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The outbreak of war in Korea in June, 1951, impelled the American rabbinate to analyze its resources and to assume the task of serving the spiritual needs of the Jewish men and women in arms. By the end of 1951 it was expected that well over 100 American Jewish chaplains would be in the uniform of their country. Following an emergency meeting held on August 16, 1950, the Division of Religious Activities of the National Jewish Welfare Board, the body officially recognized as responsible for the procurement and development of the Jewish chaplaincy program in the armed forces, called upon all three major rabbinical associations, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform, to undertake a self-imposed draft system to provide a regular induction and rotation system for Jewish chaplains in the expanded military establishment. The rabbinic bodies representing the three branches of Judaism inaugurated a self-draft program, involving the alumni of Yeshivah Ner Israel, Baltimore, Md.; Yeshivah Torah Vodaath, Brooklyn; the Hebrew Theological College, Chicago; and the three largest seminaries. A few weeks after the beginning of the Korean conflict, Jewish chaplains were on the battlefields. In 1951, six Jewish chaplains were in Korea, and six others in the Far Eastern Theatre of operations.

The Division of Religious Activities began a program of expansion to meet the needs of Jewish men and women in arms. Supplies were flown to the Korean battlefields to enable Jewish troops to observe the High Holy Days in the fall of 1950 and Passover in April, 1951. The problems of the chaplaincy loomed large in view of both the youth of the soldiers and the need for sustaining morale among men to whom the issues of Korea had not been completely clarified.

The expansion of the armed forces and the induction of many Orthodox young men in the armed services occasioned many difficult problems of ritual observance. In March, 1951, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations established an Armed Services Division, charged with the responsibility of seeking the co-operation of government agencies in assuring a maximum of religious observance among Orthodox Jewish servicemen. It also provided literature, information, and material assistance to aid these men maintain their traditions.

The Synagogue Council of America, represented by its Vice-President, Rabbi Norman Salit, aided in the establishment of a Religious Advisory Council to co-operate with civilian defense authorities (February 21, 1951).
On a local level, organizations such as the New York Board of Rabbis offered similar co-operation to city and state authorities.

Synagogue Surveys

The year under review (July, 1950, through June, 1951) was one of surveys of American synagogue life. During the fall of 1950, two large religious bodies, the Reform Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC), and the Conservative United Synagogue of America, heard reports of thorough surveys of religious practices in their respective groups.

REFORM TRENDS

The UAHC biennial convention meeting in November, 1950 (Cleveland), heard the report of the Committee on Reform Practice, whose chairman, Rabbi Morton Berman of Chicago, gave a graphic portrayal of distinctive trends in Liberal Judaism based upon a complete survey of congregational life.

Rabbi Berman noted that over 240 out of 255 Reform congregations "have moved toward increased ritualism, and have thus helped to create the picture of a growing movement toward what resembles traditional Judaism." Among the tendencies noted by Rabbi Berman were an increased interest in maintaining the religious aspect of circumcision, and the almost universal custom of naming new-born girls at Sabbath services. (This was the practice in nine-tenths of the congregations.)

The bar mitzvah ceremony had been introduced into 90 per cent of Reform congregations. The use of head covering both in the bar mitzvah and marriage ceremonies had become more widely permissive.

The restoration of Memorial services on the festivals had become more common. Sunday worship, a practice which had been inaugurated in the nineteenth century, had fallen into disuse. Only six major synagogues and one small one continued Sunday services in lieu of Sabbath worship.

The reading of the Torah had been adopted as standard practice; however, only 30 per cent of the congregations permitted women to read the Torah blessings.

In addition to the intensification of High Holy Day and Festival ritual, the survey indicated that the minor festivals, Hanukkah, Purim, and in some cases Lag B'Omer (Arbor Day), had taken on fresh meaning in the enrichment of Temple worship.

Several voices were heard deploring the trend towards traditionalism. Rabbi Harry Essrig, of Grand Rapids, Mich., cautioned against a swing too far in the direction of ceremonialism at the cost of "sacrificing intellectual integrity." In the same vein, Rabbi Irving Reichert, of Cincinnati, rejected what he termed "the reintroduction of medieval nostrums into the synagogue."

CONSERVATIVE TRENDS

The United Synagogue of America at a meeting held in Washington in November, 1950, heard a report concerning the results of a national survey
conducted to determine trends in Conservative Judaism. The survey dealt with four aspects of synagogue life: synagogue attendance, children’s education, adult education, and youth work. The report was based on a total of 1,500 responses, including approximately 1,200 from individuals and 300 from congregations.

The report revealed that the average Conservative congregation consisted of over 200 families: 43 per cent had less than 200 families and 57 per cent had more than 200 families, while one-fifth of the congregations had over 500 families. Daily service had disappeared in half the congregations and was preserved in many others only by the presence of mourners. Late Friday evening services had become the focal point of synagogue worship in 95 per cent of the congregations, and there was a trend towards increased attendance. Attendance at service was stimulated by an emphasis on sociability and fellowship: 78 per cent of the congregations reported that a social hour followed the worship services.

Saturday morning services seemed to be on the decline everywhere except in very large cities. Of Conservative synagogues, 57 per cent reported less than 50 worshipers in attendance at that time; 70 per cent indicated attendance of under 100. Another definite trend was the increase of women worshipers. A majority of the congregations revealed that women outnumbered men in Friday evening attendance. Young people were notably absent from worship services. (On the other hand, the synagogue center provided a focal point for much of the social life of Jewish youth.)

There was a greater emphasis on the role of music in worship: 24 per cent of the Conservative congregations reporting utilized the organ. In general, congregants demanded more congregational singing and the creation of new synagogue music. To answer this need, the United Synagogue was expanding its Department of Music. In response to the question, “How often do you attend services?”, congregants answered as follows:

- Never—7%
- Occasionally—41%
- Often but not regularly—20%
- Quite regularly—31%

The report on religious education pointed to higher standards for the bar mitzvah ceremony. More than 85 per cent of the congregations required Hebrew school attendance averaging three years as a pre-requisite for a bar mitzvah. Half the congregations permit girls to be bas mitzvah and three-fourths of the Conservative congregations followed the confirmation practice universal in Reform congregations.

**Building Expansion**

The five postwar years (1945–50) witnessed a prodigious building program in American synagogue life. Jewish congregations and synagogue centers embarked on a large-scale expansion of their physical facilities. While no

---

1For the results of another study of confirmation, see Jewish Education, below.
statistics were available, some officials of national religious bodies estimated the cost of the program to be from $50,000,000 to $60,000,000.

Contributing to synagogue growth was the marked influx of Jewish families into the suburbs of the larger cities, particularly in Nassau County, N.Y., Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Los Angeles. Many of these families were enrolled by suburban congregations in which membership developed on social and cultural, as well as religious grounds. Many of the new Reform and Conservative congregations drew their membership from young couples reared in traditional Jewish homes. On the other hand, there was ample evidence to indicate that many Jews without any previous affiliation were joining synagogues. (See Commentary, April, 1951, “Park Forest: Birth of a Jewish Community.”)

Congregational Organization

The organizational strength of the three major wings of Judaism could not be ascertained statistically, for there was yet to appear an adequate comprehensive study of synagogue membership (except for the general survey indicated in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1951 [Vol. 52], pp. 86-87). But the expansion of regional offices, with enlarged staff facilities, the creation of community activities departments, such as that of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, the development of more than a score of new congregations, as reported by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, all pointed to the energetic activity of congregational organizations.

ORTHODOX

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (UOJC) was the over-all lay body of traditional Judaism in America, with an annual budget of over $92,000. During the period under review the UOJC opened regional offices in Philadelphia and Boston, with a full-time staff to serve the Tri-State and New England areas. Its three main operating divisions were the Kashruth Division, the Community Activities Division, and the Armed Services Division. In addition, the Women’s Branch had over 250 affiliates. In the legislative field, the UOJC joined with other Jewish organizations (through a Joint Commission) on February 15, 1950, in urging the passage of Fair Sabbath Laws, to enable traditional Jews to observe Saturday as a day of rest.

During 1951 the UOJC broadened its publication program considerably. In addition to its official publication, Jewish Life, a national bulletin, Jewish Action, was launched, and a manual for rabbis and communal leaders, Prakim, was issued quarterly. A pamphlet, Modernity and Mitzvot, of which 5,000 copies were distributed, gave evidence of a more aggressive attitude towards promoting traditional Judaism.

The Union of Sephardic Congregations consisted of fifty congregations following the Spanish rite. Its primary objectives were to publish and distribute prayer books, and to maintain contacts with Sephardic communities and rabbis throughout the world.
The Yeshiva Synagogue Council was comprised of 895 congregations, with an estimated membership of 175,000 families.

**Reform**

Outstanding event of the year was the completion in the fall of 1951 of the transfer of Reform headquarters from Cincinnati to the House of Living Judaism in New York City. Occupying the new building were the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) and its subsidiary bodies, directing the work of the men's, women's, and youth departments. The move represented a historic event in American Jewish life. Reform Judaism, represented by the oldest synagogue bodies in the United States, had expanded for almost a century from its center in the Midwest. With the shift of organizational headquarters to the heavily populated eastern seaboard, Reform Judaism hoped to spread its influence more widely. During the period under review thirty new congregations were founded in the New York area alone.

The National Federation of Temple Youth had branches in 400 Reform congregations. During the period under review, it expanded its leadership training program, sponsoring a two-week camp leadership training institute, seven regional summer camp conclaves, and a summer study tour to Europe and Israel.

**Lay Bodies**

The National Council of Young Israel was a fairly large Orthodox organization which was not directly affiliated with the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations. With over seventy branches in every part of the United States and Canada, it had grown to a membership of 10,000 families. Organized as a lay religious movement almost forty years before, its focal point was traditional Judaism. But it boasted a comprehensive program that included an employment bureau, a veterans' bureau, a Women's League, the publication of *Young Israel View-Point*, special Israel projects, and a youth program of sports, dramatics, music, and art.

Young Israel Synagogue Centers were in the process of construction in several cities at a cost varying from $100,000 to $250,000. Plans were also under way for a Young Israel branch in Tel Aviv.

The National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs of the United Synagogue of America, with a membership of 25,000 men in 175 groups, adopted the Leaders' Training Fellowship of the Teachers Institute. This program prepared and trained future professional and lay leaders for the Jewish community. Ten lay institutes were held during the year in various sections of the country. The Federation published the magazine *Torch*.

**Rabbinic Bodies**

Largest of the Orthodox rabbinic bodies was the Rabbinical Council of America, whose membership of 435 consisted of graduates of the two largest
In contrast to the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, its members were English-speaking, and for the most part American-born. Its budget of $20,000 was derived from special bequests, community contributions and from joint projects with the UOJC. The Council dealt with problems of Jewish law, particularly in the field of dietary observance, marriage and conversion, and *agognot* ("deserted wives").

The Rabbinical Council of America sought to develop higher standards of procedure for weddings and circumcisions, and through its Rabbinic Welfare Committee established standards governing the relations of rabbis and their congregations, including such matters as tenure and pensions. The organization continued to sponsor "Torah Tours," under the direction of Rabbi Theodore Adams, which reached a large number of communities and a score of campuses in a kind of "home missions" programs.

The Conservative Rabbinical Assembly of America, whose membership reached 485, devoted much of its attention to the problem of Sabbath observance. The issues had been sharply defined at the June, 1950, convention held in New York City, in which the Law Committee submitted majority and minority reports which mirrored a wide divergence of opinion. A responsum submitted by Rabbis Morris Adler, Jacob Agus, and Theodore Friedman on behalf of the majority of the Committee stated: "In the spirit of a living and developing *Halachah* responsive to the changing needs of our people, we declared [sic] it to be permitted to use electric lights on the Sabbath for the purpose of enhancing the enjoyment of the Sabbath, or reducing personal discomfort or of helping in the performance of a *mitzvah*." The majority view also favored a relaxation of the prohibition against riding on the Sabbath for the purpose of participating in Sabbath worship. Among the opinions was that of Rabbi Ben Zion Bokser who was concerned about the hazards involved in yielding to convenience, and therefore disagreed with the majority opinion.

Rabbi Solomon Goldman, in his keynote address at the biennial convention of the Conservative United Synagogue of America in November, 1950, delivered an impassioned plea for a concerted drive for a rebirth of a vital Sabbath experience in the United States. A National Sabbath Commission, sponsored jointly by the Rabbinical Assembly of America and the United Synagogue, was established. By the middle of 1951, a program was well under way to study means of strengthening observance of the Sabbath. The High Holy Days of 5712 (October, 1951) was to see the launching of this program on a local synagogue level.

The Reconstructionist movement continued to adhere to the principle that it was not a sectarian group within Judaism, but rather a philosophy of Jewish life permeating every aspect of Jewish community living. The Reconstructionist magazine, a journal of wide influence in religious circles, marked its fifteenth year of publication.

A Rabbinical Fellowship of Conservative and Reform rabbis was created in December, 1950, to seek among other objectives to explore new forms of Jewish religious worship. One hundred and thirty rabbis were affiliated with the Fellowship.

Indicative of the influence of Reconstructionism on both Conservative and
Reform Judaism, was the release, in January, 1951, of a statement of principles to which 500 rabbis and Jewish leaders were signatories. The statement formulated a minimal program for contemporary Jewish life to which Jews of all persuasions could subscribe. Offices were opened in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Philadelphia during 1951, in order to set up a national structure.

**Education**

The theological seminaries of all three branches of Judaism reported a substantial increase in enrollment. The four leading theological schools enrolled 1,289 students in the fall of 1950. Of these, 1,037 were registered in the Orthodox seminaries as theological and pre-theological students (535 in the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University, and 502 in the Hebrew Theological College of Chicago); 134 in the Reform Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion; and 118 in the Conservative Jewish Theological Seminary of America. (The large Orthodox enrollment included many younger students.)

Registration at the teachers' institutes of the HUC-JIR was 230; 363 at the JTSA; 331 students were registered at the Teachers' Institute of Yeshiva University.

For the first time each of the three major groups succeeded in raising $1,000,000 for the maintenance of its annual program. (The National Planning Board of the JTSA meeting in May, 1951, set a budget of almost $2,000,000.) Other innovations included: The opening by Yeshiva University of a psychological clinic to serve the general community; the opening of a Graduate School by the Hebrew Theological College of Chicago; the establishment by the JTSA of a Louis N. Rabinowitz Institute for Research in Rabbinics, created to prepare and publish accurate texts of ancient rabbinic works; and the adoption by the HUC-JIR of the policy of inviting college graduates who did not possess a mastery of the Hebrew language to take accelerated courses in preparation for admission to the rabbinical department.

The Hebrew Union School of Sacred Music in New York City, the first school for cantors in the United States, held its first graduation on June 17, 1951. Graduates of the school were trained as cantor-educators. The first class consisted of ten graduates, who had completed a three-year course.

**ADULT EDUCATION**

The Orthodox Young Israel Institute for Jewish Studies operated in New York City, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, and several other cities. The Young Israel School for Adult Studies in New York City announced that it was conducting over forty separate courses during 1951.

The Jewish Chautauqua Society, sponsored by the Reform Federation of Men's Clubs, reported that its program of lectures on Judaism at hundreds of colleges, universities, and church summer camps had been vastly expanded during the past few years. The Institutes on Judaism, providing lecture-
courses to Christian clergy in local communities, a project of the UAHC, had likewise been extended to many more communities. A trust fund created by the will of the late Dr. David Philipson was to be devoted to the development of an audio-visual program. A new staff member was added to the UAHC Commission on Education to direct this activity.

The Director of the Conservative National Academy for Adult Jewish Studies, Dr. Israel Goldman, reported that 120 Institutes had been held during the past year with a total enrollment of over 10,000 adults. Most recent development was the increased popularity of the Weekend Jewish Laymen’s Institutes, conducted largely during the summer, which utilized camp facilities for serious study and worship.

The Rabbinical Assembly-United Synagogue Education Conference, held early in 1951, focused its attention on the adolescent group, which it termed the most neglected segment of the Jewish community. To meet the religious and cultural needs of this group, a Youth Commission was established under the auspices of the United Synagogue.

The role of music, the dance, and dramatics in Jewish education was also stressed. A series of workshops in these fields were conducted under the joint auspices of the Hebrew Union School of Education and Sacred Music and the UAHC in New York City during 1951.

Representation

The Synagogue Council of America prepared to celebrate its twenty-fifth anniversary during the closing months of 1951. This body represented the six major religious organizations in the United States: the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, the United Synagogue of America, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Rabbinical Council of America, the Rabbinical Assembly of America, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

With a modest budget of less than $20,000 in 1950, the Synagogue Council represented the Jewish religious community in government and civic affairs. The Council co-operated with Protestant and Catholic bodies, particularly in the observance of National Family Week and Church Canvass Week.

Working with the National Community Relations Advisory Council, it dealt with many problems in the church-state area, particularly those dealing with religion in public education.

During the period under review the Synagogue Council expanded its federal chaplaincy program by providing for the religious needs of Jewish inmates in twenty-five federal penal institutions. It distributed to 350 American congregations religious objects salvaged by allied forces in Nazi-destroyed Jewish communities which had been turned over to Jewish Cultural Reconstruction, Inc.
The Impact of Israel

As described in the American Jewish Year Book (Vols. 50 and 51), the stirring events in the state of Israel had made a deep impression on the American synagogue. The pulpit spoke not only of the spiritual implications of the modern miracle, but also of the political consequences for the western world. At its biennial convention in November, 1950, the UAHC urged that Americans offer aid to Israel as a means of strengthening the cause of democracy.

The number of rabbinic leaders visiting Israel increased during the past year. Several congregations gave gifts to their rabbis of a trip to the Holy Land on the occasion of special anniversaries. In one instance, the Orthodox rabbi of a congregation in St. Paul, Minn., was the recipient of a free tour made possible by a Roman Catholic friend of the congregation. A special delegation of Conservative rabbis visited Israel in the summer of 1950, and issued a lengthy report on religious trends in the new state. A similar delegation of Reform rabbis was scheduled to visit Israel on a study tour, and to confer with important leaders. The Orthodox rabbinate was also well represented among visitors to Israel.

Synagogue and State in Israel

It was a two-way passage. Distinguished visitors representing the religious parties in Israel toured the United States, both on behalf of financial campaigns and to present the views of the Religious Bloc in Israel. The visit of Rabbi Judah Maimon, Israel Minister of Religion, in February-March, 1951, evoked much heated debate in synagogue ranks. Symptomatic of the tension was the refusal of several Reform leaders to attend a reception in honor of the Israel statesman.

Rabbi Maimon was challenged by the Conservative and Reform rabbinate to justify the lack of recognition of non-Orthodox rabbis in the new state. Most articulate in its denunciation was the Central Conference of American Rabbis, whose retiring president, Rabbi Jacob Marcus, in an address before the June, 1950, convention condemned the exclusion of Liberal rabbis from serving as official religious functionaries in Israel.

The Orthodox rabbinate rose to the defense of the Israel religious policy. Rabbi David Golovensky, in the Reconstructionist (December 29, 1950), argued that it was unfair to impose American standards upon a country whose religious expression, like that of many European countries, assumed a hierarchic rather than a congregational form. Many rabbis vigorously questioned the right of non-Israelis to interfere with the internal affairs of that nation. Their opponents insisted with equal vehemence that in such matters as the religious education of immigrants and the importation of non-kosher meats, American Orthodoxy had no right to dictate to the Labor government of Israel.

The visit of Prime Minister David Ben Gurion of Israel in May, 1951, was used by some religious extremists as the occasion for an overt demonstration
against the religious policy of his regime. Official Orthodox bodies disavowed
the demonstration, deploring its effect upon the crucial Israel Bond Drive.

The possibility of establishing a new Sanhedrin, to grapple with the
thorny problems of applying Talmudic law to the modern scene, was dis-
cussed in religious circles. Objections were raised by the Reconstructionist
(January 26, 1951), which queried: "How can one group of rabbis coming
from all over the world, legislate for the citizens of a sovereign state?"

Rabbi Jacob Agus voiced a further objection (National Jewish Post, Jan-
uary 19, 1951), pointing to the impracticality of legislating for Jews in differ-
ent kinds of civilizations. Any attempt at establishing universal norms, he
held, would only create further disunity.

Social Action

The exposes of corruption in public life and the deterioration of public
morality revealed in a series of legislative investigations prompted the rab-
binate to call for a searching of souls and for concerted action to arouse the
social conscience of all citizens.

ORTHODOX

The Rabbinical Council of America, reflecting the views of the Orthodox
rabbinate, spoke out against the decline in public morality revealed by the
Kefauver investigations. Its May, 1951, convention called for the implementa-
tion of the Kefauver Report by government agencies, and the strengthening
of the moral fibre of American political life.

CONSERVATIVE

Professor Mordecai M. Kaplan, addressing the annual convention of the
Rabbinical Assembly of America, expressed scepticism as to the value of mere
exhortation. The task of religion, he declared, was not to change our social
environment, but to create new attitudes and values.

Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of
America, commented on the problem of moral leadership of the world at
the June, 1951, commencement exercises of the Seminary, asking whether
America could expect to lead the world while it still practiced and believed
in racial superiority.

The Rabbinical Assembly of America, through its Social Action Commit-
tee, supported the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law, strengthening the United
Nations, and the ratification of the Convention on Genocide. The Conserva-
tive rabbinate shared the concern of its colleagues in other branches of the
synagogue with the danger to civil liberties.

Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer, on behalf of the Social Action Committee, urged
support of the Point Four program of American aid to under-developed
countries.

The Rabbinical Assembly also went on record as being opposed to federal
aid to private and parochial schools. "We do not believe that federal funds
should be used, either directly or indirectly, in support of non-public schools,
either in the form of free secular textbooks or transportation. We are not opposed to the extension of such aid in the form of lunches or of medical or dental services."

REFORM

The Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), in its June, 1951, convention, reflected its concern for the moral implications of the present world crisis in a symposium sponsored by its Commission on Justice and Peace, in which Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, led the discussion.

The Commission on Justice and Peace of the CCAR linked its endorsement of United Nations action in Korea with its opposition to "communism and all other forms of totalitarianism—domestic and foreign." But it insisted that "we favor every action, consistent with our national welfare and defense, to reach a peaceful settlement of the Korean war and a general settlement between the East and West." Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn, on behalf of the commission, also pressed for a plan for reduction of armaments within the framework of the United Nations.

Other goals sought by the Reform rabbis were: fair employment legislation, racial equality in housing and recreation, and the outlawing of lynching and the poll tax. Like the Synagogue Council, the commission asked that congressional committees be enjoined from publicizing the names of accused persons prior to their being afforded an opportunity for defense, in order to protect their individual rights.

The right of rabbis to express "liberal" views in the pulpit and to identify themselves with liberal social action was defended in a resolution approved by the conference. In San Francisco, the Jewish Community Relations Council had taken exception to the stand taken by four rabbis in signing a "peace resolution," suggesting that the rabbis should have consulted Jewish community relations bodies before their action. The commission was concerned lest pressure be exerted upon rabbis that would restrain them from acting according to the dictates of their own conscience.

Rabbi Jacob Shankman, chairman of the Committee on Church and State, was supported in his plea for the elimination of sectarian religious teachings in public education. The Conference passed a resolution in opposition to the released-time program, an action which was to lead to a controversy between the Archdiocese of New York and the Reform rabbis.2

During the week following the convention, several Jewish bodies supported the stand taken by the CCAR as reflecting the views generally held by the Jewish community in regard to religion in public education.

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Passage of the Aid-to-India bill, made possible, according to some observers, through pressure exerted by religious groups in America, was supported by the Synagogue Council of America in April, 1951. The statement was quoted in a discussion in Congress to indicate Jewish concern over the issue.

2 See p. 119.
The concern of Jewish religious groups with the larger problems of mankind was also revealed in discussions held at rabbinical conventions on the advisability of establishing a “service” movement comparable to the work of the American Friends Service Committee. James Marshall, addressing the Rabbinical Assembly convention in 1951, urged the Jewish community to avoid parochialism in its charities, and to render more service to the general community, not as individuals, but as a Jewish group. In the same spirit, a Jewish service organization, called the American Jewish Society for Service, was initiated in the summer of 1950, by a group headed by Rabbi Ferdinand Isserman of St. Louis, consisting of young men and women willing to volunteer their services in a concrete program of aid to the needy. This group planned to assist in a self-help housing project in Indianapolis during the summer of 1951.

MORRIS N. KERTZER

JEWISH EDUCATION *

Two themes were uppermost in the minds of lay and professional people interested in American Jewish education during the review year (July, 1950, through June, 1951). One was stock-taking—the drawing up, so to speak, of a balance sheet of the assets and liabilities of the present status of Jewish education in America. The other was speculation about the general direction of the Jewish schools in the coming years: their objectives, curricula, and organizational forms.

Problems

These two themes were discussed in the English, Yiddish, and Hebrew pedagogic periodicals, in the Anglo-Jewish weeklies, and in the more serious journals. They were also echoed at national and regional professional conferences, and at the conventions of some of the rabbinical and other organizations.

This discussion was stimulated to a large extent by the First National Conference on Jewish Education, convened on the week-end of January 13-15, 1951, in New York City, by the American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE) in co-operation with thirty-two major national organizations, scores of communities, all the local community central agencies for Jewish education, and a large number of individual schools.

The general discussion, in which representatives of Jewish religious and cultural organizations of various orientations participated, was characterized by a feeling of ambivalence. On the one hand, attention was focused on some of the positive developments in Jewish education: the upward trend in en-

* Prepared with the help and co-operation of the American Association for Jewish Education.
rollment; the increased proportion of girls attending the weekday afternoon Hebrew schools; the development of different types of Jewish schools; the increasing appreciation of the community principle in Jewish education; the attempts at reconstructing the curriculum in accordance with the needs of the American Jewish child; and last but not least, the efforts at improving the training and the status, social and material, of the Jewish teachers.

On the other hand, the discussion was also permeated with a sense of apprehension that the American Jewish school was not fulfilling its historic function: that it was failing to transmit the classical Jewish heritage to the younger generation; that it was not serving as an effective instrument for socializing the Jewish child into the general American environment in terms of the religious, ethnic, social, and cultural values of the Jewish child's own religion, history, and traditions; that it was not giving the children a sense of identification with the Jewish community; that it was not developing in them an active appreciation of the broad social and religious idealism which underlay the network of religious, social, educational, and humanitarian institutions developed by American Jews; and that as a consequence, the Jewish school was slow in evolving into an indigenous American Jewish educational institution.

Most of the educational conferences held during the year centered around the problem of how to develop Jewish education in the United States as a source for intellectual and religious vitality.

The Jewish educators, while sharpening to some extent the misgivings about the future of American Jewry that prevailed in the American Jewish community, viewed the new situation both as a challenge in rethinking the objectives of the American Jewish school and in curriculum building. This was especially manifested at the Silver Jubilee Conference of the National Council for Jewish Education consisting of top American Jewish educators held in Cleveland on May 30–June 2, 1951.

Leo L. Honor, the first president of the National Council for Jewish Education, stressed the pioneering role the Council had played and was playing in creating a permanent Jewish teaching profession in the United States; in recognizing the need of relating the work of the Jewish teachers to that of other Jewish professional workers (rabbis, center workers, and social workers) rendering service to American Jewish children and youth; and in continuing efforts to develop Jewish education in terms of the specific realities of American Jewish life.

Samuel Blumenfield's key address and the discussion that followed helped gain insight into the thinking of the Jewish teaching profession. "The philosophy of modern Jewish education in America" was Dr. Blumenfield's thesis—"essentially an expression of the Hebrew Renaissance and the upsurge of Jewish nationalism and Zionism is no longer satisfying. Israel as an aspiration can no longer serve as a dominant motivation... The Jewish educator will have to strive for a greater integration of the Jewish school curriculum, the Jewish faith and tradition..."
YIDDISH SCHOOLS

The aims of Jewish education were also seriously examined in the educational circles devoted to the sponsorship of Yiddish schools. During the late twenties, the Yiddish schools, conducted mainly by labor-oriented organizations, had begun to incorporate in their curricula elements of the Hebrew classical heritage and of the Jewish religious tradition. But by and large, their curricula remained based mainly either on the secular culture developed in Eastern Europe or on Zionism. The most recent trend, observable during the period under review, stressed a program in which Jewish life in the United States would be central.

ORTHODOX SCHOOLS

In the Orthodox-oriented Jewish educational circles, there was relatively little speculation about a re-evaluation of educational objectives. The Mizrachi National Education Committee expressed its strong opposition to the creation of small synagogue school units, which educationally were ineffective, wasteful, and resulted in the fragmentation of the Hebrew school system. Isidor Margolis, executive director of this organization, at the Mizrachi convention held in Atlantic City, November, 1950, called for “a return to the large adequately manned and programmed general [community] school.” This stand was officially endorsed in several editorials in the Vaad Bulletin (May–June 1951; February, 1951). The Torah Umesorah reported a growth of the all-day school movement.

Jewish School Enrollment, 1950

During 1950–51 Jewish school enrollment recorded the largest relative increase since the annual Jewish school census was instituted six years before by the Department of Research of the American Association for Jewish Education in co-operation with the American Jewish Year Book. The aggregate enrollment in all Jewish schools including children attending Sunday schools, weekday afternoon, Yiddish, all-day schools, congregational and non-congregational, and those attending on released time numbered in the spring of 1951, 302,454. This represented an increase of 13.4 per cent over the preceding year. Probably part of the increase should be ascribed to more complete reporting as the existing community central agencies for Jewish education gained more experience in gathering enrollment statistics and as central agencies for Jewish education were being organized in more communities.

1 The Jewish school enrollment figures for 1950 are based on the reported actual enrollment in all of the five major metropolitan centers having each a Jewish population of 100,000 or more (New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Boston); in all of the six large urban centers having each a Jewish population of between 50,000 and 100,000 (Newark, Essex County, N. J., Detroit, Cleveland, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco); in four of the six Jewish communities having each a Jewish population of from 25,000 to 50,000 (Miami, Milwaukee, Providence, and St. Louis); and in 133 intermediate and small communities. These 148 communities were distributed over 35 states and comprised a Jewish population of approximately 4,000,000 or approximately 80 per cent of the total Jewish population in the United States. Since no enrollment data were available for the remainder of the smaller and intermediate communities whose aggregate Jewish population amounted to approximately 1,000,000, or 20 per cent of all Jews in the United States, an estimate was made. The enrollment data used for the Yiddish and all-day schools are those of last year.
TABLE 1
GROWTH OF JEWISH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT,
1948-51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weekday School Enrollment*</th>
<th>Sunday School Enrollmentb</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent of Total</td>
<td>Per Cent Annual Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>141,278</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>+6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>132,642</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>+8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>122,109</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>118,502</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The term weekday school includes the weekday afternoon Hebrew, Yiddish, and the all-day schools.

b Includes 3,393 enrolled in released time classes in 1950; 5,037 in 1949; and 3,202 in 1951.

However, only a small part of the reported increase should be ascribed to this source. A number of communities and organizations which had good facilities for gathering enrollment statistics reported increases for the review year as large as, and even larger than the increase noted during the preceding year. Apparently, there was a continued growth in interest in Jewish education. Probably a part of the increase could also be ascribed to the growth of the Jewish population.

An increase of more than 15 per cent in enrollment for the year under review was recorded by the religious schools affiliated with the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues.

Of the total Jewish school enrollment in 1951 the larger part of the students (157,974, or 52.8 per cent) were attending Sunday schools: 141,278, or 47.2 per cent, were attending weekday afternoon schools exclusive of released time classes. The Sunday school enrollment also recorded the larger relative increase (21.0 per cent, against 6.5 per cent for the weekday schools).

ENROLLMENT BY CONGREGATIONAL AUSPICES

For the second consecutive year an attempt was made to record the Jewish school enrollment in Sunday and weekday afternoon Hebrew schools by congregational and non-congregational auspices. Not all communities polled, however, submitted this information. In 1950, 100 communities reported on the number of children attending Jewish schools under Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and non-congregational auspices. In 1951, 135 communities reported such information. The total enrollment in the 135 communities was 105,332, or 34.8 per cent of the total number of children attending Jewish schools in the United States. Of this number, 85.7 per cent were in congregational schools and 14.3 per cent in non-congregational schools. The Conservative congregations claimed the highest share of the reported enrollment in the 135 communities (37,677 or 35.8 per cent); the Reform congregations, the next highest (33,407, or 31.7 per cent); followed by the Orthodox congregations (17,660, or 16.8 per cent).
One must repeat at this point the observation made in last year's review article (American Jewish Year Book, 1951 [Vol. 52], p. 97 and f.), in connection with the discussion of the enrollment by auspices. Many non-congregational schools, known under such names as United Hebrew Schools, Associated Talmud Torahs, Hebrew Institutes, etc., though not under Orthodox Congregational auspices, were Orthodox-oriented. This would increase considerably the number of children studying under Orthodox, though not under Orthodox congregational auspices.

Of all the children attending weekday afternoon schools, 73.3 per cent were studying under congregational and 26.7 per cent under non-congregational auspices. Of all the children attending Sunday schools, 92.1 per cent were found in congregational schools, and 7.9 per cent in non-congregational ones.

Of the children enrolled in schools under Reform auspices in the 135 reporting communities, 90.5 per cent were in Sunday and 9.5 per cent in weekday afternoon schools. Of the children attending the Orthodox and Conservative congregational schools, 59.6 per cent and 59.8 per cent respectively were found in Sunday schools, and 40.4 per cent and 40.2 per cent respectively in the weekday afternoon schools.

Sunday School Confirmation Requirements and Programming

Confirmation is a very important event in the American Jewish Sunday school calendar. Like bar mitzvah, its Hebrew school counterpart, confirmation, because of the pageantry of the ceremony and the social esteem bestowed on confirmands, serves as a strong motivation for children to pursue their religious studies in Sunday school. Confirmation also shares with bar mitzvah the questionable distinction of being in most cases a terminus for the formal religious education of the American Jewish child. This circumstance, coupled with the fact that the majority of American Jewish children receive their religious education in Sunday schools, make the confirmation a potent influence in the development of the American Jewish school.

It was in order to weigh this influence that a study of confirmation programming and requirements was made by the Department of Research of the American Association for Jewish Education in co-operation with the American Jewish Year Book. A study of the bar mitzvah educational requirements and practices was presented in the American Jewish Year Book, 1951 (Vol. 52), pp. 104-106.

Special confirmation questionnaires were mailed to 760 Sunday schools, of which 298, or 39.2 per cent, responded: 106 of the responses came from the metropolitan area of New York City, and 192 came from 154 cities distributed over 33 states and the District of Columbia.

Of the 298 respondent schools, 251, or 84.2 per cent, recorded that they had confirmation classes and 47, or 15.8 per cent, that they did not. All the 123 reporting Reform Sunday schools were in the first category. Of the 108 Conservative Sunday schools which answered the question on confirmation,
Of the 52 Orthodox Sunday schools included in the study only 15, or 28.8 per cent, recorded having confirmation classes. (Because of the small number of Orthodox, inter- and non-congregational Sunday schools included in the study, they were omitted from all subsequent discussion involving comparative analysis.)

SEX AND AGE REQUIREMENTS

Of the 298 respondent Sunday schools, 46, or 15.4 per cent, made no provision for confirmation, for either boys or girls. The overwhelming majority of the Sunday schools required both boys and girls to be confirmed.

Most Sunday schools had a minimum age requirement for confirmation. Of the reporting Sunday schools, only 9.2 per cent recorded no specific age requirement for girls, and 10.8 per cent none for boys. In almost all cases the age requirement was the same for both boys and girls. However, it was not uniform in all schools. The age of confirmation varied from twelve to seventeen. In the great majority of the schools it was fourteen or fifteen.

Of 110 Reform Sunday schools for which information on confirmation age was available, 32.7 per cent confirmed girls at fourteen and one-half years of age or younger, and 30.8 per cent of the schools confirmed boys at this young age; 63.6 per cent of the Reform schools confirmed girls at the ages of fifteen, fifteen and one-half, and sixteen, and 65.4 per cent of the schools confirmed boys at those ages. Only one Reform school reported confirming boys and girls at the age of seventeen.

Of the Conservative schools, 41.7 per cent confirmed girls at fourteen and one-half years of age or younger, and 32.1 per cent of the schools confirmed boys at this young age. Almost half of the Conservative schools (49 per cent) confirmed girls at the ages of fifteen, fifteen and one-half and sixteen, and more than half (52.6 per cent) confirmed boys at those ages.

CONFIRMATION COURSES

Of the 298 Sunday schools which answered the question on confirmation, 215, or 72.1 per cent, also supplied information on the subjects taught in the confirmation classes.

The programs of studies in the confirmation classes plus the special instruction given by the rabbis to the confirmands, read more like catalogues of courses offered by theological seminaries than that of programs of one-day-a-week classes for students who had been graduated from elementary one-day-a-week religious schools. A listing of the courses studied either in the regular confirmation classes or in supplementary sessions with the rabbi would include: the main tenets of Judaism; Judaism and democratic ideals; the basic literary sources of Judaism; the prayer book: liturgy and spiritual values; contemporary Jewish life: its problems and movements; the survey of Jewish history; personal ideals: their basis in modern science and in Jewish religion.

*The United Synagogue of America found that "73 per cent of the 200 congregations who answered the survey conduct a confirmation service, 11.5 per cent do not have a confirmation service, and 15.5 per cent did not answer this question" (Report on the Findings of the National Survey, Fall 1950, II, p. 12).
and history; the survey of American Jewish history; the American Jewish
community: its structure, institutions, and functions; Jewish literature; Bible;
Bible as literature; the Hebrew language; and the history and geography of
Israel.

These courses suggest a scholastic background and intellectual maturity on
the part of the confirmands which most of them did not have. The confirm-
a tion courses would also require that each Sunday school possess a teaching
staff intimately familiar both with American culture and the history and the
religious literary sources and traditions of Israel; few Sunday schools pos-
sessed such a staff.

The number of individual courses studied by the confirmands in the con-
firmation classes was quite large. Of the 215 Sunday schools which indicated
the number of subjects taught in the confirmation grades, 37.2 per cent
taught three subjects and 31.2 per cent of the schools taught four, five, and
more subjects. Of these 215 Sunday schools, 193 reported on the subjects
taught.

Religion was the most popular subject in the confirmation grade, Jewish
contributions to Western civilization the least popular one (only one school
reported giving it, and that outside the regular confirmation session). This
represented quite a change: during the Thirties, the Jewish Sunday schools
had emphasized the achievements of Jews in all fields of human endeavor.
The programs of the confirmation grades in those years were replete with
courses dealing with anti-Semitism and Jewish contributions to society. In
1951, however, out of 193 Sunday schools not one was recorded as offering
such courses as part of its regular confirmation program.

RELIGION

Religion was taught in 114, or 59.1 per cent, of the respondent schools.
In the Reform schools religion was the basic subject of instruction: 71.0 per
cent of the Reform schools included in this study taught it; in the Con-
servative schools the proportion was 44.2 per cent.

The proportion of schools that taught religion in both Conservative and
Reform schools was probably larger. In some schools the teaching of the
prayer book and of customs and ceremonies included the study of the
spiritual values expressed in the prayers and customs, as well. However, for
the purpose of this study a school was considered to be teaching religion
only when it was given as a special subject.

Customs and ceremonies were taught in twice as many Conservative as Re-
form confirmation grades, proportionately: 46.5 per cent as compared with
21.5 per cent. Different schools emphasized different aspects of the subject:
ritualism from the Jewish women's point of view; vocabulary of Jewish living
(this referred to the Hebrew nomenclature of the holidays and the Jewish
customs); rituals: their origin and significance; the Jewish calendar; dietary
laws, etc.

Bible was taught in one-third of all the confirmation grades. It was about
equally popular in the Conservative and Reform schools, being taught in
32.6 per cent and 34.6 per cent respectively of the schools.
Jewish history was reviewed in 37.3 per cent of all the schools: in 46.5 per cent of the Conservative, and 29.9 per cent of the Reform schools.

Modern Jewish problems, including contemporary Jewish social movements and current events, were studied in 25.9 per cent of all schools, in 29.9 per cent of the Reform schools, and 20.9 per cent of the Conservative schools. Only 8 of the 193 reporting schools indicated that Israel was studied as a separate subject. In many schools it was discussed as part of current events.

Hebrew as a subject taught in the confirmation classes was reported by 55 schools, or 28.5 per cent of all schools reporting on confirmation subjects. Slightly more than half of the Conservative schools included the study of Hebrew in their confirmation programs. In the Reform schools one-fourth of the schools taught Hebrew in the confirmation grades, if one were to consider the study of the prayer book as a study in Hebrew also; for in many Reform schools the Hebrew parts of the Union Service were studied during the Hebrew session.

However, the study of Hebrew as a pre-requisite for confirmation, though not necessarily in the confirmation grade, was reported by 115, or 38.6 per cent, of all schools that answered the confirmation questionnaire.

An increasing number of Sunday schools were making Hebrew a requirement for confirmation. This was indicated by the fact that of the 115 schools reporting Hebrew as a confirmation requirement, 50.5 per cent had introduced it during the previous three years. In this development the Conservative and the Reform group shared more or less equally. The amount of Hebrew taught in the Sunday schools was relatively meagre. A report on forty-one larger Reform Sunday Schools recorded in this connection that "the vast majority of the schools teach Hebrew only for the purpose of reading and understanding prayers [in the Hebrew Union Prayer Book]. Only three schools are so ambitious as to hope that their students will be able to approach a mastery of modern Hebrew." 3

In the Conservative schools, the trend was to make the Sunday session an integral part of the three-day-a-week school, and the study of Hebrew an integral part of the school's program.

SUPPLEMENTARY CONFIRMATION INSTRUCTION

In 113 schools, or 37.9 per cent, the rabbi supplemented the instruction given in the regular confirmation classes by holding one or more sessions with the confirmands during the week (in some cases only twice a month.)

During these sessions religion, with the emphasis on denominational differences in laws, customs, and rituals and the woman's role in observing and preserving them, was the major subject of study. The problems of Jewish youth and of the American Jewish community were also discussed.

In a number of schools (15.6 per cent) part of the special session with the rabbi was devoted to preparation for the confirmation exercises, which usually included discussion of the papers that the confirmands were to present. In most cases, the papers dealt with historic and religious themes.

The study of history, on the other hand, played only a minor part in these special sessions, only 9 schools out of 113, or 8.0 per cent, reported studying it.

The American Jewish Sunday schools were quite uniform in their curriculum. The sectarian divisions within the Jewish community were only to a slight degree reflected in the classroom. There was little difference in the subject matter studied in the confirmation grades of the Sunday Schools conducted under Conservative, Reform, and even Orthodox auspices. As for particularistic doctrinal emphasis and interpretation of the subject matter studied, it would require an expert ear skilled in scholasticism to discern any differences.

This uniformity of the Sunday school curriculum was also reflected in the texts used in the Conservative, Reform, and in many cases also in the Orthodox Sunday Schools.

For example, Lee J. Levinger's, *History of the Jews in the United States* and *The Story of the Jew for Young People* by Elma Ehrlich and Lee J. Levinger were used in many Conservative, Reform, and Orthodox Sunday Schools. The same was the case with some of the history books published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Likewise, R. B. Gittelsohn's, *Modern Jewish Problems* was used by schools of all three denominations. What was more significant, books on religion that reflected either a definite Conservative or definite Reform orientation, were used by the confirmation grades of both groups. For instance, the confirmation manual by H. G. Enelow, *Faith of Israel*, Beryl D. Cohon's, *Judaism in Theory and Practice*, Hayyim Schauss's, *Lifetime of a Jew* and *Jewish Festivals*, and Leon Feuer and Benedict Glazer's, *The Jewish Religion*, all written from a Reform point of view, were used by the confirmation grades of both Conservative and Reform schools, and in some cases also by Orthodox schools.

Similarly, books written from a Conservative point of view such as for instance, Milton Steinberg's, *Basic Judaism*, Morris Joseph's *Judaism as Creed and Life*, and even Ben Edidin's, *Customs and Ceremonies*, which was written from a right-Conservative point of view, were used by a number of Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox schools.

Even in the study of the Bible, where emphasis, interpretation, and approach are basic to religious orientation, texts written from a Reform point of view were used by Conservative schools. Thus, Mortimer J. Cohen's *Pathways through the Bible* was used by a large number of Reform and Conservative schools.

**HIGH SCHOOL CLASSES OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS**

Very few Sunday schools had post-confirmation classes. But quite a number had high school departments which offered programs of religious studies to graduates of the first eight years of the elementary Sunday schools. Sun-

---

4 High school departments have been assumed to include grades beginning with the ninth year.
5 The study of 41 larger Reform congregational Sunday Schools with a combined enrollment of 20,100 pupils referred to above, reported that while only 60 pupils were enrolled in post-confirmation classes, 3,300, or 16.4 per cent, were attending high school classes. Simon Lazarus, *op. cit.*
for confirmation and by moving up the confirmation classes from the elementary to the high school department. Educationally, this was a significant device as it induced a considerable number of early teen-agers to stay in the religious school for a longer period than they would otherwise have done.

Almost half of the 102 Sunday Schools that indicated the number of years on which their high school programs were based (43.1 per cent) had only one-year programs; 36.3 per cent had two-year programs; 12.7 per cent had three-year programs; and 5.9 per cent had four-year programs. This was generally true for both the Conservative and Reform Sunday schools.

In the Reform group, 43.3 per cent of the schools had only one high school class, 35.0 per cent two classes, 13.3 per cent three high school classes. Of the Conservative Sunday schools 45.0 per cent had one class, 38.1 per cent had two high school classes, and 11.9 per cent three high school classes.

The subjects studied most in the high school classes, as indicated by the 191 Sunday high schools reporting, were religion (including the study of the prayer book), 15.7 per cent; social problems and current events, 17.8 per cent; Bible, 19.4 per cent; American Jewish history, 9.9 per cent.

There was considerable variation in the programs of the Reform and Conservative high school classes. Of all the Reform Sunday high schools reporting on programming, 23.3 per cent emphasized the study of religion; 31.1 per cent community social problems; 10.7 per cent American Jewish history; 12.6 per cent of the high schools taught the Bible. Of the Conservative Sunday high schools 6.8 per cent taught religion, 27.3 per cent taught the Bible, and 11.4 per cent social and community problems.

Hebrew in the Public High Schools

Courses in the Hebrew language were taken during 1950–51 by 5,700 students in thirty-seven New York City public, senior, and junior high schools.

In Newark, N. J., 110 boys and girls studied Hebrew in the public high schools of the city.

The teaching of Hebrew was introduced for the first time during 1950–51 in the public high schools of Pittsburgh, and was being taught for the first time during the fall of 1951 in the public high schools of New Haven.

Communal Events and Developments

The Jewish educational system in the United States was becoming more and more an integral part of the Jewish community. A significant expression of development was contained in the statement of guiding principles for regulating the relationship between congregational schools and community central agencies for Jewish education issued in the winter of 1950–51 by the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and the AAJE.

Inter-school community-wide Jewish holiday celebrations were reported as having taken place in Montgomery, Ala.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Peoria and East St. Louis, Ill.; Davenport, Ia.; Michigan City and Evansville, Ind.; Bal-
timore, Md.; Framingham and Quincy, Mass.; Schenectady, Syracuse, and Buffalo, N. Y.; Morristown, Clearfield, Mt. Carmel, and Pottstown, Pa.; Knoxville, Tenn.; San Antonio, Tex.; Milwaukee, Wis.; and Lynchburg, Va. In Atlanta, Ga., and Bridgeport, Conn., inter-school Maccabiad sport festivals were held.

Community consecration ceremonies for children entering Jewish schools, and community exercises for those being graduated from weekday schools were reported by Reading, Pa.; Camden, N. J.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Columbus, Ohio; and Miami, Fla.

City-wide Jewish musicals for children were reported in Springfield, Mass. and Cincinnati, Ohio. In St. Louis, Mo., all the Jewish schools participated in the Golden Jubilee Celebration of the Jewish Federation.

Inter-school Israel rallies were held in Chicago, Ill.; New York City and Albany, N. Y.; Camden, N. J.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Sioux Falls, S. D.; Newport News, Va.; Worcester, Mass.

Minneapolis reported a mass community bas mitzvah ceremony conducted by Orthodox congregations.

COMMUNITY SELF-STUDIES

In Philadelphia a community self-study of Jewish education was inaugurated at the initiative of the Allied Jewish Appeal. In Harrisburg, Pa., and Providence, R. I., Jewish education community self-studies were completed by the local Jewish community councils. In Waterbury, Conn., the recommendations of a Jewish Community Self-Study Committee for the strengthening of the local Jewish educational system and the creation of a local Jewish Community school board had been approved by the local community council. In Pittsburgh a central community agency for Jewish education was formed as a result of such a self-study.

Teachers

Hebrew Teachers Codes for licensing teachers and regulating salaries went into effect in New Haven, Conn.; St. Paul, Minn.; St. Louis, Mo.; and in Philadelphia, Pa., for the Conservative schools affiliated with the Board of Jewish Education.

In New York City 118 Jewish schools (all-day, weekday afternoon, and Yiddish schools) extended social security coverage to their teachers.

During 1950–51 the National Board of License with offices in New York City issued licenses to Hebrew kindergarten and music teachers for the first time.

The New York Federation of Reform Synagogues awarded the largest number of teacher certificates since the program of teachers certification started in 1945. Altogether sixty-seven teachers were granted certificates, of whom forty-eight completed their course requirements at the Hebrew Union School of Education and Sacred Music. In addition, eight principal's certificates were awarded. Special certificates for teachers of the arts were awarded for the first time: four in art and two in music.
The Hebrew Teachers Union and the other educational agencies in the city of New York were co-operating in an effort to centralize the placement of Hebrew teachers.

Audio-Visual Educational Materials

The larger central agencies for Jewish education, such as the Jewish Education Committee of New York, the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago, and the Bureau of Jewish Education of Los Angeles, produced film strips, slides, and albums for use in Jewish schools.

The Commission on Jewish Education of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations at its meeting in June, 1951, authorized the use of the trust fund created by the will of David Philipson, honorary chairman of the commission, for the undertaking of a production program of audio-visual aids.

The National Council on Jewish Audio-Visual Materials, sponsored by the AAJE, marked the second year of its existence as well as the second anniversary of the Pedagogic Reporter. This periodical published information concerning available audio-visual and curricular materials.

Conferences

The major conference of the year was the First National Conference on Jewish Education referred to above. Among the important decisions of the conference were: the recommendation that a long-range study of Jewish education in the United States be undertaken; the approval, in principle, of a Keren Hahinukh, a fund for expansion and experimentation in Jewish education; and the creation of a permanent advisory council, representing major national organizations in Jewish life, to aid the AAJE in developing, promoting, and expanding Jewish education.

For its initiative in convening the first National Conference on Jewish Education, the AAJE was given the 1950 Stephen S. Wise Award for Jewish Education and Culture in the United States by the American Jewish Congress. The award carried with it a cash grant of one thousand dollars.

The main theme of the Eight Annual Jewish Pedagogic Conference of the Jewish Education Committee of New York on February 12-13, 1951, was "The Role of American Jewish Life in the Curriculum of the Jewish School."

In Cleveland two educational conferences were held during the year. One was the Mid-Western Conference on Jewish Education called by the United Synagogue of America. The other was an educational conference of all local groups interested in Orthodox education.

In Boston the Bureau of Jewish Education and the Northeast Zionist Region held an educational conference in March, 1950.

The Rabbinical Assembly of America in co-operation with the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and the Teachers' Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America held its annual conference in
New York City on February 12-14, 1951. This conference was devoted to the theme of "Education for Children of High School Age."

An educational conference of all the branches of the Zionist Labor movement of America was held during the week of August 18, 1951.

The Third Annual Convention of the National Association of the Hebrew Day School Parents Teachers Association, affiliated with Torah Umesorah, was held in Baltimore, Md., on May 29-30, 1951. The theme of the convention was "The Hebrew Day School and Personality Growth of the Child."

Exhibits

The Eighth Annual Children's Art Exhibit was held during the period of March 20-May 6, 1951, at the Jewish Museum in New York City. The theme of the exhibit was "My Grandfather's World and Mine." Children from Jewish schools exhibited paintings and murals.

School Buildings

Lack of adequate physical school facilities continued to be a major defect in the Jewish educational system of the United States. Of eighty-three communities which answered the inquiry on school buildings, fifty-nine, or 71.1 per cent, indicated that the existing facilities were inadequate. The respondents included small and intermediate communities, as well as the larger metropolitan centers.

Of 63 reporting communities having each a population of 3,000 Jews or fewer, 34, more than half, recorded that they needed new school buildings, 17, or 27.0 per cent, reported that they had adequate facilities, and 16, or 25.4 per cent, recorded that Jewish school buildings were erected in their localities during the past three years.

Of 17 communities having each a Jewish population between 5,000 and 15,000 that reported concerning school buildings, 8 had erected school buildings during the past three years, and 11 recorded the need of new school facilities.

Of 6 communities having each a Jewish population between 15,000 and 50,000, 5 reported having built new school buildings during the past three years; yet all claimed that they needed new school facilities.

Of the 5 communities in the United States with a Jewish population of between 50,000 and 100,000, all reported that they needed additional new school buildings. Two, Baltimore and Essex County, New Jersey, reported that they had erected five new school buildings during the last three years at a cost of over $1,000,000, while four communities were planning to erect new buildings during the next year or two at a cost of over $2,500,000 (San Francisco, 1; Pittsburgh, 2; Cleveland, 8; and Baltimore, 3.)

Of the five largest Jewish communities having each a Jewish population of 100,000 and over, all except Boston indicated the need of new school buildings. During the previous three years all the cities in this category had
erected new school buildings: Los Angeles, 12, and Chicago, 11. New York had erected 23 new Jewish school buildings during the previous five years.

**Personalia**

Jacob Golub, librarian and educational consultant of the Jewish Education Committee of New York, was honored at a dinner on March 3, 1951, on the occasion of his retirement after thirty-five years of distinguished service in Jewish education. Dr. Golub was a pioneer author of Jewish history textbooks from a scientific point of view.

**AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY AND ISRAEL**

The two outstanding developments during the period under review (July 1, 1950, through June 30, 1951), were the launching of the Israel Bond Drive and the preparations for the World Zionist Congress. The bond drive represented the first direct approach by the government of Israel to American Jewry for assistance through a large-scale loan. The debate on the relationship between the Israel government and the Zionist movement, which began in 1948, was intensified by the preparations for the World Zionist Congress. The congress which met in Jerusalem on August 14, 1951, was the first to be held since the state of Israel came into being.

**Israel Bond Drive**

The Israel Bond Drive was officially launched on May 10, 1951, with a mass meeting in Madison Square Garden in New York City at which Prime Minister David Ben Gurion of Israel, who had come to the United States especially for the occasion, was the chief speaker.

The bond drive was planned at a conference held in Jerusalem early in September, 1950, and a National Planning Conference held in Washington, on October 27, 1950, at which a four-point program was adopted. This program included: the Israel Bond Drive; the United Jewish Appeal (UJA); grants-in-aid and, finally, private business investments. The American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel (AFDCI) was set up, with headquarters in New York City, and branch offices in every important community.

Both Zionist and non-Zionist organizations responded to the call, pledging themselves to raise substantial sums of money and to assist with their organizational machinery.¹

¹ For additional information concerning the bond drive and other funds raised for Israel, see pp. 213 ff.
Private Investment

In addition to communal fund raising, there was some advance in the promotion of private investment in Israel. According to the report of the Investment Center in Tel Aviv, Americans invested a total of £10,000,000 ($28,000,000) in Israel enterprises during the period from March, 1950, to March, 1951. Both the Palestine Economic Corporation (PEC) and the American Palestine Trading Corporation (AMPAL) increased their stocks and undertook new enterprises in Israel. The PEC had 6,119 stockholders as of December 31, 1950, compared with 4,774 a year earlier. It co-operated with the Palestine Economic Corporation of Canada Ltd., and with the Central Bank of Cooperative Institutions in creating new banking facilities (the Union Bank of Israel Ltd., and the Canada-Israel Central Bank Ltd.); during 1950 the PEC completed the largest single factory development in Israel (consisting of twelve modern buildings in Haifa), and began the building of the Radio City of Tel-Aviv on Herzl Square.

AMPAL reported an increase in credit facilities from $8,500,000 to $18,000,000 during 1950 and an increase in gross assets of the parent company from $10,300,000 on January 31, 1950, to over $20,000,000 on June 31, 1951. Several new projects were undertaken by AMPAL during the year. These included the building of new hotels in Tel Aviv and in Beersheba; the opening of a plywood manufacturing project, a glassware factory in the Negev, and canneries in the Galilee; investment in an oil company; and the financing of purchases. Most of these projects were undertaken in partnership with other concerns.

The Jewish labor movement purchased $1,030,800 worth of shares in the Amun Israeli Housing Corporation to build low-cost homes in Israel as of July, 1951.

American Zionist Problems

The congress of the World Zionist Organization that met in Jerusalem on August 14, 1951, was the first to be held since the state of Israel came into being in May, 1948. It was faced with ideological and practical problems; most of the latter were concerned with the American scene. Among these problems were: the continued existence of the American Section of the Jewish Agency and of the American Zionist Council (AZC), both of which were established during World War II; and the reorganization of the fund agencies—the Jewish National Fund (JNF), the Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund), and the United Palestine Appeal (UPA).

With the consent of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, a Zionist Emergency Committee had been established in the United States shortly after the outbreak of World War II, to co-ordinate Zionist work in the United States. In time this committee was reorganized into the American Zionist Emergency
Council, to which representatives were sent from every Zionist organization in the United States.

During the period that the Palestine question was before the United Nations, the American Section of the Jewish Agency had been active in presenting the Jewish case before the international forum. Leading members from Jerusalem—David Ben Gurion and Moshe Shertok—participated in the work. At all times the members of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem had insisted on the final authority of the Jerusalem executive in all important matters. After the establishment of the state of Israel, the American Zionist Emergency Council was renamed the American Zionist Council (AZC) and Louis Lipsky was elected chairman.

The respective functions and authorities of the Jewish Agency and the AZC in the United States became difficult to delimit. Originally (1929), the Jewish Agency, as distinct from the Zionist Executive, had been organized in order to broaden the representation of the Jewish people interested in the development of Palestine. Leading non-Zionist bodies and individuals had been given representation in this body. But, in the course of time, the Jewish Agency had become another name for the old World Zionist Executive. From time to time proposals were made to reorganize the Jewish Agency as the body representing both Zionists and non-Zionists interested in the upbuilding of Israel, as was originally intended.

FUND ORGANIZATIONS

The JNF, originally created in 1900 with the purpose of buying land to keep as the inalienable property of the Jewish people, had become an autonomous organization, subject to control only by the Zionist Congress; while the Keren Hayesod, established in 1921, had come under the direct control of the Jewish Agency, serving as its exchequer. In the United States, both the JNF and the Keren Hayesod had for years been receiving their allocations from the UPA, which, in turn, had for years been receiving its allocation from the UJA. The JNF had, in addition, been carrying on "traditional" collections and activities of its own. These collections brought in only a fraction of the total income of the JNF, but were considered of immense value as an educational medium.

With the establishment of the state of Israel and the flight of the Arab population, the government of Israel acquired control as custodian of abandoned property over many times the amount of land that the JNF had bought in the course of fifty years. Consequently, certain members of the government, including the prime minister, expressed the view that there was no longer any need for the JNF. In the United States, the American Section of the Jewish Agency insisted that the autonomy of the JNF should be curtailed and that it should be subject to the jurisdiction of the Agency Executive. The prevalent opinion in the Jewish Agency was that the Keren Hayesod and the JNF should be combined into one fund, both in Jerusalem and abroad, with the Jewish Agency in control. On the other hand, proponents of the JNF argued that the JNF had a rich tradition of work that had grown out of land purchase, such as reclamation, amelioration, and afforestation, which it should be permitted to continue.
Relationship Between American Zionism and Israel

Other questions facing the Zionist movement in the United States were: Should the Zionist movement be treated as the sole or main instrument through which the Jews of the Diaspora were to help the development of the state of Israel and to render it assistance? Or should the movement, having completed its pioneer role of propagating an idea now demonstrated to be workable, give way to a larger, more inclusive organization, or combination of organizations? Did membership in the Zionist movement entail an obligation to emigrate to Israel, or at least to encourage and assist other Jews who were not driven by sheer necessity, to emigrate to Israel? What status, if any, should be given Zionist organizations outside Israel in relation to that country?

Israel Position

Prime Minister David Ben Gurion expressed his views on most of these questions on several occasions. He believed that there was need for a strong Zionist movement in the United States, but that it could draw its strength only from its own work and not from any special status or privileges granted it by the government of Israel; that the Zionist movement ought to foster among all Jews Jewish loyalties, the study of the Hebrew language, and a sense of attachment to Israel; but that so long as Zionists remained in the Diaspora, they could have no say in the affairs of the state of Israel. Ben Gurion also expressed the opinion, based on his own observations, that the largest amount of financial assistance to Israel came from people who were not particularly concerned with the organizational structure or strength of American Zionism.

American Zionist Position

Much of the annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) held in mid-June, 1951 in Atlantic City, N. J., was taken up with refuting Ben Gurion's views. Nearly all Zionist leaders in the United States, while disagreeing among themselves on many questions, were of the opinion that, in the long run, the state of Israel needed a strong Zionist movement in the United States.

Typical of such opinion were statements by Nahum Goldmann and Joseph B. Schechtman, chairman and member, respectively, of the American Section of the Jewish Agency. In the opinion of the former, "The state of Israel must recognize the Zionist movement as a representative of Jewry outside of Israel and give it the necessary status." The latter, who was also a leader of the Revisionists, asserted that "With Israel established as a sovereign state, the World Zionist Organization becomes for Jews living outside Israel, but ready and willing to help Israel and to facilitate the Kibbutz Galuyot ["In-gathering of the Exiles"], a Senatus populusque Judaeus."

Dual Loyalty

During the period under review the question of the political allegiance of American Jews and the threat of dual loyalty continued to be discussed. In
an exchange of views between Ben Gurion and Jacob Blaustein, president of the American Jewish Committee, during the latter's visit to Israel in August, 1950, at the invitation of the government, Ben Gurion attempted to clarify the position of the government of Israel. The following is an excerpt from his statement made on August 23, 1950:

The Jews of the United States, as a community and as individuals, have only one political attachment and that is to the United States of America. They owe no political allegiance to Israel. . . . We, the people of Israel, have no desire and no intention to interfere in any way with the internal affairs of Jewish communities abroad. The government and the people of Israel fully respect the right and integrity of the Jewish communities in other countries to develop their own mode of life and their indigenous social, economic, and cultural institutions in accordance with their own needs and aspirations. . . .

We should like to see American Jews come and take part in our effort. We need their technical knowledge, their unrivalled experience, their spirit of enterprise, their bold vision, their "know-how". . . . But the decision as to whether they wish to come—permanently or temporarily—rests with the free discretion of each American Jew himself. . . . We need halutzim, pioneers, too. Halutzim have come to us—and we believe more will come, not only from those countries where Jews are oppressed and in "exile," but also from countries where the Jews live a life of freedom and are equal in status to all other citizens in their country. But the essence of halutziat is free choice. . . .

HALUTZ MOVEMENT

Most Zionist leaders in the United States were of the opinion that their movement ought to make an American contribution to Israel in manpower. Thus Israel Goldstein, former treasurer of the Jewish Agency, wrote: "American Zionists are called upon to make a contribution of manpower to Medinat Israel. . . . Even if only a fraction of one per cent of American Jewry immigrate to Israel annually, it would be a negligible subtraction here, but it would be a significant addition there, qualitatively if not quantitatively. . . ." On the other hand, it was the consensus of opinion among American Zionist leaders that the training of halutzim, or young pioneers, for Israel, ought to receive limited encouragement.

The Hechalutz Organization of America reported that during the year under review it maintained six training farms where 100 halutzim received cultural and educational preparation for aliyah (emigration to Israel as pioneers). Almost 300 members of Hechalutz embarked for permanent settlement in Israel, the majority to work in collectives and a minority to do professional work.

Hechalutz supported the activities of Haikar Haoved (The Working Farmer), an organization whose aim it was to establish in Israel a moshav (smallholder's village) of 100 American families who would invest funds in farms. This project was being supported by the Settlement Department of the Jewish Agency.
Political Activity in the United States

The American Zionist Council's attempts to co-ordinate political activity by American Zionist bodies in behalf of Israel during 1950–51 met with some difficulties. AZC president, Louis Lipsky, saw fit to resign his position in November, 1950, on this very score, but was prevailed upon to withdraw his resignation the following month. Apart from its routine activities of publishing a bi-monthly bulletin, co-operating with the American Christian Palestine Committee, and keeping in touch with its 730 branches throughout the country, the Council undertook special assignments during the year. These consisted of creating a favorable climate of opinion for Israel's application to the United States for a grant-in-aid of $150,000,000 and its demand for retribution from Germany for confiscated Jewish property.

Influential non-Zionist bodies such as the American Jewish Committee and B'nai B'rith supported Israel's requests for aid. The American Council for Judaism, on the other hand, at its annual convention in Chicago in mid-April, 1951, denounced the "lobbying" in favor of Israel, Zionist "control of philanthropy," and "the spectacle of American Jews being mobilized as salesmen for Israeli bonds."

U.S. Aid to Israel

On December 26, 1950, the United States Export-Import Bank announced a $35,000,000 credit to Israel to help finance a two-year expansion program for agriculture and the production of new fertilizer plants. According to Oscar Gass, economic advisor to the Israel government, the new $35,000,000 credit would be used to buy American equipment and materials necessary to double the country's 1949 agricultural output by 1953.

On October 20, 1951, legislation was approved by Congress authorizing an appropriation of $7,328,903,976 to finance military and economic foreign aid through the newly established Mutual Security Agency. The bill was signed by President Harry S. Truman on October 31, 1951. Under this legislation, which authorized funds for both military and economic purposes, Israel was to receive $64,950,000 for economic aid, of which $50,000,000 was earmarked for the relief and resettlement of Jewish refugees. The amount allocated to Israel for military aid had not yet been determined, but it was believed that Israel and the Arab states would share an estimated $39,600,000.

The allocation of funds for refugee resettlement was approved largely as a result of a special amendment to the mutual security bill introduced on April, 1951, in the Senate by Paul H. Douglas and Robert A. Taft and in the House by John W. McCormack and Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

American Zionists and Internal Israel Politics

The ZOA became involved in an issue of internal Israel politics when it decided to align itself with the General Zionist party in Israel. The alliance
between the group led by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver and Emanuel Neumann and that party in Israel was of some duration, but the official expression of solidarity was first taken at a meeting of the Administrative Council of the ZOA in October, 1950, shortly before the municipal elections in Israel, when the resolution was carried by a vote of 53 to 8. This stand was sustained by the national convention in Atlantic City in mid-June, 1951, a few weeks before the Knesset elections in Israel, by a vote of 320 to 127.

The members of the minority in the ZOA and the leaders of the Hadassah Women’s Organization of America who fought against this stand, were either opposed on principle to any alliance with any party or preferred an alliance with the Progressive party of Israel.

American Zionists and Church and State in Israel

Another issue of internal Israel politics which was strongly debated in the United States was that of the place of religion and religious education in Israel. The first cabinet crisis in Israel in October, 1950, was the occasion for protest meetings in America called by leaders of Mizrachi and Agudat Israel and other Orthodox Jews. These meetings demanded that religious Jews arriving in Israel, notably those from North Africa and the Middle East, not be “coerced” into sending their children to non-religious schools. The second cabinet crisis in Israel, in February, 1951, elicited another wave of protests. Ben Gurion’s visit to the United States and the arrest of a group of young zealots in Jerusalem charged with a plot to blow up the Knesset, were other occasions for Orthodox protests. Young yeshiva students picketed Madison Square Garden on May 10, 1951, before Ben Gurion’s appearance, and the prime minister was visited by a delegation of Orthodox Jews.

Technical Assistance to Israel

Hadassah, the American Technion Society, and several other organizations continued to lend technical assistance to Israel. During the period under review, Hadassah, with a membership of 300,000, undertook to open a new medical center to take the place of the hospital on Mount Scopus; increased the capacity of its hospital in Beersheba; and opened a children’s hospital in Rosh Ha’ayin, as well as the Lasker Guidance Clinic.

The American Technion Society was instrumental in the appointment of Dr. Leon Shereshevsky of Howard University as Visiting Professor of Physical Chemistry at the Haifa Technion for the academic year of 1950–51, and sponsored the trip to the Technion of Dr. Harold Urey. A donation of $100,000 enabled the Technion to expand its Junior College.

Dr. Urey’s trip to Israel was utilized by the Weizmann Institute, whose friends in the United States joined with the American Technion Society and the American Friends of the Hebrew University, for fund-raising purposes.
The American ORT Federation increased its activities in Israel and maintained forty-one trade schools in that country. When Jacob Greenberg, associate superintendent of schools in New York City, visited Israel in May, 1951, at the invitation of the Israel Ministry of Education, the ORT Federation invited him to inspect its schools and submit a report.

The American Committee for OSE, Inc., also increased its field of activities in Israel and maintained seven convalescent homes for children and twelve medical day nurseries in nineteen localities in Israel.

The Pioneer Women's Organization, affiliated with the Labor Zionists, working in co-operation with the Moatzt Hapoalot (Women Workers' Council), was adding the twenty-seventh institution to the list of those which it maintained and the Moatzt Hapoalot in Israel administered. The new institution was a youth village and agricultural training settlement near Ge-dera, on the road to the Negev.

In January, 1951, the Women's League for Israel, also working in co-operation with the Moatzt Hapoalot, opened in Nathanya its fifth hostel. Most of the above projects lay in the fields of both social work and education. The same was true of the new Student House at the Hebrew University planned by the Hillel Foundation of B'nai B'rith. Rabbi Maurice Pekarsky arrived in Jerusalem in the fall of 1950 to work on that project.

Educational Aid

Another project connected with the Hebrew University in Jerusalem was the financing by the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), in co-operation with the American Friends of the Hebrew University, of an educational faculty headed by Eliezer Rieger of New York. In addition, the NCJW brought to the United States fourteen students from Israel on scholarships for postgraduate courses in social work. The National Jewish Welfare Board sent Louis Kraft, its retired executive director, to Jerusalem, to lecture for six months at the Jerusalem School of Social Science and to organize a YMHA in that city. The American Mizrahi voted at its convention to establish a college in Ramat Gan along American lines.

The American Jewish Congress in January, 1951, laid the cornerstone for the Louise Waterman Wise Youth Center in Jerusalem.

The Jewish Theological Seminary of America sent its dean of the Teachers' College, Moshe Davis, to Israel to lecture on American Jewry at the Hebrew University. At the same time, in his capacity as head of the Eternal Light radio program, Rabbi Davis made arrangements with the Radio Department of the Jewish Agency for jointly sponsored programs.

The Dropsie College of Philadelphia opened a field station at Ein Harod for those of its students who were carrying out social research projects in Israel.

Both the ZOA and Hadassah increased the number of their scholarships for study in Israel. In June, 1951, the ZOA began to publish a new magazine in the United States, entitled Zionist Quarterly.

Columbia University in New York City opened a Center of Israel Studies
with Professor Salo W. Baron in charge. The purpose of this center was to prepare American students who wished to become experts in Israel affairs.

The American Fund for Israel Institutions, which aimed to strengthen the cultural ties between Israel and America, sponsored a tour of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra in the United States during the winter of 1950 and spring of 1951.

M. Z. Frank

JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICES

This article will discuss the developments during 1949-50 in the fields of Jewish immigrant aid, family service, child care, care of the aged, Jewish hospitals and clinics, and Jewish vocational services. (For special treatment of the services in the field of youth and community center work and Jewish education, and an extensive discussion of fund raising, see articles on these subjects under appropriate headings.)

Immigrant Aid

With the end of World War II, aid to Jewish displaced persons (DP’s) and other immigrants began to constitute one of the major programs of Jewish social service. The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) and the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) co-operated with such American public agencies as the Displaced Persons Commission, and with the International Refugee Organization (IRO) to expedite the flow of Jewish DP’s. The United Service for New Americans (USNA) encouraged communities to make community assurances for DP immigrants lacking individual sponsors, and helped thousands of arrivals to settle in the local communities of the United States through a program involving about 350 communities. Locally, nearly all the regular Jewish social agencies, as well as specially organized agencies and volunteer groups affiliated with the National Council of Jewish Women co-operated in the program of aid to the newcomers.

The peak of postwar Jewish immigration was reached in 1949 when nearly 38,000 Jews entered the United States, 31,163 being admitted under the Displaced Persons (DP) Act of 1948 and the balance under the regular immigration quota laws.

However, the stringent enforcement of the regulations set up in the DP Act as amended on June 16, 1950, particularly as a consequence of the passage of the Internal Security Act, caused a considerable decrease in the flow of DP’s. During the summer of 1948, the flow of Jewish immigration had reached a peak of more than 4,000 per month. During the last half of 1950, however, the monthly average was only 650 to 750. A low point was reached in October, 1950, when only 413 Jewish DP’s reached the United States.

The private Jewish and non-Jewish social agencies engaged in immigrant aid attacked this problem, and with the co-operation of the responsible gov-
ernmental agencies succeeded in easing the procedural and administrative difficulties. As a result, the flow of Jewish displaced persons began to increase. By December, 1950, it reached 1,456, and during the first six months of 1951 a total of 8,536, or a monthly average of more than 1,400, were admitted. Nevertheless, the number of Jews admitted during the calendar year 1950 was only 14,105, of whom 10,245 were DP's, and 3,860 immigrants under the regular quota laws.¹

Community Services

A very large percentage of the newcomers called upon the local social services for help. All those who had been provided with community assurances were automatically routed to responsible social agencies in the communities of destination.

The kind of aid provided varied largely with the size of the community. The chief services provided were: reception at local receiving points; orientation, including tutoring in English and preparation for American life and citizenship; provision for temporary shelter and assistance in obtaining permanent housing; financial aid until the family became self-maintaining; vocational guidance and job placement; child care; institutional service for aged and sick; medical care; casework where family problems arose or personal adjustments were found to be unsatisfactory, etc. Nearly 100 communities, including all but one of the larger ones, had professionally staffed family agencies which provided the social services for the great majority of resettled newcomers. Community centers, hospitals, vocational agencies, children's agencies, etc., all helped in this program. In more than 200 communities the local sections of the National Council of Jewish Women provided a wide program of services. In communities where there were no Jewish family agencies, these local sections provided practically all the services available to the immigrant: reception upon arrival; help in finding housing, furniture, and employment; referral for medical and other services; and help toward their Americanization. The local welfare fund co-ordinated the services of the various agencies.

As the flow of displaced persons to the country subsided, there was a gradual reduction of the immigrant aid program. Nearly all the employable immigrants had found work; and the time required to integrate them into the communities was reduced to between three and eight months.

HARD-CORE CASES

For some immigrants, however, this rapid adjustment was not possible. Families without any employable member, aged and chronically sick persons, and immigrants with special problems constituted a "hard core" of immigrants requiring more extensive and prolonged care. More than 300 persons were so designated by JDC and IRO. In addition, an equal number came to the attention of their communities. Though relatively few in number, their

¹ For additional statistics and information concerning legislation, see article on Immigration and Naturalization, above.
care involved the expenditure of considerable funds over a long period of time, and a continuing program for immigrant aid was thought to be necessary for some years to come.

Family Service

After the welfare fund, the most common Jewish social agency was the family agency. The 1950–51 Directory of Jewish Social Work Agencies listed ninety-six such organizations. These included only those in which one or more professional caseworkers were employed; there were, in addition, a number of organizations run completely by volunteers—a type of agency rapidly disappearing from the Jewish community. In some fifty of the smaller localities, the professional director of the welfare fund himself provided family service, especially to immigrants and to transients, as a part of his over-all responsibilities.

The type of service rendered by the Jewish family agency paralleled pretty largely that provided by the better non-sectarian family agencies. The core of the service consisted of skilled casework that aimed to assist clients with their social and personal difficulties. Practically all of them provided some concrete service: care of the aged, homemaker service, financial aid, help for transients, assistance in finding housing, employment, medical care, etc. Forty-three of the agencies, in fact, were multiple-function agencies, providing both family service and child care.

A substantial number of family agencies existed in the smaller Jewish communities with Jewish populations ranging from 2,500 to 8,000, where one professional person usually served both as caseworker and administrator. In communities with a Jewish population of approximately 10,000, family agencies employed two, three, and even four professionals. The largest agencies in New York City and Chicago operated with staffs of sixty and more professionals. Thus, in December, 1950, sixty-four agencies reported a full-time professional staff of 502 caseworkers and supervisors. Twenty-four agencies had only one professional worker, while the remaining forty employed an average of eleven or twelve. The largest agency was Jewish Family Service of New York City, employing fifty-seven caseworkers and twenty supervisors.

The great majority of the family agencies were independent, being operated by their own boards of directors. Nine or ten, especially those in cities having a Jewish population between 5,000 and 12,000, operated as functional departments of their welfare fund organization and were administered by a committee of the welfare fund board of directors. The function of the staff in such cases was the same as in the other communities.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The increased dependence of Jewish social service upon central Jewish fund-raising bodies was reflected in the experience of the family agencies. During 1950 these received more than two-thirds of their operating income from the Jewish welfare funds and less than one-fourth from their community chests. This represented a great though not a permanent change in the
pattern of support of Jewish family agencies. The sharp increase in welfare fund contributions to the support of Jewish family agencies since 1946 was attributable almost entirely to the immigrant aid program. The welfare funds assumed almost the entire burden of financial responsibility for the direct relief which Jewish family agency service gave to refugees.

A close relationship existed between the Jewish family agency and the general community. Traditionally, the Jewish family agencies regarded themselves and were regarded by the communities as part of the total social service structure of the community. Only one Jewish agency, in fact, stated that it had not received funds from its community chest in 1950, either directly or through the machinery of the Jewish welfare fund. Furthermore, all Jewish family agencies were active participants in the work of their local councils of social agencies.

The sources from which the Jewish family agencies drew their support during 1950 are indicated in the table which follows:

**TABLE 1**

**Sources of Operating Income, Jewish Family Agencies, 1950**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>No. of Family Agencies Reporting Income</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Funds</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Welfare Funds</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Chests through Jewish Welfare Funds</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Chests directly</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for Service</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Funds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments and All Other</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total income of these fifty-eight agencies reporting to CJFWF for 1950 was nearly $10,000,000, of which over nine-tenths (91.7 per cent) was received from central funds. The division of central funds into Jewish welfare funds and community chests shows that the former contributed 69 per cent of all operating expenses, while the latter gave 22.7 per cent.

**FEE PAYMENTS**

As the above table shows, thirty-five of the agencies reported receiving fees of some kind as payment for services. In some agencies this included fees for camp care; in others for service to children in foster homes; and in still others for visiting housekeeper service, etc. The charging of fees for counselling service, as such, while much discussed, was not as yet a widespread practice. In fact, it was limited to a few of the largest agencies staffed with highly skilled casework practitioners. This situation prevailed in the non-sectarian field as well.

The amount collected from fees for all purposes totalled only 1.7 per cent of the operating income of the thirty-five agencies. The conclusion was therefore inescapable that any dependence by the community on fees as more than a minor source of income was as yet unjustified.
Reports for 1950 from the Jewish family agencies indicated that they had had the same experience as was reported by the non-sectarian family agencies: a definite decline in the volume of cases. This decline amounted to about 15 per cent during the period from January 1 to December 31, 1950. Similarly, there was a decline of about 15 per cent in the number of applications for service. During the year 1949, on the other hand, there had been an increase of nearly 25 per cent over the previous year.

It is not to be assumed from the drop in number of cases served that the agencies gave less service. As a matter of fact, the average monthly number of active cases was nearly 10 per cent higher than in 1949; both the number of assistance cases and the total expenditures by the agencies for assistance increased by over 15 per cent. Despite a drop in the total number of cases served, service per case was of longer duration during the year.

Another factor which must be considered in estimating the extent of service by Jewish family agencies was the very high proportion of immigrant aid cases. Such cases generally required greater service over a longer period of time than others. Almost 10,000 cases were served monthly by a group of forty-two Jewish family agencies during 1950; of this number approximately 4,500 were immigrant cases and 5,500 non-immigrant. The figures represented an increase of 27.5 per cent over 1949 for immigrant cases, and a decrease of 3.5 per cent for non-immigrants.

The decline in the number of non-immigrants served was of special significance. Many of the Jewish family agencies had been operating with a case load one-third to two-thirds of which consisted of immigrants. With the drop in immigration, they had to plan for a program with a different emphasis. For the largest communities this adjustment presented no serious difficulty; agencies could supply casework service to the aged and the chronically ill, for which there was increasing demand; many agencies could also expand their counselling service. But in the smaller Jewish communities, especially those with a Jewish population of from 5,000 to 15,000, the Jewish family agencies had become professional and had grown because they had received support from the Jewish welfare funds for their service to immigrants. Non-immigrants had represented only half, or less, of the total case load. The family agencies faced the problems of finding other programs, and of making certain that the community was willing to support non-immigrant services.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For some time, Jewish family agencies had been decreasing the extent of their financial assistance to clients. Immigrants had been the chief exception to this rule, because they were considered ineligible for public assistance when they arrived in the United States. Assistance to immigrants amounted to about 80 per cent of all the financial assistance given by Jewish family agencies during 1950. Assistance provided by forty agencies increased from slightly less than $3,500,000 in 1949 to slightly less than $4,000,000 in 1950, an increase of 15.3 per cent, due entirely to the immigrant aid program. During the same period, the reports from these agencies showed that the number
of cases receiving supplementary aid—521 in 1949—dropped to 487 in 1950, a decrease of 6.5 per cent.

However, Jewish agencies still provided financial assistance to non-immigrants for emergencies, to supplement public assistance in selected cases, and for special purposes not provided for in the programs of public agencies. In some states the public assistance agencies made even selective supplementation impossible, by counting such aid as family income and hence deductible from the public assistance grant.

**TRANSIENT SERVICE**

There was a considerable decline during the period 1940-50 in the extent of service to the Jewish transient. The number of Jewish transients served by the Jewish family agencies declined 5.2 per cent during 1950 from what it had been in 1949.

While most Jewish communities discharged their responsibility to the transient through the family agency, it was generally recognized that the operation of a transient program required co-ordinated planning in which all agencies serving transients participated to avoid duplication in service and to make shelter, health care, transportation, and casework service available where necessary.

The transient caseload consisted largely of people who did not readily seek the aid of the family agency; frequently they came to the agency only because they were referred by the community. The decline in volume of this type of social service during the last decade resulted in the elimination of most of the special shelters for Jewish transients which had once been common in Jewish communities. Instead, hotels, lodging houses, private homes, and occasionally public agency facilities were utilized to provide one or two days of transient care.

**Child Care**

The recent falling off in the number of institutions caring for Jewish children and performing placement and adoption services continued during the period under review. This was consistent with the decrease in the number of children handled by most child care agencies, despite the increased number of children in the population. The Jewish Social Work Agencies Directory listed sixty-eight child care agencies for 1951; the majority were not separate children's services but parts of multiple-function agencies. Of fifty-one agencies reporting to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds on their activities during 1950, only twenty-three were separate agencies; the other twenty-eight, being departments of multiple-function organizations, limited themselves largely to foster home care. The majority of the separate children's agencies operated children's institutions, though about half of them also had foster home departments.

**SOURCES OF INCOME**

Like the family agencies, the children's agencies depended increasingly for support upon the local Jewish welfare fund. This is shown in Table 2.
Almost half of all the income for the Jewish children's agencies came from the central fund organizations. However, more than one-third of the total income of the agencies (37.1 per cent) came directly from Jewish welfare funds. Not quite 12 per cent came from community chests, either directly or through the Jewish welfare fund organizations. One-fourth of the total income came from public funds, usually in the form of payments for foster care of children by public welfare departments or other governmental bodies. This occurred usually in the larger communities with a Jewish population of over 40,000. Some cities reported no income whatever from governmental funds.

Since the end of World War II there had been a decline in the number of Jewish children receiving foster care in private homes and in institutions. During 1950 the number cared for further declined by about 10 per cent from 1949. About two-thirds of this decline resulted from the reduction in the number of immigrant children served by the agencies. There was also a net decline in the number of non-immigrant children served, and in both foster home placements and institutional care.

However, the number of Jewish children in the population had been increasing steadily as part of the rise in the general birth rate during and after World War II. The reason why the number of children under care decreased rather than increased is attributable to a number of factors: first, the improved economic conditions in the United States, with accompanying reduction of dependency due to economic causes; second, the current social attitude, which questioned the removal of children from their families, even in cases where the atmosphere in the child's home was unwholesome; the third (and quite important) reason for the decline was the preventive action of the social agencies, both public and private (e.g., the Aid to Dependent Children program).

**REGIONAL SERVICE**

As a result of the decline in the number of children in institutions, there were fewer such agencies, and those in operation had smaller populations. At the same time there was an increasing tendency for the Jewish communities...
to utilize some of the larger Jewish children's institutions to serve larger regional areas. The principal agency in the Jewish field providing such service was the Bellefaire Regional Child Care Service which, in addition to providing foster care and institutional service for Jewish children in Cleveland, had set up an extensive regional program serving about half of the United States. Because of the highly developed facilities for psychiatric, educational, and social treatment at Bellefaire, many Jewish communities, including some with children's institutions of their own, purchased service from Bellefaire for specially selected problem children.

Another instance of this regional activity was the Hawthorne-Cedar Knoll School, operated by the Jewish Board of Guardians of New York, which accepted selected youth with behavior problems from other communities. Other Jewish children's institutions also began to explore the possibility of their providing service to areas outside their own localities. Some foster home service by regional Jewish children's agencies, especially in the South, was similarly provided. Thus, as the decline in numbers of children continued, greater specialization in service was increasing; at the same time many of the smaller communities where the development of special local children's services would not be justified were receiving some help from regional bodies.

**Jewish Vocational Agencies**

During the period July, 1950, through June, 1951, the twenty-five Jewish Vocational Service (JVS) agencies in the United States and Canada saw 65,732 applicants. With increased business and employment activity the number of applicants decreased by approximately 16 per cent and the character of the applicants changed. Although the group as a whole was a cross section of the Jewish communities in America, a significant proportion were vocationally disadvantaged. This included persons who suffered from physical or emotional handicaps, individuals whose skills were not utilizable in the labor market, older workers returning to employment, and young people entering the labor market for the first time.

During the twelve months ending June 30, 1951, the JVS's registered a total of approximately 47,000 new applicants. About 20 per cent of these requested counseling service. The JVS's received 71,187 job openings and made a total of 25,927 placements. Two-thirds of those placed were citizens; one-third were immigrants.

JVS activities in helping the handicapped were characterized by the development of sheltered workshops and vocational adjustment centers designed to speed the vocational development of marginal applicants. In a number of cities special programs were developed to assist the training and re-training of middle-aged and elderly persons returning to the labor market.

During this same period the JVS's reported a total registration of 11,151 immigrants and 8,685 placements. The immigrant load was approximately 24 per cent of the total new registrations and immigrant placements were approximately 33 per cent of the total number of JVS placements. These
figures reflected the priority of service given émigrés and the concentration of efforts on speeding their adjustment to American economic life (see Table 3).

TABLE 3

NEW REGISTRATIONS AND PLACEMENTS OF CITIZENS AND NON-CITIZENS IN TWENTY-FIVE JEWISH VOCATIONAL SERVICES

(July 1, 1950, through June 30, 1951)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
<th>Non-Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Registrations</td>
<td>47,031</td>
<td>35,880</td>
<td>11,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Registrations</td>
<td>10,670</td>
<td>6,580</td>
<td>4,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Registrations</td>
<td>36,361</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>7,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Placements</td>
<td>25,927</td>
<td>17,242</td>
<td>8,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Care of the Aged

The postwar years saw Jewish social service for the aged turn from an almost exclusive reliance upon institutions to an increasing use of non-institutional services. Some family agencies established special departments for the aged, others assigned special personnel to work with the aged. Service being given in family agencies included the social investigation of applications for admission to institutions, casework with the aged in their own homes, boarding and foster care programs, assistance with homemaker service, and aid in the establishment of satisfactory living conditions outside of the institution. Similarly, Jewish community centers were carrying on recreational and cultural activities for the Jewish aged in the centers and in institutions for the aged.

Nevertheless, the Jewish home for the aged remained the costliest means of caring for the Jewish aged in the community and the one which received the most support and attention. The 1950–51 Directory of Jewish Social Work Agencies listed seventy-three Jewish homes for the aged in the United States, with bed capacities ranging from 11 (Portland, Ore.) to almost 1,000 (New York). The services of these institutions varied from the simple provision of food and shelter to carefully planned social and medical programs including housekeeping, medical and nursing service, intramural social work, recreation, occupational therapy, etc.

During 1948–50 homes began to experiment with new programs, in some cases outside the walls of the institution itself. Such programs included "apartment house" projects in which ambulatory residents lived in a building away from the main institution, with individual living arrangements that made it possible for them to lead semi-independent lives while at the same time utilizing the full facilities of the institution. Another type of service being experimented with was "home care" in which the aged person remained in his own home but received nursing and personal help from the staff of the home for the aged. A third type of program was the "out-resident" program in which the ambulatory aged person occupied a room in a private house near the institution but used the services of the home.
SOURCES OF INCOME

Payment for service by residents or their families provided more than half (51.4 per cent) of all the income of the institutions. This included money paid by about 40 per cent of all residents from their receipt of Old Age Assistance.

Thirty-four of the forty-five homes reporting received money from central funds—17.1 per cent of which came from the Jewish welfare funds. Eighteen homes received 4.9 per cent of their funds from community chests.

TABLE 4

SOURCES OF OPERATING RECEIPTS, 45 HOMES FOR AGED, 1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Number Receiving Income from Source</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Funds</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Jewish Welfare Funds</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Community Chests through Jewish Welfare Funds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Community Chests directly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions and Membership Dues</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for Service</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Funds and Grants directly to institutions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments and All Other Sources</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOLUME OF SERVICE

In recent years nearly all of the existing homes had been expanding and several new ones were under construction. While most of the homes had been planning new construction since the end of the war, additional beds became available in substantial amounts for the first time in 1950. The total bed complement in forty-five homes increased 6 per cent during 1949 and another 12 per cent during 1950, the total bed complement thus increasing from 5,383 to 6,420. Even so, the demand for additional beds continued acute; nearly all homes had long waiting lists and the pressure upon both the institutions and other social services of the community for help for the aged was steadily growing.

CO-ORDINATION OF SERVICE

The institutions for the aged, family agencies, community centers, vocational services, and other community agencies co-ordinated their social planning for the aged through the central Jewish organization. In most communities a council or committee on care of the aged, in which all the interested agencies and welfare fund were represented, served as the co-ordinating body. In a few larger communities a central referral and information service was also established. In some communities this service was part of the family agency intake department. In New York City, a separate organization, the Central Bureau for Jewish Aged, served all the other agencies of the community.
The last few years saw considerable improvement in the quality of program and administrative personnel in work for the aged. An example was an institute for administrators of homes for Jewish aged, held in Chicago, August 27-30, 1951, under the joint sponsorship of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) and the Chicago Jewish Federation. At this institute between forty and fifty administrative persons from the Jewish institutions of the United States studied the best practices in management, programming, and community co-operation for homes for the aged.

REGIONAL SERVICE

Every Jewish community had some cases of aged persons in need of community help. The cost of institutional service was high, however, and the minimum size for efficient operation was between forty and fifty beds; hence a large number of communities could not afford to establish separate local institutional facilities for the aged. One solution was regional rather than local institutions for the aged. Some homes, such as the B'nai B'rith Home and Hospital for the Aged in Memphis, were set up as regional operations. Others served the communities of their entire state (for example, Beth Sholom Home in Richmond, serving Virginia; River Garden Home in Jacksonville, serving Florida). The practice of purchasing service from these institutions by other communities has developed rapidly. Plans for the support of the service and participation in the administrative process were being worked out by the institutions and the central Jewish organizations of the communities served.

NATIONAL PLANNING

The problem of care of the aged had become so important that Jewish social service undertook to co-operate with religious groups, federal agencies, and other interested organizations. To that end the CJWFW in October, 1949, joined with other national groups and with governmental agencies in a National Committee on the Aging under the auspices of the National Social Welfare Assembly. This body was studying how to improve employment possibilities for the aged, and how to improve their financial stability and the co-ordination of health and welfare services.

Hospitals

Jewish hospitals were first established in the United States to enable the Jewish patient to conform to Jewish dietary practices and other ritual requirements. In the course of time Jewish hospitals came to serve all members of the community and enabled Jewish medical students discriminated against in many communities to practice medicine. All Jewish hospitals were non-sectarian in admission of patients. In fact, about one-half of all patients served during 1950 in the Jewish hospitals were non-Jewish; the proportion of Jewish patients served varied considerably, from as few as 8 per cent at the Touro Infirmary of New Orleans to nearly 100 per cent in some of the special hospitals.

The great majority of hospitals still provided either a full or modified
kosher diet, though at least ten had no kosher kitchen. In most of the hospitals with kosher kitchens, kosher trays were prepared upon request only, and the percentage of kosher meals so requested was found to be quite small. At least a dozen hospitals, however, especially those with a very high proportion of Jewish patients, served entirely kosher meals.

There was no doubt that Jews regarded hospital and clinic activity as a basic community service. Since World War II there had been a steady expansion of old hospitals and construction of new hospitals. In 1950 there were sixty-three Jewish hospitals in the United States, most of which had out-patient clinics. Six separate clinics were also to be found in the communities. At least thirty-six of the hospitals were general hospitals distributed as follows: New York City, twelve; Philadelphia, three; Chicago, two; and one each in nineteen other cities. Every city in the United States with a Jewish population of 30,000 or over maintained at least one general hospital under Jewish auspices; three hospitals were in small Jewish communities of less than 15,000 Jewish population.

SOURCE OF SUPPORT

The support of the Jewish hospitals came mainly from payment for service. The table below indicates that this amounted to 70.3 per cent during 1950. Of the remainder of the income, 11.3 per cent came from Jewish welfare funds, and 3.5 per cent from community chests. The actual sums of money involved in hospital costs were so great, however, that even these relatively small percentages represented heavy charges upon the community welfare funds, constituting from 20 per cent to 45 per cent of the total local expenditures of several Jewish communities.

TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Support</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Welfare Funds</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Chests</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for Service</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Funds</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions and Membership Dues</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments and All Other</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOCIAL PLANNING

Because the hospital was no longer merely a place in which to cure the very sick, the mutual interests of communities and hospitals involved them in extensive health planning. Practically every large Jewish community had during 1949–50 conducted some sort of a community survey. These surveys attempted to determine communal responsibilities not only with regard to support of hospitals and clinics, but also with regard to other special aspects of the health care of the community.

MORRIS ZELDITCH
YOUTH AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES

In 1951 young people between the ages of fifteen and thirty constituted about 22 per cent of the total population of the American Jewish community (see American Jewish Year Book, 1951 [Vol. 52], p. 5, Table 2). The present activities and future of this group were much discussed during the period under review (July, 1950, through June, 1951) by various Jewish organizations, regardless of whether or not they themselves conducted youth activities.

National Youth Organizations

This article will consider the activities of national Jewish membership organizations and co-ordinating bodies, as well as that of adult youth-serving agencies.

The following information concerning national Jewish youth organizations is based in part on replies received by the author as a result of a questionnaire distributed by the American Jewish Year Book in the fall of 1951, and in part on material to be found in official directories and reference works.

Of sixty-eight national youth organizations listed in the booklet Youth Organizations in the United States published by the Young Adult Council of the National Social Welfare Assembly in June, 1951, sixteen were Jewish, constituting almost 25 per cent of all organizations listed. Local units of these national Jewish youth organizations constituted a significant proportion of all Jewish youth groups, particularly in the smaller Jewish communities.

On the basis of the Year Book study and an estimate of the size of organizations whose memberships were not given, about 80,000 young people were believed to be members of local chapters of national organizations. However, there was much duplication among the memberships of these organizations. This total does not include the young people meeting in Jewish centers and synagogues who belonged to local Jewish groups which were not affiliated with national Jewish youth organizations.

General Trends and Problems

While most of the national youth organizations were sponsored by adult bodies, three reported that they raised their own funds and received no subsidy from their parent body. Of the national organizations reporting comparative membership figures for the period 1949–51, three indicated a rise in membership, seven a loss of members, and one no change. All but one of the Zionist youth groups reported a loss of membership during the period under review. The drop in membership, according to these reports, was between 10 and 15 per cent.

This decline in membership in youth organizations was attributed by the
organizations affected to a variety of causes. These included selective service, the drop in the total number of young people, and the tensions in American society since the close of World War II. The age of those enrolled in youth groups, as reported by B'nai B'rith youth organizations and by the annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference, was also significantly lower.

The Zionist groups, particularly affected by the loss of membership, engaged in self-evaluation and rephrased their statements of purpose. Many stressed the importance of the *halutz* programs, and at the same time attempted to induce their members to participate in the American Jewish community.

Thus, the Intercollegiate Zionist Federation of America at its National Convention, held on June 17-20, 1951, stated: "IZFA recognizes that its most vital task . . . is the obligation to offer to the American Jewish college student the intellectual and emotional equipment which will enable him to consider the possibility of participating personally in the upbuilding of Israel. . . . We must work to maintain and strengthen the link between Israel as the focus of creative Jewish life and the kind of creative American Jewish community which we believe possible and which we shall work to develop and improve."

The same trend was indicated in the statement of the Labor Zionist Habonim at its convention held December 24-28, 1950: "Far from isolating itself from the community, [the *halutz* program] must root itself in it, if [it] is to be carried to a larger number of American Jews."

The point of view of general Zionist youth groups was perhaps best stated by the chairman of the American Zionist Youth Commission at the convention of the ZOA, held in the summer of 1951, when he said: "American Jewish youth has a twin task—to help the youth of Israel with moral support and maximum aid and to participate actively in the upbuilding of the Jewish State on the spot. . . . As for America, we must educate our youth for positive Jewish living. . . ."

Three major problems were listed by almost all the national Jewish youth organizations returning a questionnaire. These were: the lack of adequate volunteer leadership, inadequate financial support, and the apathy on the part of unaffiliated Jewish youth.

**SERVICES AND PROGRAMS**

Although the activities of local chapters differed greatly, the services and national programs of the national Jewish youth organizations were very similar during the year under review. Each of the national organizations published a periodical, as well as one or more items of program material.

Nine of the eleven organizations replying to the Year Book questionnaire indicated that they had conducted camp weekends, conferences, and institutes. Five of the Zionist youth groups reported trips to Israel; of these some were made in co-operation with the Jewish Agency, others were separate tours. All of the Zionist youth groups had *halutziut* as part of their official program. All but one of the non-Zionist youth groups reported some form of national Israel-centered project or activity. Many, however, had rephrased
the formulation of their purposes and objectives to indicate their involvement in Jewish life in the United States.

An interesting new development were the workshops on the history, traditional observance, current significance, and present observance of Jewish festivals. To meet their members' desire for more Jewish knowledge many national Jewish youth organizations and local community groups established study groups, youth lectures, and film forums.

Summer tours and work-study trips to Israel attracted larger number than in previous years from both Zionist and other youth groups. Other activities included youth hosteling, United Nations Day celebration, and programs for servicemen and hospitalized veterans.

In addition to raising funds for their own projects, youth groups participated in the youth divisions of such community welfare campaigns as Jewish welfare funds, United Jewish Appeal (UJA), Community Chest, and the March of Dimes.

In general, the programs of youth organizations attempted to satisfy three major needs: for social and recreational activity, for education, and for service to the community.

ZIONIST ORGANIZATIONS

Over 50 per cent of the young people were enrolled in national Zionist youth organizations.

Junior Hadassah, the Young Women's Zionist Organization of America, had the largest membership of all the Zionist young adult groups, with 12,000 members between 18 and 25 years of age, organized in 200 units in some 40 states throughout the country. It promotes Zionism through educational programs, projects in Israel and the fostering of halutziat.

National Young Judaea provided a co-ed Zionist youth program for 14,000 members between the ages of 10 and 18. The largest Zionist youth group, it had 839 groups throughout the United States. It fostered group activities and worked to develop young Jews “dedicated to giving personal service to the Jewish people in America and Israel.” In addition, Young Judaea maintained a national leaders association.

The Labor Zionist youth organizations in the United States reflected the division in the labor movement in Israel. The largest organization numerically was Habonim Labor Zionist Youth, which had 3,200 co-ed members between the ages of 10 and 23 in 23 cities in the United States and Canada. Affiliated with the Labor Zionist Organization of America-Poale Zion (LZOA), it supported the Mapai party in Israel and conducted a program of education oriented toward “democratic socialism.” While Habonim's main purpose was to train its members for life in Israel as halutzim (pioneers), it also urged them to participate in the American Jewish community. Hashovim consisted of the younger members of the LZOA (in their late twenties and early thirties); it too stressed halutz training.

Hashomer Hatzair, with 3,500 members, reflected the ideology of the left-wing Mapam in Israel, and concentrated on collective colonization in Israel, in the belief “that the Jewish people have no future as a nation in America.” Hechalutz Hatzair was also a completely halutz movement with 700 members.
Brit Trumpeldor of America, Inc. (BETAR) had 1,300 members, who were educated along Revisionist lines.

A cultural Zionist youth group was Hanoar Haivri, the youth branch of the Histadruth Ivrit of America. Its activities consisted of sponsoring Hebrew-speaking circles and preparing publications in Hebrew.

All Zionist youth activities on college campuses were combined in the Intercollegiate Zionist Federation of America (IZFA), which had 2,000 members and chapters on 120 college campuses. IZFA was jointly supported by the Zionist Organization of America, Hadassah, the Labor Zionist Organization of America, and the Mizrachi Organization of America. IZFA had its own halutz movement called Haoleh, which included students interested in the professional and technical vocations as well as in collective agricultural settlements.

Hanoar Hatzioni consisted both of young adults actually preparing to go to Israel (Plugat Aliyah) and of teen-age groups being educated in the halutz ideals. Hanoar Hatzioni was sponsored jointly by the Zionist Organization of America and Hadassah Women’s Organization of America through the American Zionist Halutziat commission, and had over 400 members during the period under review.

RELIGIOUS ZIONIST ORGANIZATIONS

The Noar Mizrachi of America (NOAM) was the youth movement of Mizrachi. It had 2,000 male members between the ages of 11 and 26 in 75 units in 10 states, NOAM was dedicated “to the continued building of Israel as a Jewish State in the spirit of the Torah, and to the strengthening of traditional Judaism in the American Jewish Community.”

Junior Mizrachi Women’s Organization of America, with a membership of 3,000 young women over 18 years of age in 12 states, was the youth group of the Mizrachi Women of America. It sponsored and supported religious children’s homes in Israel.

Hapoel Hamizrachi of America, the major organization of the Orthodox Labor Zionists, had two youth movements—Bnei Akiva of North America and the Bachad Organization of North America.

Bnei Akiva, with which Hashomer Hadati merged in 1950, had a co-ed membership of 2,500. Through leadership seminars, camps, and educational projects, Bnei Akiva attempted “to train and educate young boys and girls to live in Israel according to the ideals of Torah V’Avodah [Religion and Labor].” The Bachad organization was the Orthodox Zionist halutz movement; it maintained two agricultural training farms in the United States for “religious pioneers.”

RELIGIOUS AND SYNAGOGUE GROUPS

While not considered religious Zionist youth groups, the Agudath Israel Youth Council of America, and the National Council of Pirchei Agudath Israel (the junior scout movement) of Agudath Israel of America, Inc., concentrated their activities on Israel and on relief activities, particularly the shipment of food packages.

The National Council of Young Israel had a membership of 8,000 Ortho-
dox young people between the ages of 4 and 20 in 400 clubs and 70 branches associated with synagogues; its program was "to strengthen and develop traditional Judaism in America."

The Young Peoples League (YPL) of the United Synagogue of America was the national organization of young adult groups affiliated with Conservative synagogues in the United States and Canada. Through 130 local affiliates YPL conducted for its 10,000 members "a program of religious, cultural and social activities which will lead to Jewish self-fulfillment and the participation of young people in Jewish community life." Toward the end of the year under review the United Synagogue also started the organization of a teenage youth association and program.

The National Federation of Temple Youth, the national association of youth groups associated with Reform synagogues, was composed of 7,500 members between the ages of 16 and 25, and had 260 local groups in over 35 states throughout the country. It conducted conventions, conclaves, and institutes to develop "knowledge, faith and leadership" among its members. The National Federation was a central clearing house for youth programs in the synagogue.

**YOUTH DIVISIONS OF ADULT GROUPS**

The B'nai B'rith Youth Organization (BBYO) was the largest youth group which was neither Zionist nor religious in orientation. BBYO had a total membership in excess of 23,000 and had 1,075 units in all 48 states of the United States, as well as in Canada, Israel and other countries. The groups included Aleph Zadik Aleph (AZA) for boys between the ages of 14 to 21, B'nai B'rith Girls (BBG) for girls of high school age, and B'nai B'rith Young Men and Young Women (BBYM-YW) for young adults between the ages of 19 and 26.

During the year under review BBYM and BBYW merged into one organization. AZA, the largest of the groups, constituted almost 50 per cent of the 1,075 local units within BBYO. The past year's national program consisted of recreational and educational activities, contributions to a children's home in Israel, and the observance of AZA Sabbath, Brotherhood Week and Civil Rights Month.

The National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) maintained a Junior Division for 600-700 girls between the ages of 18 to 27 and a Councilette Division composed of 1,500-2,000 girls of high school age. Both youth divisions were sponsored by the local sections of the NCJW in local communities. They attempted "to prepare teen-agers and young adults for active participation in local, national and international affairs and for Council leadership." During the period under review they supported a scholarship fund for social work students, sent packages to children in Israel, France, and Morocco, and volunteered for various community services.

While there were young people in the Youth and English Speaking Division of Workmen's Circle, the youth section was the Young Circle League (YCL), which had 650 members between the ages of 14 and 18 in 6 states. The YCL conducted "social, cultural and educational activities within the program of a Jewish labor fraternal organization."
On the pro-Communist left there was the Jewish Young Fraternalists (JYF), which had as its purpose the "aid to and friendship with progressive Jewish youth in Israel and Europe and with democratic youth of the world for peace and democracy." During the year, the JYF claimed to have disassociated itself from its former sponsor, the Jewish People's Fraternal Order of the International Workers Order, Inc.

University Fraternities and Sororities

A large number of Jewish young people in colleges and universities were members of "Jewish fraternities"—so called because their membership was composed predominantly of Jews. The available statistics, as of December 1, 1950, supplied by the fraternities themselves to the publication The Fraternity Month included alumni and undergraduate members. (It was often estimated that undergraduates constituted about 12 per cent of the membership.) The Jewish fraternities listed were: Alpha Epsilon Pi, with 10,000 members; Beta Sigma Rho, 2,550; Kappa Nu, 3,500; Phi Alpha, 5,417; Phi Epsilon Pi, 9,200; Pi Lambda Phi, 10,275; Phi Sigma Delta, 6,656; Sigma Alpha Mu, 10,600; Tau Delta Phi, 5,500; Tau Epsilon Phi, 8,500; and Zeta Beta Tau, 12,543.

The Jewish sororities were: Alpha Epsilon Phi, with 10,021 members; Delta Phi Epsilon, 4,000; Phi Sigma Sigma, 5,252; and Sigma Delta Tau, 5,480.

Although they had no intensive Jewish program, these groups showed some Jewish awareness. For example, Alpha Epsilon Pi presented an annual award to that "undergraduate whose work is considered to be outstanding in the field of Jewish communal and interfaith activities." Phi Epsilon Pi gave an award "to the person making the finest contribution to the essential Jewish life in America" (won by Eddie Cantor on September 7, 1951); Zeta Beta Tau presented annually the Gottheil Medal "for outstanding service to Jewry" (awarded to Jacob Blaustein on May 16, 1951), and also gave an annual contribution to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem; Sigma Alpha Mu had prepared a Friday evening Kiddush service which was available to chapters.

Two apparently contradictory developments took place within these fraternities and sororities during the period under review. On the one hand, as a result of the agitation on college campuses against discriminatory fraternities, many "Jewish fraternities" became officially non-sectarian; on the other hand, there was an increase in Jewish content in those who had not taken that step.

Co-ordinating Agencies

The Directory of Jewish Youth and Young Adult Councils published by the National Jewish Youth Conference in February, 1951, listed 252 local Jewish youth and young adult councils.

Through these youth councils, most of which were organized after 1945, local Jewish youth groups co-ordinated their activities, exchanged information, and conducted such joint activities as conferences, program clinics, Israel Independence Day celebrations, and cultural affairs. Most of the youth coun-
cils initiated youth divisions in welfare fund campaigns and many had representation on the boards of directors of Jewish centers, community councils, and welfare funds.

During the period under review many of the councils published program aids for their constituent groups, conducted Jewish holiday programs, and participated in inter-group programs. According to a *Directory of Youth Newspapers* published by the National Jewish Youth Conference in June, 1951, thirty-three Jewish youth and young adult councils published their own community newspaper. Many local councils, such as those in Newark, St. Louis, Detroit, and Houston published directories of local Jewish youth groups listing their names, addresses, and purposes.

**ZIONIST YOUTH COUNCIL**

In April, 1951, the Zionist youth groups in the United States created the Zionist Youth Council (ZYC), under the sponsorship of the American Zionist Council. Fifteen Zionist youth groups were affiliated with the ZYC.

Succeeding the Young Zionist Actions Committee which had functioned primarily in the area of Zionist political activity, the ZYC had "an enlarged and broader program in fields of common interest to all Zionist youth movements." The ZYC sponsored a reception for the Prime Minister of Israel David Ben Gurion in May, 1951, at which he addressed 450 youth leaders. During the summer of 1951 the ZYC conducted a Zionist Youth Summer Institute, in conjunction with the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

**NATIONAL JEWISH YOUTH CONFERENCE**

Organized in 1948 as "the permanent nation-wide youth body to represent local and regional Jewish youth and young adult councils and national Jewish youth organizations," the National Jewish Youth Conference (NJYC) aimed to help its member councils exchange local experiences, to co-operate with Jewish youth throughout the world and with other ethnic groups, and to provide opportunities for closer relationships with Israel.

An outgrowth of the National Jewish Youth Planning Commission, the NJYC was sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB). At its 1951 convention the conference asked its executive committee to seek "co-sponsorship with other national youth service organizations" and to work toward the setting up of an advisory committee composed of adult national Jewish organizations. The conference also adopted a reciprocal adoption project for new Israel agricultural settlements and published a listing of all youth tours to Israel.

During the summer of 1951 the NJYC adopted a final constitution and developed a policy for social action. Two new services were the establishment of Jewish Youth Lecture Service, and the publication of a directory of non-fee speakers of national Jewish youth organizations.

As a representative of Jewish youth, the NJYC participated in the Young Adult Council, a co-ordinating body of major American youth organizations, and through that body in the meetings of the World Assembly of Youth held in the United States during the summer of 1951 dealing with the theme of "Youth and Human Rights." As a result of its participation in the Mid-
Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, the NJYC published a documentary report giving "a picture of the White House Conference as well as attempting to give a plan for action to help achieve the Conference goals."

The following national organizations were affiliated with the National Jewish Youth Conference as of June 30, 1951: Bnei Akiva of America, Habonim Labor Zionist Youth, Intercollegiate Zionist Federation of America, Jewish Young Fraternalists, Junior Hadassah, Junior Mizrahi Women, National Federation of Temple Youth, National Young Judaea, Noar Mizrachi, and Young Israel.

Youth-Serving Agencies

Not all the youth organizations were officially affiliated with adult bodies. However, most of them received support and services from adult youth-serving agencies.

The major Jewish youth-serving agencies in the local community included Jewish community centers, synagogues and schools. In many communities there were also local Zionist and other youth commissions.

The major responsibility of the Jewish community centers was service to youth. They provided facilities, resources for programming, and trained professional guidance and leadership. During the year under review, according to a report by the JWB, 331 Jewish Centers in 226 communities located in 44 states served 168,000 youth ranging in age from 15 to 25. Their activities consisted of club and inter-club projects, special interest groups, teen-age can-teens, young adult lounge programs, athletics, dances, dramatics, music, films, camping, social action activities, and Jewish cultural events. The centers were open to all Jewish youth, regardless of denominational or ideological interest.

The synagogues and schools assumed as their major responsibility the formal education of Jewish youth. However, many of them also provided facilities and leadership for youth activities. Many of the youth groups meeting in synagogues were affiliates of national synagogue youth groups.

During the year a growing number of large communities, such as the Chicago and Miami Jewish Centers, initiated extension programs, often in cooperation with synagogues. In such instances the synagogue provided the facilities and the center the trained professional leadership. There were usually joint boards which made policy.

The primary concern of the national and other youth commissions was service to the youth groups affiliated with their national movements. Locally, they also provided resources and leadership for these youth groups, often in cooperation with other Jewish youth-service agencies in the community.

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) served as the national association of Jewish community centers and YM-YWHA's. Through a national program, field service, specialized service departments, program consultants, and cultural councils, JWB aided local centers in programming for young people.
It maintained a youth services department, which during 1950 gave direct
guidance and consultation service to 283 agencies in 189 communities on
youth programming, leadership training, and the organization of youth coun-
cils. During 1950, a study entitled, *The Reactions of Jewish Boys to Various
Aspects of Being Jewish*, was completed by the Jewish Center Division of
JWB, jointly with the Commission on Community Interrelations of the
American Jewish Congress. Other projects completed included a survey of
young adults' participation in public affairs and an inquiry on why adoles-
cents came to Jewish centers. These studies were undertaken to provide useful
clues for programming.

Recognizing the importance of improving Jewish education for young
people, the JWB and the American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE)
issued in January, 1951, a joint statement of specific recommendations. The
recommendations, growing out of the "Statement on Common Objectives and
Areas of Co-operation in the Fields of Jewish Education and Jewish Center
Work," were formulated by a joint commission of the JWB and the AAJE,
and adopted by both during the year. The JWB was also meeting with the
Synagogue Council of America to produce a similar statement.

The American Zionist Youth Commission (AZYC) organized in 1940, was
sponsored jointly by the Zionist Organization of America and Hadassah. It
promoted and supported the work of the Zionist youth groups under its aus-
pices—Junior Hadassah, National Young Judaea, and the Intercollegiate Zionist
Federation of America. The AZYC also provided service to non-affiliated
Jewish youth groups. About 25,000 young people were affiliated with and
served by the AZYC. There were also in existence over 200 regional and local
youth commissions. The Commission served as the counselling and resource
bureau for its affiliated organizations and commissions.

The National Chalutzut and Youth Commission of the Labor Zionist
Movement (Chai) gave "counsel and material assistance to the educational
aspects of the movement and its youth segments (Hashavim and Habonim)."
Habonim, the Labor Zionist Organization of America (LZOA), and the Pio-
near Women were members; the Farband Labor Zionist Order joined Chai
in May, 1951.

The B'nai B'rith Youth Commission administered the B'nai B'rith Youth
Organization (BBYO). BBYC also served "on a more casual basis" young
people who did not pay national dues. The BBYC aimed "to help young
people achieve personal growth according to their individual capacities, so
that they may lead personally satisfying and socially useful lives in the Jewish
community and in the larger community of which they are part," through
participation in democratically functioning groups open to all Jewish youth
"under local supervision and policy-making lay committees."

The American Jewish Committee (AJC) also had a Division of Youth Ser-
vices, established in 1945, which co-operated with other youth and youth-
serving agencies in "developing effective democratic programs for young
people." The AJC had no youth membership on a national scale, though in-
dividual chapters had young adult membership.

During the year under review, the AJC Division of Youth Services partici-
pated and worked with the Mid-Century White House Conference on Chil-
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dren and Youth and the Youth Division of the National Social Welfare Assembly, with whom it sponsored a Youth Radio Series, a documentary called Listen to the Children. The Division also worked with individual agencies, such as the Inter-cultural Conference held by the National Girl Scouts, and published such resource materials as Teen-Agers Look at Their Town, a pamphlet which developed a type of community audit for youth.

Another important youth-serving agency was the Youth and Chalutziut Department of the American Section of the Jewish Agency, the executive of the World Zionist Organization. The department was in direct contact with the Youth and Hechalutz Department of the Jewish Agency whose headquarters were in Jerusalem.

The primary function of the Department during the past year was "to stimulate, co-ordinate and service existing Zionist youth groups in the USA, and to stimulate interest in Israel among American Jewish youth in general." It supplied educational material to youth organizations; assisted youth groups in initiating and maintaining scholarship and institute programs; received and cared for "shelihim" ("educational emissaries"), and advised Jerusalem on programs designed to promote Zionism and the halutz movement among American Jewish youth. During the year under review, according to the reports prepared for the twenty-third Zionist Congress at Jerusalem, 38 shelihim arrived in the United States. Nine hakhsharot (training farms), composed of 217 haverim (members) existed in the United States during 1950; after January, 1951, the number decreased considerably. During the summer of 1950, 60 young people participated in a Summer Institute in Israel and 65 were part of a work-study project, both inaugurated by the Youth and Chalutziut Department.

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds serviced youth divisions and councils connected with local Jewish Welfare Funds and Federations in a number of cities: Cleveland, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, and Detroit.

Hillel foundations sought to serve the needs of Jewish youth on college campuses. The foundations were not membership organizations but rather "reach out to the entire Jewish student body as the organized Jewish community on the campus."

Many of the national adult bodies sponsoring youth organizations also invited representatives of these youth bodies to serve on their Boards of Directors and committees.

Youth-serving agencies were employing a growing number of professionally trained workers. For example, the Jewish centers throughout the United States employed 941 trained group workers during the year under review.

SERVICE TO ARMED FORCES

With the outbreak of the Korean war in June, 1950, the responsibility for serving Jews in uniform was resumed by the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), the agency authorized by the United States Government since 1917 to satisfy the religious, welfare, and morale needs of Jewish personnel in the United States Armed Forces, and of hospitalized veterans.
NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

In June, 1951, when JWB began preparations for the High Holy Days it was estimated that in October, 1951, there would be 135,000 Jews in the armed forces of the United States.

From July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, the JWB distributed to Jews in the American armed forces at home and abroad and to hospitalized Jewish veterans 171,700 prayer books, religious articles, and cultural materials, 69,500 pounds of kosher foodstuffs, and 250,000 individual gift items.

During the same period, the number of JWB field workers responsible for organizing and conducting welfare and morale programs for armed forces personnel grew from 18 to 26, while the number of community-wide JWB Armed Services Committees representing most local organizations increased from 149 to 271. These field workers, together with the 5,420 volunteers on the Armed Services Committees, were serving, as of June 30, 1951, at 338 installations, as compared with 259 installations the year before.

In addition to recruiting, endorsing and serving full-time chaplains, the Division of Religious Activities expanded the corps of part-time Jewish chaplains from 180 to 208 and the number of domestic military installations and veterans' hospitals covered from 475 to 515.

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

The Women's Organizations' Division of JWB, comprised of eight women's national organizations, shipped 250,000 comfort items to servicemen at home and abroad and to hospitalized veterans through its 50 "Serve-A" committees which, as of June 30, 1951, served 180 hospitals, 14 camps, and 9 overseas chaplains. More than 3,000 volunteers were mobilized by the division in 117 communities for service at hospitals and military installations.

The eight affiliated women's organizations were: Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America; the National Council of Jewish Women; the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods; the Committee on Girls and Women of JWB's Jewish Center Division; the National Women's League of the United Synagogue; the United Order True Sisters; the Women's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; and the Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress.

As the representative of the American Jewish community on the United Service Organizations (USO), JWB participated in twenty-nine activities during the year under review. These included seven USO-JWB Clubs, fifteen USO-JWB area operations, two USO Clubs which functioned as joint-agency operations, and five JWB area offices.

OTHER AGENCIES

Other agencies devoted part of their efforts to meeting the needs of Jewish military personnel and veterans. The Jewish War Veterans handled veterans' claims and aided widows and dependents of deceased Jewish veterans to secure benefits to which they were entitled by law. The National Committee on Veterans Affairs of B'nai B'rith listed as its major projects: a Serve-a-Hospital

1 See article on Religion, above.
program for disabled veterans in hospitals; finding housing and employment for veterans; entertainment, parties, and other activities for disabled veterans and servicemen; and the development of community programs in behalf of all veterans and their families. The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America organized an Armed Forces Division during the year under review to serve the special needs of Orthodox Jews in uniform. Several other local and national adult and youth agencies granted free membership to Jewish servicemen, as well as sending them literature and packages.

LOCAL ACTIVITIES

In local communities across the nation, activities were conducted for Jewish service personnel and veterans by JWV posts and auxiliaries, Jewish community centers and YM-YWHA's, B'nai B'rith lodges and chapters, Jewish youth and young adult councils, local sections of the National Council of Jewish Women, men's clubs, sisterhoods, synagogues, bureaus of Jewish education, Jewish community councils, federations and welfare funds, and other groups.

Many of these were conducted in co-operation with or under the auspices of one of the community-wide armed services committees or as part of the activities of one of the Serve-a-Hospital, Serve-a-Camp, or Serve-a-Chaplain Committees.

Jewish community centers and synagogues in all areas where the influx of draftees was great made their recreational and cultural facilities available, assisted in recruiting junior hostesses, and performed other services in behalf of the men and women in uniform.

FINANCING OF JEWISH COMMUNAL PROGRAMS

The period under review (July, 1950, through June, 1951) was marked by relative stability in the financing of Jewish communal services in the United States and abroad. The postwar period of Jewish fund raising which had been inaugurated with the first $100,000,000 campaign for the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) in 1946 had reached its peak in 1948, when American Jewry, responding to the needs of Israel for aid in repelling the attacks of the Arab states, contributed the greatest sums in its history. Fund raising began to decrease in 1949 after the conclusion of the war in Israel. This trend continued during the spring of 1950, but the rate at which fund raising results fell off was generally less sharp than in the preceding year. Campaigns conducted in the fall of 1950 yielded only slightly less than had been raised in the year before, and communities conducting welfare fund drives in the spring of 1951 for the UJA and other domestic and overseas causes collected on the average about the same amount as in the spring of 1950.
Factors Affecting Fund Raising

Several factors undoubtedly influenced this trend toward stabilization, although the extent to which each of them accounted for this development cannot be measured with any accuracy. Inflationary economic conditions which developed in the summer of 1950 after the outbreak of war in Korea were of great importance, since high levels of business profits and personal incomes made increased funds available for philanthropic purposes. Jewish contributors may also have been more aware of the need to give generously in order to help Israel absorb the large numbers of Jewish immigrants. When the crisis of the war in Israel had passed, there had been a temporary decline in American Jewish philanthropy in Israel. However, as the economic problems of Israel became more grave and were brought more sharply to the attention of American Jewry, the American public seemed to realize that they would have to continue assistance on a large scale for some time to come. In addition, contributors were apparently responding to the needs of domestic programs and institutions, which were beginning to receive greater emphasis in community campaigns.

The success of philanthropic campaigns in the spring of 1951 was achieved in spite of the fact that the Israel Bond Drive, representing a new form of financing for the state of Israel, was launched during that period. When plans for the bond drive were under discussion in the fall of 1950, many people feared that it would compete with the philanthropic campaigns and serve to reduce philanthropic contributions. Anticipating this, local Jewish federations, welfare funds, and community councils organized philanthropic drives in most cities about a month in advance of the normal schedules for spring campaigns. The slogan, "additional, not substitute dollars" was widely publicized. Indeed, it appeared that the launching of the bond drive had given fund raising in the Jewish community an added impetus. These various factors joined to halt the downward trend in fund raising during 1949 and 1950.

Results of Fund Raising

Local Jewish community campaigns conducted by federations, welfare funds, community councils or less formal structures ("joint appeals") raised approximately $140,500,000 in 1950. Fund-raising results during the preceding decade are indicated by Table 1.

In examining the trends in fund raising, it is more helpful to note the figures for cities other than New York than the total figures, since the New York figures included large sums raised by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies for its building fund during 1945 and 1949. Other cities saw a decline from the peak year of 1948 of 21 per cent in 1949 and 14 per cent in

---

1 In addition, local Jewish agencies received about $10,500,000 from non-sectarian community chests (see below).
1950. The sums raised in 1950 represented a decline of 32 per cent from 1948 but were still nearly triple the amount raised in 1945, the last year before the intensification of postwar fund raising began.

**TABLE 1**

**AMOUNTS RAISED IN LOCAL CENTRAL COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS**

(Estimate in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>$29,304</td>
<td>$11,970</td>
<td>$17,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>71,570</td>
<td>36,630</td>
<td>34,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>132,148</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>87,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>157,362</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>106,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>201,405</td>
<td>65,841</td>
<td>135,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>171,212</td>
<td>64,250</td>
<td>106,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>140,487</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>91,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates used in this and all other tables are those developed by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) on the basis of reports received regularly from the great majority of Jewish fund-raising organizations.*

A variety of national Jewish organizations conducting programs in the United States or sponsoring various activities in Israel and other overseas areas raised, through sources other than welfare funds, about $27,500,000 in 1950 (see Appendix). Together with the funds derived from community campaigns, this indicated a total of about $168,000,000 raised in an organized manner in the Jewish communities in 1950, compared with $201,000,000 in 1949. These totals are not all-inclusive. They represent the largest part of Jewish fund raising as reported by the CJFWF. A great deal of fund raising took place in a less organized manner and on a smaller scale through congregations, membership groups, local educational or welfare institutions, and the like. Such efforts were not subject to any regular reporting system and, therefore, represented an unknown quantity. Similarly, special drives by synagogues, centers, hospitals, etc., for building funds were normally not included in these totals unless their funds were derived from overall central Jewish community campaigns. Taking all of these factors into account, it was probable that the total of Jewish philanthropy of all types was in the vicinity of $200,000,000 in 1950 and $250,000,000 in 1949.

**Distribution of Funds**

Overseas needs, especially in Israel, continued to absorb the major portion of the funds and to represent the chief cause for which donors were solicited. This was a continuation of the pattern which had prevailed in the American Jewish community for the previous decade. Since 1948, however, a variety of other interests were being featured in the centralized fund raising. The distribution of funds showed minor variations in 1950 but conformed in general to the 1949 pattern.

During both years, overseas and refugee needs accounted for almost 80 per cent of the total funds distributed by Jewish federations and welfare funds.
(again excluding New York, because of the special case of the New York Federation building fund). Within the category of overseas and refugee needs, a somewhat smaller percentage was received by the UJA; this was offset by an increase in the costs of the care provided to refugees settling in local Jewish communities in the United States.

**TABLE 2**

**Distribution of Funds Raised in Local Central Community Campaigns**

(Estimates in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount Budgeted</td>
<td>117,257</td>
<td>144,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas and Refugee Needs</td>
<td>77,960</td>
<td>91,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>3,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>4,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>5,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>22,512</td>
<td>22,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Funds</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>16,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The difference between totals budgeted and totals raised represents "shrinkage" allowance for non-payment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, and contingency or other reserves. The figures for 1950 are preliminary, subject to revision when more complete reports are available.

b Figures for New York include the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugees costs in New York City were borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of the UJA nationally. Most overseas and domestic agencies which were normally included in welfare funds conducted their own campaigns in New York. The New York UJA included the following beneficiaries (in addition to the national UJA): the American Jewish Congress, the Joint Defense Appeal and the National Jewish Welfare Board.

"Pre-campaign budgeting" was emphasized by the UJA in 1950 as a means of ensuring a minimum income in the event that there was a further decline in the total raised. The failure to do this in 1949 had led to the UJA's receiving a reduction in allocations which was greater than the proportionate decline in the total funds raised. As a result of pre-campaign budgeting agreements, the elimination of capital fund items from the regular campaigns, and other adjustments, the UJA percentage of the total was about the same in 1950 as the previous year.

National organizations with domestic programs (community relations, national hospitals, cultural agencies, theological seminaries, national service agencies, etc.) were granted almost the same proportions of the total funds in 1950 as in 1949.
On the other hand, local programs (other than refugee care) obtained about the same dollar amounts in both years. Since the total raised was less, this resulted in local programs receiving a higher percentage in 1950. Such programs included Jewish hospitals, centers, Jewish education, community relations activities, and similar services. It should be noted that the above figures reflected only that portion of local services which was financed through the Jewish fund-raising campaigns. Many local Jewish services and institutions derived all or the major portion of their financing from non-sectarian community chests in which Jews participated as individuals together with other individuals in their communities. In 1950 it was estimated that local Jewish institutions and agencies received about $10,500,000 for health and welfare purposes from community chests. Central Jewish campaigns allocated additional monies either to supplement the grants these institutions received from community chests, which were not always adequate to meet their operating needs, or to finance such activities as Jewish education and community relations programs which were considered the specific responsibility of the Jewish community.

BUILDING FUNDS

In addition, funds were raised for new hospitals, community centers, educational institutions, and the like; and for the remodeling or expansion of existing plants. From the end of the 1920’s until the end of World War II building programs had not been feasible because of the depression and war. After the war many cities planned to build in order to meet the needs for renovation and expansion of institutional facilities, and to adjust facilities to the changes in geographical distribution of population. In 1949 many of the communities which had delayed construction because of the urgency of overseas campaigns decided that some projects could no longer be postponed. Seeking to avoid special campaigns for these purposes, some decided to include amounts for building purposes in their annual drives. Usually, this was done on the basis of a three-year plan by which specific sums were allocated from each annual campaign over a three-year period.

By 1950, several cities had concluded that building funds should be separated from their annual drives, since the combined drives did not produce sufficient additional funds and controversy arose over the fact that the UJA received smaller net sums. Some large cities continued to make provisions in their 1950 and 1951 campaigns for building projects, while others undertook special campaigns for these purposes.

Aid to Israel

The Independence Bond Issue of the Government of Israel was launched officially in the United States on May 1, 1951, as a new channel through which financial aid to Israel could flow. A number of questions occupied the Jewish community as a result of this new development.

Since the establishment of the state of Israel in May, 1948, the relationship between governmental and philanthropic financing to meet Israel’s needs for
foreign exchange had been discussed. Although it was obvious that Israel, as a sovereign nation, would have access to financial resources that could not have been commanded by the quasi-governmental Jewish Agency for Palestine, there was no immediate clarification of the respective roles in the expenditure of funds to be played by governmental finance and private philanthropy. The government did, of course, immediately establish its taxing, borrowing, and currency powers in Israel and instituted the controls over foreign exchange which had previously been exercised by the Mandatory government over Palestine. It also negotiated a loan in 1949 from the United States Export-Import Bank and borrowed additional funds, both in Israel and in other countries. In Israel itself there was some division of responsibilities in function between the government and the voluntary agencies. The Jewish Agency for Palestine, which had formerly exercised functions analogous to those of a sovereign state, received the status of a voluntary organization representing the World Zionist Organization. The most obvious change was that the government assumed all responsibility for military security, so that after August, 1948, no philanthropic funds were used for that purpose.

In the economic, welfare, and cultural fields, distinctions in function and responsibility were less clearly drawn, and were still not definitive as of the time of writing. Whatever changes did occur were based primarily on financial exigencies. Thus, the Jewish Agency, theoretically charged with responsibility for the care, maintenance, and settlement of immigrants, found itself by 1949 unable to fulfill all of the tasks involved in that responsibility. The government at first made some subsidies and arranged for loans to the Agency; then it began to take over directly some aspects of immigrant absorption—notably housing and unemployment relief through public works projects. On the other hand, the Jewish Agency continued to be active in agricultural colonization, aiding the older agricultural settlements as well as the new immigrants.

The four-point program of aid to Israel which was presented to the American Jewish community in October, 1950, originated with the announcement by David Ben Gurion, prime minister of the state of Israel, of a program to receive and absorb at least 600,000 new immigrants during a three-year period, and to develop the Israel economy for that purpose. This program, he estimated, would require $1,500,000,000 during the next three years. Of this sum, Israel would undertake to supply a total of $500,000,000 leaving $1,000,000,000 to be raised abroad, principally in the United States.

At Ben Gurion's invitation, fifty American Jews, representing American fund-raising and Zionist organizations, met with the officials of the government and of major Israel philanthropic agencies in Jerusalem in September, 1950. Accepting the statement of Israel's needs, the American representatives discussed primarily the methods to be used in raising the funds, and especially the proposal of floating a bond issue in the United States, which the Israeli cabinet was then considering. Some reservations were expressed as to the potential success of a bond issue, and as to the losses which might be incurred in philanthropic contributions because of competition between bond
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1 See articles on Overseas Programs in American Jewish Year Book, 1950 (Vol. 51) and 1951 (Vol. 52).
and philanthropic campaigns. These reservations were, however, set aside in view of the magnitude of the financial requirements presented and the obvious impossibility of raising those sums through philanthropic contributions. The conference concluded with a unanimous resolution to call upon American Jewry to provide Israel with $1,000,000,000 during the three-year period from 1952-54 through: 1. an enlarged and strengthened UJA; 2. intensive efforts to secure private investments; and 3. purchase of state of Israel bonds, should the government decide to float such bonds in the United States. A fourth point, calling for efforts to secure grants-in-aid to Israel from the United States government was added later, in October, 1950, when a large conference of delegates or observers from virtually every important Jewish organization in the United States met in Washington, D.C., and ratified the four-point program.

At the Washington conference there was no definition of the precise amounts to be raised through each of these four channels, and little discussion of the specific projects to be covered by each of the different methods of financing. The discussion centered on the magnitude of Israel's total needs and on ways and means of raising the funds. Consideration was also given to the possible impact of bond sales on philanthropic giving and to the question of whether greater unification in philanthropic fund raising for Israel should be established. Some groups, especially those representing local federations and welfare funds, stressed the need to differentiate carefully between the uses to be made of investment and philanthropic funds; they also emphasized the importance of maintaining the priority of philanthropic contributions, so that Israel would not lose its precious resources of free foreign exchange, which incurred no obligation of repayment. The priority of philanthropic contributions was adopted by the conference without dissent as was the principle that the four types of financial support for Israel should complement and supplement rather than substitute for one another.

Israel Bond Drive

Reinforced by this indication of support from American Jewry, the government of Israel floated an Independence Bond Issue in the United States for $500,000,000. The American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel (AFDCI) was incorporated in the State of New York in December, 1950, to promote the sale of these bonds. The leading officers of the United Jewish Appeal—Henry J. Morgenthau, Jr. and Henry Montor, resigned their posts in the UJA as of December 31, 1950, and became respectively, Chairman and Vice-President of the AFDCI. The nucleus of the AFDCI Board of Governors included Jewish community leaders who had been prominent in fund-raising activities for the UJA.

The period between October, 1950 and May 1, 1951, when the bond drive was launched publicly, was used by the sponsors of the bond drive to prepare the prospectus, register with the Securities Exchange Commission and the forty-eight states, and build an organization. The organization and the campaign techniques adopted by the AFDCI closely resembled those of Jew-
ish philanthropic campaigns. Jewish volunteer committees in each city or region were staffed by professional campaign managers. The methods of individual solicitation and small group meetings were employed. Even the technique of soliciting and publicizing large advance pledges was adapted to the sale of bonds. Mass organizations were enlisted in drives to promote bond sales among their memberships. Although the sponsors of the bond drive emphasized its investment aspects, they introduced in their sales promotion the theme of the one responsibility of world Jewry for the absorption of immigrants to Israel. The major discernible difference in organization between the UJA and the bond campaign was that the UJA obtained its funds through Jewish federation and welfare fund campaigns in which it was included together with other overseas, domestic, and local causes; whereas the bond campaign set up its own local organizations. Many of the federations and welfare funds took the position early in the development of the bond program that they could not, within their charters as philanthropic agencies, sponsor an investment program, although they would be prepared to offer the bond campaign full co-operation. In some of the smaller communities, co-operation was almost equivalent to unofficial sponsorship of the bond drive.

In line with the decision of all parties that the levels of philanthropic aid to Israel must be maintained, emphasis was placed on the early organization of the 1951 UJA and on the completion of 1951 community spring campaigns prior to the launching of the bond issue, scheduled for May 1, 1951. This was done through local co-ordinating committees, in which all representative groups of a Jewish community participated to plan jointly. Generally, communities undertook organized activities for the sale of bonds only after the success of the local federation and welfare fund drives had been assured.

At this writing (September, 1951) it was difficult to assess the success of the bond drive and of the four-point program as a whole. As had already been noted, the levels of philanthropic giving were maintained, although the success of the 1951 fall campaigns was not yet assured. Because of arrangements governing the distribution of UJA funds, Israel was expected to receive a larger income from philanthropy in 1951 than it had in 1950. In addition, Israel seemed likely to receive a total of about $85,000,000 in the form of a grant-in-aid from bills pending in Congress for military and economic aid to friendly foreign countries.3

Efforts were being made in the field of private investment, largely on an individual profit rather than organized community basis.4

The results in cash of the bond issue itself, as of September, 1951, were $33,000,000, as announced officially by the AFDCI. Sponsors of the bond drive hailed this accomplishment as representing a considerable success in view of the short period in which the bonds had been offered to the public. There was, however, some uncertainty as to whether the volume of sales could be maintained and increased.

1 See p. 183 for a summary of U. S. aid to Israel.
2 For a description of American private investment in Israel, see p. 179.
TRANSFERABILITY OF BONDS

The question of the transferability of bonds for the payment of philanthropic contributions was probably the most difficult that arose during the initial period of the bond drive. According to the terms of the bond issue, with some exceptions, bonds could not be transferred for a period of three years, and were convertible only in Israel pounds to be used in Israel. This was a unique restriction for an investment program, and an adverse feature from the point of view of marketability. One of the few avenues of escape from the non-transferability clause was the provision that bonds could be transferred to tax-exempt agencies. This provision, together with the provision for convertibility into Israel currency, opened the door for widespread use of the bonds for contributions to philanthropic organizations working in Israel. The AFDCI sought to establish a limitation on this provision by stating that it would redeem bonds transferred to philanthropic organizations to the extent of 25 per cent in one year of the total value of bonds purchased by any given subscriber.

This provision caused concern to the UJA and to many local federations and welfare funds, as well as to other philanthropic agencies raising funds for Israel in the United States on the grounds that it created confusion between investment and philanthropy and in the event that transferability were widely used might make it difficult for some of the agencies to finance those programs which required dollar expenditures. This difficulty was discussed with Israel governmental officials while they were in the United States in May and June of 1951, but no solution was arrived at. It was decided to re-examine the subject of transferability at a later date, after additional experience would have demonstrated the extent to which bonds were actually being used for the payment of philanthropic pledges.

United Jewish Appeal

The UJA continued in 1951 as in previous years to provide the major channel for American Jewish philanthropic aid to Israel and to Jewish refugees in other overseas areas and in the United States. The UJA, which was reconstituted yearly by agreement between the United Palestine Appeal (UPA) and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) accelerated the organization of its 1951 campaign, in line with the general policy of assuring priority to philanthropic contributions before bond sale campaigns would be organized. The agreement between the constituents of the UJA was arrived at without difficulty and conformed, in general, with the agreement of the previous year. One major change was the transfer of responsibility for the transportation of immigrants to Israel from the JDC, which had performed that function throughout the postwar period, to the Jewish Agency for Palestine, financed by the UPA. During the last quarter of 1950, the JDC had found itself without funds to finance the transportation of immigrants to Israel, and had made supplementary appeals in a number of cities in order to meet that need. The JDC argued that it was illogical to
handle the transportation of immigrants to Israel apart from the rest of the program of immigrant absorption and prevailed upon the UPA agencies to finance transportation out of their share of the 1951 UJA funds.

The UJA agreement for 1951 provided that, after allocations to United Service for New Americans (USNA) and the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), for care of refugees in the United States, 67 per cent of the first $55,000,000, and 87.5 per cent of all additional amounts were to be allocated to the UPA. In 1950, the provision had been that the UPA would receive 60 per cent of the first $50,000,000 net and 70 per cent of the next $25,000,000. The 1950 UJA campaign raised an estimated $88,000,000, resulting in the following allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USNA</td>
<td>$2,222,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYANA</td>
<td>9,656,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDC (estimated)</td>
<td>26,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA (estimated)</td>
<td>45,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UPA thus received about 63 per cent of the JDC-UPA total in the 1950 campaign. With the same UJA income UPA would receive 73 per cent in 1951. Part of this increase in funds for the financing of Israel programs was offset through the assumption by UPA of transportation costs for immigrants. On the other hand, the JDC assumed full financial responsibility for the Malben program for the care of “hard core” immigrants in Israel in 1951. Israel would also gain from anticipated reductions in the cost of the refugee assistance program in the United States. It was expected that the combined expenditures of USNA and NYANA would total about $6,500,000 in 1951, compared with almost $12,000,000 in 1950.

As in previous UJA agreements, income of the Jewish National Fund (a constituent of the UPA) from “traditional collections,” over a ceiling of $1,800,000 plus expenses not exceeding $300,000, was to be credited to the UJA.

**Co-ordination of Campaigns for Israel**

In 1950, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, supported by an official act of the government of Israel, had established its authority to determine which organizations would be permitted to conduct campaigns in the United States on behalf of Israel. The Agency’s Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns was continued in 1951, and renewed its authorizations to ten organizations. The Jewish Agency also renewed, in 1951, its allocations to the Mizrachi Palestine Fund, the General Zionist Constructive Fund, the Agudath Israel and Poale Agudath Israel, on the basis of agreements providing that these groups would not conduct fund-raising campaigns in the United States. A similar agreement with the Revisionist Tel Hai Fund was still pending.
The controls exercised by the Jewish Agency were limited to fund-raising matters and did not extend to questions of budget and program. The CJFWF continued to sponsor proposals which it had been advancing for the past two years for greater planning in the use of philanthropic funds contributed by American Jewry to Israel. It proposed formally to the Jewish Agency in November, 1950, that there be established a central Israel budget, whereby a central authority in Israel would determine the distribution of all American philanthropic contributions in relation to a system of priorities based on Israel's most urgent needs. This proposal was based on the economic analyses of the CJFWF Institute on Overseas Studies, which stressed the urgency of Israel's economic problems and strongly suggested such modifications in the programs of the philanthropic agencies that would contribute to solving the economic problems of Israel and its recent immigrants.

Closely related to the concept of a central budget, upon which the CJFWF laid its major emphasis, was the proposal for greater unification in fund raising for Israel, either through a central Israel fund or through some modified form of a central fund which might allow for certain limited types of separate fund raising. The CJFWF maintained that greater unification would help to concentrate the full resources of the community on the central campaigns, increase the totals raised, and thus make more funds available for Israel. The Jewish Agency differed with the proposal for more unified fund raising, as did a section of the community fund-raising leadership itself. They argued that a limited number of special campaigns for Israel, conducted by agencies such as Hadassah and the National Committee for Labor Israel (Histadruth), tapped sources which would not be available to the welfare funds, and added to the total raised for Israel.

There was greater unanimity among community leadership on the desirability of planning the use of philanthropic funds. The Jewish Agency, while not accepting the specific proposal of a central Israel budget, did undertake to provide the American community with a more comprehensive picture of the total needs of Israel, indicating the priorities among various projects which were seeking support. The Agency found itself unable to develop such a program in time for the 1951 campaign, but indicated that an attempt to do so would be made the following year.

JEWISH AGENCY

The Jewish Agency for Palestine continued to concentrate during 1950-51 as it had during the previous year, on two major activities: 1. the initial care and maintenance of immigrants; and 2. agricultural colonization. These two programs accounted for over 90 per cent of Agency expenditures during both years.

Faced in the summer of 1950 with a population of 90,000 immigrants in reception and transit camps, the Agency drastically revised its method of handling immigrant maintenance by instituting work camps throughout Israel. These camps, known as maabarot, provided temporary housing and the immigrants were placed almost immediately upon their own resources, either to find employment themselves or to work on governmental public works projects. Thus, maintenance costs to the Jewish Agency were reduced
and long periods of idleness were avoided. The population in reception camps had been reduced to 30,000 by March, 1951, but then began to rise again, due to the continued pressure of large-scale immigration.

JNF

The Jewish National Fund (JNF) assumed increasing responsibility for activities related to colonization, supplementing the efforts of the Agency in that field. The JNF also continued its traditional functions of land purchase, afforestation and land improvement which accounted for about 30 per cent of its total expenditures.

JDC

Appropriations for the JDC program in 1950 continued to decline, as they had in 1948 and 1949, totaling $36,965,627 in 1950 compared with $54,740,118 in 1949. During the first eight months of 1951, JDC appropriations were $16,419,405, against an estimated budget of $22,350,000 for the full year. JDC continued to expand its Malben program in Israel, for which it assumed full financial responsibility in 1951 (previously, the Jewish Agency had shared in the cost). Malben was to cost $8,000,000 in 1951, compared with an initial expenditure of $7,500,000, shared by the JDC and the Agency during the first fifteen months of operations.

In Western Europe, JDC continued its policy of gradually withdrawing its own support and stimulating the local populations to maintain their native institutions, and also to assume at least partial responsibility for Jewish refugees within their borders.

In Eastern Europe, JDC operated only in Hungary. Although the JDC program in Hungary was reduced from that of previous years, Hungary continued to account for about $4,000,000 of JDC appropriations during 1950.

Emigration programs accounted for $15,000,000 of JDC appropriations in 1950, but were expected to be reduced to about $1,250,000, because of the transfer to the Jewish Agency of responsibility for financing immigration to Israel.

Other Israel Campaigns

As Table 1 of the Appendix indicates, reports available for overseas agencies other than the UJA showed total income of over $17,000,000 in 1950. Programs on behalf of Israel accounted for about $15,000,000 of this total, which does not include many minor fund-raising efforts for which reports are unavailable. The decline in fund-raising levels which prevailed in welfare fund campaigns and consequently in the UJA was also evident in the individual collections of other overseas agencies.

A campaign for a Hadassah Medical Center in Jerusalem was the only new project of major proportions undertaken in the field of fund raising for Israel during the period under review. This project, announced at the Hadassah convention in August, 1950, was designed both to provide the new Medical School with hospital facilities (replacing the Hadassah Hospital on
Mt. Scopus) and to help meet the medical needs of Jerusalem's growing population. It was to involve a total cost of $5,500,000, providing a 450-bed hospital and a Nurses' Training School. With $2,000,000 already available through previous collections, Hadassah was seeking $3,500,000 in additional contributions, to be raised by its chapters during the next three years. Simultaneously, Hadassah was continuing its regular collections for the operating needs of its medical program in Israel, for contributions to the Youth Aliyah department of the Jewish Agency, for JNF, for other child welfare and youth services in Israel, and for its membership activities in the United States.

**European Programs**

Relief operations in Europe had declined consistently since 1948, due to the mass emigration of displaced Jews, improved conditions in Western Europe, and the closing of Eastern European countries to Western contacts. During the period under review there was further contraction of overseas work by the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) and other groups (Jewish Labor Committee, Labor Zionist Committee, National Council of Jewish Women, etc.), as well as by the JDC. Simultaneously, however, these organizations were expanding their activities in Israel. The World ORT Union, financed in the United States through a JDC grant to the American ORT Federation in lieu of a separate campaign, continued to expand its program of vocational education in Israel. HIAS, after months of negotiation, obtained the agreement of the Jewish Agency to an expanded HIAS project of shelter care for immigrants, involving an estimated contribution of about $600,000 during the twelve-month period from May, 1951, to May, 1952. It was understood, however, that HIAS, having reserve funds available with which to meet this cost, would not conduct campaigns or seek welfare fund allocations for that purpose.

**Domestic Programs**

Reports available from fifty organizations and institutions concerned with various types of Jewish domestic programs of community relations, health and welfare, cultural, religious and educational activities, etc., indicated a total income of $20,600,000 in 1950, compared with $21,000,000 in 1949. This heterogeneous group of agencies thus received about the same level of support from the Jewish community in both years. An examination of Table 2 in the Appendix will indicate, however, that there were significant variations among groups of agencies and between individual institutions within a given field of activity. There was some decline, for example, in the funds available for community relations activities and for secular cultural agencies. On the
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1 The American ORT Federation and the Women's American ORT maintained membership programs in the United States.

2 Organizations reporting both years had total income of $20,636,000 in 1950, compared with $20,417,000 in 1949.
other hand, there were increases in the sums obtained by religious institutions and by national hospital programs.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Among national domestic services, the field of community relations accounted for the largest share of central community funds. Although more was spent on religious institutions, the latter were financed primarily from congregational sources and not through the community-wide fund-raising structure. Within federations and welfare funds, community relations agencies were the largest national beneficiaries, second only to the UJA.

Programs in this field had undergone great expansion during the past decade, their combined annual budgets increasing about six-fold between 1940 and the peak year of 1948. Since that time, their income had declined, as part of the over-all decrease in community fund raising—but the rate of decline was less severe for community relations agencies than for welfare fund collections as a whole.

The Joint Defense Appeal (JDA), the fund-raising arm of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, campaigned vigorously for a larger share of the funds raised in community campaigns, intimating that it might find it necessary to withdraw from welfare funds and to conduct its own campaigns if an "equitable" distribution of funds were not made. In Boston and Chicago, the JDA obtained permission from the welfare funds to conduct supplementary appeals in 1950 under its own auspices, after the completion of the welfare fund drives. In Chicago the JDA withdrew entirely from the Welfare Fund in 1951. It had been part of the fund for a three-year period from 1948 through 1950. Similarly, the JDA and the New York UJA (which had included the JDA since 1947) failed to reach an agreement, with the result that the JDA conducted its own campaign in the Greater New York area during 1951. The JDA had sought a guarantee of $2,000,000, whereas the New York UJA was prepared to offer 7 per cent of the total net receipts, without guaranteeing a specific sum. The 7 per cent formula had prevailed in 1950, resulting in $1,750,000 for the JDA.

In this field fund-raising problems were closely related to unresolved questions of program planning, and inter-agency co-ordination. For many years, disagreements had existed concerning the validity and effectiveness of the distribution of functions, activities, and finances among Jewish community relations agencies; and, beyond that, concerning some of the premises on which the programs themselves were based. These were some of the problems submitted to study by the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), with the participation of all its affiliated agencies—national and local—and the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC). The study had been proposed by the LCBC in June, 1949, as a means of evaluating existing programs and inter-organizational relationships. The proposal was ultimately adopted by the NCRAC and Robert M. MacIver, Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Columbia University, was selected in June, 1950, to

7 The LCBC was an informal body, made up of officers of Jewish welfare funds in twelve large cities outside New York. It met from time to time for joint discussion with representatives of national agencies which were beneficiaries of local welfare funds, and for joint consideration of fund-raising and budgeting problems.
make an initial survey. Almost a year later (May, 1951), he submitted his findings and recommendations to the NCRAC Committee on Evaluative Studies, which had been responsible for the project, which had been financed by the welfare funds affiliated with the LCBC. Professor Maclver’s report quickly became a focus of sharp controversy, and widespread community discussion was developing around the report and the issues it raised.⁸

In addition to the community relations agencies, the LCBC gave intensive consideration to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA), an international news service which had received allocations from most welfare funds. The JTA, after a period of internal conflict due to differences of opinion on questions of structure and finances, underwent reorganization during 1949 and 1950. The reorganization involved changes in board membership and a separation of the American JTA from its overseas offices, from the Overseas News Agency (ONA) and from other former affiliates. The LCBC, finding itself unable to clarify and evaluate these structural and financial arrangements, recommended that its affiliated welfare funds treat the JTA on the basis of purchasing its service, rather than granting it philanthropic allocations as a communal agency. The JTA continued to appeal to welfare funds for communal support, maintaining that its reorganized setup qualified it for such consideration. Community practice varied, with a considerable number of welfare funds following the LCBC recommendation while many others continued to finance the JTA as formerly.

NATIONAL HOSPITALS

Unlike local Jewish hospitals, which, for the most part, were included in local federation financing and planning, national Jewish health institutions derived the bulk of their support from their respective constituencies in the form of individual contributions, reached through independent national campaigns. Some of the major tuberculosis institutions were established prior to the turn of the century, and had never been integrated with the local health and welfare planning that developed later. Welfare funds contributed less than 10 per cent of the total income of the national hospitals.

As a group, the national health institutions were able, in 1950, to maintain their level of financing and to increase it slightly. Some budgets were growing because of expansion of facilities and development of new programs. The largest institutions—the National Jewish Hospital of Denver and the City of Hope of Los Angeles—had been engaged since the end of World War II in special building fund drives to remodel outmoded facilities or to build new ones. Reserves which they had accumulated before that time were used for these building projects, and supplementary sums raised. The National Jewish Hospital, seeking to double its bed capacity, had committed about $2,100,000 for that purpose since 1945; the City of Hope was developing a national medical center to treat all diseases and initiated a cancer program in the spring of 1951. This institution expended $3,600,000 for capital purposes between 1946 and the end of 1950.

This expansion of capital plant, which had its parallel in some of the

⁸ Since this article covers the period ending June 30, 1951, it has not been possible to include a summary of the discussion and controversy surrounding the Maclver Report.
smaller institutions, increased substantially the annual operating costs which would have to be met in the future. By 1950, institutions which had operated for years with annual surpluses were incurring operating deficits, because of their inability to raise funds commensurate with the growing operating budgets.

**EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS**

The bulk of financial support for educational, cultural and religious institutions was obtained from individuals and groups (including congregations) sympathetic to the philosophies and cultural objectives of those institutions. Such funds were raised through independent campaigns rather than through community-wide welfare fund drives. In many cities, however, and especially in the smaller ones, where Jewish organization tended to be more completely centralized, the welfare funds did contribute to theological seminaries and a variety of secular educational and cultural projects.

The income of religious institutions on which comparable reports were available grew from about $6,000,000 in 1949 to $6,600,000 in 1950. In addition to this increase in operating budgets, major programs of expansion, including capital expenditures, were at various stages of development. The three largest theological seminaries—the Hebrew Union College, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, and Yeshiva University—continued the building fund campaigns which they had initiated soon after the end of World War II. All these programs emphasized training in fields other than the rabbinate—e.g., education, community administration, etc. Yeshiva University continued its efforts to evolve a full non-sectarian university, embracing all fields of learning, both Jewish and non-Jewish. In the spring of 1951, this program was given added impetus by the receipt of a charter from the New York State Board of Regents for a Yeshiva University Medical School. Yeshiva University thereupon announced that it would seek $25,000,000 for this project, and began to appeal to the Jewish community, including welfare funds, for support on its behalf.

At the end of 1950, the group of religious institutions listed in Table 2 of the Appendix reported total reserves of about $8,000,000, and a total plant value of about $8,750,000. This capital was far short of the postwar goals which the institutions had set to finance the expansion of their facilities and programs (e.g., $7,500,000 for Yeshiva University, excluding the medical school; $12,000,000 for the Hebrew Union College; and $10,000,000 for the Jewish Theological Seminary of America).

Brandeis University was the only project under secular auspices whose program was comparable in magnitude to those of the theological institutions. In the fall of 1950, Brandeis enrolled its third freshman class, thus continuing the gradual building of an undergraduate college of liberal arts and sciences, to be followed eventually by graduate schools. Brandeis intensified its fund-raising efforts for both operating and building needs, and continued to rely during this initial phase of its development on direct solicitation of individuals rather than on community welfare funds. In addition to seeking large individual gifts, Brandeis organized local chapters of associates and friends. On a somewhat less ambitious scale, the Chicago Medical School also
pursued its efforts to reach Jewish contributors and Jewish welfare funds for the financing of its non-sectarian program of medical education. The Chicago Medical School, although having a large proportion of Jewish students, was organized as a non-sectarian institution, both in sponsorship and financing. Brandeis, on the other hand, held to the concept of a Jewish-financed non-sectarian University.9

Programs of Jewish research, Jewish education, youth activities, and the like, under secular auspices were maintained at approximately the same level in 1950 as in the previous year. Except for Jewish education, there was no indication of any heightened interest in these programs, nor of any significant drive toward expansion similar to that which was taking place in the theological seminaries or in the Jewish sponsorship of non-sectarian educational projects. Expenditures for Jewish education in local communities rose modestly, continuing a trend evident for the past few years, and reflecting the growing responsibility being assumed by federations and welfare funds for the planning and financing of Jewish education in their communities. Nationally, the American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE) sought to develop its program. It organized a large national conference in January, 1951, in which all the major national Jewish organizations participated. The AAJE also sought and obtained the endorsement of the LCBC for a plan of gradual budgetary expansion, to allow it to increase its services by 1953 to a level of operations costing $250,000 compared with expenditures of $120,000 in 1950.

In the financing of youth activities there was little change, except for some readjustment in the budget of the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), reflecting the impact of the country's defense mobilization. After the outbreak of the Korean war, the JWB was called upon to resume some of its armed services programs, which had been undergoing liquidation during the postwar period. In 1950, JWB spent $473,254 for armed services program, compared with $315,252 in 1949. Since the organization's total income did not increase, these additional requirements were met partly through borrowings from the Jewish Welfare Trust Fund (which had been set up after World War I, and which had assets of $721,820 at the beginning of 1950), and partly by cut-backs in the services provided by JWB to Jewish community centers. The Center Division spent $626,470 in 1950, compared with $704,933 the previous year.

In addition to its special program for Jewish personnel of the armed forces, JWB participated in the United Service Organization (USO), which had been deactivated on January 31, 1950, and resumed operations on January 1, 1951, in response to the new emergency. As a member agency of the USO, JWB undertook a number of non-sectarian projects with USO financing.10

Several projects were terminated or curtailed due, at least in part, to their inability to mobilize interest and financial support. The Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service suspended its active operations in April, 1951, after three years of functioning. It had been a joint venture by national
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9 See also p. 92.
10 See also p. 208
organizations and local communities to provide post-graduate training in administration and community organization. Although activities were suspended, its board of directors continued in existence in order to explore alternative plans of training for Jewish communal service, recognizing the continuing need for such a program. The Jewish Occupational Council, concerned with research and service to local agencies in the field of vocational training and adjustment, underwent drastic reorganization and was continuing for the present as a part-time operation on a nominal budget. Similarly, an effort on the part of several agencies to establish a joint Office for Jewish Population Research failed to materialize, but some guidance was being given by the CJFWF to those of its member agencies who were interested in conducting local population surveys. Some activity in this area was also maintained by the JWB.

The Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO), through action of its board of directors, went on record in favor of a unification of Jewish research activities, as a way of concentrating resources and expanding activities in this field. There was, as yet, however, no concrete plan for such a program nor any organized effort to stimulate greater financial support.

Zionist-Welfare Fund Controversy

In the fall of 1950, a number of vigorous attacks were made by some Zionist journalists and organizational leaders against the communal fund-raising organizations, their executive directors, and lay leaders. These attacks were directed in part against the economic analyses produced by the CJFWF Institute on Overseas Studies which tended to be critical of the policies and programs of organizations raising funds for Israel and called for greater co-ordination and efficiency in the expenditure of those funds. A brief controversy also arose over a plan developed by the CJFWF for a community-sponsored national campaign service which might be set up at such time as the UJA might no longer be in a position to organize national campaigns. This plan was attacked as a harbinger of a drive by federations and welfare funds for domination and control over Jewish life; the key and professional leadership of welfare funds were accused of being assimilationist and anti-Zionist in outlook, undemocratic, and lacking in Jewish background and conviction. The controversy ended, at least for the moment, when the opposition accepted the assurance of the CJFWF at its General Assembly in Washington, D. C. December 1–3, 1950, that the plan was not meant for implementation and even if it were to be adopted by some future General Assembly, it would not call for the raising and distribution of funds by one overall national organization, but simply for a series of campaign aids and services to be provided to each welfare fund by a national agency representing all of them.

Despite theoretical differences over the nature of Jewish communal organization in America, practical conditions favored the continued co-operation among Zionists and non-Zionists in the unified fund-raising machinery of the UJA nationally and the welfare funds locally. Both the Government of Israel and leaders of the Jewish Agency for Palestine reiterated their desire to maintain the unified structures which had functioned for more than a decade and had been responsible for the mobilization of huge sums for Israel.

Arnold Gurin
## APPENDIX

### RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES

#### TABLE 1

Receipts of National Jewish Agencies for Overseas Programs from Federations and Welfare Funds and Other Sources 1950 and 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal...</td>
<td>$88,000,000</td>
<td>$103,000,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Israel Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Com. for Weizmann Inst. of Science</td>
<td>312,868a</td>
<td>303,108</td>
<td>341,266d</td>
<td>452,122d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of Hebrew University</td>
<td>405,082a</td>
<td>468,908b</td>
<td>97,102b</td>
<td>29,828b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society</td>
<td>70,015a</td>
<td>36,021</td>
<td>168,134</td>
<td>188,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institutions</td>
<td>329,147</td>
<td>372,531</td>
<td>621,398</td>
<td>374,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Council of Israel Institutions</td>
<td>137,743</td>
<td>191,727</td>
<td>27,860</td>
<td>44,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah</td>
<td>NRk</td>
<td>NRk</td>
<td>6,502,848g</td>
<td>6,764,780m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Hadassah</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>64,238</td>
<td>79,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel</td>
<td>535,629</td>
<td>581,365</td>
<td>2,064,807</td>
<td>2,633,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Women</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>997,804</td>
<td>940,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>571,308</td>
<td>614,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,790,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,953,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,456,765</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,121,770</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society</td>
<td>$555,844</td>
<td>$687,528</td>
<td>$864,529</td>
<td>$1,005,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women</td>
<td>33,000w</td>
<td>41,705</td>
<td>345,150</td>
<td>374,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$588,844</strong></td>
<td><strong>$729,233</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,209,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,379,412</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERSEAS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$90,379,328</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,682,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,666,444</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,501,182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE I

a Estimated pledges. The estimate of $105,000,000 for 1949, as reported in the 1951 American Jewish Year Book has been revised to $103,000,000 on the basis of later and more complete information.

b Beginning January 1, 1950, the American Committee for the Hebrew University, the Weizmann Institute of Science and the Technion College in Israel, Inc. (U.I.T.) have conducted a joint campaign on behalf of its three constituent organizations. Since a full accounting of income chargeable to the U.I.T. campaign is not yet available, table shows receipts of the individual constituents for fiscal years ended in 1950.

c Estimated. Includes amounts received directly from federations and welfare funds for periods prior to 1950 and estimated welfare fund contributions in amounts received from U.I.T. 1950 campaign.

d Excludes grant of $375,000 by Jewish Agency for Palestine.

e Includes $70,355 from other countries.

f Includes $283,636 from other countries.

g Excludes $344,627 in notes and loans.

h Excludes grants of $116,667 by UPA and JDC.

i Excludes contributions in kind for American Technion Society, valued at $80,000 in 1949 and $84,000 in 1950.

j 1950 figures are preliminary. 1949 figures are audited and differ from preliminary estimates reported in 1951 American Jewish Year Book.

k No records are available of federation and welfare fund allocations to Hadassah.

l Includes unsegregated welfare fund allocations. Excludes collection for JNF ($937,736), contributions in kind ($642,007 imputed value) and Medical School collections ($351,148).

m Includes unsegregated welfare fund allocations. Excludes collection for JNF ($973,410), contributions in kind ($479,427 imputed value) and Medical School collections ($303,811).

n Excludes JNF collections ($17,909) and grants from other organizations ($20,000).

o Excludes JNF collections ($28,751) and grants from other organizations ($14,667).

p Includes $402,568 from Canada and $39,978 from Latin America.

q Includes $531,579 from Canada and $103,779 from Latin America.

r Excludes collections for JNF and other organizations.

s Welfare funds accounted for about 40 per cent of the total raised and for about 60 per cent of the total outside of New York City. Figures for 1949 cover nine months only. Hadassah collections included ($303,811 in 1949 and $351,148 in 1950).

t Labor Zionist Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation and Vaad Hashala have not made reports available to CJFWF.

u Includes $71,072 from other countries and $113,668 from IRO and other governmental sources.

v Includes $78,222 from other countries and $388,189 from IRO.

w Estimated.

NR—No report available.
| TABLE 2 |
| RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS, FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND OTHER SOURCES, 1950 AND 1949 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Relations Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,886,340</td>
<td>$4,293,698</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Jewish Congress-World Jewish Congress&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>860,880</td>
<td>936,418</td>
<td>15,182</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>256,986</td>
<td>316,862</td>
<td>540,391</td>
<td>681,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,004,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,546,978</strong></td>
<td><strong>$555,573</strong></td>
<td><strong>$681,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Welfare Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;City of Hope&quot; (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>$148,570&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$79,340</td>
<td>$710,522</td>
<td>$754,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Patients TB Home</td>
<td>9,668</td>
<td>12,456</td>
<td>131,407</td>
<td>139,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Consumptives' Relief Society</td>
<td>37,542</td>
<td>33,675</td>
<td>345,443</td>
<td>288,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>69,328</td>
<td>50,679</td>
<td>196,715</td>
<td>185,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Desertion Bureau</td>
<td>55,570</td>
<td>58,489</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Home for Jewish Children</td>
<td>175,564</td>
<td>198,068</td>
<td>264,947</td>
<td>227,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
<td>72,649</td>
<td>83,154</td>
<td>1,061,485</td>
<td>1,024,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$410,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>$336,859</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,710,519</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,619,534</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Jacob Teachers Seminary</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$166,400</td>
<td>$108,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Theological College</td>
<td>31,314</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>225,151</td>
<td>188,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Inst. of Religion</td>
<td>112,615</td>
<td>97,443</td>
<td>1,005,268</td>
<td>741,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>120,231</td>
<td>116,813</td>
<td>1,046,791</td>
<td>883,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute</td>
<td>17,598</td>
<td>11,581</td>
<td>151,486</td>
<td>131,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizrachi&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>44,308</td>
<td>39,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Beth Jacob Schools</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>106,909</td>
<td>92,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ner Israel Rabbinical College</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>111,014</td>
<td>105,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaim Berline Yeshiva and Mesilta</td>
<td>8,025</td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>95,688</td>
<td>124,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telz</td>
<td>8,786</td>
<td>7,345</td>
<td>119,861</td>
<td>129,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>157,509</td>
<td>148,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Chachmei Lublin</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>59,404</td>
<td>64,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>31,707</td>
<td>39,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Lubavitcher Yeshivot</td>
<td>11,484</td>
<td>12,369</td>
<td>276,978</td>
<td>270,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>15,224</td>
<td>15,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Cheetz Chaim</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>38,815</td>
<td>42,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Vodaath</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>26,320</td>
<td>445,416</td>
<td>404,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>98,445</td>
<td>702,367</td>
<td>744,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$441,797</strong></td>
<td><strong>$436,180</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,978,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,265,585</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Agencies</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Research</td>
<td>$4,459</td>
<td>$4,556</td>
<td>$9,235</td>
<td>$3,290</td>
<td>$2,268</td>
<td>$2,165</td>
<td>$15,962</td>
<td>$10,011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Zionist Fund</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>177,496</td>
<td>398,564</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>177,496</td>
<td>398,564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai Brith National Youth Services Appeal</td>
<td>432,113</td>
<td>439,082</td>
<td>1,059,734</td>
<td>913,482</td>
<td>34,298</td>
<td>174,484</td>
<td>32,070</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Relations</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>3,681</td>
<td>4,814</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>13,245</td>
<td>11,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropa College</td>
<td>38,718</td>
<td>42,266</td>
<td>48,083</td>
<td>64,244</td>
<td>24,997</td>
<td>23,810</td>
<td>111,798</td>
<td>130,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadruth Ivrit</td>
<td>17,693</td>
<td>18,460</td>
<td>55,583</td>
<td>61,516</td>
<td>95,842</td>
<td>102,191</td>
<td>169,118</td>
<td>182,167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>27,215</td>
<td>27,986</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>32,070</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>8,220</td>
<td>8,296</td>
<td>84,250</td>
<td>80,546</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>3,757</td>
<td>93,236</td>
<td>89,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers' Sem. and People's Univ.</td>
<td>4,077</td>
<td>5,697</td>
<td>31,288</td>
<td>42,945</td>
<td>29,296</td>
<td>32,961</td>
<td>64,661</td>
<td>81,603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menorah Association</td>
<td>8,681</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>29,773</td>
<td>25,655</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>39,026</td>
<td>37,976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural College</td>
<td>18,135</td>
<td>25,437</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>205,988</td>
<td>184,597</td>
<td>251,123</td>
<td>255,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO)</td>
<td>32,296</td>
<td>34,560</td>
<td>151,101</td>
<td>126,422</td>
<td>10,416</td>
<td>183,397</td>
<td>171,398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'itarot</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>8,385</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>13,539</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>24,222</td>
<td>34,985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>488,461</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>120,862</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>609,323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$574,505</td>
<td>$598,358</td>
<td>$1,712,833</td>
<td>$2,278,825</td>
<td>$414,861</td>
<td>$677,660</td>
<td>$2,701,499</td>
<td>$3,554,843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$56,354</td>
<td>$51,012</td>
<td>$50,676</td>
<td>$60,014</td>
<td>$7,260</td>
<td>$2,017</td>
<td>$114,290</td>
<td>$113,043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>9,078</td>
<td>9,317</td>
<td>50,867</td>
<td>50,867</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>17,538</td>
<td>14,218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.</td>
<td>76,257</td>
<td>91,408</td>
<td>36,710</td>
<td>38,572</td>
<td>121,489</td>
<td>127,250</td>
<td>234,456</td>
<td>257,239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare</td>
<td>5,183</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>12,564</td>
<td>13,555</td>
<td>21,354</td>
<td>21,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board</td>
<td>1,013,333</td>
<td>1,014,909</td>
<td>48,339</td>
<td>60,731</td>
<td>1,061,672</td>
<td>1,081,640</td>
<td>1,114,551</td>
<td>1,122,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>3,987</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>15,815</td>
<td>14,276</td>
<td>25,758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>42,492</td>
<td>46,516</td>
<td>12,462</td>
<td>12,462</td>
<td>71,917</td>
<td>71,917</td>
<td>71,917</td>
<td>71,917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,208,557</td>
<td>$1,224,506</td>
<td>$95,517</td>
<td>$104,829</td>
<td>$234,896</td>
<td>$209,365</td>
<td>$1,538,970</td>
<td>$1,598,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DOMESTIC</strong></td>
<td>$7,639,956</td>
<td>$8,142,881</td>
<td>$10,053,228</td>
<td>$9,950,249</td>
<td>$2,943,409</td>
<td>$2,932,843</td>
<td>$20,635,893</td>
<td>$21,025,973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DOMESTIC AND OVERSEAS</strong></td>
<td>$98,019,284</td>
<td>$113,825,774</td>
<td>$22,719,672</td>
<td>$23,451,431</td>
<td>$5,031,604</td>
<td>$5,676,297</td>
<td>$125,769,860</td>
<td>$142,953,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NR—No report.**

* Figures for JDA are on a cash basis; includes UJA of Greater New York which transmitted $2,098,786 for the 1949 campaign ($1,868,752 transmitted in 1949 and $212,034 transmitted in 1950) and $1,526,788 for the 1950 campaign. Additional proceeds of the 1950 campaign were received in 1951 and will be included in the 1951 totals of cash received. Income from B'nai Brith sources was not reported separately. In 1948, such income totalled $46,000. For 1951, JDA is campaigning independently in New York and Chicago. Unpaid pledges totalled $594,971 at the end of 1950.

* Only non-JDA income shown on this line; income from JDA is included under JDA.

* Includes UJA of N.Y.: $466,990 in 1949 and $449,628 in 1950 on cash basis. Excludes welfare fund grants retained by local divisions. Congress estimates these at over $100,000 annually. Excludes foreign income of World Jewish Congress which was not reported.

* Includes one-time grant of $75,000 by Los Angeles Jewish Community Council.

* Includes income of Hillel, BBYO and VSB, but excludes grant from ADL.

* Unaudited bookkeeping data.

* Includes grants by local vocational agencies.

* Includes UJA of N.Y.: $302,746 in 1949 and $310,207 on cash basis.

* Program suspended February 28, 1951.