Bank were used slowly at first, but orders were being placed more rapidly by the middle of 1949. Progress in developing the investment of private American capital was disappointingly slow. The Palestine Economic Corporation, the Israel Corporation of America sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), and the American Palestine Trading Corporation of Histadrut (AMPAL) were the major organized efforts to mobilize investment. These efforts, combined with projects of individuals or private groups, failed to realize more than a fraction of their goals during the first year of the state. It was estimated that no more than one-third of \$60,000,000 in capital investment in Israel came from abroad during that period. Efforts were being made by the Israel government and the Jewish Agency to establish coordinated services both in Israel and in the United States to guide interested investors and to overcome some of the obstacles which had developed in carrying out investment projects.

Relationship of American Philanthropy to Israel

The achievement of the Jewish state as a reality rather than a political ideal had its repercussions on all Jewish affairs and raised new questions of relationship in all spheres—political, economic and cultural. One of the facets of these emerging problems was reflected in an organizational controversy that developed in the UPA in the Fall of 1948 and delayed the organization of the UJA for 1949.⁵

A group of individuals prominent in UJA campaigning organized themselves as a "Committee of Contributors and Workers to the UJA" with the expressed purpose of bringing about a reorganization in the United Palestine Appeal (UPA). They asked that local community welfare funds be given representation on the UPA board of directors together with the existing representatives of the Jewish National Fund (JNF) and Keren Hayesod; and that responsibility for administering UPA funds be centered clearly in the Jewish Agency in Israel rather than channeled through the fund offices in New York, which were controlled by the American Zionist parties. Underlying these organizational proposals was the allegation that American funds, raised by all of American Jewry, might be used by the American Zionist parties (and particularly by the General Zionist) to bring pressure upon Israel for the types of political and economic programs which would conform with the views of those parties. These charges were vigorously denied by the General Zionist leadership, who interpreted the controversy as an attempt by the fund-raising groups to destroy the integrity and autonomy of the Zionist movement.

The differences were settled ultimately through a compromise agreement which provided that local communities were to receive 40 per cent representation on the UPA board, clarified the powers of the UPA board for more direct

⁴ See p. 135.

⁵ For other aspects of this subject, see pp. 141 and 168.

management of its own affairs, and set up certain explicit safeguards whereby the agencies in Israel would have the final voice in determining how funds were to be transmitted and spent. A conflict over the leadership of the UJA campaign for 1949 followed, with the Jewish Agency intervening to make the final decision. The General Zionist members of the American Section of the Jewish Agency thereupon resigned, charging that the Jewish Agency, as an international body, had no jurisdiction to decide on a question which was purely an internal American matter.

It was apparent that the problems and issues underlying these controversies were not fully resolved and that the Jewish community would continue to be concerned with them for some time to come.

ARNOLD GURIN

SOCIAL SERVICES

THE YEAR under review was one of transition in American Jewish communal services—the ending of one era and the beginning of another.

After twenty years of dealing with the emergencies that accompanied depression, war, and postwar adjustment, communities found themselves in 1949 faced with mounting pressures to meet needs that long had been put off and neglected.

Communities were older, with a much larger proportion of people over 60, and with the prospect that this proportion would grow even faster. On the other hand, the record number of war babies had reversed a previous trend toward a smaller birth rate, and many familial problems, resulting from tensions of war marriages, were forecast.

Hospitals with 1929 facilities and practicing 1929 methods would be hopelessly outdated. To keep up with the advance in medical science required constant adjustment in technique and equipment.

Family welfare agencies which had left to governmental agencies the basic task of relief, while themselves concentrating on preventing personal and family breakdowns arising from psychological, emotional, and environmental factors, now found themselves again concerned with relief on a growing scale, due to the greatly accelerated influx of refugees.

Vocational service agencies faced again the problems of growing unemployment in a tightening job market, and the need to find employment for young people and marginal workers.

Community centers found themselves with deteriorated buildings in slum neighborhoods, from which most of the Jewish population had departed.

To complicate the picture, agencies which had come to depend largely on community chests rather than directly upon the Jewish community for their support, found their dollar income virtually stationary, while the value of the dollar had shrunk to only 72 per cent of its 1929 purchasing power. At the same time communities were staggering under the load of rebuilding shattered European Jewish communities and reconstructing individual lives and a complete society in the new state of Israel.

These conditions demanded the sharpest self-evaluation, keen analysis of the causes of problems, and their projected solutions.

The former communal structures of American Jewry had often been erected by groups of individuals acting for themselves and not as an organized community, and without planned relationship to needs other than their own, without consultation with other groups or official community sanction.

The new communal structures, whose foundations were being laid during the period under review, were based upon different procedures and set in a different framework. Almost all of the agencies which sought to serve the community were associated, at the time of writing, with the local federations. Decisions were arrived at communally with the knowledge and consideration of all other communal needs and their relative urgencies and were based upon systematic collection of facts and expert consultation.

Studies

New York as well as Philadelphia and Newark to a large extent had completed a series of studies which embraced every major field of need and service. Chicago was in the process of continuous intensive self study.

Baltimore, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Montreal, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Toronto, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Kansas City (Mo.), and Minneapolis conducted studies of their health needs or engaged expert consultants for guidance on them; Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Los Angeles, Montreal, Toronto, and Milwaukee were especially active in such studies during the period under review.

Cleveland, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Toronto, Cincinnati, Houston, and Toledo were some of the numerous cities which were examining the needs of their aged and chronic sick.

Baltimore, Kansas City, Syracuse, and Hartford were typical of the cities analyzing the family welfare services, in some cases with special reference to refugee needs.

A number of cities were scrutinizing the Jewish center requirements—Newark, Los Angeles, St. Paul, Miami, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Kansas City, Atlanta, and others.

The emerging pattern revealed that the largest cities had virtually completed the basic process of determining their needs in terms of major structure and services, and other cities were studying and analyzing those fields where their problems seemed most pressing, under central communal auspices and coordination.

As a corollary to their special studies communities were organizing to deal more intensively on a permanent basis with these problems. Detroit's federation, for example, set up a special permanent social planning division. Smaller cities, such as Kansas City, Cincinnati, and Buffalo, followed the example set by Milwaukee and Hartford in expanding their professional staffs to make such local planning possible.

Joint Planning

A movement of special significance which took place during the period under review was the association of a number of communities, each too small

to meet its own social welfare problems adequately, for the study of their common needs and to plan for them through collective action. The Jewish communities of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina jointly studied their needs in reference to the aged and worked out a plan for meeting them; five southeastern states made a similar study of child care problems; there was joint planning for the aged by the cities of Virginia, the communities of eastern Pennsylvania, and by several cities in New Jersey; there was joint planning for both child care and aged in the Southwest; and for health in Arizona.

This action marked progress toward an assumption by communities of the responsibility for their own needs which they had previously left to national and regional agencies.

Allied with this development was the beginning of a changing relationship between small cities and large ones in the use of the latter's facilities. The practice had been one of haphazard, individual arrangements under which each large community planned its facilities and then unilaterally offered or withheld them from neighboring small cities. During this period a start was made in the East Central area of the United States toward joint consultation on such plans and toward agreements concerning the respective financial responsibility of the cities in that area for the use of facilities, with reference to participation in management and policy determination.

Construction

With these studies behind them and with many of the blueprints ready, communities finally turned to the actual construction of buildings, which really began to get under way during the period under review.

A few communities had already completed or purchased their new plants—Buffalo, a community center; Omaha, a home for aged; Denver, a new hospital; Hartford, a center and hospital. Most of the other communities had either just begun construction or were about to do so. All in all, the construction reflected an enormous investment by American Jewry in its communal future.

For the large cities the problems of health and age had become especially pressing. At the time of writing, practically every major city had already raised funds for new hospitals or major additions, and in several construction was already under way. Baltimore started its drive for a \$12,000,000 medical center; Boston added major facilities for obstetrics, maternity, and other purposes to its Beth Israel Hospital; Chicago was constructing additions to its Michael Reese and Mount Sinai hospitals; Cleveland's additions to Mount Sinai were well under way; Detroit was expected to break ground for its new hospital in the near future; Los Angeles was raising funds for additions to two hospitals, while the Los Angeles national Jewish Consumptives Relief Association had already completed major new units for the care of the tuberculous.

Miami purchased a former government hospital, which it was renovating and planning to expand; Montreal was constructing additions, including a nurses' home, to its Jewish General Hospital. Based upon its current \$50,000,000 capital program, New York had vast plans which included new

hospital facilities in areas of recent and rapidly growing Jewish settlement and major additions to existing old plants; Philadelphia initiated a similar program for its hospitals, and had a good part of the funds in hand; Pittsburgh and St. Louis included substantial sums for hospital repair and improvement in their last welfare fund drives; San Francisco completed most of the work toward erecting its new Maimonides Hospital for the Chronically Ill and additions to its Mount Zion Hospital; Toronto raised over \$4,000,000 for its new Mount Sinai Hospital and was planning to start construction soon; Cincinnati raised over \$1,000,000 for its hospital additions; Minneapolis had secured most of the funds for its new hospital; Providence was in a similar position, with the help of federal governmental subsidy.

All these plans represented a mobilization of American Jewry for an attack on sickness and disease within the framework of America's tradition of sectarian sponsorship of medical programs from which all of society would benefit. At the same time there was a constant surveillance of the growing role of government in meeting medical needs, so that Jewish communities would undertake no program which government might be likely to provide.

The list of communities with plans for the expansion of institutional facilities for the aged was even larger. Most of these communities raised at least part of the funds needed and several undertook construction. These included Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Troy, Paterson, Memphis, Jacksonville, Baltimore, Miami, New York, Pittsburgh, Toronto, San Francisco, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Jersey City, Kansas City, New Haven, Dallas, Houston, Oakland, Portland (Ore.), Rochester, Worcester, and others.

Cities of every size and in every section of the country were planning for new and renovated community centers. Buffalo and Hartford moved into their new facilities, Montreal's construction was well under way, Detroit started a new neighborhood unit, Sioux City was to occupy its new quarters in the near future, Hamilton's (Ontario) plant was under construction, as was that in Columbus (Ohio). Cities with similar plans in the blueprint or intensive discussion stage, with sites already acquired in a number of instances, and with part of the funds already raised in most, represented a cross-section of Jewish communities: Miami, New York, Toronto, Milwaukee, New Haven, Paterson, Winnipeg, Atlanta, Camden, Houston, Oakland, San Diego, Scranton, Harrisburg, Springfield (Mass.), Syracuse, Trenton, Youngstown, and others.

This was exclusive of the very extensive construction of new synagogues, some with special recreational and educational facilities, a number of which were completed, and exclusive also of the construction of new communal plants for Jewish education.

Communities which raised part of their funds in 1945 and 1946 and then held up building because of scarcity of construction materials, United Jewish Appeal priority, building costs, and other reasons, found that prices had risen to the point where substantial additional funds were needed in order to carry out their original plans. Some annual welfare fund campaigns set aside various percentages of their incomes for these purposes in 1948, and such inclusion was more widespread in 1949.

Much of the funds still remained to be secured, and careful planning was

required to assure that the need being met was unavoidable, that buildings were constructed wisely and economically, with proper provision for future maintenance and operating costs, and that no intolerable mortgage commitments would be incurred. There was considerable evidence that many of the mistakes of building in the 1920's would be avoided.

Maintenance of Services

In planning and building new facilities and programs, communities were confronted with the problem of maintaining the most necessary and permanent services. Caught between the shrinkage of the purchasing power of the dollar on the one hand, and the virtual freezing of community chest support on the other, communities turned increasingly to Jewish welfare fund campaigns for supplemental funds to maintain minimum operations. Such supplementation which long had been the pattern in Chicago, and had for several years been a major factor in Los Angeles and Newark, was extended to other cities such as Cleveland, in 1948, and San Francisco, in 1949. The welfare funds had been established primarily to meet community obligations for non-local purposes, while community chests were to provide for local needs with the exception of such specific Jewish programs as Jewish education and community relations. But the funds now found themselves confronted with local pressures to which they were compelled to respond by providing sufficient supplemental support to maintain essential minimum standards of operation.

MEDICAL CARE

The major financial problem in the largest cities was medical care. Hospital costs had risen to the point where they accounted for 35 per cent, and even more, of total local federation expenditures. In addition, changing concepts of medical care emphasized the desirability of central planning, coordination, and operation of all types of hospital programs. The inter-relationship of all types of medical problems upon which these concepts were based, meant the extension of hospital responsibility from the care of acute and physical illness to that of chronic and mental ailments. It called for close cooperation with related communal programs, such as those for the aged, which also involved a large incidence of chronic illness. New programs of home care were initiated, both to provide a well-rounded service and to ease the financial strain on hospitals.

Such central community planning was increasingly evident during the period under review in Boston (as a result of its health survey), in Baltimore, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Montreal, St. Louis, Cincinnati, San Francisco, and New York. One concrete evidence of this planning was the merger of Israel Zion and Beth Moses hospitals in Brooklyn, N. Y., to form the new Maimonides Hospital.

At the same time these concepts posed serious questions as to the limits of Jewish responsibility. How far could communities go in assuming service and financial obligations? How did these responsibilities relate to those of other groups in the community, and to the growing role of government?

As communities like Cleveland studied these questions in order to limit their capital and program extension to the most urgent and clear-cut needs, the role of Jewish hospitals in contributing to research and medical care, in postgraduate education of Jewish doctors, and in pioneering in other areas began to take more definite shape.

The 310,000 persons cared for by fifty reporting Jewish hospitals in 1948 represented a high point of service, although the increase over 1947 was slight, reflecting in part the limitations of hospital capacities. This was true also of the number of new admissions and the 3,600,000 days of care given in 1948.

Local and national tuberculosis hospitals showed little change in admissions and totals of days of care in 1948. This fact, and the emphasis in communities on local care in the light of medical findings that climate was not a necessary factor in arresting tuberculosis, has meant continuing differences of opinion between community organizations and national tuberculosis hospitals on the financing of current operations and plans for capital expansions.

Hospitals for chronic illnesses gave somewhat greater service because of an increasing incidence of these diseases in an aging population, greater pressure for their care, and greater interest and recognition by general hospitals of their responsibilities for treating these illnesses.

About one-fifth of all days of service in general hospitals in 1948 were given without charge to the patients, a slight increase over 1947. The proportion in tuberculosis hospitals was much higher, more than three-fourths of the care being free.

As part of the trend toward medical centers and integration of medical programs, communities were merging independent out-patient clinics giving free or very nominal fee service with general hospitals. Montreal was the latest to follow the pattern. Thirty-six communities or hospitals reporting out-patient services had over 1,400,000 patient visits in 1948—a 4 per cent gain over 1947, but a slowing of the upward trend in evidence since 1945.

The proportion of Jewish persons using out-patient facilities continued to decline, the ratio of Jews among new patients being only about one out of four. Two primary causes for this decline were the shift of Jewish population away from the location of Jewish hospitals and improved economic circumstances which enabled more Jewish persons to use private medical resources at regular fees.

The service rendered by Jewish hospitals to the total community was also evident from the fact that less than half the patients admitted to general Jewish hospitals for in-service care were Jewish. In tuberculosis hospitals, however, more than one-half were Jewish, and in hospitals for chronic illness nearly nine-tenths were Jewish. The proportion of Jewish patients was generally consistent with the size of the Jewish community—higher in the larger cities.

CARE OF THE AGED

The growing emphasis on care of the chronically ill cut across several fields of Jewish service and was especially evident in programs for the aged. Although in the past some institutions had been reluctant to admit persons with chronic illnesses, during this period, in forty-six reporting agencies,

nearly one-third of the beds of institutions for the aged were set aside for the chronically ill, in some as much as 100 per cent.

There was, in addition, a general recognition that services for the aged could not be limited to institutional care, but had to include also provision for home care and residence in private boarding or foster homes wherever feasible, with non-institutional case work, recreation programs in Jewish community centers and other facilities, occupational therapy, and health services closely tied in with hospitals.

The trend toward the formation of community planning committees for the aged under federation auspices, to tie together the planning and the services of institutions for the aged, hospitals, family welfare organizations, community centers, and vocational service bureaus, continued. The result was a far more flexible and intelligent program, intended not only to meet the current pressures, but to lay the foundations for meeting the larger problems in the future.

Greater flexibility was also being achieved in institutional programs as communities began to follow the example of New York City in experimenting with apartment houses and other congregate living arrangements differing from the traditional institution.

With an increase of 3 per cent in the number of beds available, there was little or no abatement in the pressures on institutions for the aged during 1948, and there were long waiting lists. Fifty-three institutions were caring for a total of only 7,700 persons, 95 per cent of whom were 65 years of age or over.

A factor of growing importance, and one to which Jewish communities were giving increasing attention, was the governmental aid provided by Old Age Assistance. The number of residents of Jewish institutions for the aged receiving such aid continued to rise and almost one-third of them were receiving such help.

CHILD CARE

While planning for a growing number of aged who required help, communities were expecting an increase also in responsibilities for child care, reversing the sharp downward trend. The peak of child care reached in 1937 had been followed by a decline which lasted until 1945, reflecting both the lower birth rate and the improved child care practices which made possible the prompt return of children to their parents or relatives.

But in 1945 there began an upswing in child care needs, and in 1948, 8,000 children were cared for by 54 reporting agencies. The high birth rate during the war, coupled with all the tensions, uncertainties, and maladjustments of many war marriages, created problems which the communities would have to face in the near future.

The program of child care continued to be one of integrating all forms and types of service within a flexible pattern, so that each child could receive the type of help he needed and could shift from one to another when necessary. Emphasis was on keeping a child within his own home wherever possible, separating him from his parents only as a last resort, and returning him home at the earliest feasible date. When the child was separated, every attempt was made to place him in an environment most closely matching his home, namely

a foster home. Group institutional care was reserved for those children with special problems and then only for the temporary periods needed.

Thus, 55 per cent of the children under care of Jewish agencies in 1948 were in foster homes, an increase of 5 per cent over 1947, but less than would have received such help had a serious shortage of foster homes not continued. Communities were addressing themselves with increasing concern and co-ordination to the problem of securing more foster homes.

Approximately 25 per cent of the children under care were in institutions. Hartford joined the growing list of cities which had closed their institutions, and Newark was the latest city to merge its institutions and non-institutional agencies into one all-embracing communal child care agency. Cities which no longer operated institutional programs (which were much more specialized and intensive treatment services and thus much more expensive) pooled their resources by utilizing regional agencies for the relatively few children requiring such care, or arranged to use the facilities set up by very large cities such as New York City.

The remainder of the children under care were in their own homes (13.2 per cent), or in homes of relatives (3.6 per cent).

FAMILY WELFARE SERVICE

There was little change in the total number of families helped by family welfare service agencies (with or without financial aid) during 1948. The 45,000 families receiving service were 2 per cent fewer than in 1947; and the 44,500 applications for aid in 1948 were 1 per cent less than in 1947. But for 39 reporting agencies the number of immigrant cases during the year grew by 22 per cent—and these cases were much more expensive than the others.¹ The resulting total increase in assistance costs was a 33 per cent increase over 1947, reflecting the higher cost of living in 1948. Total assistance granted by reporting Jewish agencies was \$2,250,000, the largest sum expended since 1932. It was anticipated that the costs in 1949 for these purposes would be even higher.

TRANSIENT CARE

For the first time since the war, there was no increase in family welfare aid to transients. Financial aid to transients declined, and the trend toward the closing of shelters which had been maintained by federations under family welfare agency direction continued. Thus, one of the ancient traditions of Jewish charities, the providing of shelter for strangers, was disappearing from organized communal programs. Communities found the volume of need too small to maintain this expense, in view of other urgent requirements and the fact that they could provide the services needed more adequately, flexibly, and economically through the use of hotels, lodging houses, private homes, and other arrangements. Of fourteen large cities checked, only Detroit and Cleveland were maintaining federation-supported shelters and even those cities were using the shelters partly for **refugees**.

Theoretically, the care of transients had become a responsibility of tax-supported agencies, but in practice the municipal lodging house standards

¹ For discussion of immigrant aid, see pp. 103 ff.

often had not yet reached a level acceptable to the Jewish communities, so that provision for Jewish transients continued to constitute a minor responsibility for Jewish communal programs.

Community Centers

Several of the changes mentioned in relation to other fields also affected community centers—shifts of population, outmoded plants, greater concern for the aged, community-wide coordination of program, and less emphasis on institutionalization. In the 318 centers affiliated with the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) in 1948, there was a growing emphasis on adapting the program to the needs of the individual and the group rather than adapting the service to the limitation of a central building. In accordance with this emphasis, communities were working toward relating community centers more closely to synagogue centers and Jewish educational facilities and programs, as part of an integrated over-all community service. The plan was to use center staff and skills in synagogue centers and Jewish educational organizations, to bring meetings and programs into individual homes, and to decentralize the center operations on a neighborhood basis wherever desirable.

In consonance with this approach, more attention was being given to "family-centered" programs, in which parents were related to the work being done with children in the development of their skills and personality. Furthermore, education for communal service and responsibility was stressed. Programs increased in variety and flexibility, involving more nursery schools under center auspices, programs for the aged, youth councils. Rural summer camps and urban day camps were integrated into winter programs as part of year-round communal service.

Emphasis on mass activities in a number of centers was giving way to concentration on activities of small groups, under more skilled, professional direction, in which group association was employed as the avenue for individual personality development. This required more trained professional staff, and schools of social work had not yet caught up with the demand.

The combined total membership of community centers rose to 468,000 in 1948, a gain of 10,000 over the previous year, and an increase of more than 11 per cent since 1944.

Like other communal services the rise in the costs of center operation was attributable more to the inflation of the dollar than to the expansion of services. The costs in 1948 were nearly 11 per cent over those of 1947, and almost 45 per cent over 1945. Most of the increase was for the cost of programs; administrative and maintenance costs were being cut.

The volume of operation and the sources of center financing were evident from a sample of 89 centers which had a total income of \$6,620,000 in 1948. Nearly one-half of that income came from federations and community chests; nearly one-fourth of the income came from program, and less than one-fifth from membership dues. Although average dues rates had increased 25 per cent in the past few years, they had not increased more rapidly than operating costs, and the proportion remained the same.

Vocational Service

The economic factors which were affecting the experiences of all the fields of service described—hospitals and clinics, institutions for the aged, child care and family welfare agencies, and community centers—most directly affected Jewish vocational service organizations. Newest of Jewish communal agencies, vocational service was most influenced by the rapid and drastic alternate rises and falls in the types of need and demand. The year 1948 found them operating at a record level. Applications reached a high of 87,247 in twenty-one agencies, 10.6 per cent above the previous record of 1947; placements were up 14.6 per cent; registrations rose 4.4 per cent, including a notable rise of 17 per cent in registration for counseling; and the number of persons in the active file at the end of 1948 was 17.4 per cent greater than in 1947, with a striking rise of 32.7 per cent in counseling cases.

The significant causes of these increases were several: the declining labor market in the latter months of 1948 with a natural lay-off rate higher in December, 1948, than in any December since 1939; the increased number of immigrants entering communities and seeking guidance, retraining, and employment; the rise in the number of requests for guidance in choosing and preparing for a career, especially from young people about to select their life's work—reflecting also a greater recognition of the value of these agencies by the Jewish community generally; and greater attention to the needs of marginal workers, such as the aged and handicapped, whose problems were aggravated by a tightening employment market in which they were often the first to be discharged.

These conditions were underscored by the experience in April, 1949, when job openings received had dropped 22 per cent under that month of 1948 and placements were 11.5 per cent under 1948, at the same time as the active file for both counseling and placement had grown by more than 17 per cent.

Increased concentration on assistance to aged employable individuals who were able and willing to work and were reluctant to become a drain on their families or communities, was evidenced by the intensive and quite successful drive of the Federation Employment Service (FES) of New York City to bring the special needs of this group to employers. Similarly, the renewed interest manifested by several communities in sheltered workshops as possible opportunities for the aged, marginal workers, the handicapped, and immigrants pointed up the communities' interest in creating employment opportunities for these special groups where normal channels seemed closed or limited, and where the undesirable alternative was some form of direct relief.

The aggregate cost of operating the twenty-one vocational service agencies in 1948 was \$1,200,000, received almost entirely from Jewish federations and welfare funds. The Chicago Jewish Vocational Service initiated the experiment of charging fees to some applicants, along the lines of experiments initiated in previous years by family welfare agencies in several cities. Other vocational services, however, felt that the charging of fees would produce a very limited income; that it might adversely affect the ability of the agency to attract a representative clientele and hence harm its service out of proportion to the

financial gain; and that fees were not as important a factor in the employment counseling process as they might be in family case work. The results of the Chicago experiment were being watched with interest.

Meanwhile, the field of vocational service was apparently continuing to expand as more cities launched this service under organized community auspices. Denver and Seattle employed vocational counselors in their family welfare agencies, largely to aid immigrants, and New Orleans and Akron likewise added vocational programs to their community services.

PHILIP BERNSTEIN

IMMIGRANT AID

THE RESUMPTION of Jewish immigration after World War II resulted in a very large movement to the United States of the survivors of Nazi concentration camps and of those who had fled the unbearable conditions prevailing in Europe.

The need for aid to these immigrants reversed the trend toward the elimination of special agencies providing immigrant aid in the United States, which had prevailed for a while during the war. At the time of writing, two major national organizations, the United Service for New Americans (USNA) and the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) were engaged in an unprecedented volume of work. In the local communities as well, nearly all Jewish social agencies were engaged to some extent in the provision of immigrant aid. The National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) reported that in 187 Jewish communities its sections were participating in the local immigrant aid programs. Immigrant aid was a major part of the programs of Jewish family agencies in almost all of the nearly one hundred communities where they existed; in some cases the immigrant load constituted as much as two-thirds of the total load of the family agency. At least an equal number of communities without organized family services were accepting and caring for refugees. Similarly, the communal agencies permanently involved in child care, recreational and cultural activity, medical care, vocational placement, training and counseling, and immigration and naturalization work were engaged more or less extensively in immigrant aid.

Needs of Immigrants

The postwar immigrants required considerably more in the way of aid than had the previous migrants of the 1930's. The majority of the new immigrants arrived in the United States with little funds, often in need of complete assistance in order to achieve economic and social rehabilitation. Because of these needs in 1949, immigrant aid constituted a major form of Jewish social service in the United States.

Services

The exact number of immigrants receiving aid during this period is not known. But an estimate of the extent of the need may be obtained from the

figures of one agency. According to the 1948 annual report of the USNA, 59 of every 100 Jewish immigrants who arrived in the United States in 1948 were assisted by its Port and Dock Department; 29 of these were provided with shelter at its reception centers, and 40 received casework assistance from its family service or religious functionary division. Similarly, HIAS met all boats or planes bringing in Jewish immigrants and provided a very large proportion of them with pier service, temporary shelter arrangements, transportation within the United States, and related national services.

The cost of operations of these two major national immigrant aid agencies reveals the extent of the service provided. In 1948 USNA spent approximately \$3,688,000 of its total expenditure of \$10,462,141 on its national services; HIAS spent \$2,390,755 in 1948 on its national and international service. USNA estimated that it would spend about \$4,450,000 on national services in 1949; HIAS estimated that it would spend about \$5,000,000, including its international services.

As a part of migration services, national agencies cooperated with international organizations such as the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), International Refugee Organization (IRO), and with such agencies of the United States government as the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Displaced Persons Commission, in dealing with such special problems as temporary visas, transit to other countries, and similar legal involvements. For the local communities, the migration services provided interpretation of immigration laws and regulations. HIAS received some cooperation and international services through its offices in Europe, in the Far East, and in Central and South America.

One of the highly successful forms of immigrant aid performed by both USNA and HIAS and usually classified as a form of migration service was the provision of the assurances required of immigrants under the Displaced Persons (DP) Act of 1948.

It was possible to obtain individual assurances for DP's who had relatives or friends in the United States to comply with these requirements. However, a very large number of displaced persons were without relatives or friends in the United States. For these and for those unable to obtain individual assurances from other sources, the DP Act of 1948 permitted community assurances. Individual assurances were processed through both HIAS and USNA and then transmitted to the Displaced Persons Commission. Community assurances, however, were processed through USNA, which succeeded in obtaining an increasingly large number of such assurances with the cooperation of local Jewish communities. Most of the immigration through July, 1949, was on the basis of individual assurances. Of approximately 25,000 cases (involving 55,000 to 60,000 individuals) processed through August, 1949, there were 14,800 individual assurances and 10,200 community assurances.

LOCATION AND SEARCH

Another national service in which all national and migration agencies participated was that of the location of and search for prospective immigrants who were relatives and friends of Jews both in the United States and abroad. This form of immigrant aid, which reached its peak during 1946 and 1947,

was declining steadily, but had been instrumental in uniting thousands of families in the chaotic period following the end of the war.

PORT AND DOCK SERVICE

Still another important service rendered by national organizations, known as pier or port and dock service, consisted in meeting the boats or planes on which immigrants were arriving and helping them make their first contact with the United States. This involved making arrangements for the immigrant's meeting relatives or friends, helping him through customs and immigration inspection, assisting him to understand the unfamiliar language and customs, providing him with temporary shelter when needed, food and medical care, arrangements for transportation to destinations in other cities, and similar assistance.

HIAS met all the planes, boats and trains, and provided service to a very large group of Jewish immigrants. During 1948, assisted by volunteer workers from the National Council of Jewish Women, USNA met a total of 709 ships, planes, and trains bearing over 9,000 Jewish immigrant passengers in all of the principal ports of entry in the United States.

RESETTLEMENT

A major form of immigrant aid rendered by the national agencies was the resettlement of immigrants from the port of arrival to an ultimate city of destination. Every attempt was made to prevent an accumulation of large numbers of the arriving immigrants in New York City and to a lesser extent in San Francisco. USNA maintained a special department which arranged with agencies in local communities all over the United States for the reception and care of immigrants.

Through a complex system of quotas and specific arrangements with individual Jewish community agencies, USNA settled more than 2,800 persons in 122 communities in 37 states during 1948. Beginning in 1949 there was an acceleration of immigration under the DP Act and a much wider distribution of Jewish immigrants was achieved; hence, by the end of July, 1949, 7,716 arrivals under the DP Act had been assisted to their destinations in 334 communities in 43 states.

In the period ending June, 1948, USNA estimated that 60 per cent of all Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remained in New York City, with about 40 per cent going off to settle in other communities. A gradual change in this proportion took place as a result of the provision of community assurances from the communities outside of New York, combined with planned effort by USNA to move all possible immigrants to other communities. As a result it was expected that during 1949 approximately 40 per cent of arrivals would remain in New York and 60 per cent would go into other communities.

HIAS also encouraged the movement of individual immigrants to join friends and relatives in other cities, but was not maintaining a continuing relationship with local agencies for this purpose.

NATURALIZATION AND AMERICANIZATION

Immigrants were aided in naturalization and Americanization both nationally and locally. On the national level, the work consisted essentially of consultation with local agencies and liaison with government. The actual naturalization and Americanization was carried on largely within the local communities themselves. In this respect the local sections of the NCJW were particularly active.

EUROPEAN JEWISH CHILDREN'S AID

Unattached Jewish children were served through the European Jewish Children's Aid (EJCA). Although the EJCA retained its separate corporate identity, its executive was the director of USNA and its program was managed through USNA. Until 1941, EJCA had been authorized to issue corporate affidavits for unaccompanied minors whose admission to the United States was requested by parents and agencies abroad. After 1941, the United States Committee for the Care of European Children assumed the responsibility of issuing corporate affidavits for all such children on a nonsectarian basis. The United States Committee referred all Jewish children who entered the United States on its corporate affidavit to the EJCA. EJCA was directly responsible to the United States government for children admitted on its corporate affidavit. The United States Committee delegated the responsibility for all children entering on its corporate affidavit to the ECJA.

The cost of financing the immigration of Jewish children who were considered a national responsibility was borne by the EJCA. The cost of maintaining children who were placed in local communities was the responsibility of the local community. Following the end of the war a large number of unattached children came into the United States under this program. About 1,000 were admitted under the terms of the "Truman Directive." Relatively small numbers entered the United States after the beginning of 1948; nearly all the children who arrived were members of family groups.

Local Communal Aid

Important forms of service were performed by the local communities. These services were of a great variety: financial assistance, vocational service, medical care, loans to assist immigrants to establish themselves in business and take advantage of housing, and recreational and cultural opportunities. In addition, communities helped immigrants with a great variety of personal problems.

NEW YORK CITY

The largest single local agency rendering services to immigrants was the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), established in the Summer of 1949. Included in these services were relief and family service, child care, aid to religious functionaries, vocational services, and business and rehabilitation loans; not included were such services as port and dock or shelter. The creation of the NYANA placed the administration of services to immigrants formerly rendered by USNA in local hands and established an

unusual pattern: that of the organization of a special agency for services to immigrants at the local level. On July 5, 1949, the NYANA began to provide financial and casework service to newcomers resident in New York City. The NYANA took over the New York City caseload, which averaged 5,000 cases open each month during the first six months of 1949. Nearly 2,750 new cases were added during the first six months of 1949 and 1,960 were closed. In June, 1949, some 79 per cent of the local caseload were receiving financial assistance in addition to casework service.

VOCATIONAL ADJUSTMENT IN NEW YORK CITY

To assist the newcomers in speeding their vocational adjustment, the Vocational Service Division of the USNA (also transferred to NYANA in July, 1949) secured a total of 4,353 jobs for its registrants, or an average of 405 per month, in 1948. During the first six months of 1949 a total of 2,369 jobs were secured, 518 persons were enrolled in special training courses, and several hundred more were assisted in other ways, such as the securing of union membership, tools, equipment, and occupational licenses where these were required for employment.

OTHER LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Outside of New York City, most of the local services to immigrants were provided by the agencies which served the whole community. Financial aid and personal adjustment were usually carried on by the Jewish family service agency. For special services in naturalization, preparation of affidavits, and related activities the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) maintained professionally staffed departments of service to the foreign born in the local sections of Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Miami, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Worcester, and San Francisco. In the smaller Jewish communities where there was no established Jewish family agency, the gap was filled by a special service to foreign born operated most frequently by the local sections of the NCJW. While it no longer carried on the national types of immigrant aid, NCJW maintained through its National Service to Foreign Born Advisory Committee a national consultative and information service to the 187 local sections which participated in the local aid programs.

HIAS maintained seven branch offices outside of New York: in Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, Seattle, San Francisco, and Baltimore. These offices operated a wide range of services which were as a rule classified as national forms of aid. The USNA had no branch offices at all. Through its field staff, it provided continuing consultative services to the local agencies for their information and guidance.

FAMILY SERVICE

Family service was one of the principal forms of immigrant aid in local communities. In the smaller and medium-sized communities, child care service was included in family service; in the larger communities child care services were frequently operated independently of the family service agency.

A preliminary analysis by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), based on service reports for 1948 by thirty-nine Jewish

family agencies, showed that immigrant cases represented approximately one-sixth of all cases under care during 1948. In one-fourth of the reporting agencies the immigrant load accounted for one-third or more of all cases. Practically all agencies showed increases in 1948 in their load of immigrant cases over the load of 1947; the average increase was 22 per cent. The family agencies in Newark, St. Louis, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Oakland, Portland, Ore., and St. Paul, Minn., reported that one-half or more of their total caseloads on December 31, 1948, consisted of immigrants. Over 40 per cent of all the financial assistance given by the reporting agencies went to aid immigrants. In Newark, St. Louis, Buffalo, and Minneapolis, four out of every five assistance cases during the average month were immigrants.

Almost two-thirds of the total amount expended for financial assistance cases in 1948 went to immigrant aid. Moreover, the immigrants received higher monthly grants than the rest of the agency clients assisted: an average of \$115 per month per case for aid, as compared with \$49 per month for non-immigrant cases. This discrepancy was due to the fact that immigrant families needed almost complete rehabilitation. In addition, many non-immigrant cases were receiving public assistance with supplementation from the private agency, while the immigrant was not eligible for public assistance.

However, not all immigrants were in such need. A considerable proportion of the migrants, especially those with relatives or friends in the United States, never came to the attention of any agency and made successful, occasionally even phenomenal, adjustments—financially, socially, and culturally. The efforts to assist immigrants in their rehabilitation were to a considerable degree highly successful. Reports from family agencies indicated that most of the immigrants learned English, adjusted themselves in their community, and found means of livelihood without community help following an initial period of from three to eight months' duration.

FINANCING IMMIGRANT AID

Nevertheless, the amounts of money involved and the heavy costs of those cases which could not be readily assisted to early economic self-maintenance constituted a growing problem for many of the local Jewish communities. In New York City, for instance, it was estimated that the cost of operating NYANA during 1950 would be between \$11,000,000 and \$12,000,000.

Although there were three communities in which the community chest provided funds for this type of immigrant aid, in practically all others the cost was carried by the Jewish federation or welfare fund from funds raised in the Jewish communities. In some cases this meant that some of the funds originally intended for overseas services had to be allocated to this local service.

CHILD CARE IN COMMUNITIES

Despite the fact that the number of unattached children among immigrants had decreased, the total service to immigrant children actually increased during 1948. This resulted from the fact that unattached children required long-term aid and the loads tended to be cumulative. Thus, reports received by the CJFWF from thirty-two agencies showed a rise in the proportion of

immigrant children cared for—from one in five of all children under care by those agencies to one in four during 1948. Twelve agencies indicated that one-third or more of their children clients were immigrants. Of those requiring agency service, the large majority were placed in family foster homes and only a small number in institutions.

VOCATIONAL SERVICE

Perhaps the most urgent need of the newcomers was for that form of aid known as vocational service. The personal adjustment of the family to its new situation depended heavily upon the kind of employment its wage earners could obtain and the financial return from that employment. In the study made of the communities by the CJFWF, it was found that practically all communities provided some form of vocational counseling and placement service for immigrants in 1948. In the larger communities the service was generally available through the regular vocational service agencies; few family agencies or migration agencies provided preliminary counseling and placement. In the intermediate and small communities, this service was usually provided by the family agency or a functional refugee committee.

According to statistics published by the Jewish Occupational Council, immigrant cases represented 21.7 per cent of all active cases of 16 vocational agencies in the United States and Canada, exclusive of New York City, for the month of December, 1948. With the inclusion of USNA (reorganized as NYANA), the proportion was 42.0 per cent of the total. Job placements of immigrants outside of New York City accounted for 23.9 per cent of all placements in December, 1948, ranging from no immigrant placements in four communities to over 60 per cent of all placements in four others. If New York City is included, the placement average for December, 1948, was 31.0 per cent.

OTHER SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITIES

All the health and welfare services available to the total Jewish community were utilized by the immigrant in need of aid. Community centers, Y's, hospitals, clinics, institutions for the aged and children, camp agencies, and others, all participated in service to the immigrant.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

Of special significance in the organization of local service to the immigrant was the extent to which the sections of the NCJW helped the local agencies, or themselves provided a program of community adjustment in smaller communities. About one-half of the sections reporting to the National Council of Jewish Women stated that they assisted in finding housing for the immigrants. Since housing was one of the main obstacles to organized resettlement, this represented quite a considerable effort.

Other forms of aid provided by volunteer groups of NCJW included the provision of furniture, the teaching of English, the provision of hospitality and orientation arrangements, and similar services. The NCJW reported that 115 of its local sections assisted in or provided community adjustment programs of the above type in their respective communities. In 101 Jewish com-

munities local sections provided technical services including location and search (77), migration service, affidavits, and information on international matters (58), and naturalization (82).

Coordination

As can be seen from this picture of immigrant aid in the local Jewish communities in America, the variety and number of agencies involved was so great that in a number of communities coordination efforts were necessary. This was usually provided by the social planning departments of the Jewish federations, although in a few communities special coordinating committees were set up to correlate the work of the various agencies concerned with aid to the immigrant.¹

The future of immigrant aid was not altogether certain at this writing. However, once the displaced persons camps were emptied of their Jewish residents, it was expected that the load would begin to drop sharply. The national services, including preparation for migration, port and dock activities, and temporary shelter work, would decline drastically. Local aid was likely to be curtailed to a lesser extent, but requirements for such aid were expected to begin to show a considerable decline after the middle of 1950.

MORRIS ZELDITCH

¹ See *Community Organization*, p. 139.