Communal Affairs

RELIGION

The period under review witnessed few novel developments in Jewish religious life in the United States. There were, however, clear indications that certain trends previously noted in the pages of the American Jewish Year Book were persisting and vigorous. Many observers from varying points of vantage noted a growing interest in Judaism (e.g., Bezalel Sherman, a secularist Socialist Zionist, Robert Gordis, a Conservative scholar, rabbi, and communal leader, and Horace Kallen, a liberal philosopher, all writing in Judaism, a quarterly published by the American Jewish Congress [Vol. I, no. 1, January, 1952]). Symptomatic of this return to religion were the large audiences that attended the lectures of Professor Martin Buber, noted religious thinker, on his tour of the United States in late 1951 and early 1952. The Jewish Statistical Bureau in January 1952 furnished concrete evidence of the felt need of American Jews for professional religious guidance. The Bureau reported that of the 3,876 congregations in its list, a total of 2,577 indicated that they had rabbinic leadership, a figure in excess of any previously recorded.

There were repeated references again during 1951-52 to the need for a "democratization" of the American Jewish community in which the synagogue was to play a unique role. Among the prominent religious leaders who discussed this problem were Nelson Glueck, president of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion and Prof. Mordecai M. Kaplan (addressing a conference on the survival of the American Jewish community sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America in May 1952); Rabbi Philip Bernstein in his presidential address before the Central Conference of American Rabbis (June 1952); and Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner, speaking at the Hebrew Union College (June 1952). Professor Kaplan went so far as to propose the convening of a "Jewish world council" that would define the status of world Jewry and "reconstruct" local American Jewish bodies into organic Jewish communities. Rabbi Brickner concurred with this approach, calling upon "the Jewish religious and cultural leaders of America to establish an American Jewish organization based on religion and achieving unity but not uniformity."

The trend previously noted toward the development of Jewish religious life in the metropolitan suburbs continued. All three congregational groups (Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform) reported the establishment of new congregations outside of metropolitan areas. No statistics were available; but several individual synagogues revealed a loss in their large memberships because younger members were leaving cities in favor of suburban life. In some
cities (e.g., Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Newark) plans were being made to move synagogues closer to the new centers of Jewish population in the suburbs.

During the past year, many religious and educational organizations took cognizance of the tremendous potentialities for good in the new mass communications medium of television. Synagogue organizations that included the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and the New York Board of Rabbis, and lay organizations like the American Jewish Committee and the Washington Jewish Community Council undertook to produce religious programs for telecasting. A score of Passover television shows, many of them built around Seder scenes, were featured on most of the major networks. Several commercial shows also produced plays with Passover content. The Biennial Convention of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations in November 1951 voted to establish a commission to study the most effective use of both radio and television in religious education.

For the first time services were telecast direct from synagogues: Temple Israel, Park Avenue Synagogue, and the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue, all in New York City, telecast services from November 1951 to May 1952 under the joint sponsorship of the New York Board of Rabbis and the American Jewish Committee. These two organizations also sponsored a weekly morning chapel program. Early in 1952 the Synagogue Council and the American Jewish Committee joined in a weekly telecast of religious news. The Washington Jewish Community Council sponsored a weekly religious program in cooperation with the Washington Board of Rabbis. High Holy Day services were telecast over a national network by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The Jewish Theological Seminary of America produced a series of religious dramatic programs over a national network.

These television programs supplemented the many radio broadcasts with Jewish religious content already in existence. Outstanding was the weekly "Eternal Light" program of the Jewish Theological Seminary, which continued to win the annual Ohio State University award for conspicuous achievement.

An article by Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer, "What Is a Jew?" appeared in Look magazine on June 17, 1952, aroused wide interest, and was reprinted in the August 1952 issue of Reader's Digest.

Lay Organizations

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, at its Biennial Convention in New York City in November 1951, reported a substantial growth in Orthodox synagogues, Talmud Torahs, day schools, and seminaries. The general theme of the convention was a demand for greater militancy in Orthodox ranks. The Union helped to organize several new Orthodox congregations in recently constructed housing developments in Brooklyn and the Bronx, New York City. A nation-wide program was launched in February 1952 to assist
small communities to procure scrolls of the Torah. The first recipient was a synagogue in Geneva, N. Y.

The Women's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations observed its thirtieth anniversary in May 1952, when it reported a membership of 35,000 women, representing more than 2,000 sisterhoods. The organization took a strong stand against mixed pews in the synagogues, pointing out that the custom of separate pews for men and women was a major distinguishing feature of the Orthodox synagogue. Plans were made to initiate a nation-wide educational program on this subject.

The Mizrachi Organization, religious branch of Zionism, with 70,000 members in the United States, observed its Golden Jubilee in March 1952. A project undertaken by the Mizrachi Organization was the creation of a special memorial marker carved in marble brought from the State of Israel to commemorate the death of six million Jews in Europe during World War II. The sculptor, A. Raymond Katz, was commissioned to design the memorial.

**Conservative**

The United Synagogue of America represented several hundred Conservative congregations in the United States and Canada. The Committee on Jewish Law of the Rabbinical Assembly of America recommended in June 1952 that it be established as a congregational principle that the Jewish partner of a mixed marriage no longer be eligible for membership in a Conservative congregation.

**Reform**

In the summer of 1952 there were 452 Reform congregations associated with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Recognizing the need for training lay leaders in congregational work, the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues sponsored a leadership institute in the spring of 1952 devoted to a study of the history and teachings of Reform Judaism.

**Rabbinic Organizations**

The two largest Orthodox rabbinic bodies increased in membership; the Rabbinical Council of America had 475 members, and the Union of Orthodox Rabbis over 600 members.

The Rabbinical Assembly of America, representing over 500 members of the Conservative rabbinate, met in annual convention at Cleveland in June 1952. The theme of the conference, "The Unity of the Jewish People," brought together discussants representing several secular agencies including representatives of the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, the National Jewish Welfare Board, and the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. Also participating were representatives of the Reform and Orthodox Rabbinate.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, meeting in Buffalo, N. Y., in June 1952, announced that its membership had reached 625.
LOCAL RABBINICAL BOARDS

The influence of local boards of rabbis noted in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1952 (Vol. 53) was extended, notably in Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Washington, Miami, and Southern California.

During the year under review, the New York Board of Rabbis increased in membership to 600 and included in its ranks rabbis from many parts of the country. The out-of-state membership was a new development, created by the need for guidance to local rabbis on such matters as pastoral training and rabbinic tenure. Its chief activity, the chaplaincy program in civilian hospitals, mental institutions, and prisons in the State of New York, was expanded to cover 136 institutions served by 73 chaplains. A new advance was the inauguration of a practical training course for civilian chaplains at Bellevue Hospital in which rabbis were to serve an internship before qualifying for the chaplaincy—the first course of its kind. In addition to this course, the Institute for Pastoral Psychiatry at Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York City was continued.

CHAPLAINCY IN THE ARMED SERVICES

The increased demands for rabbis to serve in the Armed Forces presented a serious problem to the smaller communities. In recent years the seminaries were able to graduate only enough rabbis to fill the civilian demand. With the younger graduates entering the armed services, smaller congregations found it difficult to obtain spiritual leaders. Even civilian chaplains were called upon to serve military installations which did not have sufficient Jewish personnel to warrant full-time chaplains. Over 200 rabbis served in this capacity.

Jewish veterans in ever-growing numbers presented a serious challenge, one that was likely to increase in scope. Civilian chaplains served at veterans' facilities as well as other hospitals.

Several problems of Jewish law arose as a result of the settling of Jewish soldier families in military installations in Japan and Germany and other areas which offered no religious facilities. The Responsa Committee of the Division of Religious Activities of the National Jewish Welfare Board was asked to settle such problems as the validity of a circumcision performed by a military surgeon. Previous problems handled by this committee included the problem of observing the Sabbath while crossing the International Date Line. The Publications Committee of the Division of Religious Activities made available a new edition of the Haggadah. A training program for military chaplains was held in Atlanta, Ga., in February 1952 and a retreat for European chaplains was held in July 1952 in Heidelberg, Germany.

To meet the increased demands of Jewish men in uniform the Biennial Convention of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations in November 1951 provided its armed services division with a larger budget. The division supplied Purim scrolls to military installations and also shipped many Passover packages to servicemen in the United States and overseas.

1 For a full discussion of community service to the armed services, see p. 151 and f.
Ritual and Observance

In the Orthodox and Conservative wings of Judaism efforts were made to strengthen and redefine practices in Jewish ritual and observance.

ORTHODOX

The Orthodox rabbinate made a vigorous defense of traditional Judaism during the year under review. Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, addressing the annual convention of the Rabbinical Council of America (June 1952), suggested abandoning the term "Orthodox" for that of "traditional," as expressive of a positive rather than a defensive approach to American Jewish life. On several occasions the Jewish community was asked to remove nontraditional practices from religious life. For example, the Orthodox rabbinate of Detroit in March 1952 declared in an official announcement that "Orthodox Rabbis of Detroit will not participate in or officiate at any function where the minimum requirements of Jewish tradition are not met." The specific reference was to weddings at which Detroit Orthodox rabbis would not officiate if the ceremony was followed by a meal "not in conformity with Jewish dietary laws." A similar resolution was adopted by the Orthodox Rabbinate of Boston. Equally critical of current practice was the Orthodox position in the matter of maintaining traditional forms of funeral services. One religious leader, Rabbi Oscar Fleishaker, of Rock Island, Ill., maintained that all Jewish funerals should be held under the supervision of a traditional burial committee—the Chevra Kadisha. A trend had evidently developed, even among traditional Jews, to follow more Liberal practices in the burial ritual.

Similarly, the Orthodox rabbinate issued a call for the traditional observances of the circumcision ceremony; the substitution of a surgeon in place of the traditional Mohel was strongly condemned. The rabbis declared that the essential aspect of the act was religious and not medical. The Rabbinical Council's Fourth Annual Torah Tour was launched in Nashville, Tenn., in February 1952 and covered forty cities in the United States and Canada.

CONSERVATIVE

The United Synagogue of America placed its major emphasis during the period under review on national Sabbath observance. Special manuals were produced and formal ceremonies were held in an effort to reaffirm the centrality of the Sabbath in American Jewish life. At the same time, the Responsa Committee of the Rabbinical Assembly recommended relaxation of the law against dancing and sports on the Sabbath. The committee felt that Jews could indulge in these activities without violating the spirit of the Sabbath day.

RECONSTRUCTIONIST

The Reconstructionist movement continued its attempts to raise the level of Jewish worship and ritual observance. At a meeting of Reconstructionist leaders held at Brandeis University in September 1951 it was decided to publish supplementary readings for religious services in Reform, Conservative,
and Orthodox synagogues. A general plan of action for the next few years was also developed.

Education

The major effort of the Yeshiva University during the year under review was a $25,000,000 building campaign for a new medical school. In January 1952 Dr. Harry M. Zimmerman was appointed Director of the institution, which was scheduled to open in the fall of 1953 with a freshman class of 100 students. Despite its sectarian sponsorship the University announced that the medical center would be nonsectarian in character and that it would “have a separate and distinctive name and a board of overseers of outstanding civic and communal leaders representing all faiths.” Students were to be accepted solely on the basis of scholarship and character, “regardless of race, color, creed or sex.” Early in 1952 the Yeshiva purchased three parcels of land in the Bronx to complete the site for the school. A new departure for medical schools was the announcement of an organized course in ethics which would stress the importance of ethical practices in the medical profession.

Yeshiva University established a workshop for cantors in February 1952. This development was partially inspired by the opening of cantor's schools under Reform and Conservative sponsorship.

The Graduate Department of Yeshiva University conducted an extensive summer school program in 1952 offering more than forty courses in education, community administration, and Jewish history. Announcement was made of the establishment of a graduate department of mathematics leading to the Ph.D. degree.

Conservative

The Jewish Theological Seminary of America announced that its goal for 1952 was over $2,100,000. Geographic expansion of the Seminary was seen in the growth of the University of Judaism at Los Angeles, which offered both graduate and undergraduate degrees, and operated on a budget of $55,000. Enrollment at the Seminary for the year 1951-52 included 18 students in the Graduate School, 45 in the Teachers Institute, and 399 in the Extension Department. During the academic year the Seminary underwent a complete administrative reorganization. Twenty-three rabbis were ordained in June 1952. Among them was an Indian-born student who planned to serve a congregation in his native land.

A Cantor's Institute was scheduled to open in October 1952. The institute would offer a six-year course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Sacred Music. Max J. Routtenberg was named as director.

Reform

The Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) witnessed the ordination of twenty-three new rabbis in 1951. In October 1951 Nelson Glueck was elected president for life. Dr. Glueck had been ordained

2 For another account of Yeshiva University's medical school project, see p. 39.
by the Hebrew Union College in 1923 and had had a distinguished career as an archeologist before assuming his present post. The HUC-JIR School of Education added a new course, the Creative Teaching of Music. The Cantor's School offered a new refresher course of advanced study for cantors now in pulpits. Fourteen students were graduated as cantor-educators in June 1952, the second class in its history.

The primary purpose of the Chicago College of Jewish Studies was to train Hebrew School teachers and Sunday School teachers. It offered undergraduate studies leading to the degree of Bachelor of Hebrew Literature (BHL) and graduate study leading to two advanced degrees, Master of Hebrew Literature (MHL) and Doctor of Hebrew Literature (DHL).

SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, PUBLICATIONS

The Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary acquired many valuable books. Outstanding among its gifts in 1951–52 was the celebrated Prague Bible, published in 1518, of which there is only one other copy in existence (in the Bodleian Library of Oxford University).

The American Jewish Archives of HUC-JIR under the direction of Professor Jacob R. Marcus devoted its attention to early Jewish history in the Americas. Professor Marcus and his associates spent the summer of 1952 in Central America unearthing early records of Jewish life in that region.

Reform Jews established a Samuel Schulman Publication Fund for Biblical Studies in honor of the eighty-eight-year-old rabbi emeritus of New York City's Temple Emanu-El. Rabbi Schulman is the sole surviving member of the committee which translated the Bible into English for the Jewish Publication Society of America. This Bible is in standard use in all American synagogues.

YOUTH AND ADULT EDUCATION

There were several attempts to meet the needs of Jewish adolescents and young adults for religious education.

The Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox) planned to establish jointly with the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations a Department of Education to deal with all problems in the area of youth and adult education.

Conservative Judaism initiated a new organization for high school students, called the United Synagogue Youth, which held its first convention in December 1951. Over 500 young people from 67 communities attended. The Young People's League, with 150 chapters throughout the United States, reported a growth in summer camps and regional leadership institutes. In April 1952 the Commission on Jewish Education formally established a Foundation School System, whose purpose was to extend the synagogue nursery school plan to include the first two grades of elementary school. Such schools would provide an all-day program of education intended to develop in the Jewish youngster a positive orientation to Judaism.

The Chicago College of Jewish Studies sponsored a series of youth forums on Jewish education, Israel, and the problems of youth, in cooperation with the Hillel Foundations, the Chicago Federation of Temple Youth, and Junior
Hadassah. The college also sponsored a summer camp in 1952 which combined recreation with Jewish educational opportunities.

The Women’s Institute of Jewish Studies under the auspices of the Jewish Theological Seminary witnessed a substantial growth, its enrollment increasing from 106 to 223. Courses were given in Bible, Hebrew, Contemporary Jewish Literature, Religion and Talmud. A new course called Vital Books was added during 1951–52.

HUC sponsored three youth pilgrimages in the spring of 1952 in which young people from fourteen cities who were members of the National Federation of Temple Youth were given an opportunity to study the history of the Reform movement.

The Jewish Chautauqua Society, sponsored by the (Reform) Federation of Men’s Clubs, reported in February 1952 that it had sent 309 rabbis and discussion leaders to 840 colleges during the previous year. It had also arranged for 14 full-term resident lectureships at various universities, and for rabbi-instructors at 193 Christian summer church camps. An additional project was the presentation of 20,000 books of Jewish content to 550 college libraries.

The Impact of Israel

Synagogue interest in Israel continued unabated during the past year. The (Reform) Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) showed its moral support of the new state by purchasing a $5,000 bond for investment. In August 1951, following a five-week conference in Israel, a group of rabbis representing the CCAR reported that there was fertile soil for the Liberal movement in Israel. In the wake of this pilgrimage, Rabbi Joshua Trachtenberg spent five months in the Holy Land on behalf of the American Committee for Liberal Judaism in Israel. Dr. Trachtenberg in an address before the Buffalo convention in June 1952 recommended a five-point program for Israel: the establishment of pilot congregations; development of a youth program; sponsorship of Liberal schools such as the one already in existence in Haifa; educational and social service work in the immigrant camps; and the founding of a settlement of Liberal young people. President Philip Bernstein voiced the hope that a Reform rabbi would be sent “to help lay the foundation for a progressive religious movement in Israel.”

The reaction of American Orthodoxy was instantaneous. Rabbi Samuel Berliant, addressing the Rabbinical Council of America (June, 1952), sounded a note of deep concern about “the attempts of Reform Rabbis in America in conjunction with their congregational bodies to plant the seed of religious dissension in the Holy Land and establish a machinery center [sic] of their creed among the traditional-minded Jews there.” He implored the Rabbinical Council to “take energetic and all necessary measures to counteract and nullify this new spiritual danger to the welfare of our coreligionists in the Holy Land.”

The Conservative movement also began to establish roots in Israel and to create cultural links between the American synagogues and the new state. Under the joint sponsorship of the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Jew-
ish Agency for Palestine, the Seminary-Israel Institute was inaugurated in February 1952 for the purpose of helping to develop cultural unity between American Jewry and Israel. A series of lectures by prominent American and Israeli leaders was presented during the early spring of 1952. One of the speakers, Hayim Greenberg, of the Jewish Agency, discussed the complex question of religion in Israel, suggesting that "the only rational solution of the problem is the ultimate separation of all religious matters from the State." Recognizing that this goal could be achieved only with great difficulty, Greenberg stated that "Religion can best flourish and fructify society through its spiritual influence only in a climate of unabridged individual freedom." Following the Institute, Louis Finkelstein, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary, conducted a pilgrimage to Israel and participated in a special Seminary convocation at Jerusalem which granted an honorary degree to Prime Minister David Ben Gurion. In addressing the convocation, Rabbi Finkelstein called for a world meeting of spiritual leaders of all faiths to grapple with the perplexing moral problems of the modern world.

Social Action

The American synagogue keenly felt the impact of the conflict between the Western Powers and the Iron Curtain countries. Rabbi Samuel Berliant, on behalf of the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox) in June 1952 appealed to Jewry to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to join in combatting all forms of totalitarianism. The convention of the Rabbinical Council condemned Soviet aggression as a threat to religious liberty. Similar views were expressed by all other wings of the religious community. The Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative) and the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Reform) went on record as supporting efforts to resist Communist aggression. The Reconstructionist, organ of the Reconstructionist movement, also urged Jewish support for the Mutual Security Program (April 7, 1952).

Rabbi Israel Goldstein, addressing the Church-Peace Union in February 1952, expressed the view that the free world was in danger of losing Asia and Africa because the Soviet Union had succeeded in persuading much of the world of its sympathy for the underprivileged. Rabbi Goldstein urged that America must use moral force to win them back.

Reports of religious persecution behind the Iron Curtain were discussed widely from Jewish pulpits. Many rabbis saw in the suppression of religion behind the Iron Curtain a clear indication that Communism was a threat that must be fought with vigor. At the same time, all three rabbinic bodies uttered warnings against the dangers of curtailing civil liberties in the struggle against Communists in the United States.

The Rabbinical Association again went on record as viewing with apprehension the resurgence of chauvinism and its concomitant anti-Semitism in Western Germany. The rabbis were particularly uneasy over the current American policy of building a strong Germany to meet the menace of Com-
munism, fearful lest the proper precautions to prevent the revival of German militarism would not be taken.

The Synagogue Council of America joined the National Lutheran Council and the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA in an appeal for revision of United States immigration and naturalization laws, and sought an end to all discriminatory statutes.

The Women's League of the United Synagogue urged its members throughout the country to fight the McCarran and Walter bills in Congress. The Women's League in a letter to President Truman on behalf of its 100,000 members, called for vigorous action by Federal law enforcement agencies, deploring the "display of race hatred which led to violence and murder in the state of Florida."

In their presidential addresses, both Rabbi Samuel Berliant of the Rabbinical Council of America and Rabbi Philip Bernstein of the Central Conference of American Rabbis stated that the synagogue had a great responsibility in the struggle for racial equality.

The Young People's League of the United Synagogue meeting in Atlantic City in March 1952 recommended "wide study of the meaning of the rival philosophies of government competing for the minds of men, in particular democracy and communism; close attention to the current threat to public education by partisan religious groups . . . and deep concern for the present condition of morality in government, business and labor."

The forthcoming national elections, always occasion for community tensions, elicited a joint statement by religious leaders on fair election practices. The Synagogue Council representing the three wings of Judaism, joined with other religious bodies in a request to all political candidates to shun racial and religious bigotry.  

The Rabbinical Assembly in June 1952 invited all of religious Jewry to join with them in preliminary discussions to study the possibility of a joint commission on social action which would coordinate the social action program of the three rabbinic bodies.

The Committee on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis published a booklet which included all the resolutions passed by that body from 1917 to 1952. It offered an excellent picture of the wide range of rabbinic concern and included such issues as atomic energy, discrimination, agriculture, the poll tax, inflation, social security, and the United Nations.

The proposed revision of New York State laws regarding Sunday observance evoked a demand by Jewish religious bodies for legislation that would permit those observing Saturday as the Sabbath to obtain relief from Sunday restrictions comparable to those recommended in the field of sports. The New York Board of Rabbis also joined in the fight for the revision of the State Sabbath laws.

1 For another account of this statement, see p. 94.
Religion and the Public Schools

Many Jewish religious leaders felt strongly that religious teachings were being inserted into public education, and demanded that Americans be alerted to the danger of the breakdown of the principle of the separation of church and state. Nelson Glueck, president of the HUC-JIR, severely criticized those sectarian groups which "attempt to use the public schools as a group to beat down more vigorous or aggressive religious rivals" (May, 1952). Reflecting the deep anxiety felt for the future of public education in the United States, two rabbinic bodies, the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly and the Reform Central Conference, held conferences in New York City in May 1952. The proposal in New York State requiring all school children to repeat a specific prayer was condemned by the Association of Reform Rabbis of New York City in December 1951. Strong objections were also voiced by the Brooklyn and New York Boards of Rabbis. The convention of the Rabbinical Association went on record in opposition to released time despite the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Zorach case. The rabbis maintained that "the ideal educational medium for the Jewish community is the all day school."

In March 1952 the New York Board of Rabbis filed a brief amicus curiae in the suit against the released time law in the New York State Courts.

Inter-Religious Activities

During the year, the recommendations of the MacIver report, particularly those dealing with inter-religious activities, were widely discussed within the national religious organizations. Many rabbis chose the report as a sermon topic.

National religious bodies and individual rabbis generally supported the suggestion of Prof. Robert MacIver that primary responsibility for work with the Christian churches in the inter-religious field should rest with Jewish religious agencies. There was little agreement among the agencies as to the method of implementing the recommendation.

The Jewish Theological Seminary continued its interfaith activity through its Institute for Religious and Social Studies sponsorship of the Annual Conference of Science, Philosophy, and Religion. In April 1952 the New York State Board of Regents granted the Institute a provisional five-year charter.

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations continued to extend its work in the field of Christian-Jewish relations. In cooperation with the Central Conference of American Rabbis, it sponsored a series of institutes on Judaism for Christian clergymen.

A situation which was potentially highly explosive took place in New York

4 See p. 43 and f.
5 See p. 39 and f.
6 See p. 162 and f.
City during the Easter season of 1952. A group of zealous Catholic lay groups attempted to persuade merchants to close their stores in The Bronx and Brooklyn on Good Friday. Jewish merchants protested this invasion of religious liberty, and vehement protests were lodged. The Archdiocese of New York issued a sharp criticism of the ill-advised action as a result of representations made by several Jewish organizations. The Archdiocese's statement was highly effective in relieving the anticipated tension.

SERVICE MOVEMENT

The American Jewish Society for Service, a Jewish service movement (reported in the 1952 YEAR Book) announced that its program for 1952 would be the building of a dining hall and recreation center at an inter-racial boy's camp in Winchester, N. H.

Anniversaries

Temple B'nai Israel in Sacramento, Cal., marked its one-hundredth anniversary in February 1952. Governor Earl Warren delivered the principal address. Temple Israel of New York City celebrated its eightieth anniversary in November 1951. In honor of the occasion a series of services were telecast over station WPIX.

Synagogues joined in the plans to mark the three-hundredth anniversary of the first Jewish settlement in America in 1954. In New York City the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, oldest in the United States, announced in March 1952 that a series of historical books containing biographies of prominent seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Jews would be published under the authorship of Rabbi David de Sola Pool.

Morris N. Kertzer

JEWISH EDUCATION

A major problem in American Jewish education today is the pressing need for qualified teachers. This need has been growing increasingly acute. The AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR Book for 1948-49 (Vol. 50) drew attention to the shortage of qualified teachers. "Two contradictory developments," the YEAR Book recorded, "took place in the field of Jewish education during the past several years. On the one hand, there was a continuous expansion of educational activity and an increasing Jewish school enrollment; on the other hand, a shrinking supply of qualified teachers and administrative personnel."

These two trends continue to dominate the scene of American Jewish education. Jewish school enrollment, according to the annual school censuses conducted for the YEAR Book by the Research Department of the American Association for Jewish Education, has grown 18.2 per cent since the school year 1948-49.

1 Prepared with the cooperation of the American Association for Jewish Education.
The supply, however, of qualified professional Hebrew teachers has not only lagged behind the growth in enrollment, but, as we shall show below, has actually declined in number. As a consequence, we are today confronted with a major crisis in Hebrew education.

Regrettably, the annual Jewish school censuses collected no data on the extent of the teacher shortage. However, information available from other sources, and also from this year's school census, even though fragmentary and indirect, enables one to make an evaluation of the present teacher situation.

**Teacher Situation**

The 1952 Jewish school census carried a question, which, though not specifically directed to gathering data on the lack of teachers, sheds some revealing light on the problem. The question called on the respondents (federation and welfare fund executives, directors of central agencies of Jewish education, or heads of community centers) to state "what are, according to the opinions of your local leaders, the major needs of Jewish education in your community?" In response to this query, 51.3 per cent of the communities which answered the inquiry recorded that their major need is teachers and better qualified teachers; 25 per cent of the communities indicated that their major educational need is better programming, and/or more effective teaching, which, of course, cannot be carried out without qualified teachers.

Also, the Hebrew Teachers' Federation of America, a national association of licensed Hebrew teachers, reports that it has received requests for qualified Hebrew teachers from over two score cities in states as far apart as Connecticut and Oregon, Maine and California, New Jersey and Minnesota, but that they were able to fill, usually inadequately, less than 20 per cent of the requests.

Among the communities which have reported shortages of teachers during the past year to the American Association for Jewish Education, are such major ones as Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Newark (Essex County), Pittsburgh, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, San Francisco, and many intermediate and small communities, such as Buffalo, Providence, Rochester, Milwaukee, St. Paul, and Syracuse. Hardly a community of any size is not at present in need of qualified Hebrew teachers.

The need for qualified Hebrew teachers has been increased recently by several developments, educational and social, which have taken place both in the congregations and in the Jewish communities at large, and whose cumulative effect is an intensification of the school program. First is the tendency among congregations to limit enrollment in the one-day-a-week Sunday schools to younger children, from five through eight or nine years of age, thus making it compulsory for the older children to attend the afternoon schools, which meet several times during the week.

Second, an increasing number of congregations, as well as entire communities, have been requiring Bar and Bas Mitzvah candidates to meet certain educational prerequisites, which include attendance for several years at a mid-week Hebrew school (see American Jewish Year Book, 1951 [Vol. 52],
In addition, more and more Hebrew schools are requiring parents to enroll their children at an early age.

Another factor in the increasing demand for teachers of Hebrew is that elements of the Jewish population which have heretofore assigned little or no importance to Hebrew in their program of Jewish education have recently rediscovered the religious and educational values for their children of the study of Hebrew. Thus, many Reform and other congregations have been adding midweek sessions to their Sunday school schedules, primarily for the teaching of Hebrew. The Committee of Religious Education of the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues has reported that 11 per cent of the children who attend on Saturday or Sunday, attend in addition one midweek session; 9 per cent of the children attend two midweek sessions. Altogether, 20 per cent of the Saturday or Sunday enrollment attended either one or two midweek sessions during 1951-52, as compared with 17 per cent in 1950-51.

Likewise, all Yiddish organizations sponsoring schools have been assigning more weight and time in their curricula to the teaching of Hebrew and the Hebrew classical sources.

Last but not least, the natural growth of the Jewish population is providing a wider base for Jewish school enrollment in general, and also a wider base for enrollment in the weekday school.

A doctoral dissertation presented at Dropsie College offers some information on the extent of the teacher shortage. According to this study, over 4,200 Hebrew teachers service Jewish schools of whom about 1,700 are employed in New York City and over 2,500 in the rest of the country.

The average number of years a Hebrew teacher stays in the profession, the study points out, is less than nine years. Accordingly, close to 500 new teachers are required annually to replace those who for various reasons leave the profession. Now, all the Jewish teacher training schools, both those which claim high academic rating and those which do not make such claims, have been graduating a total of between 20 to 25 per cent of the number of teachers the schools annually require. In 1947-48, the Jewish teachers' seminaries graduated 83 teachers; in 1948-49, 85; in 1952, the number of graduates was 131.

This situation is partly a result of the general shortage of teachers in the United States, but is mainly the result of unfavorable employment conditions in Hebrew schools. With minor exceptions, Hebrew teachers' salary scales are low. Few cities have professional codes to insure those opportunities for professional growth, economic betterment, and provisions for retirement, sickness, and other benefits capable of giving Hebrew teachers a feeling of social and economic security.

As a consequence of the unsatisfied demand for qualified Hebrew teachers, many persons have been employed in the Hebrew schools who lack profes-

---

2 High Lights, February 1952, No. 42, p. 3.
3 Menachem (Emanuel) M. Edelstein, The Status of the Professional Teachers in Jewish Schools of America with Special Reference to New York City.
4 The following schools reported graduating teachers for the weekday schools: Beth Midrash L'morim of the Yeshivah University, New York City; Hebrew Teachers College of Roxbury, Mass.; Hebrew Teachers Training School for Girls, New York City; Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York City; Herzliah Hebrew Teachers Institute of New York City; Yiddish Teachers' Seminary and People's University, New York City; College of Jewish Studies, Chicago; and Gratz College, Philadelphia.
sional training, have a very superficial acquaintance with the Hebrew language and Hebrew classical sources, and are little concerned with the objectives of Jewish education.

These substandard teachers, many of whom regard their work only as a temporary source of supplementary income, nullify most efforts at raising educational standards and objectives, and threaten to lower the standards already achieved after many years of laborious effort. They serve also to retard public recognition of Hebrew teaching as a permanent profession.

Various suggestions have been made by communities as to how to alleviate the teacher shortage. Characteristic of the thinking of Jewish educators in the larger communities is that of Samuel L. Dinin, executive director of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Los Angeles. Dr. Dinin suggests that in order to meet the need for more, younger, and better qualified teachers, Jewish communities take the following steps:

1. Set up a pension and retirement fund for certified teachers, making it possible for the older teachers to retire; 2. Initiate a program of finding, selecting, and encouraging young people in the high schools and colleges to pursue courses leading to the teachers' diploma; 3. Assign an increased supervisory staff to give the present corps of pupil-teachers closer supervision and guidance; 4. Establish experimental centers where there can be experimentation with new organizations of curriculum, new methods of teaching, and new texts and materials.

Many of the smaller communities which have central agencies for Jewish education have suggested as an emergency measure that they train their own teachers locally, fully realizing how inadequate their sources are for such a task.

School Curricula

In 1952, in connection with the annual school enrollment census, the Research Department of the American Association for Jewish Education endeavored to learn what was taught in the highest grades of the weekday afternoon Hebrew schools. With this aim in view, the programming in these grades was studied: subject matter, texts used, and time allotted for each subject. Data was also gathered on the number of years on which the school's course of studies was based, the total enrollment in each school, and the enrollment in the highest grade.

This information was obtained by means of special questionnaires filled out by heads of 223 elementary weekday afternoon Hebrew schools in 166 communities. An analysis of these questionnaires yields interesting information on the structure and the courses of study of the Hebrew schools.

Of the 223 schools which have filled out the questionnaires, 151 or 67.5 per cent reported their curricula based on a definite number of years, and the rest either indicated no organized curricula or failed to supply the information.

The largest single group of schools, 34.2 per cent, had courses of study based on five years; 33.6 per cent of the schools had courses of study based
on six years; 16.8 per cent of the schools had four-year curricula; over 10 per cent, three- and two-year curricula; and about 5 per cent of the schools had curricula based on seven and more years.

ENROLLMENT IN THE HIGHEST GRADES

Of all the children enrolled in the weekday afternoon schools included in the sample, irrespective of the number of years their courses of studies were based on, only 10 per cent were in the highest grade in the spring of 1952.

This proportion decreases as the number of years called for by the courses of study increases. In schools having a two-year course, the proportion of children found in the highest (second) grade was 45 per cent. In the schools with a three-year course, the proportion of children in the highest (third) grade was 21.3 per cent; in schools with a four-year course, the proportion of children in the highest grade (fourth) was 11.4 per cent; in the schools with a five-year course, the highest grade had only 10.7 per cent of the enrollment; and in the schools with a six-year course, the highest grade had only 7.4 per cent of the total number of children attending the school.

The highest elementary grade is usually the smallest in the school. In over 41 per cent of the elementary schools which reported on size of their highest grades the enrollment was less than ten children, with some having but five, four, and even fewer pupils. The median enrollment in the highest grade for the 180 schools reporting on size was twelve. The small size of the highest grades presents administrative and budgetary difficulties which few schools can solve adequately.

NUMBER AND LENGTH OF SESSIONS PER WEEK

The highest grades of the Hebrew schools met a varying number of times per week. In 6.2 per cent of the schools the highest grade met once a week; in 20.8 per cent of the schools the highest grade met twice a week; in 35.4 per cent of the schools the highest grade met for three sessions a week; in 22.5 per cent of the schools, four times a week; and in 15.2 per cent, five times per week.

Likewise, the length of the midweek sessions of the highest grades varied greatly. The range was from one to two and one-half hours. Even Hebrew schools having the same number of weekly sessions met for varying numbers of hours per week. Thus, schools having only three sessions a week met for sessions lasting one hour, one and one-half hours, two hours, and even two and one-half hours. The same was true of schools meeting two, four, and five times a week.

In almost 40 per cent of the schools, the highest grade met for a total of five or six hours per week; in over one-fourth of the schools, between three and four and one-half hours per week; in almost one-fifth of the schools, children attended the highest grade for two hours or less a week, and in 15.7 per cent of the schools, for seven and more hours a week.

It must be noted that the contemporary American elementary Hebrew school is a sharply curtailed elementary educational institution. The overwhelming majority of the elementary Hebrew schools have only three-, four-, and five-year courses; a very small proportion of the children who enroll in
Hebrew school ever reach the highest grade; and almost 60 per cent of all
the Hebrew schools meet only from two to six hours a week.

PROGRAMMING IN THE HIGHEST GRADE

The weekday afternoon Hebrew schools which offer a two- or three-year
course have very limited programs of study. In the highest grades of this type
of school, mechanical reading, some Hebrew language study, and customs and
ceremonies constitute the complete course. But even this limited course is
followed by only half of the schools reporting for this group. In the other
half, a first-year Hebrew primer, which serves as a text both for mechanical
reading and learning the Hebrew language, is all that is studied.

The weekday afternoon Hebrew schools which report four-year courses rep-
resent a considerable advance from the point of view of programming. The
course of studies in the highest grades of these schools includes the Penta-
teuch, prayer book, the Hebrew language, customs and ceremonies, history,
and current events. Not all subjects, of course, were taught in all schools.
Only 12.5 per cent of the four-year schools polled taught all subjects; 37 per
cent taught four subjects in the highest grade, and almost half of the schools
taught two or three subjects. The schools which taught three and more sub-
jects met from four to five and one-half hours a week.

Almost all the four-year schools taught the reading of Hebrew prayers an
average of about one hour a week (fifty-seven minutes). More than three-
fourths of the schools in this category taught the Hebrew language. Half of
them taught a simple first-year Hebrew language text; the rest used a second-
year Hebrew text. An average of seventy-three minutes a week was given to
the study of the Hebrew language by schools in this group. Six out of ten
four-year schools taught the Pentateuch. The majority studied the first two
books of the Pentateuch, Genesis and Exodus, in an abbreviated school edi-
tion. Only a few schools succeeded in teaching the other books of the Penta-
teuch. On the average, Pentateuch was studied over two hours a week.

Over half of the schools in this category taught history in the highest
grades; the majority taught modern Jewish history, the rest offering either a
review of general Jewish history or American Jewish history. Only one school
reported teaching the history of modern Israel. On the average, the four-year
schools scheduled history for about an hour a week.

Exactly half of the four-year schools reporting taught customs and cere-
monies an average of forty-five minutes a week, and only one school out of
seven taught current events for an average of thirty minutes a week.

The courses of study in the highest grades of the five-year schools were
similar to the ones followed in the four-year schools, with the addition in
some schools of singing and Jewish literature (in English).

As a matter of record, not one school taught all subjects. The highest num-
ber of subjects (six) was taught by 25 per cent of the schools; 40.9 per cent
taught five subjects; 22.7 per cent, three or four subjects; and over 10 per
cent of the schools taught only two subjects. The schools which offered five
or six subjects taught from five to seven and one-half hours a week.

The Hebrew language was taught in 90 per cent of the five-year schools.
One-third of the schools taught first-year Hebrew in the highest (fifth) grade;
but the texts were those intended for high school classes, such as *Ivrit Le-Mitlamdim* by Simha Rubinstein, or *Ivrit Hayah* by Harry Blumberg and Mordecai H. Lewittes. Slightly more than one-third of the schools in this category used a second-year language text. The rest used either third-year language texts or anthologies of Hebrew literature.

Over 80 per cent of the five-year schools reported teaching Bible. Of these, two-thirds studied an abbreviated school text of Genesis and Exodus; the rest of the schools taught the other books of the Pentateuch or the Former Prophets; one school reported teaching the Talmud and one The Ethics of the Fathers. On the average, a five-year curriculum school devoted about one hour and one-half a week to the study of Bible.

History in the highest grades was taught in six out of ten of the five-year weekday afternoon schools included in the study. Several schools reported teaching current events in modern Israel; the rest offered either a general review course in general Jewish or American Jewish history. On the average, one hour a week was devoted to the study of history. One out of six schools taught singing in the highest grade for weekly periods of from fifteen to thirty minutes.

Only one out of five schools taught current events, on the average for over one-half hour a week. Anglo-Jewish and general periodicals were used as texts. Four schools reported teaching Jewish literature in English.

The courses of study of the six-year schools were similar to those of the five-year schools, except for the teaching of Yiddish, which was reported by several six-year schools. Hebrew as a language was taught in nine out of ten schools. As in the case of the schools based on five-year curricula, over one-third of the schools in this category used advanced first-year Hebrew language texts, another fifth of the schools used a second-year Hebrew language text, while the rest used anthologies of Hebrew literature or Hebrew stories and the *Hadoar Lanoar* (a Hebrew periodical for children). On the average, the six-year schools devoted slightly more than one and one-half hours a week to the study of the Hebrew language.

All schools in this category taught the Bible in their highest grade. One-half of the schools taught Numbers and Deuteronomy, and over one-fifth taught Exodus and Leviticus, while several still taught Genesis. Over one-fifth of the schools taught Judges and Kings, and one school reported teaching Mishnah.

On the average, almost two hours a week was devoted to teaching Bible in this group of schools.

Three out of four schools in this category taught history. The largest single group taught modern Jewish history; a few schools taught United States history, and only one reported teaching the history of Zionism. About one hour a week was devoted to the study of history. Almost half of the schools taught customs and ceremonies for an average of forty-five minutes a week.

Two-thirds of the schools taught prayer and worship, to which they devoted slightly over one hour a week. One out of five schools taught current events for an average of forty-five minutes a week; one out of twelve schools reported teaching Yiddish, and one out of ten singing.

This description of the programming in the highest grades of the weekday
Community Financing of Jewish Education

The trend towards larger appropriations in the financing of local programs of Jewish education by local federations and welfare funds continued during 1950 and 1951.

The total amounts budgeted for all local needs in forty-five communities reporting to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds for 1950 and 1951 were $22,561,923 and $23,456,523, respectively. During these two years the amounts allocated for Jewish education in the forty-five communities were $1,862,112 and $1,994,074. The relative increase in the total amount budgeted for all local needs during these years was 4.0 per cent; the relative increase in the amount allotted to Jewish education for these two years was 7.1 per cent.

The measure of community sharing in the financing of Jewish education is better shown when federation allocations for Jewish education are classified according to the size of the Jewish community.

In communities having less than 5,000 Jews, the proportion allowed for Jewish education out of the total allocated for all local needs was 30.5 per cent in 1950 and 33.3 per cent in 1951; for communities having a Jewish population from 5,000 to 15,000, the respective relative shares allotted for Jewish education were 16.6 per cent and 17.6 per cent; and for communities having from 15,000 to 40,000 Jewish inhabitants, the respective proportions were 24.8 and 30.1 per cent.

In the large communities, however, those having a Jewish population of over 40,000, the proportion allotted for Jewish education out of the total budgeted for all local needs was 6.53 per cent in 1950 and 6.66 per cent in 1951.

Philadelphia and New York reported having received the largest appropriations for Jewish education in the history of those cities in 1951.

The total amount budgeted in New York City for all local needs in 1950 and in 1951 exceeded the aggregate amount budgeted for all local needs in the other forty-four communities reporting to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. In 1950 and 1951, the forty-four reporting communities budgeted for all local needs $11,168,386 and $11,508,609, respectively. New York’s Jewish community’s federation budget for all local needs for 1950 was $11,393,537 and for 1951, $11,947,884.

In the case of Jewish education however, the amount allocated for New York City represented 27.1 per cent of the total amount allocated for Jewish education in the forty-four reporting communities in 1950, and 27.5 per cent of the aggregate allotment for Jewish education in these cities in 1951.
Tuition Fees in Weekday Afternoon Schools

In May 1952 the Research Department of the American Association for Jewish Education released a comprehensive study on tuition fees.5

According to this study, more than two-thirds of all responding schools—138 out of 203 schools, distributed over 78 cities in 28 states—reported changes in tuition fees in the last four or five years.

CONGREGATIONAL SCHOOLS

The average annual tuition fee in congregational schools in 1946–47, including members’ and non-members’ children, was $47.30; in 1951 it was $65.00, an average increase of $17.70 or 37.4 per cent. One-fourth of the congregations which charged the lower fees, when arranged in order of the amounts of the tuition fees, charged an annual rate of $35.00 or less before the fees were raised, and $52.70 or less after they were raised, an increase of $17.70 or 50.6 per cent; another fourth of the congregations which charged the higher fees charged $60.00 or more before the rates were raised, and $76.50 or more after they were raised. The median tuition fee for all congregational schools was $50.00 for the original fees and $68.50 for the raised fees.

NONCONGREGATIONAL SCHOOLS

In noncongregational schools tuition fees were lower than in congregational schools. The average annual tuition fee in the noncongregational school in 1946–47 was $41.70; in 1951, the average tuition fee was raised to $61.30, an increase of $19.60 or 47.0 per cent. One-fourth of the noncongregational schools which had the lowest tuition fees charged $25.00 or less before the fees were raised, and $43.30 or less after they were raised, an increase of 73.2 per cent. Another quarter of the noncongregational schools which charged the higher tuition fees charged $60.00 or more before they were raised, and $74.30 after they were raised, an increase of $14.30 or 23.8 per cent.

PROPORTION OF TUITION FEE INCOME TO INSTRUCTIONAL COST

Of the 203 congregational and noncongregational schools included in the study, 145, or 71.4 per cent, reported on instructional cost and tuition fee income.

The total educational bill for teachers’ and principals’ salaries in the 145 schools in 1951 was $1,796,848. Of this sum, $808,186 or 45.0 per cent was covered by tuition fees.

In the congregational schools the tuition fee income accounted for 52.2 per cent of the total instructional cost. In the noncongregational schools, the proportion was only 34.2 per cent.

6 Information Bulletin No. 20, Tuition Fees in Weekday Afternoon Schools.
Jewish School Enrollment, 1952

In the spring of 1952, the aggregate enrollment in all types of Jewish elementary and secondary schools—including children attending Sunday, weekday afternoon, all-day, Yiddish, congregational and noncongregational schools, and those attending released-time classes—numbered 336,084. In 1951 it had numbered 302,454, indicating an increase for the year of 33,630 children, or 11.1 per cent. This is the seventh consecutive increase in Jewish school enrollment since school census taking was inaugurated in 1945. Part of the increase is probably to be ascribed to more complete reporting as the existing local community central agencies for Jewish education succeed in improving the recording and reporting of enrollment data and as new central agencies for Jewish education are being organized in more communities. But better reporting probably accounts for only a small fraction of the increase. Communities and organizations which had adequate facilities for gathering school statistics in the past report substantial increases in enrollment, in some cases larger than those recorded for the United States as a whole.

The Committee on Religious Education of the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues reported an aggregate enrollment for 1952 in its 65 affiliated schools of 15,285, an increase over 1951 of 1,615 pupils, or more than 12 per cent. The Board of Jewish Education of Baltimore reported that the Jewish school enrollment in the city had grown from 4,816 in 1951 to 5,768 in 1952, an increase of 19.8 per cent; Syracuse reported an increase from 814 to 965, or 18.6 per cent; Pittsburgh reported an increase from 3,866 in 1951 to 4,470 in 1952, an increase of 15.6 per cent. Cincinnati recorded an increased enrollment for the year from 2,223 to 2,474, or 11.3 per cent. Los Angeles reported a rise in enrollment from 12,052 to 13,746, an increase of 14.1 per cent. Chicago reported an increase from 21,086 to 24,313, or 15.3 per cent; Essex County Jewish school enrollment increased from 4,986 to 5,559, or 11.5 per cent. Minneapolis told of an increase in enrollment of 11.9 per cent; Memphis, 10.5 per cent; and Savannah, 9.2 per cent.

The larger part of the Jewish school enrollment in 1952 was found in Sunday schools (52.4 per cent); only 47.6 per cent was enrolled in the weekday schools.

Enrollment by Auspices

For the third consecutive year, Jewish school enrollment in the Sunday and weekday afternoon Hebrew schools was recorded according to congregational and noncongregational auspices.

6 The Jewish school enrollment figures for 1952 are based on the reported actual enrollment in the five major metropolitan centers each of which has a Jewish population of 100,000 or more (New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Boston); in five of the six large urban centers each of which has a Jewish population of between 50,000 and 100,000 (Newark [Essex County], Cleveland, Baltimore, Pittsburgh and San Francisco); in three of the six communities each having a Jewish population of 25,000 to 50,000 (Miami, Washington, D.C., and St. Louis); and in 129 intermediate and small communities. These 142 communities were distributed over thirty-seven states and Washington, D.C., and comprised a Jewish population of approximately 3,800,000, or approximately 75 per cent of the total Jewish population in the United States. Since no enrollment data were available for the remainder of the intermediate and smaller communities whose aggregate Jewish population amounted to approximately 1,800,000 or 20 per cent of all the Jews in the United States, an estimate was made for them.
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### Growth of Jewish School Enrollment 1948–52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weekday School Enrollment*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday School Enrollment*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>160,077</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>+13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>176,007</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>336,084</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>141,278</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>+ 6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>157,974</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>+21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>302,454</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>132,642</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>+ 8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>130,574</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>+ 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>266,609</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+ 4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>122,109</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>128,719</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>+ 6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>255,835</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+ 6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>118,502</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>120,896</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>239,398</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

b Includes 5,037 enrolled in released-time classes in 1949; 3,393 in 1950; 3,202 in 1951; and 3,000 in 1952.

The total recorded enrollment under all auspices in the 140 communities was 123,392 pupils: 63.4 per cent were found in Sunday schools and 36.6 per cent in afternoon weekday Hebrew schools. The proportion enrolled under Orthodox congregational auspices in these communities was 17.1 per cent; under Reform auspices, 30.2 per cent; under Conservative auspices, 35.1 per cent; and under noncongregational auspices, 16.6 per cent. Most of the noncongregational schools were Orthodox-oriented, though not under Orthodox congregational auspices.

Of the children attending Orthodox congregational schools, 45.5 per cent attended weekday afternoon schools, and 54.5 per cent Sunday schools; of those attending Conservative congregational schools, 41.9 per cent were in weekday schools and 58.1 per cent in Sunday schools; of those attending Reform congregational schools, 10.0 per cent attended on weekday afternoons, and 90.0 per cent on Sunday and Saturday mornings; of the noncongregational school enrollment, 62.9 per cent were in the weekday afternoon schools and 37.1 per cent in Sunday schools.

### Publications

Very few works of a theoretical nature dealing with problems in Jewish education in the United States appeared during the period under review. Among the few published were Shprach un Dertziung (Yiddish) by H. B. Bass, a collection of essays dealing mainly with the methodology of teaching the Yiddish language. The one-hundredth issue of the Pedagogisher Bulletin published in Yiddish by the Jewish Education Committee of New York and edited by Yudel Mark appeared during the year, marking the thirteenth year of its publication.

The Jewish Education Committee of New York City published a bibliography by Max Zeldner of about 1,400 titles of books and articles dealing with methods and materials of teaching Hebrew in the light of modern language methodology. The Jewish Education Committee also continued to publish illustrated children's booklets in Hebrew. During the year it published
Hannah Senesh by Aron Meged, edited by Simha Rubinstein; Ha-Sod ("The Secret") by Merim, translated by Elhanan Indelman; and Ha-Otzar Ba-Meerah ("The Treasure in the Cave") adapted by Elhanan Indelman from the play by Michael Almaz.

The American Association for Jewish Education published a Jewish Education Register and Directory—1951. The Register contains a number of statistical and evaluative articles on the progress and present status of Jewish education, the Jewish teaching profession, and a listing of Jewish schools in the United States.

The Department of Research of the American Association for Jewish Education released three studies: Bureau Subventions for Jewish Schools, a study of criteria for financing Jewish schools by central community funds; Educational Requirements for Bar Mitzvah in the United States; and Tuition Fees in Weekday Afternoon Schools.


For children in the higher grades, the Commission on Jewish Education published Little Lower Than the Angels, by Roland B. Gittelsohn, a book on the Jewish religion for children of high school age.

The United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education published an illustrated Hebrew language text in two volumes: Shalom Yeladim ("Hello, Children") by Teresa K. Silber; and the first of a three-volume history text, The Jewish People by Deborah Pessin.

CURRICULA

Two curricula for the congregational school were published during 1950 and 1951. In August 1951 the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education published a curriculum for junior high school classes. It constitutes the second part of the Curriculum Outline for the Congregational School, published in August 1948. Both parts were prepared by Louis L. Ruffman. The curriculum is intended for children attending the congregational schools six hours a week, and is organized around three major areas: the Torah, the Jewish people, and Jewish life and religious practices.

Curriculum for the Congregational School, by Leon S. Lang, which was presented as a doctoral dissertation at Dropsie College, was published by the Board of Jewish Education of the Philadelphia branch of the United Synagogue of America with a foreword by Simon Greenberg. It, too, is intended for schools giving a minimum of six hours of instruction a week. The curriculum outlines a three-year program of studies, organized in terms of four major areas: Judaism, Israel, Torah, and the Hebrew language.

An Outline of a Curriculum on Israel, based on the activity principle, by

Jacob S. Golub and Zalmen Slesinger, was published jointly by the American Association for Jewish Education and the Jewish Education Committee of New York.

Curriculum Workshop

A curriculum workshop, sponsored jointly by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Jewish Education Committee, was opened on January 31, 1952. The purpose of the workshop was to encourage experiments and creative teaching in the one-day-a-week schools.

Conferences

During the year there were the usual number of national, regional, and local Jewish educational conferences.

The National Council for Jewish Education met in Chicago, June 1-5, 1952, in conjunction with the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service and the National Association of Jewish Center Workers. The conference dealt with the theme of changes in the American Jewish community and their bearing on the development of Hebrew education.

The Conference of the National Jewish Women's Organizations, held on May 14, 1951, New York City, adopted a resolution calling on women's organizations to dedicate "... our active influence and our best efforts ... to make Jewish education of the highest quality for all ages: children, youth and adults."

The Eighth Annual Meeting of the Torah Umesorah, held in New York City, launched a campaign to establish a Teachers Training College for the education of day school teachers and administrators.

The Rabbinical Assembly Conference on Jewish Education (in conjunction with the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and the Teachers' Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America) was held in New York City on December 9 and 10, 1951. It was devoted to adult education, in celebration of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the National Academy for Adult Jewish Studies.

The Fourth Annual Assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board, held at Camp Wel-Met, Narrowsburg, N. Y., August 30 to Sept. 7, 1951, passed a resolution calling on federations and welfare funds to provide adequate allocations to Jewish educational institutions.

On June 23, 1951, the Large City Budgeting Conference, composed of representatives of the twelve major welfare funds of the country, stressed the growing importance of Jewish education in the United States.

At the Southeastern Synagogue Conference held under the auspices of the Mizrachi National Education Committee in Miami Beach, Fla., May 16-18, 1951, a plan was suggested for a regional all-day high school with dormitory facilities which would serve the needs of the entire South.
At the thirteenth annual conference of the American Association for Jewish Education, an announcement was made of the launching of the National Study for Jewish Education which had been decided on by the first national Conference on Jewish Education, held January 1951. It was also announced that Oscar I. Janowsky of the College of the City of New York had accepted the chairmanship of the study.

The first Greater New York Assembly on Jewish Education was held on February 10, 1952, under the auspices of the Jewish Education Committee of New York. Its various panels dealt with such problems as the state of Jewish education in metropolitan New York; the writers' responsibility in Jewish education; the role of the rabbi; and the Jewish teaching profession. The delegates voted to convene the Greater New York Assembly on Jewish Education annually.

The National Association of Yeshiva Teachers and Principals held regional conferences in New England, New Jersey, and New York, at which the educational goals of the yeshivah and teaching techniques were discussed.

The Annual Conference of Jewish Teachers in Philadelphia, February 12, 1952, concerned itself with the problem of evaluating achievements in Jewish schools, while the Philadelphia pedagogical conference of the Yiddish schools was devoted to a discussion of cultural conflicts in American Judaism. The tenth annual Pedagogic Conference sponsored by the Jewish Education Committee of New York City held on April 26-27, 1952, revolved around the theme of the teaching of Hebrew.

Pedagogic conferences were reported held during the year in Buffalo, Chicago, Boston, and Los Angeles. The seventh annual Cejwin Workshop of executives of central agencies for Jewish education and Jewish school administrators was held during the Labor Day week end, 1951, at Cejwin Camps, Port Jervis, N. Y.

The second annual meeting and workshop of the National Council on Jewish Audio-Visual Materials was held in New York City on May 27, 1952. A citation was presented to the United Israel Appeal for its production of Tent City as the "outstanding film of Jewish content produced in the year 1951."

Other Developments

An Audio-Visual Center was opened during the period under review under the auspices of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in New York City, in the Union House of Living Judaism. The center was to specialize in the production of educational films and recordings concerning various phases of Jewish life and history, and to guide Jewish schools in establishing audio-visual programs as part of their curricula. In March 1952 it released as its first filmstrip, The Jews Settle in New Amsterdam—1645, written and directed by Samuel Grand.

In May 1952 Chicago conducted a special Jewish High School Month Campaign for increasing the registration for Hebrew high schools among the graduates of the elementary Hebrew schools.

A second annual Bar and Bas Mitzvah Fete for over 600 boys and girls
who were to become bar and bas mitzvah during the year was held on Oc-
tober 27, 1951, by twenty-seven Conservative congregations of Philadelphia.

The Hebrew Teachers College of Boston celebrated its thirtieth anniver-
sary on November 27, 1951.

The Department of Education and Culture of the Jewish Agency for Israel
conducted two seminars in Israel for teachers of Jewish schools from July 13
to August 18, 1952: one for teachers in service, conducted by Judah Pilch;
the other intended for senior students of American Jewish teachers' colleges
was held at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and was scheduled to last
for six months. In addition, the Department of Education and Culture con-
ducted a seminar for teachers in training in the United States in August 1952.

Survey of Jewish Education in New York City

A comprehensive three-year survey of Jewish education in New York City
was started in September 1951 by the Jewish Education Committee with the
financial assistance of the Building and Research Fund of the Federation of
Jewish Philanthropies of New York City. The survey is being directed by
Israel S. Chipkin, with the assistance of an Advisory Board of Communal Lay
Leaders under the chairmanship of Judge Maximilian Moss, former president
of the Board of Education of New York City, and an Advisory Committee of
Technical Consultants headed by Jacob Greenberg, associate superintendent
of schools.

Uriah Zevi Engelman

JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE

This article discusses trends in Jewish social service, with special emphasis
on the fields of family service, services for children, and for the aged.
Reference is also made to medical care provided under Jewish auspices. The
fields of overseas and immigration services, community organization, and fund
raising will receive only incidental treatment in this article. The statistical
material presented ¹ covers the period from January 1, 1951, to December 31,
1951, unless stated otherwise, and the nonstatistical studies, articles, and
discussions to which reference is made, cover the period until June 1952.

Trends

The year 1951-52 in Jewish social service may be characterized as one of
relative stability with emphasis upon refinement, increased specialization, and
better coordination. Some expansion of existing services took place, particu-
larly in the field of medical care and in care of the aged. Much attention was
given during the year to better coordination of local services and to the rela-
tion of functional agencies to federations and other coordinating bodies.

¹Grateful acknowledgment is made to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, which
provided the statistical data for this article.
With a decline in immigration and a leveling off of fund raising for overseas purposes, attention was centered on domestic needs to a greater extent than in preceding years and efforts were made to strengthen and develop existing local services. In a few instances new services were projected, such as foster home service for the aged and for the mentally ill, and treatment-oriented group homes for children. On the whole, however, these represent an effort to provide more effective service for a group of clients who were previously served in some other way, rather than an adaptation to a new type of need. The extension of social services to upper income groups made some headway, particularly in the larger communities, but by far the greatest proportion of clients in Jewish social agencies throughout the United States came from underprivileged groups.

The changes which took place in 1951–52, in other words, were gradual and developmental and contrast strongly with the developments of an emergency nature which characterized the peak years of refugee immigration. No new and startling fund-raising campaigns were necessary after the establishment of the Israel Bond Drive in December 1950 and the stabilization of the United Jewish Appeal campaign, nor was it necessary to mobilize new staffs on an overnight basis. Better coordinated local service, exploitation and some expansion of existing services, and refinement of skills through specialization, were characteristic of 1951–52.

Community Organization and Fund Raising for Social Service

The comparative stabilization which was evident in the operations of functional agencies during 1951–52 had its counterpart in the field of fund raising and in community organization. It is most likely, in fact, that the trends toward stabilization, refinement and development of services which were observable in the functional fields were directly dependent upon similar developments in the fields of fund raising and community organization. There had been a 50 per cent increase in fund raising from 1940 to 1945, a 400 per cent increase between 1946 and 1948 over the peak reached in 1945, a decrease of 20 per cent in 1949 and of 15 per cent in 1950. In 1951 fund raising leveled off, with total funds only 5 per cent less than in 1950. It is estimated that there will be about a 10 per cent decrease in the 1952 campaigns. In spite of the decrease of 35 per cent to 40 per cent since the peak achievement of 1948, however, the Jewish community continues to raise about five times the amount raised in 1940.

Much of this development certainly stemmed from the response of the American Jewish community to overseas needs, and especially to the needs of the new State of Israel. It was perhaps inevitable, therefore, that much attention should be focused on overseas and refugee services. With comparative stabilization abroad, however, and with the decreased refugee need, attention was again focused on the basic social services of the local community.

---

2 Refugee immigration declined from 37,000 in 1949 to 16,500 in 1951, and probably will be 8,000 or less in 1952.

Nonrefugee services accounted for 25 per cent of the total budgeted out of Jewish campaigns in 1941. In 1948 they represented 9 per cent, but in 1951 they represented 17 per cent. With this shift of emphasis to domestic services, some examination of current trends as these are related to basic community needs and services was in order.

At the 1952 meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, for example, most of the principal papers were devoted to this subject. Isidore Sobeloff, reporting at this meeting on the results of a questionnaire to which fourteen communities replied, set forth a number of different lines of development in community organization. Among those which might be considered present-day trends are the following:

1. the changing relationships of functional agencies to the central organization, especially in the area of social planning; 2. the stimulation of new services or variations of old by the central organization; 3. the greater intercommunication of functional agencies and interrelating of their services to total community problems; 4. the beginnings of development of specialization on the part of members of the central staff. (In New York, as an example, consultants are now employed by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, in the fields of group work, casework, and medical care.); 5. increased development of community organization as a professional field.

All of this is in keeping with the stabilization and refinement which have occurred in the functional agencies and, indeed, may have served to stimulate parallel developments in such agencies. However that may be, the picture is a consistent one in both community organization and direct agency service.

This is pointed up by a similar study carried out by Harold Silver and presented at the 1952 meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service. Silver studied trends in the field of family and individual welfare, considering direct services for families, children, and the aged. He received replies from the heads of thirty-six agencies in twenty-three communities, ten of whom were executives in homes for the aged, five in vocational services, six in family agencies, eight in child care, and nine in family and child care agencies. Silver reports growing professionalism, increased specialization, and sharpening of skills as factors with which these executives were particularly concerned.

**Family Service**

A committee of family agency executives organized by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds undertook to prepare a statement on the development of the Jewish family agency, its goals and its essential purposes in 1952. This statement gives recognition to the fact that the *raison d'être*
of the Jewish family agency has changed over the course of the last seventy-five years. Starting as a relief agency operating on the principle that "the Jews should take care of their own," the Jewish family agency carried out its relief function as its primary one up until the establishment of public relief on a wide scale, that is, during the early Thirties. At this point it became clear that Jewish family agencies could not possibly meet the relief needs of the total Jewish community. The question arose, too, whether it was desirable to try to do so, after the rest of the community had adopted relief as a governmental function. Accordingly, Jewish family agencies turned over the major part of their relief-giving function to the public agencies and retained only that part which the public agency could not carry. Most Jewish family agencies continued to provide both financial assistance for maintenance purposes in those cases which were not eligible for public relief, and money for special purposes, such as business loans and scholarships. Certain special services which ultimately can be translated into relief terms, e.g., homemaker service, camp care, and others, were also offered by the Jewish family agencies. The dropping of maintenance assistance as a major function, however, made it necessary for the family agency to redefine its essential purpose and its goal, and this redefinition took a period of years. Many attempts were made to define function in terms of the preservation of wholesome family life. It was recognized, however, that in such definition there was little, if any, differentiation between the Jewish family agency and the non-Jewish agency. Other attempts were made to define function in the terms of the special casework skills which the staffs of the Jewish family agencies had developed, but it was found that the element of skill could not be used to distinguish the Jewish family agency from the nonsectarian, nor was there any clear-cut distinction between casework skills in the family agency, as contrasted with children's or other agencies.

The influx of refugee immigration provided a function very similar to the original one for those family agencies which took on immigrant aid as their specific responsibility. This was well understood by the community and there was comparatively little difficulty in securing community support for this function. With the recent drop in refugee case loads, however, it again became necessary to define the function of the Jewish family agency, and the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds proceeded to set up a working committee for this purpose. The work of this committee paralleled that of a similar committee set up by the Family Service Association of America, which had found a similar necessity among non-Jewish family agencies.

Sufficient progress was made by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds' committee to enable it to prepare the report referred to above in which the purpose and services of the Jewish family agency were set forth in the following manner:

---

8 Attention should be called to the examination of the rationale for a Jewish family agency contained within a survey report on the Jewish Social Service Bureau of Springfield, Mass. (A Jewish Community Looks at Its Casework Services, by Robert Morris, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, June 1952). This report recommends the continuance of a Jewish agency, even though it is assumed that many services can be procured just as effectively in this community under nonsectarian auspices. A study of the values of the Jewish agency operating under such circumstances is proposed.
Purpose
The purpose of the Jewish family agency may be stated as follows: Along with other family agencies, it is interested in the well-being of the family and in the conservation and enrichment of family life in the community. It has a special orientation because of its interest in the family as a unit in the total Jewish community. Its primary objective is the prevention, wherever possible, of breakdown of the family, the strengthening of family ties, and the maintenance of healthy and satisfying family living. Its concept of the family extends beyond those living under one roof, and it is concerned with relationships among family members wherever they may reside . . .

Services
Jewish family services may fall into the following categories:

1. Problems of Family and Personal Interrelationships
These problems are served through counseling, a skill developed by family agencies over a period of years. Included in this category are marital problems, problems of parent-child relationships, and adjustment of individuals. Service to meet these problems is an essential characteristic of a Jewish family service.

2. Concrete Services Administered Through Casework Skills
These vary according to the availability of public and other resources to support social and economic requirements for family well-being. For example, a concrete program such as homemaker service given in connection with a family service may be available only to counseling clients of the agency, or may be open to any member of the community requiring the services of a homemaker. In either case, in order to be a valid part of family service, the homemaker service would need to be administered by a caseworker.

Concrete services provided by Jewish family agencies include:
Relief for short periods or for exceptional cases; business loans; psychiatric treatment; boarding care for the aged; nursing homes for the chronically ill; transient relief; payment for children's camp care; psychological testing; room registry or housing; chaplaincy and service to prisoners or parolees. Thus the types of concrete services available through Family Service differ from community to community. Similar services may be provided under other than family service auspices. Available concrete services in a community are necessary for healthy family living, but need not be administered by a Jewish family service.

3. Information and Referral Service
Information services to help families make full use of all community resources are a valid part of a family service when the program is administered through casework methods and with casework objectives.

This statement represents a consensus of opinion by a diverse group of Jewish family agencies in 1952. As the years go on, it will undoubtedly be superseded by other statements which will have greater meaning in terms of prevailing conditions in the Jewish community at that time. For the present,
however, Jewish family agencies are functioning on this basis, and to judge from the extent of their service and the amount of money being contributed by the Jewish community for this purpose, they are well rooted in American-Jewish community life.

### TABLE 1
**Jewish Family Agency Income, Sources of Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>63*</td>
<td>$8,927,465</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9,800,000</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes multiple service with child care. NYANA is excluded.

b Income of New York Association for New Americans (NYANA) was $4,877,252.

### TABLE 2
**Volume of Service, Total Open Case Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Open Cases 1951</th>
<th>Per Cent Change From 1950</th>
<th>Exp. for Fin. Assistance</th>
<th>Mo. Exp. Per Case</th>
<th>Per Cent Receiving Fin. Assistance</th>
<th>Per Cent Receiving Public Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47,376*</td>
<td>-6½</td>
<td>$4,502,619</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>33.3 o</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding NYANA which served 5,789 cases.

b Includes immigrants.

o Excluding NYANA where 88 per cent received financial assistance.

### TABLE 3
**Active Case Count, 1951, as Reported by 47 Jewish Family Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Average</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Cases</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assistance Cases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 1951</td>
<td>Per Cent Change From 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All cases</td>
<td>9,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>3,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonimmigrants</td>
<td>5,497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In addition NYANA spent an equal sum for immigrant assistance in New York City in 1951.
TABLE 4
STAFFING IN JEWISH FAMILY AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Agencies</th>
<th>Total No. of CWs and Supvrs.</th>
<th>Prof. Staff of More Than Two</th>
<th>Prof. Staff of One or Two</th>
<th>No. of Supvrs.</th>
<th>No. of CWs</th>
<th>Ratio of CWs to Supvrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70*</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>103^b</td>
<td>333^e</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes NYANA.
^b In 39 agencies including NYANA.
^e In 39 agencies including NYANA.

TABLE 5
SIZE OF CASE LOAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Agencies Reporting</th>
<th>Between 20-29</th>
<th>Between 30-39</th>
<th>Between 40-49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above statistical picture reveals that Jewish family agencies are receiving substantial support from federations and welfare funds and from community chests. Volume of service has declined largely because of lower refugee loads. The statistics also indicate that the size of the case load has been relatively low, and that supervision has been intensive. This means that the conditions for a high quality of service have prevailed. The Jewish family agencies, on the whole, have received favorable recognition for the high standards which they have maintained and for the leadership which they have taken in offering the most advanced service in the field. Most Jewish agencies, the statistics indicate, have not ignored financial services, although the amount spent for direct financial assistance has declined, as might be expected with a lower refugee load. Jewish family agencies have taken the leadership in extending service to higher income groups on a fee-charging basis. Income from fees is still nominal, but may be expected to increase as Jewish family agencies acquire greater experience in working on a fee basis.

Services for Children

Services for children provided by Jewish agencies fall into two major categories, namely, services for children in their own homes, including parent-child counseling and psychiatric care; and services to children outside their own home, that is, in foster homes or institutional placement. In the first category there are a great many children receiving service in family and mul-

10 For a comprehensive statistical picture of Jewish social work, see the 1952 Year Book on Jewish Social Service published by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.
multiple service agencies, together with the substantial case loads of Jewish child guidance agencies, such as The Child Guidance Institute of the Jewish Board of Guardians in New York City, the Child Guidance Service of the Jewish Child Care Association of Essex County, and the Children's and Youth Services of the Jewish Community Services of Long Island. At present there is no national statistical accounting of those children who are receiving counseling and psychiatric services while residing in their own homes. It would appear, however, that the number is large and that they may account for a considerable number of the cases which are listed as family cases. From all appearances it would seem that the number of such cases is growing and that the disposition of family and multiple service agencies to take on this type of case is also growing.

Whether the increased case load of this character is at all related to the declining case load in the field of foster home and institutional placement is unknown. It is quite possible, however, that effective service of a preventive nature leads to less need for the placement of children outside their own homes.

However that may be, the fact is that case loads in Jewish placement agencies have shown a steady downward trend since 1938. A considerable part of the decline in 1951 resulted from the decreased service to immigrant children, which was one-third less than in 1950. Even without this decrease in the number of immigrant children, however, there has been a steady decline in the case loads of Jewish placement agencies.

There is evidence that while the number of children in placement has decreased, the types and the quality of service offered by such agencies has been improving. In fact, it is quite possible that the decline in caseload is very directly related to better quality of service. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) has noted that the decline in the number of children receiving placement service accompanies a relatively stable intake situation. In other words, the number of applications for placement has not declined as the number of children in placement has. This may mean that placement agencies are discharging children faster, as a result of better casework, more emphasis on work with parents, etc. The CJFWF is planning to study this matter.

The character of the case load in some children's agencies has changed considerably, with many more emotionally disturbed children being accepted. Efforts have been made to meet the needs of such children through new types of treatment facilities such as small group homes, subsidized and specialized foster homes, remedial school programs in institutions, as well as through better trained staff, more intensive work with parents, and additional psychiatric service. Most of the larger communities have organized or are planning services along these lines.

The quantitative changes in the staff picture as compared with 1950 are slight. For the ten agencies providing foster home care only, there were fifteen supervisors and forty-one caseworkers in 1950, as compared with fourteen supervisors and forty-three caseworkers in 1951. The average load per worker

---

TABLE 6
INCOME OF CHILDREN’S AGENCIES, SOURCES OF SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>1951</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$5,318,432</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 5,000,000</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7
VOLUME OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Child. Under Care</th>
<th>Per Cent in Foster Homes</th>
<th>Per Cent in Child. Inst.</th>
<th>Per Cent in Homes of Parents</th>
<th>Per Cent in Homes of Other Relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>4,027</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8
CHILD CARE STAFFS AND CASE LOADS, 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Agen. Reporting</th>
<th>Supvr. Staffs</th>
<th>Caseworkers</th>
<th>Children per Caseworker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Home Only ......</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Home and Inst.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in 1950 was twenty-five cases in these agencies, as contrasted with twenty-two for 1951. In the eleven agencies providing both foster home and institutional care in 1951, there were thirty-four supervisors and ninety-five and one-half caseworkers, with an average case load of twenty-eight. (Table 8.)

As in family service, the statistical picture indicates substantial support from federations and chests as well as a stable contribution from public funds. The ratio of the number of children under care and professional staff is not out of line with that of the family agencies. The decline in the number of children receiving the care of professional staff must, of course, be weighed against the increased number of emotionally disturbed children in placement and the more intensive type of casework which is being provided for them. The statistics do not show this, but Silver’s questionnaire study, referred to above, corroborates this well-known trend in Jewish child care. (Tables 6 and 7.)
Care of the Aged

The picture in the field of care of the aged in 1951-52 is one of both quantitative and qualitative developments. Old services are being expanded and new ones are on the horizon. Limited just a few years ago to institutional care, the field is now many-sided and the possibilities for intelligent service for the aged are being explored everywhere. In addition to institutional care, several private residence or foster home programs for the aged are now under way in Jewish agencies and widespread recreational programs are now being developed. The National Council of Jewish Women has taken the leadership in this particular phase of service, urging local chapters to sponsor recreational projects.

TABLE 9

INSTITUTIONAL CARE OF THE AGED, INCOME, SOURCES OF SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>$8,193,705</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payments for service are as low as 5 per cent in one home and as high as 83 per cent in another. A substantial part of payments for service stems from Old Age Assistance grants and Old Age and Survivors' Insurance. In some places these are not available to persons residing in institutions.

Of the fifty homes reporting, forty get money from central funds and ten do not, forty-eight out of the fifty get some money from contributions and membership dues. All fifty receive payment for service. (Table 9.)

TABLE 10

VOLUME OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Homes Reporting</th>
<th>No. of Per. Served</th>
<th>Per Cent of Inc. in 1950</th>
<th>Per Cent of Inc. in 1951</th>
<th>Receiving OAA</th>
<th>Receiving Old-Age and Survivors Ins.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-four homes reported 6,104 residents on January 1, 1950, as compared with 6,879 on December 31, 1951, an increase of nearly 13 per cent in the two-year period. Buildings completed in 1950 resulted in an influx which diminished in 1951 when beds were again filled. Much building is still going on, however, and this will result in further expansion of institutional service. By mid-1951, institutional expansion plans were under way or completed in Atlantic City, Buffalo, Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Houston, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, New York, Oakland, Philadelphia, Portland, Ore.; Rochester, N. Y.; St. Paul, St. Louis, Toronto, and Washington, D.C.

See the June 1951 and 1952 issues of the Jewish Social Service Quarterly for articles on the various types of service for the aged which have been developed within the past few years.
Here again the statistical picture fails to indicate the qualitative developments in service for the aged throughout the country. Within the better institutions, for example, casework programs are being adopted and a great deal of work is being done by way of meeting the individual needs of the elderly placed person and his family. The foster home programs are mostly in an incipient stage, but all of these programs are in the hands of professional casework staffs and all are designed to meet the psychological needs of elderly persons who can remain in the community.

It is only a few years since elderly people held no particular interest for caseworkers. Their potentialities for change were looked upon as strictly limited and therapeutically oriented caseworkers looked upon the elderly person as an undesirable, since unresponsive, client. Today, caseworkers, recognizing that the ability of the elderly person to respond to psychological understanding is enormous, are showing a greater willingness to specialize in the field of services for the aged, and highly effective programs of casework service for the aged are being developed.

Aside from casework services, there are numerous other attempts to meet the needs of elderly persons—in such areas as housing and medical care. Apartment projects for the aged have caused widespread interest. There is increasing attention, too, to the needs of the chronically ill, and institutional facilities are being used more and more for this purpose. Another significant development is home medical care under hospital auspices, a service available to all age groups but one which has proved to be extremely meaningful to the sick elderly person. The field of care of the aged is one in which volunteer interest may be properly utilized, and a good deal of effort is being made to direct interested volunteers to this field.

**Hospital Services**

In 1952 the Jewish community continued to give heavy support to hospitals under Jewish auspices, many of which are available to both the Jewish and non-Jewish community. Most of the larger Jewish hospitals have social service departments equipped with trained professional staff. On the whole, however, hospital social service departments have not worked together with social agencies as closely as they might. Several of the larger cities are giving attention to this matter at present and it seems likely that better coordinated hospital and social service programs will be worked out within the next few years.

---

14 See the June 1949 issue of the *Jewish Social Service Quarterly* for articles on medical social work and its relation to other types of social service.

15 In New York City, Montefiore Hospital and the Jewish Community Services of Long Island now function cooperatively in providing home care for the aged. A new cooperative program for psychiatric service to social agency clients has just been worked out by Hillside Hospital and the Jewish Community Services of Long Island. In Chicago, there is a parallel effort to utilize the psychiatric facilities of the Michael Reese Hospital by several casework agencies, and in Cincinnati, an effort is being made to work out home medical care for elderly persons through the cooperation of the Social Service Department of the Jewish Hospital and the Jewish Family Service Bureau. In St. Louis, the Jewish Hospital and several social agencies have worked out a plan of cooperation in order to cope with the black market situation in the field of child adoption.
TABLE 11
INCOME OF HOSPITALS, SOURCES OF SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>$78,608,193</td>
<td>10.3*</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of 35 general hospitals, 31 are affiliated with central funds, 21 are affiliated with federations, 16 with chests directly, 20 with chests through federations; 29 have income from membership dues and contributions and 35 receive payment for service; 27 get government funds, and 33 receive money from investments and other sources.

The bed complement of Jewish general hospitals was 14,018 as of December 31, 1951. One-half of the patients treated were Jewish.

TABLE 12
TYPES OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>No. of Jew. Hospitals</th>
<th>No. Diff. Communities Represented</th>
<th>As of Dec. 31, 1951</th>
<th>Entire Year, 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Beds and Bassinets</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15,837</td>
<td>11,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12,861</td>
<td>9,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National TB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other special</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The over-all increase in volume of service for fifty-two hospitals reporting was 6 per cent in the number of patients under care in 1951 as compared with 1950. The largest increase (8 per cent) was in hospitals for the chronically ill. These fifty-two hospitals provided 4,500,000 days of care in 1951, a rise of nearly 4 per cent over 1950. One day in every five was free to patients in the general hospitals. Most of the care in tuberculosis hospitals was provided without cost to patients.

In hospital service, as in institutional care for the aged, federation and chest support is still significant, and in terms of dollars allocated represents a major field. Payments for service and receipts from public funds are much greater than the sums contributed by federations and chests. Despite the comparatively low percentage of federation and chest receipts, however, the absolute sums contributed still make the hospital field a major one in Jewish philanthropy. (Table 12.)
Professional Problems

The problems which Jewish social workers in the functional fields were discussing in 1951-52 were many and varied. They included five which were almost of universal interest. These were: 1. the development of counseling as one of the principal services of the functional agencies; 2. the problems of unionization in social work; 3. the extension of service to upper-income groups through fee charging; 4. research; and 5. the influence of the "Jewish component" in individualized service.

Counseling

At the time of World War I, social workers, who until then were concerned with specific and concrete services, especially relief, turned to psychiatry as a way of meeting the basic difficulties of their clients. In the years following, they borrowed heavily from psychiatry, and casework methods were transformed to the point where they were almost indistinguishable from psychiatric methods. During the Thirties, however, when public relief became a problem, many caseworkers steeped in psychiatric philosophy and method began to consider its applicability to the public relief situation. There were some attempts to separate out what had come from the field of psychiatry and what might be derived from casework experience itself. One group of caseworkers placed emphasis on the administration of concrete services with psychological understanding and defined casework in these terms. After some years, however, it became apparent that clients were interested in using social agencies for something more than concrete services. In many instances they were seeking a psychological kind of help from the agency, even when concrete services were not needed. In the attempt to meet this type of need on the part of their clients, many caseworkers found it desirable to distinguish what they were doing from what was being done by the psychiatrists, and a new term was adopted, namely, counseling.

Some caseworkers still do not distinguish among casework, counseling, and psychotherapy, using all three terms synonymously. However, many others have been interested in distinctions, and in some instances adaptations have been made in the very structure of agencies corresponding to clear-cut distinctions with regard to services offered by the worker as a caseworker, those offered by workers serving as counselors, and those offered by psychiatric staff only. Prominent Jewish agencies have taken much of the leadership in this development of offering counseling as well as psychiatric and tangible casework services. In the year 1952 there was a great deal of interest in the further clarification of the specific character of each of these services.

Unionization

An exception to the relative stability shown in other aspects of Jewish social work was the volatile situation existing in several cities because of dif-
ferences between boards and staff, as well as sharp divisions among staff, over the matter of union affiliation. Following the expulsion, in 1950, of the United Office and Professional Workers of America (UOPWA) from the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) on the grounds that the UOPWA was dominated by Communists, the members of the social service division, formerly known as the Social Service Employees Union (SSEU), were divided in their allegiance, many joining the newly formed CIO Community and Social Agency Employees, others electing to remain with the SSEU. During the period under discussion, the boards of some Jewish agencies took the position that they could no longer continue to recognize the old union because of allegations of Communist control. Much disaffection between agency boards and staffs, and among staffs, resulted. However, only one extramural conflict occurred. In December 1951 supporters of the SSEU went on strike against the Essex County Jewish Community Council and its affiliated agencies in Newark, N. J. Service in several of the agencies was disrupted; the community was divided into partisan groups over the issue of whether employees had the right to join a union of their choice, despite charges of Communist control. The strike was settled by the recognition of two unions, in accordance with the wishes of the divided staffs: a CIO union and a union purported to be independent of any affiliations. By the spring of 1952, SSEU was in a state of dissolution and most of the Social Service workers were affiliated with the Community and Social Agency Employees, CIO. In other instances, the employees were represented by committees within the various agencies elected to bargain collectively on their behalf.

FEE CHARGING

Most social workers no longer seriously doubt that social services should ultimately be made available to all income groups. The rise of counseling as a service, particularly in the growth of the family agencies, has led to widespread demand in some of the larger cities for such service on the part of even those who can afford to pay the full cost, which is often equal to or greater than the charges of private psychiatrists. Since there is not enough trained counseling staff available to serve the total community, a question arises as to priorities. On the whole, agencies have felt that they still have a primary obligation to economically disadvantaged groups. Fee scales have been adopted in a good many agencies, however, and generally range from nominal charges to fifteen dollars or more per interview. The percentage of income derived from fees for professional services is still extremely low,17 perhaps due to the fact that social workers find it difficult to charge for their services. Most caseworkers believe today, however, that there is much value for the client in paying whatever he can afford to pay for service, and there are few who would return to the days when fees were unknown in social agencies. It seems quite certain that fee charging will become more extensive among Jewish social agencies, and although present statistics do not indicate this, it is quite possible that as agencies acquire greater experience along these lines, the percentage of income derived from fees will increase.

17 See Table 1 and Table 6. On the whole, casework agencies which charge fees are now receiving less than 5 per cent of their income from fees.
RESEARCH

During the past few years, several of the larger agencies have recognized the need for research carried out on an intra-agency basis. It is believed that casework and counseling methods have advanced to the point where research regarding their efficacy is desirable, and several agencies have established or extended research programs for this purpose. Many questions have arisen regarding the auspices under which such research should be carried out, the type of personnel required, the methods to be followed, etc. Some have felt that this type of research should not be carried out under the agency's own auspices, but instead should be in the hands of disinterested and objective outsiders. The personnel, they have held, should be under no obligation to the agency itself. Others have felt that this kind of objectivity may be less important than the kind of understanding that results from being part of the agency. The need for personnel trained in research method has received stress. Some have felt, however, that research methods in this particular field must first be developed, and that in such development casework understanding must play a primary role. Some feel, too, that research interest should be developed on the part of all caseworkers and that participation in research projects should be looked upon as an integral part of the caseworker's job.

For the most part, research projects under way in the major agencies have been financed through special funds. Most smaller agencies do not have such funds available and even though the interest is present, they have not been able to proceed with research into their own work in the same manner.

THE JEWISH COMPONENT

For many years workers in Jewish agencies have given a good deal of thought to the question of what is Jewish in the practice of the casework agencies. Specific Jewish components in group work, in community organization and in overseas work, could easily be recognized, but the Jewish factor in casework appeared to be much more elusive. In 1946, the Jewish Education Committee of New York established a workshop consisting of caseworkers and Jewish educators who were interested in this question, and later the work of this committee was taken over by the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service. At present there is no organized group working on this problem, but much thought is being given to it by workers, administrators, and others in the most advanced agencies. It is recognized that the Jewish casework agencies cannot perform a proselytizing function and that they most certainly cannot take any position other than a totally objective one.


19 The Jewish Family Service of New York has established a research department, using special funds for this purpose and The Jewish Children's Bureau of Chicago has carried out a research project on the values of its "dispersed" institutional program. The Jewish Board of Guardians in New York City has also carried out extensive research projects, a report of which is published in Social Science and Psychotherapy for Children by Otto Pollack and collaborators, Russell Sage Foundation, 1952.

with regard to the beliefs and practices of their clients. Many workers feel, however, that it is essential to know what these beliefs and practices are, whether they have any bearing upon the problem brought by the client, how they influence his total psychology, what feeling qualities they carry, how much need the client has to find these qualities in others, etc. In other words, the Jewish component is now being examined from a psychological standpoint. In such examination there appears to be a great deal of promise for the development of counseling and casework in Jewish agencies along special and specific lines.

Herbert H. Aptekar

JEWISH VOCATIONAL SERVICES

During the period under review (July 1951 through June 1952), the economy of the United States was mixed, geared neither to wartime nor peacetime production. Generally, throughout the nation employment was high, but there were a number of soft spots. In many areas, the labor shortage was critical, but in others, New York City for example, there was a substantial labor surplus. And even within specific industrial areas there were occupational contradictions: unfilled jobs in certain categories alongside of unemployed workers in other categories.

Jewish vocational service agencies, most sensitive of all social services to changes in the economic climate, worked with a wide variety of troubling educational and vocational problems. In the main, the people they served were difficult employment cases. The Jewish Vocational Service (JVS) of Cleveland for example, reported that employment was at a peace time peak; in fact, the number of persons employed was within one or two thousand of those employed during the wartime peak in 1943. This gave the Cleveland JVS an opportunity to place many of its marginal applicants for whom job opportunities would normally not be available. Because of the nature of the clients who were demanding service, it was becoming more and more a rehabilitation agency.

During the calendar year 1951, the JVS agencies served 60,000 persons for job placement and 10,000 persons for vocational counseling; received 70,000 job openings and made 24,000 job placements. Sixteen thousand refugees were given employment service, resulting in 9,000 direct job placements; 2,000 emigres were given counseling service. It was estimated that the placements effected by the JVS agencies during this period saved at the annual rate of $3,000,000 in relief costs for the American Jewish community. In this context, one agency (Philadelphia) noted: "In general, it appears that with higher cost per social service dollar in the area, more and more social agencies are looking to the vocational agency for solution to the problem through placement."

The agencies also performed a number of other services: group guidance; psychological testing; small business consultation; occupational research; library service; employment discrimination investigation; and related func-
Counseling Services

Although the JVS agencies devoted more of their time to rehabilitative counseling, they continued to concentrate on the educational problems of Jewish youth. As a preventive measure in diagnosing vocational difficulties before they became deeply rooted "adult" problems, JVS services to youth adapted themselves to the problems of the day. These, in general, had to do with Selective Service, job opportunities in defense industries, leaving school—or having plans abruptly terminated—and the traditional difficulties of discrimination in education and employment.

Some of the agencies reported an increasing number of emotionally disturbed youngsters applying for vocational guidance. Whether this was due to the times or the fact that the JVS agencies were becoming better known through the network of health and welfare referral services, it is not possible to say. New York's Federation Employment Service, however, reported "a sharp increase in very complicated counseling situations, in particular a high percentage of mentally retarded youngsters and those with blocking emotional conflicts that made the counseling process a very difficult one, possible in many instances only with the support of casework and psychiatric services."

Immigrants

Service to immigrants during 1951-52 continued to absorb the energy and staff time of the Jewish Vocational Service agencies. Before the year was over, the lessened flow of immigration had sharply reduced the number of new applicants applying for service, but the demands upon the agencies continued at the same level. This was due, in large measure, to a high re-registration figure for immigrants, the number returning for service constituting as high a proportion of the total load as did the new applications. Reports from various JVS agencies indicated that this resulted typically from the immigrant's desire to advance occupationally. In addition, more intensive service was needed for the "hard core" of those immigrants with severe employment limitations, based on physical, emotional, or language factors.

In only two communities, Toronto and Montreal, did the JVS agencies report an upswing in immigrant intake and service. Montreal indicated that the agency had serviced more immigrants during the period specified than during any previous period in its history. The Toronto JVS reported an increase of 75 per cent in its services to new Canadians.

In commenting upon the immigrant load and relief costs, Miami reported that: "Whereas the relief cost in December 1949, before the bulk of newcomers arrived, had been over $8,000 per month, by 1952, when three times as many new Americans had arrived, the total relief expenditure was reduced to $1,954 for May 1952, due primarily to JVS activities."
Rehabilitation Services

Perhaps the one conspicuous trend during the period under review was the development of vocational rehabilitation services. Many of the JVS agencies organized, or were planning to organize, special services or facilities to supplement the conventional testing, counseling, and placement. These programs took a number of forms: sheltered workshops, protected work trials with sympathetic employers, special services to particular problem cases (e.g., cardiacs, the retarded, the tuberculous). They constituted intensive service for severely disadvantaged persons, without which the workers needing help would have found it very difficult, if not impossible, to find their way to satisfactory and useful employment.

In general, the goals of the various kinds of rehabilitation services were: to determine through a selected and controlled work environment the client's ability or capacity to adjust to a work situation; and to provide a vocational process which would “harden” the client to a point where he would once again feel capable of holding a job in competitive industry.

The first approach evaluates the worker's capabilities in a manner which probes more deeply than the traditional techniques of interviewing, counseling, and testing. The second approach attempts to train or retrain the client in proper work habits and attitudes; to develop in him a belief that he is capable once again of entering private industry; and to give him certain rudimentary skills which may be used in job seeking and placement.

The JVS in Pittsburgh had for many years operated such a sheltered workshop. During the period under review, centers were opened or planned in Chicago, Cincinnati, Denver, Detroit, Montreal, and Newark. Underlying the developments in all instances was the need to return “unemployable” persons, relief clients in many cases, to a competitive work situation and some form of self support.

Detroit developed programs for older, hard-to-place persons, as well as doing experimental work with protected work trials in several agencies affiliated with its Jewish Welfare Federation.

Montreal reported that its most important service to the physically and emotionally handicapped had been the development of a sheltered workshop. Started on an experimental basis in November 1950, the period July 1951 through June 1952 saw the workshop's development on a more permanent basis.

Cincinnati began a work program in homes for the aged and found it advisable to secure work contracts which then resulted in jobs for the institutional aged.

The Chicago JVS, with the support of a special foundation grant, opened a Vocational Adjustment Center which concentrated upon the establishment of positive attitudes toward work. This center entailed close cooperation with hospitals, the State Division of Rehabilitation, casework agencies, and psychiatrists.

The Miami JVS established a workshop in October 1951. In six months’
time, the workshop paid out over $8,000 in salaries. This experience enabled its clients to take employment in private industry and also eased the relief burden for the community.

Other Special Services

In Cleveland, the JVS participated in an experimental work classification clinic in cooperation with the Cleveland Heart Society which received national recognition and demonstrated the feasibility of the rehabilitation team approach in rescuing those who had had heart episodes from a life of inactivity.

The Houston JVS continued its work with the blind which it had started the previous year.

Minneapolis reported setting up special projects for the aged and the chronically ill.

Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and other communities, developed or expanded programs for vocational service to hospitalized patients. St. Louis reported that a vocational counselor was spending a day and a half at the hospital for the purpose of evaluating the employability of and developing vocational plans for severely disabled patients prior to their discharge. This agency also screened all applicants in their area who applied to the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, and evaluated all applicants for the St. Louis Jewish Scholarship Foundation.

In New York City, the Federation Employment Service, which had for years pioneered in employment service to the aged, established departments to handle the special problems of prison parolees, part-time workers, and "unemployable" relief cases, as well. The agency also developed plans for special projects with other federation agencies. These included programs for cardinals, patients from a mental hospital, and retarded youngsters under the care of the child-serving agencies.

The Boston agency, in addition to its work with the handicapped, developed a small business consultation service for those who could not readily find employment on their own. It also engaged in research studies on scholarships and loans as well as a study on the job hunting movement and attitudes of older workers.

The JVS in Philadelphia sent staff to hospitals and institutions to administer tests and counsel with patients prior to discharge, and to assist in developing vocational plans which were in accord with therapeutic needs. This agency also reported a diagnostic service to assist other agencies in determining degrees and nature of employability, and to provide a rehabilitative type of counseling to clients for purposes of bringing them into limited employment.

During this period, one of the local community relations agencies, the Bureau on Jewish Employment Problems of Chicago, and the Chicago JVS launched a special joint campaign to help Jewish young people find jobs in industries and occupations which they were normally unable to enter.

Denver used the facilities of its own "Opportunity School" for a retraining program which helped in the placement of refugees and other hard-core cases.
Kansas City reported its first referrals from a Federal penitentiary and state psychiatric hospitals.

Other Developments

During this period several smaller Jewish communities began to plan the establishment of a vocational service facility on a part-time basis.

Four additional agencies introduced fees for vocational guidance service, making a total of eight (Cleveland, Boston, Houston, Cincinnati, Denver, Milwaukee, New York City, and Philadelphia), and three agencies (Kansas City, Mo., Houston, and Montreal) expanded staff to meet more of their local needs.

The Jewish Occupational Council and JVS agencies were consulted by Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America and the Israel Consulate for the development of more adequate vocational service facilities in Israel. The JVS agencies were used to assist Israeli students in the United States and to help train vocational service personnel for Israel.

Roland Baxt

SERVICES TO THE COMMUNITY AND ITS YOUTH

Jewish community centers exist throughout the United States to provide American Jews with opportunities for group experience which will satisfy their individual and group needs. Many national Jewish organizations sponsor youth-serving programs to fulfill similar purposes for their young people.

The Jewish Community Center

In 1951 the number of Jewish community centers and Young Men's and Women's Hebrew Associations in the United States affiliated with the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) increased to 337. This represented a rise of 42 from the total of 295 in 1946, at the end of World War II. The aggregate number of individuals served by centers increased 2 per cent over the number served in 1950 to reach an estimated total of 514,000; the proportionate increase since 1946 was 15.5 per cent.

FINANCES

Center expenditures in 1951 were 8 per cent greater than those in 1950, totalling $12,763,000. This represented a growth in center budgets of 55 per cent since 1946. Program costs (51 per cent) were the largest single item in center disbursements, with administration requiring 27 per cent, maintenance 21 per cent, and 1 per cent being expended for miscellaneous purposes. Sixty per cent of the center dollar in 1951 was for personnel.

Over one-half of center income in 1951 was from central community funds; 179 centers received such allocations, 150 received allocations from Jewish
welfare funds (a rise from 74 in 1947), and 123 allocations from community chests (an increase from 89 in 1947). More than 90 centers received funds from both sources. As compared with 1950, the proportion of center funds received from community chests dropped slightly, from 23 per cent in 1950 to 20 per cent in 1951. The share of center income from Jewish welfare funds continued to rise, growing from 27 per cent in 1950 to 34 per cent in 1951. The proportion of income from membership dues decreased somewhat, though payments for program services rose from 23 per cent in 1950 to 25 per cent in 1951. Special contributions, receipts from business operations, and other sources accounted for 9 per cent in both 1950 and 1951.

PROGRAMS

The programs of Jewish community centers were varied. Services were rendered through many types of groups, including clubs, special interest groups, classes, intergroup projects, and mass events. Activities included health and physical education, arts and crafts, dramatics, music, dance, social activities, hobby groups, forums, discussions, holiday and festival celebrations, and civic projects. For children and young people, centers offered opportunities for social development. Commencing with experiences in friendship clubs, young people were enabled gradually to broaden their horizons, moving to interest groups, interclub councils, community-wide youth councils, participation on agency boards, and regional and national youth activities. For all age groups, the centers provided a variety of group associations.

During the year, steps were taken locally and nationally to refine center policies in the public affairs field. Many centers reviewed and revised existing policies or formulated new statements pertaining to the use of Jewish community center facilities as well as public forums and the handling of controversial subjects and speakers by centers. Regional JWB conferences provided opportunities for the exchange of center experiences and the exploration of sound practices in this area. The National Council of JWB at its 1952 Biennial Meeting, held May 2 to 4, 1952, adopted recommended policy statements on these subjects which grew out of an extended study by a special national committee. These statements underscored the fact that the center is a common meeting ground for all Jews and should be open to all groups whose purposes are in harmony with those of the center; that totalitarian groups are incompatible with these purposes and should be denied the use of center facilities; and that in administering this policy care should be taken to preserve the spirit of democracy and Judaism.

Centers particularly focused on serving all segments of the community, including every age group, from the nursery child through the older adult, both sexes, all economic and social groups, various ideological groups, all Jewish religious branches.

Studies of the membership of centers in 1951 indicated that 35 per cent of the members were under fourteen years of age, 12 per cent were between fourteen and seventeen years, 14 per cent were between eighteen and twenty-four years, and 39 per cent were twenty-five years and over. The latest developments have been service to the very old and the very young. Recent analyses reveal that seventy-six nursery schools and eighty-five older adult programs
were being operated by centers. Data on the distribution of center members by sex in 1951 indicated little change over 1950, with 56 per cent being male and 44 per cent female.

Centers in large cities tended to merge into single agencies responsible for a complete Jewish community center service for the community. In this fashion, for example, the Jewish Community Centers Association of St. Louis and the Jewish Community Center of Baltimore were initiated during the period under review.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER GROUPS

The centers rendered community-wide service as part of their larger philosophy. Thus, centers developed local Jewish book councils and Jewish music councils in which all Jewish organizations were represented. Centers guided community-wide youth councils bringing together Jewish youth organizations of every description. Program advisory services were developed for adult and young adult organizations and coordination was attempted of those engaged in group work and youth services in the Jewish community. The use of noncenter facilities was stressed as a means of extending services to groups not accessible to established center buildings. Programs were conducted in children’s homes, public schools, temples, and synagogues to meet the pressing needs of those unserved.

There was steady growth in synagogue-center cooperation involving the use of facilities and other forms of mutual assistance. Centers also maintained constructive collaboration with Jewish education agencies. Centers continued to devise plans for cooperation with national Jewish youth organizations, homes for the aged, and case work agencies. Centers were affiliated with their local Jewish federations and community councils and worked closely with them. Likewise, centers were active components of local councils of social agencies and welfare councils in their general community.

Jewish community centers served as settings for sports activities under Jewish auspices through extensive health and physical education programs. Interorganizational sports tourneys on a city-wide basis were common, as was participation in team play with other cultural groups. Through JWB, centers played an active part in the Amateur Athletic Union and the United States Committee for Sports in Israel.

SUMMER CAMPING

Summer camping programs were an important part of center services. Centers conducted 201 day camps in 1951 serving 40,200 children (an increase from 189 day camps serving 32,000 children in 1950). Center-operated country resident camps in 1951 numbered 36, serving 10,900 children. In that year there was a total of 142 country resident camps under Jewish communal auspices serving 47,000 children. There was a pronounced trend toward the acquisition of sizable suburban sites for center day camps. This made it possible to provide an out-of-the-city summer experience for children unable to attend the country resident camps and made it more possible to carry on a nonresident camping program.

During 1951 centers were actively involved in meeting the current na-
tional defense emergency. Center members were helped through the advice of their leaders to adjust to living in this uncertain period. Many centers co-operated in programs for military personnel and took the leadership in blood donor campaigns. Members of 150 centers contributed blood in the Jewish Community Center Armed Forces Blood Donor Campaign.

PERSONNEL

In 1951, 1,019 full-time professional workers were associated with Jewish community centers, in contrast with 400 such workers in 1941. Membership in the professional organization of these workers, the National Association of Jewish Center Workers, rose to a high point of 661. There was a serious shortage of qualified center personnel at the close of 1951, with over 100 unfilled jobs in the center field. Special efforts were made to recruit workers and to orient them through professional training institutes. Considerable attention was given to increasing the training opportunities for center workers to enrich their professional capacities and their Jewish backgrounds. At the same time, lay participation was basic to the government of the center, and the volunteer had an active role in the leadership of groups.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The American Jewish community had an investment in physical facilities for Jewish community centers estimated in 1950 to exceed $40,000,000. A recent study indicated that the 126 center building projects undertaken since 1948, of which 76 were completed, were valued at $39,000,000. Twenty centers had construction under way and thirty had acquired sites. In larger cities, there has been a trend away from the acquisition of small downtown properties in favor of larger tracts in the city outskirts. In 1951 properties as large as sixteen, seventeen and a half, and twenty-five acres were secured. During 1951 the construction of new center buildings was threatened by Federal restrictions, which were fortunately lifted by the end of the year, thus avoiding serious interruption of this construction program.

PUBLICATIONS

Jewish community centers utilized a variety of means to interpret their work. Over 200 Jewish community center house organs were published weekly, fortnightly, or monthly. In communities where there was no other Jewish journal, these newspapers were the sole source of local, national, and international Jewish news. These organs were served by the Jewish Center News Service, issued by JWB. The JWB Circle was the national organ of the Jewish Community Center movement.

National Jewish Welfare Board

The National Jewish Welfare Board is the national association of Jewish community centers and YMHA's in the United States. JWB assists communities in the establishment of Jewish community center programs and aids centers to function effectively. JWB represents the Jewish community center
movement nationally and conducts certain activities paralleling those of the local centers. It serves centers in respect to youth activities, camping, community surveys, music, health and physical education, personnel and training, Jewish center administration, and public relations. JWB also operates the Jewish Center Lecture Bureau and the Building Bureau, which aids communities in designing and constructing new buildings.

JWB operates through publications, field visits, meetings, and conferences. Its field services work from eight regional offices and its field secretaries visit local communities to counsel with them on their problems. These regional bodies provide a basis for center participation in inter-center activities in the fields of sports, youth work, and for regular conferences.

JWB is the sponsor of the National Jewish Youth Conference, which coordinates the work of local Jewish youth councils. Eleven national Jewish youth organizations are affiliated with the conference and through it correlate their own efforts and cooperate with local youth councils.

National Jewish youth organizations affiliated with the Conference include: Bnei Akiva of America, Brit Trumpeldor of America, Habonim Labor Zionist Youth, the Intercollegiate Zionist Youth Federation of America, the Jewish Young Fraternalists, Junior Hadassah, Mizrahi Hatzair, the National Federation of Temple Youth, National Young Judaea, and the Youth Department of Young Israel.

JWB sponsors the Jewish Book Council of America and the National Jewish Music Council. Through these councils, many Jewish organizations work cooperatively for Jewish cultural advancement. The fifty-seven national affiliates of the Book Council and the fifty-eight of the Music Council include congregational bodies, rabbinical associations, fraternal organizations, Zionist groups, women's organizations, Jewish universities and seminaries, Yiddish groups, associations of congregational men's clubs, and youth groups.

During the period under review the Jewish Book Council conducted Jewish Book Month, observed by approximately 2,000 organizations throughout the United States as well as overseas. In addition to the publication of its usual bibliographical and literary materials, the Council prepared three book exhibits. It published the eleventh volume of the Jewish Book Annual and presented the following awards: the Isaac Siegel Memorial Award of $250 for the best Jewish juvenile to Sydney Taylor for her book All-of-a-Kind Family; the Samuel H. Daroff Fiction Award of $250 to Zelda Popkin for her novel, Quiet Street; and the Harry Kovner Memorial Awards of $100 each to A. M. Klein, Mordecai Jaffe, and Hillel Bavli, for English-Jewish, Yiddish, and Hebrew poetry, respectively.

The Jewish Music Council of America, working through fifteen affiliated local Jewish Music Councils and other related groups, enlisted widespread participation in the observance of the Jewish Music Festival throughout the country. It sponsored a demonstration Music Leadership Training Workshop for representatives of affiliated organizations; arranged for the performance of Jewish music by major radio and TV networks programs; produced demonstration radio and TV programs; provided reviews of recommended and representative recordings of Jewish music; gave consultation to musicians and group leaders; and served as a clearing house for musical resources,
new music and recordings, and information about Jewish music activities and projects throughout the United States. The Council published program materials for group leaders on the effective use of records and a better understanding of Jewish music, and prepared sermon material. It distributed bibliographies, lectures, and suggested programs for various occasions.

Jointly sponsored with the American Jewish Historical Society is the Community Education Service on American Jewish History, whose function is to develop for use by Jewish groups programmatic materials related to American Jewish historical experience. The annual Jewish History Week is conducted by this service.

National Jewish Youth Groups

There are a variety of national Jewish youth organizations in the country, almost all of which receive sponsorship from an adult parent body. These aim to further the particular objectives of the movement with which they are identified and to provide young people with opportunities for Jewish group contact and affiliation. Information supplied by these organizations indicates that during the period under review they included over 115,000 members in more than 3,600 local units. (This is exclusive of membership figures reported for Hillel Foundations and fraternities and sororities.)

Youth Sections of Fraternal Organizations

Fraternal organizations operating youth programs were the B'nai B'rith and the Workmen's Circle. The B'nai B'rith Youth Organization (BBYO), had 24,300 registrations in 1,090 chapters in 1951—a 5 per cent membership increase over 1950. It included the Aleph Zadek Aleph (AZA) for teen-age boys, the B'nai B'rith Girls for teen-age girls, and the B'nai B'rith Young Men and Young Women for young adults. Youth programs conducted by the Workmen's Circle were the Young Circle League and the Youth-and-English-Speaking Division of the organization, together comprising 4,600 members in forty-two groups. The purposes of the Workmen's Circle youth program included fraternal insurance, cultural activity, and social action in behalf of Jewish and progressive causes. The Jewish Young Fraternalists, formerly the Youth Section of the Jewish People's Fraternal Order, described their purposes as Jewish cultural development, sports and social activity, and "Jewish youth unity and action." They reported 2,500 members in twenty-five chapters.

Zionist

There were a variety of Zionist youth programs in the United States. Junior Hadassah, sponsored by Hadassah and the American Zionist Youth Commission, was a young adult women's Zionist organization, consisting of 10,000 members in 200 chapters. It engaged in educational and fund raising programs for Israel and fostered Jewish and Zionist education in America. National Young Judaea, sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) and Hadassah through the American Zionist Youth Commission, included 14,000 young people up to eighteen years of age in 800 clubs. Plugat
Aliyah-Hanoar Hatzioni had 200 members, was sponsored by the ZOA and Hadassah, and sought to prepare teen-age and young adult youth to emigrate to Israel as pioneers. The children's portion of this program was incorporated in September 1952 in Young Judaea, with a community service stress.

Habonim Labor Zionist Youth, sponsored by the Labor Zionist Organization of America (LZOA), Pioneer Women, and the Farband Labor Zionist Order as an educational Zionist youth organization, had 2,650 children, adolescents, and young adult members in 154 groups. Hashavim, sponsored by the LZOA for the purpose of promoting pioneering emigration to Israel by young adults between the ages of twenty-two and thirty-five, numbered 100 members in two groups.

Hashomer Hatzair Youth Organization encouraged collective colonization in Israel and had a membership of 2,100 in 195 groups. Hechalutz Hatzair, devoted to a similar program, had 830 members in 11 groups. Both organizations were affiliated with the Hechalutz Organization of America. Brit Trumpeldor of America, Inc. (BETAR), with 1,600 members in 40 groups, conducted an educational program based upon Revisionist principles. Hanoar Haivri, youth section of the Histadruth Ivrit of America, was a cultural Zionist youth group devoted to the Hebrew language.

Mizrachi Hatzair (Mizrahi Youth of America) was sponsored by the Mizrachi Youth Commission (Mizrahi and Mizrachi Women of America), "to aid in the upbuilding of Israel in accordance with the Torah and to spread religious Zionist ideals to American Jewish youth." This organization, with a membership of approximately 5,000, was formed in March 1952 through a merger of Noar Mizrahi (the male Mizrachi youth movement) and Junior Mizrahi Women. Bnei Akiva of North America and the Bachad Organization of North America were sponsored by Hapoel Hamizrachi of America, an Orthodox Labor Zionist Organization. Bnei Akiva, with 2,300 members in 38 groups, sought to train young people to live in Israel according to the ideals of religion and labor. Bachad Organization, a chalutz pioneering movement conducting an agricultural training program, had 250 members in 6 groups.

Coordinating bodies for Zionist youth work were the American Zionist Youth Commission (sponsored jointly by the Zionist Organization of America and Hadassah), under which Young Judaea, Junior Hadassah, and the Intercollegiate Zionist Federation of America (IZFA) functioned, and the Zionist Youth Council, sponsored by the American Zionist Council, which coordinated all American Zionist youth organizations.

The Intercollegiate Zionist Federation (IZFA) with a membership of 1,700 in 75 groups, was sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America, Hadassah, the Labor Zionist Organization of America and the Mizrachi Organization of America, and correlated all Zionist youth activities on college and university campuses. Haoleh was the chalutz organization of IZFA.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

The National Council of Jewish Women sponsored the Councilette and Junior Division, engaging in a program of community services, Jewish history and culture, and education for girls and young women. The Councilettes
included 3,000 high school girls in 46 groups throughout the United States. The Junior Division was a similar program for young women from eighteen to twenty-seven years of age.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS

A number of Jewish youth programs were conducted under the auspices of national religious or congregational bodies. The National Federation of Temple Youth, sponsored by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (Reform), aimed to unite youth of the affiliated congregations in national youth projects. It had 9,000 members between fifteen and twenty-one years of age in 250 local units.

The United Synagogue Youth, sponsored by the United Synagogue Youth Commission of the United Synagogue of America (Conservative), sought to develop a positive orientation towards Judaism through varied programming. Established in December 1951, it reported 8,000 teen-age members in 100 local groups. The Young People's League, likewise sponsored by the United Synagogue of America, had as its purpose synagogue-centered youth activity to foster a religious orientation to Jewish life. It had 8,000 young adult members in 125 local units.

The National Council of Young Israel Youth Department endeavored to educate Orthodox youth and to help in the development of Israel according to the spirit of the Torah. It had 7,000 members ranging in age from four to twenty-one years in 400 local groups. The Agudath Israel Youth Council of America was sponsored by Agudath Israel of America, Inc. Its programs for children and youth aimed to educate Orthodox Jewish children and to meet the educational and religious needs of Orthodox Jewish youth in the United States and Israel. The Council reports 10,500 members in 100 branches of its divisions, Pirchei Agudath Israel (for eight-to-sixteen-year-old boys), Bathya Agudath Israel (for eight-to-sixteen-year-old girls), Zeire Agudath Israel (for young adult men) and Bnos Agudath Israel (for young adult women).

PROGRAMS

The programs of these groups were varied. They involved social activities such as dances, parties, picnics, and bazaars. Health and physical education activities were usually a part of programs including sports, tournaments, hiking, field days, festivals, and similar activities. Camping services were offered by some groups, and leadership training projects were common. Hobby groups, dramatics, folk dancing, music, art and crafts, and journalism were frequent activities. Cultural programs were conducted by each of these groups, including lectures, forums, seminars, book reviews, discussion groups, concerts, and institutes. Religious activities such as Sabbath programs, special holiday observance, and study groups were an important part of the programs of many groups. Particular stress was placed on programs related to Jewish events, with activities frequently related to Jewish holidays and festivals. Civic programs were featured in all of the organizations, including activities connected with civil rights and legislation, participation in local community welfare services, and support for fund-raising drives.
These youth programs generally had a national organizational structure, regional federations, and local chapters. Each received financial assistance and advisory help from its parent organization and benefited from the leadership of a commission, department, or committee of the adult group which maintained a regular relationship to the youth program.

**Staff**

Most of the organizations had a national and regional staff—and in some instances a local staff as well—through which they carried out their programs. The BBYO had thirty-four full-time national, regional, and local professional staff and thirty part-time regional assistants, and the Workmen's Circle had ten such workers. Zionist youth groups had over 40 national and regional staff and 125 full- or part-time local staff, and congregational youth groups had 18 national and regional staff. The National Council of Young Israel had sixty-three members on its national and regional staff. Leadership for local units was usually provided by the local sponsoring parent organization.

**Financing**

Youth programs were generally financed by the parent organization, with supplementary funds secured by membership dues, contributions, and special campaigns. The annual budget of BBYO amounted to $507,494, of which all but $35,000 in dues payments was secured from the B'nai B'rith Youth Services Appeal, 30 per cent from local Jewish welfare funds and 70 per cent from local lodges and women's groups. Workmen's Circle reported an annual expenditure of $70,000 for youth work and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations allocated $35,000 plus supplementary services to its program. Complete financial data on other youth programs was not available.

**University Youth Groups**

The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations undertook to bring to Jewish college students a knowledge of their Jewish heritage. They served 200,000 students in 206 units in the United States and Canada, through programs that included worship services, festival observances, lectures, forums and discussions, courses, musical, dramatic and social activities, interfaith activities, student welfare drives, and personal counselling. A national director, regional and local foundation directors (usually rabbis), and part-time counsellors staffed the program. There were seventy-one full-time directors and sixty-two part-time counsellors. The budget of the foundations totaled $1,080,000, of which two-thirds was furnished by B'nai B'rith, the balance coming from welfare funds, student fees, and individual gifts.

The most recent figures concerning Jewish college fraternities and sororities indicated that there were eleven such fraternities in the United States with a total of 89,444 members, and five sororities with 30,809 members in 1951. The combined membership of 120,253 indicated a 5 per cent increase over 1950.
Services to Jewish Personnel in the Armed Forces

With the increase in the armed forces of the United States to a record peacetime level of over 3,500,000, the number of Jewish youths in uniform had risen proportionately. As a consequence, Jewish communal and organizational services for men and women in uniform were at a peacetime peak. The chief program for Jewish youth in uniform was conducted by the JWB. Activities on behalf of service personnel were likewise offered by other groups. It was estimated that Jewish service men constituted approximately 3.7 per cent of all service men. The aggregate attendance of service men at Jewish area and club operations was 838,650; the aggregate number of personal services was 142,647.

JWB ARMED SERVICES PROGRAM

Since 1917 the JWB had served as the representative of the American Jewish community and of thirty-eight JWB-affiliated national and regional Jewish bodies, to provide for the religious and welfare needs of Jewish members of the Armed Forces and to contribute to the over-all recreational program for all service personnel. It had received the recognition of the government to serve in that capacity. JWB was a member agency of the United Service Organizations, Inc. (USO), in which it represented American Jewry.

Men and women of the Jewish faith received JWB services as they prepared to enter the Armed Forces, during their period of military service, or when patients in Veterans' Administration Hospitals. Military personnel were served in all parts of the world where United States forces were stationed. JWB's Armed Services program were rendered by three divisions of the organization: the Armed Services Division, the Women's Organizations' Division, and the Division of Religious Activities.

The Armed Services Division provided for the religious, cultural, social, recreational, and welfare needs of military personnel during their off-duty hours in the community. The program consisted of activities such as dances, sight-seeing trips, picnics, athletic tournaments, attendance at sports events, hobby groups, etc., conducted on a nonsectarian basis. JWB also undertook to meet the special needs of Jewish men and women. Arrangements were made for observance of the Passover, the High Holy Days, and the festivals. There were weekly religious services and Oneg Shabbat programs. Individuals were given an opportunity to participate in the normal social and cultural life of the Jewish civilian community and to enjoy the hospitality of private homes.

JWB was concerned with service to members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families in connection with personal problems. A professional case work consultant was employed at the national office where he worked in cooperation with the Jewish welfare agencies that assumed responsibility for this service in their respective communities.

JWB's armed services program was carried on by a professional staff of thirty-two workers covering installations in various parts of the country. It
operated USO servicemen's clubs in the United States, in the Canal Zone, and in Germany. To supplement the work of the professional staff, communities were encouraged and assisted in setting up local armed services committees. These committees were representative of the community and its organized Jewish groups, and afforded many opportunities for volunteers to participate in the program.

JWB had rendered service to patients in veterans' hospitals since the close of World War I. As a member of the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Service National Advisory Committee, JWB participated in the hospital service program on a nonsectarian basis, and in addition, ministered to the special religious, morale, and welfare needs of hospitalized Jewish veterans.

The Women's Organizations' Division of JWB provided the channel for participation in this work for Hadassah, the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the National Women's League of the United Synagogue of America, the United Order True Sisters, the Women's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, the Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress, and girls' and women's groups in Jewish Community Centers. Through its Serve-A-programs many communities shipped small comfort and recreational items to remote and isolated camps and hospitals in all sections of the world. The division also took a direct share in volunteer activities at more than 100 Veterans' Administration Hospitals.

JWB's Division of Religious Activities (DRA) was the agency authorized by the United States Department of Defense to recruit and ecclesiastically endorse rabbis for service as chaplains in the Armed Forces and in Veterans' Administration Hospitals. The DRA was composed of equal representation from the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Reform), the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative), and the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox). The DRA was responsible for procuring, training, supervising, and servicing the full-time and part-time armed forces chaplains. In October 1952 there were 105 full-time Jewish chaplains with the armed forces, 70 in the United States and 35 overseas. In addition, 224 part-time chaplains were serving military installations and veterans' hospitals. The chaplaincy services were rendered in a total of 605 installations in the United States, in addition to those covered overseas.

The distribution of religious materials and accessories, such as literature and kosher food, was a prominent feature of JWB's service to members of the Armed Forces. In 1951 JWB supplied 394,000 items to men and women stationed in this country, overseas, and on ships at sea. JWB handled the compilation of war records of casualties and of recipients of awards and honors among Jewish service men and women, in cooperation with 520 communities and the national organizations affiliated with JWB.

OTHER PROGRAMS

Activities for men and women in the armed forces were conducted by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, the Armed Services Division of the Union of Orthodox Congregations of America, B'nai B'rith, and the National Council of Young Israel.
These programs, like those for which JWB had major responsibility, aimed to satisfy the spiritual, material, and physical needs of service men and to aid them to maintain a Jewish way of life while in the service. Particular emphasis was placed upon assisting service personnel in religious observances and Jewish dietary practices. Giving a sense of security to service men in the event of anti-Semitism was likewise considered to be a function of these programs, as well as providing reassurance to service men that their needs were understood and remembered by the community back home. While these programs were mainly directed at Jewish personnel, B'nai B'rith indicated that its objectives were to serve all service personnel regardless of race, color, or creed.

These groups corresponded with the service men, mailed local newspapers and Anglo-Jewish publications to them, provided religious articles and food supplies, conducted orientation programs to adjust inductees to life in the service, presented gifts to inductees, and sponsored parties, Passover Sedarim, and other activities at nearby bases and camps, military and veterans' hospitals, synagogues and Jewish community centers. They also sent packages to servicemen, furnished comfort items to men in hospitals, maintained a list of individuals on active duty who followed Orthodox religious practices, published a directory of installations and their nearest Orthodox communities, congregations, and rabbis, issued a monthly newspaper for servicemen, distributed literature to service men and chaplains, and provided informational and consultative services to service men's families.

The Jewish War Veterans carried out their program through Post and Auxiliary members and professional staff in the form of National Service Officers. The Armed Services Division of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations executed its activities through regional offices, member congregations, sisterhood branches, and local Armed Forces committees. B'nai B'rith reported that members of the Service Committee for the Armed Forces and Veterans of each of its local lodges and chapters directed the service program in their respective communities and adjacent areas. National Council of Young Israel stated that its program was carried out by the chairman of the Armed Services Division, the director and staff.

ZIONIST AND PRO-ISRAEL ACTIVITIES

The Zionist movement in the United States was preoccupied with a number of problems and activities during the period under review (July 1951 through June 1952): a redefinition of Zionism; a clarification of the relationship between the World Zionist Organization and the State of Israel; the influencing of public opinion to favor continued aid by the United States government to Israel; the encouragement of investment in Israel; the recruiting of technical personnel for Israel; fund-raising projects traditional with some of the Zionist organizations; and the sale of Israel Bonds.
Redefinition of Zionism

The twenty-third World Zionist Congress, held in Jerusalem on August 13, 1951, witnessed a major conflict between Israeli and American Zionists over the definition of Zionism. The Israeli Zionists equated Zionism with personal immigration to Israel; the majority of the American Zionists opposed this conception.

Eliahu Dobkin, head of the Jewish Agency immigration department, represented the point of view of those Israeli Zionists who believed there was no future for Jewish life in the Diaspora outside of Israel. Dobkin contended at a plenary session of the Agency Executive on August 6, 1952, that the primary function of the Zionist movement in the United States should be the recruitment of young American Jews to become *chalutzim* (agricultural pioneers) in Israel. Dobkin felt that the reason that so few of the American Jewish youth had responded to the call to emigrate to Israel was simply that the American Zionist organizations had failed to spend sufficient money on propaganda for this purpose. The American members of the Agency emphasized that the situation in the United States was not conducive to a large-scale youth emigration, although the recruitment of *chalutzim* should be encouraged and supported.

On August 28, 1951, the World Zionist Congress finally adopted a somewhat equivocal resolution appealing to American Jewish youth to “join in a large Aliyah movement” to Israel.

The issue of personal settlement in Israel became even more sharply delineated when on December 12, 1951, Premier David Ben Gurion of Israel wondered whether “the leadership of American Zionism had gone bankrupt with the establishment of the Jewish State.” He added that “even if [the leaders] came, it is doubtful whether a big immigration from the United States would follow.” Leo Wolfson, chairman of the National Council of the Zionist Revisionists of America, immediately accused Ben Gurion of complaining about a situation that was “largely of his own making,” since he had ignored and slighted the American Zionist leadership. Benjamin Browdy, president of the Zionist Organization of America, expressed the belief that the Premier’s attack was “made primarily for domestic consumption in an attempt to placate criticism leveled against the decision of the Israel government and the Jewish Agency to introduce a system of selective immigration to Israel.” Mrs. Samuel W. Halprin, national president of the Hadassah Women’s Zionist Organization of America, issued the following statement:

As one of the principal components of American Zionist leadership we also deny his [Ben Gurion’s] charge that American Zionist leaders have gone bankrupt since the establishment of the Jewish State because some of them did not settle in Israel. American Zionists have categorically and publicly stated that the sole criterion of Zionist leadership cannot be personal immigration to Israel. . . . On the contrary, American Zionist leaders have consistently held to the view that the major criteria of Zionist leadership have been and still are mobilization of physical, material, spiritual, and political support to help secure Israel’s future, the establishment of a
strong link between the people of Israel and American Jewry, and fostering the unity of the Jewish people.

Hadassah's thirty-seventh annual convention on September 17 adopted a resolution supporting pioneering immigration on a limited scale as the cardinal principle in the upbuilding of Israel. It declared that "some portion of American Jewish youth will seek personal identification with this drama by helping Israel to reclaim its soil, plan cities, build factories, and increase agricultural production."

Emigration to Israel

This ideological conflict was resolving itself realistically elsewhere, with the encouragement of a purely technical Aliyah or immigration to Israel. In June 1952, an organization known as PATWA (Professional and Technical Workers Aliyah), with 111 charter members, was founded in New York City to help fill Israel's need for trained people by aiding American professionals to settle in Israel. PATWA published a pamphlet Choosing a Career for Israel, outlining conditions in twenty-six professions in Israel.

On December 26, 1951, the Habonim, Labor Zionist Youth Organization, decided to close its hachsharah training farms where young people had been trained for Aliyah to Israel as chalutzim. They were to be replaced by Youth Workshops in Israel where prospective chalutzim could stay for a period of nine months, later to return to the United States for a two-year period of vocational training and leadership in the Zionist movement.

Status of World Zionist Organization

The status of the World Zionist Organization vis-a-vis the State of Israel had important connotations for all of Jewry, specifically for the American Jewish community. On August 31, 1951, the World Zionist Congress adopted a declaration that read in part:

The Congress considers it essential that the State of Israel, through an appropriate legislative act, grant status to the World Zionist Organization as the representative of the Jewish people in all matters that relate to the organized participation of Jews the world over in the development and building of the land and the rapid absorption of newcomers.

In relation to all activities conducted in the interest of the State of Israel within Jewish communities outside of Israel, it is essential that the government of the State of Israel shall act in coordination and consultation with the World Zionist Organization.

In explanation of this declaration Ben Gurion stated on October 11, that the Knesset might be asked to confer a special status on the Jewish Agency inside Israel to express this situation. However, Israel would cooperate directly on matters affecting itself with all Jewish organizations desirous of such cooperation. Such direct relations of the Government of Israel with Jewish bodies and organizations would "naturally" be coordinated with the Jewish Agency.
The American non-Zionist point of view on the subject of Israel-American relations was expressed by the American Jewish Committee in a resolution adopted by its Executive Committee in Chicago on October 14, 1951, which stated in part as follows:

We urge upon the state of Israel the impropriety of: a) granting any kind of diplomatic recognition to any non-governmental body; b) granting any kind of political status in Israel to any non-Israeli organization or non-governmental body; and c) purporting to grant to any organization any special status with respect to the activities of Jews and Jewish communities in America or anywhere else outside of Israel.

The AJC also expressed its firm opposition to any interference in the community life of American Jews by persons or organizations whose composition was not exclusively American, as well as its opposition to those American Jews who might attempt to interfere in the internal political life of Israel. The AJC affirmed its position that the carrying out of educational programs among American Jews was exclusively the responsibility of American institutions.

On October 22, the Jewish Agency criticized the position of the AJC on the ground that it was clear that the World Zionist Organization sought only a legal status covering specific non-political functions in Israel, and was specifically refraining from requesting such status outside of Israel.

The American Jewish Congress in a statement on October 24, and the American Zionist Council through Louis Lipsky, its chairman, also took issue with the AJC's objections.

At the forty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Jewish Committee in January 1952, Jacob Blaustein, its president, denied that this resolution marked a change in the friendly policy of the AJC toward Israel. Blaustein reported that since the passage of this resolution, the AJC, at the request of Ambassador Eban and the Israel Foreign Office, and with the approval of the United States government, had continued to give active and substantial aid to Israel in the intergovernmental field.

As a result of this controversy the question was raised as to whether it might not be feasible to include non-Zionists in the Jewish Agency once again. On December 19, 1951, James N. Rosenberg, one of the non-Zionist founders of the enlarged 1929 Jewish Agency, submitted a personal proposal to the Government of Israel through Abba Eban, its ambassador to the United States, that “before the Jewish Agency receives special status it should be so reconstituted as to represent all elements of American Jewry.”

At a conference of Hadassah, Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the Agency Executive, indicated on January 20, 1952, that once status was granted to the World Zionist Organization it was possible that the question of including non-Zionist organizations within the Agency might arise.

**Intervention in Israel**

The question of what constituted a proper interest by an American Zionist organization in the internal affairs of Israel, and what should be termed an
improper intervention, was another important issue hotly debated by representatives of the American Zionist Council and the American Jewish Congress. The occasion for their dispute was furnished by the resolution that the convention of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) adopted on June 17, 1951, to the effect that "the Zionist Organization of America has throughout the years played a major role as a General Zionist organization and has maintained close relations with fellow General Zionists in other lands, particularly with the organization of General Zionists in Israel." Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council, commented that this seemed to indicate that the ZOA was "participating in the current election campaign to defeat Ben Gurion." To the comment by Israel Goldstein, president of the American Jewish Congress, that the "intervention of Zionists throughout the world in Israel affairs is an expression of legitimate and invited concern in such matters," Lipsky retorted that such intervention was undesirable when it took the form of "helping their vis-a-vis party in Israel by providing it with funds for its political campaigns."

The fifty-fifth annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), held in June 1952, in electing Rabbi Irving Miller as its new president, adopted the Miller resolution reaffirming the adherence of the ZOA to the World Confederation of General Zionists. However, this resolution noted that the ZOA "has never been and is not now affiliated party-wise with any other Zionist group or party, is bound by no party's discipline, reserves its independence of freedom of action and takes no part in the political life of the State of Israel, which is the exclusive function of Israeli citizens."

Public Opinion

During 1951-52, the American Zionist Council engaged in an intensive public relations program, its major concern being aid to Israel under the Mutual Security Program. On April 7, 1952, the Council presented a Memorandum on Aid to the Near East to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and Senate, urging the approval of the proposed $76,000,000 allocation to help Israel, and pointing out Israel's political and military importance to the West.

During the national Presidential campaign, the Council sought the insertion of planks favorable to Israel by both the Republican and Democratic parties. On July 1, 1952, the American Zionist Council in a memorandum submitted to the platform committee of the Republican party urged the Republican party convention to adopt a platform plank pledging continued support to Israel and the Arab states in the resettlement of their refugee populations and in the promotion of peace and economic stabilization and development in the Near East. On July 17, the Council submitted a similar memorandum to the Resolutions Committee of the Democratic National Convention. Subsequently favorable planks on Israel were adopted by both political conventions.

The Labor Zionist Organization of America endorsed Governor Adlai Stevenson for President. The American Zionist Council on October 14, 1952,
issued a statement regretting the action taken by the Labor Zionists as contrary to the bipartisan position of the Council, of which the LZOA was a member. On October 15 the LZOA denied the right of the Council to consider or act upon the LZOA's political activity, asserting that this was the LZOA's "special sphere" on which the AZC was not entitled to infringe.

**NON-JEWISH GROUPS**

Non-Jewish organizations continued to express their support on behalf of Israel. On July 26, 1951, President William Green of the American Federation of Labor announced that his organization was lending its efforts in Washington to secure passage of the McCormack-Martin and the Douglas-Taft bills, authorizing $150,000,000 in grants-in-aid to Israel. Four leaders of the American-Christian Palestine Committee, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, and Dr. Carl Herman Voss, joined in support of the above measures. The American-Christian Palestine Committee also sponsored a tour for seventeen Christian leaders, composed of clergymen, journalists, and educators who left for Israel, Jordan, and Egypt to study Arab-Israel relations.

At the national conference of the Americans for Democratic Action, its foreign policy commission issued a report on May 19, 1952, advocating the support of proposals for land reform in the Near East, endorsing the United Nations' plan for the resettlement of Arab refugees in Arab countries, and urging caution in the planning of a Middle East defense command until there was peace between the Arab countries and Israel.

**Technical and Educational Assistance**

In May 1952 the Jewish Agency announced a program in cooperation with the Israel government and Israel private industry that would permit advanced college students and postgraduates pursuing careers in medicine and in other scientific and technical fields to serve their apprenticeship in Israel. A drive was initiated to recruit qualified American teachers for at least one year's service in Israel's rapidly growing school system.

On November 1, 1951, Louis Finkelstein, chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, and Hayim Greenberg, member of the Jewish Agency Executive, announced the establishment of an Israel Institute at the Seminary, whose purpose it would be to bring to the Institute leading figures in Israel for discussions of the problems and background of Israeli life with eminent Americans of all faiths.

On December 10, 1951, Dean Irwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School announced a new undertaking known as the Harvard Law School and Israel Joint Research Project for Legal Development of Israel. Its resources were to be made available to the Israel Justice Ministry, in order to help develop a unified system of law which would meet the needs of a modern state, and at the same time reflect the historic traditions of the Government of Israel.

At the tenth annual conference of the American Fund for Israel Insti-
tions on March 21, 1952, Alan M. Stroock, trustee of the Fund, revealed that the organization had established a five-year $30,000 scholarship fund for Israeli students in honor of Edward A. Norman, founder and president of the Fund.

Rabbi Arthur L. Lelyveld, national director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, announced on January 2, 1952, the purchase of the Swiss Consulate Building in Jerusalem as quarters for the Hillel Foundation at the Hebrew University. These quarters would serve as a center for cultural and social activities for the students and the faculty of the Hebrew University.

The American Technion Society, which supports Israel's Institute of Technology in Haifa, decided to raise a capital fund budget of $10,000,000 at its two-day conference held in November, 1951. According to Maurice Spertus, chairman of the technological committee of the Technion, more than 540 American scientists and engineers had volunteered their technical assistance to Israel during 1951.

On October 28, 1951, George S. Wise, chairman of the board of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, was elected president of the American Friends of the Hebrew University (AFHU), succeeding Dr. Israel Wechsler, who was elected honorary president. In making its application for welfare funds, the AFHU indicated that it would require $1,506,000 for its 1951–52 budget.

The budget of the Mizrachi Organization of America for the year 1952 included $1,000,000 for the newly projected Bar-Ilan religious university in Israel. This was opposed by the Agudas Israel at its twenty-ninth national convention on the grounds that the university would serve as a research center for new patterns of Orthodox observances “contrary to Jewish law,” and that the money needed to set up educational facilities for the religious training of immigrants would be diverted to the university. The Mizrachi Organization in turn charged Agudath Israel with hostility to Orthodox Zionism.

Investment in Israel

All Zionist organizations concentrated on the sale of Israel Bonds; the record reveals the following sales: Zionist Organization of America—$36,000,000; Hadassah—$7,850,000; Labor Zionist Organization of America—$10,000,000; Pioneer Women—$1,250,000; and American Mizrachi—$2,000,000.

Henry Montor, vice-president of the State of Israel Bond Organization, announced that as of September 1, 1952, the Israel Bond drive had enrolled more than 400,000 subscribers with total subscriptions amounting to $140,000,000.1

In a semi-annual report, Mrs. Rose Halprin, chairman of the Economic Department of the American Section of the Jewish Agency, listed 116 new American investment projects in various stages of development undertaken during the period from October 1, 1951, to April 30, 1952. To explain Israel’s investment potentials to prospective American investors, the Jewish Agency

1 See also p. 182 and f.
appointed volunteer representatives, or "dollar a year men," in fourteen cities in the United States.

Social Service Activity for Israel

On September 17, 1951, Hadassah at its thirteenth annual convention announced that it had raised a total of $9,250,000 for its projects in Israel and activities in the United States. A new budget of $8,235,000 provided $3,000,000 for medical work, $1,500,000 for the Hadassah Hebrew University Medical School, $2,500,000 for Youth Aliyah, $600,000 for youth services, $700,000 for the Jewish National Fund, and $135,000 for Zionist youth work in the United States.

The Pioneer Women, Labor Zionist Women's Organization held its convention on September 11, 1951, and decided to raise $2,500,000 in the next two years for a program for the rehabilitation of immigrant women, youth, and children in Israel. The funds would be used to build a youth village and an agricultural school in which to train 400 adolescent men and women for a pioneering life in the border and desert areas of the Jewish State. The funds would also be used to extend the social and educational services maintained in the immigrant villages and in other institutions by the Working Women's Council of Israel, sister organization of the Pioneer Women in Israel.

The Mizrachi Women's Organization of America meeting on November 13, 1951, adopted a budget of $1,310,000, which included $485,000 for Youth Aliyah and $320,000 for social service, settlement house work, and the vocational training of immigrants in Israel.

The Mizrachi Organization of America, holding its thirty-first annual convention on November 11, 1951, adopted a budget of $2,600,000 for the year 1952. The budget included $1,000,000 for housing, children's homes, school equipment, and other assistance to religious settlements in the Jewish State.

Anti-Zionist Activities

The anti-Zionist position continued to be represented by the American Council for Judaism, which charged at its eighth national conference on April 4, 1952, that world Zionism sought to achieve the emigration of American Jewish youth to Israel through slanted text books in religious schools. Lessing J. Rosenwald, president of the Council, reported that it was "well embarked upon a program of sponsoring the creation of acceptable religious texts free of nationalist bias."

One of the most active pro-Arab and anti-Zionist groups in the United States, the Holyland Emergency Liaison Program (HELP) discontinued its activities in October 1951. HELP had been established by Dorothy Thompson, Virginia Gildersleeve, Kermit Roosevelt, Mrs. Mark Ethridge, Lessing J. Rosenwald, and others. Rosenwald explained that "HELP terminated its operations when other agencies took up the problem of Arab refugees, which was its original reason for coming into existence."
American Zionists were subjected to attack by Paul Hutchinson, editor of the *Christian Century*, at the annual meeting of the Chicago chapter of the American Council for Judaism on December 5, 1951, for what he called their "unremitting pressure on our government for loans, gifts, and other forms of extraordinary help for Israel, in a measure far beyond that offered any of her neighbors." Hutchinson also stated: "We cannot hold the confidence and support in world affairs of the Arabs and hence of the Moslem lands if they become convinced that the United States is a pro-Zionist partisan."

**Merger in Labor Zionist Movement**

The Labor Zionist Organization of America (LZOA) at its national convention held July 3-6, 1952, adopted a major policy resolution calling for the establishment of a Central Authoritative Council of the labor movement. This would be a transitional stage leading to the eventual merger of all the labor Zionist groups: the LZOA—Poale Zion, the Farband Labor Zionist Order, the Pioneer Women, and the Habonim.

**Cultural Exchange**

To encourage cultural relations between the United States and Israel, the two countries signed an agreement providing for the importation of American books, magazines, and newspapers into Israel without dollar payments. This agreement, which was similar to that under which publications from the Soviet Union were imported into Israel without foreign exchange payments, permitted the United States Embassy to use the Israel currency paid for the books for American scientific, educational, and cultural activities in Israel. American publishers would be paid in dollars from United States government funds.

The agreement was a consequence of the Israel Government's refusal after October 1, 1951, to allocate any foreign currency for the import of books. The supply of magazines and newspapers was retained but on a reduced level. During the first nine months of 1951 Israel Government allocations for United States publications had amounted to about $160,000, of which 75 per cent was for books.

A. W. Binder, professor of liturgical music at the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, announced the organization of a Composers' Committee for Israel and American Jewish Music, under the auspices of the American Fund for Israel Institutions, which was to arrange for the exchange of music between Israel and America.

A. Z. Propes, representative of the Israel Government's Tourist Department, announced that two hundred American singers, members of all Jewish singing societies in the United States, would participate in the first choral festival in Israel, to take place in August, 1952.
JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS

In the period under review (May 1951 to September 1952) an event of primary importance to the agencies in the community relations field was the completion of the MacIver Report. Because of its impact upon present and future plans for Jewish community relations work in the United States, this review is devoted exclusively to the developments in connection with that Report.

Background

In May 1951, Professor Robert M. MacIver of Columbia University submitted a Report on the Jewish Community Relations Agencies. Although his study was a year in the making, the problems with which he dealt were of much longer duration.

Essentially, Dr. MacIver had been asked to consider ways and means of making more effective and efficient the work in the Jewish community relations field. Related to this was the need for improved coordination of all the activities of the national Jewish community relations agencies, a problem that had been under discussion for at least two decades.

One of the earliest efforts in this connection was the formation in 1933 of a Joint Consultative Council, consisting of the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and B'nai B'rith, to coordinate the then-expanding and urgent "defense" activities conducted to offset the impact of Hitlerism. This effort failed as did a later attempt in 1938, to coordinate the activities of several national agencies within a General Jewish Council.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

In 1944 the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) was organized. Unlike its predecessors, this body included for the first time both the national and local community relations organizations. In fact, it can be said that it was created largely in response to pressures from many of the local welfare funds.

As its name implies, the NCRAC's function was an advisory one and its primary purpose was to enable its member agencies to exchange views on community relations problems and to work together in the promotion of...
programs whose purposes, methods, and goals were generally agreed upon. Each organization participated in the NCRAC on a voluntary basis and preserved its full autonomy.

The NCRAC was specifically precluded from taking any action that might affect the internal structure or the budget of any of its member agencies. Within these limits, however, the NCRAC was given a relatively broad mandate. According to the "Statement of Aims and Objectives" adopted at the time of its organization, it was:

1. To study, analyze and evaluate the policies and activities of the national and local agencies.
2. To ascertain the problem areas from time to time.
3. To ascertain the areas of activities of these organizations and to conduct a continuous inventory of their projects.
4. To serve as a coordinating and clearance agency for projects and policies, to eliminate duplication and conflict of activities, and to recommend further projects to member agencies.
5. To seek agreement on and to formulate policies. Policies once formulated and adopted, it is expected that the affiliated organizations will adhere to such policies and will not engage in any activities in contravention of such policies.

The NCRAC established a creditable record of accomplishment in coordinating policy-making on major issues. Despite the differences in their viewpoints, the member agencies were frequently able to achieve unanimity on difficult and complex problems confronting American Jewry.

Together the agencies planned activities in connection with such important issues as church-state relationships, public education on immigration legislation and civil rights. Joint representations more and more took the place of individual presentations, and joint public statements were often substituted for separate institutional releases. The benefits of such cooperative effort were increasingly recognized, as was the role of the NCRAC as the forum in which agencies might come to know one another's views and thus, hopefully, to achieve greater agreement among themselves.

But even within the framework of the NCRAC, it often proved impossible to reconcile differences between the member agencies. To many of the areas of work and to many of the problems, each agency would bring its own philosophy, and often growing out of that philosophy, its particular methods. Thus there were not only irreconcilable conflicts on some matters of basic policy, but even when agreement on policy was achieved, disagreement as to ways and means of carrying out the policy often persisted.

On many such occasions, the agencies would carry on independently. Sometimes these independent efforts reinforced one another. Sometimes, they appeared to be—and often were—in competition with one another and even at cross-purposes.

WELFARE FUNDS

In the communities witnessing such situations, voices were raised in vexation at what appeared to be unnecessary overlapping and wasted effort, resulting from avoidable "jurisdictional" disputes among the agencies.
The welfare funds, which in many communities had not only to determine the total amount of money to be allocated for community relations work but also the proper distribution of the monies raised, found this task formidable indeed. When, in 1949, a sharp reduction in total monies raised for community relations work began to be evident, the problem of assessing claims—often contradictory—as to the needs and accomplishments of their beneficiary agencies, was considerably heightened.

In June 1948, the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC) was organized. Consisting of Jewish welfare funds in twelve of the largest cities outside of New York, it served as a medium through which the welfare funds could discuss problems of programming, coordination, and financing with their beneficiary agencies. After several meetings between its representatives and those of the national Jewish community relations agencies, the LCBC concluded that the only way to acquire the facts it needed was through a systematic and objective study of the present status and future prospects of the entire community relations field.

COMMITTEE ON EVALUATIVE STUDIES

On January 12, 1950, the NCRAC Executive Committee unanimously agreed to initiate and to sponsor a long-term cooperative study of Jewish community relations work.

In authorizing the study, the NCRAC Executive Committee made it clear that it sought an analysis that would be "directed toward describing and analyzing the areas of activity of each of the member agencies, the objectives which they seek, the assumptions on which they rest, the methods by which they are conducted and, as far as possible, the results that have been achieved, for the purpose of making evaluative judgments as a guide in program planning."

A special Committee on Evaluative Studies was established, composed of the national agencies, representatives of the local community relations councils, and of the LCBC. To work with it, a Technical Study Committee of social scientists was appointed, consisting of the heads of the scientific research departments of the national agencies.

Robert M. MacIver, professor emeritus of political philosophy and former head of the Department of Sociology at Columbia University, was selected to conduct the study. There were some who felt that MacIver's lack of knowledge of, or experience in, the Jewish communal field would be a serious handicap in such an undertaking. He was selected nevertheless, on the basis of his record as an outstanding sociologist and his long and active interest in the field of intergroup relations. MacIver served as chairman of the Technical Study Committee, which was to report to the Evaluative Studies Committee. The latter, in turn, was to present its findings and recommendations to the NCRAC.

At the start of his undertaking, MacIver emphasized that while in the course of his study he would call upon the agencies to supply information concerning their work, and upon the technical group to check and test

---

*The total income of the national agencies in community relations work rose from $1,000,000 in 1940 to $7,772,570 in 1948. From that peak income it fell to $5,909,284 in 1950 and $5,769,855 in 1951.
findings, in the final analysis, since the proposed study was essentially an “assessment,” he would himself assume final responsibility for the judgments carried in his report.

Finally, it was agreed that MacIver’s report would constitute the first step in a continuing study process; that the national and local agencies concerned would then analyze MacIver’s findings and, ultimately, within the forum of the NCRAC Executive Committee or Plenary Session, consider appropriate courses of action.

The study, budgeted at $25,000, was financed by special grants from the welfare funds of the LCBC and by supplementary grants from the NCRAC itself.

**MacIver Report**

MacIver’s report had several sections. One consisted of his own philosophy and a theoretical analysis of Jewish community relations needs, with some general observations on the kind of program which, in his view, would meet those needs. A major portion of the report, however, consisted of a series of concrete recommendations on the relationships of the national agencies to each other, to the NCRAC itself, and to the local scene. These recommendations, MacIver pointed out, did not “stand or fall with acceptance or rejection” of his views concerning the nature of anti-Jewish prejudice and the need for a re-examination of the fundamental objectives of the agencies presently in the field.

**THEORETICAL ASPECTS**

MacIver defined the goal of community relations work to be the achievement of full participation of Jews on the broad American scene. To bring this about he believed the programs of the Jewish community relations agencies should have two primary objectives: to remove the obstacles imposed by other groups that prevented such full participation, e.g., to combat discrimination in employment, education, etc.; and to promote opportunities for such participation by improving relations between various groups in the community.

To accomplish these objectives MacIver emphasized the necessity for “careful research preparation” and “the application of well thought out strategy.” Too little attention, he felt, had been given to the determination of such “high policy.”

MacIver not only deplored the discriminatory tactics used against Jews but also scored the tendency of some Jews and Jewish organizations to encourage insularity, i.e., the “unnecessary separation” of Jews from other groups in American society. He repeatedly warned against any activities or programs or attitudes that might suggest that “the Jewish people are an enclave in the larger community, that they are a community by themselves.”

MacIver considered it important to distinguish between “anti-Semitism” and “anti-Jewish prejudice.” The former, he believed, implied “active hatred” against Jews and the latter a more “polite,” “not embittered” feeling held by “perhaps 50 or 60 per cent of the population.”
MacIver was of the view that in the country today there was "only a quite small percentage of anti-Semites (thus understood)." But he readily recognized that in times of widespread tension they may increase in numbers, gaining their adherents from the ranks of the mildly prejudiced.

"The highly distinctive observances and rituals associated with Judaism," together with certain of its demands and practices were cited as contributing importantly to anti-Jewish feelings, and MacIver deemed it of first importance to examine candidly how prejudice is fed by these and "other aspects of the distinctive tradition of the Jewish people."

Finally, MacIver asserted that while there are certain known elements in common in all forms of prejudice, further and more profound study should be undertaken to determine whether and how anti-Jewish prejudice differs from other prejudices. This, in turn, should delineate distinctly the special and unique contributions Jewish agencies might make in reducing intergroup tensions, which not only threaten Jewish security but also undermine American democracy.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS

MacIver then addressed himself to the organizational problems which were reported to him and which he described in the following terms:

(1) ... the lack of teamwork, the unwillingness or the inability of the agencies to pull together for the sake of common objectives ...

(2) needless jurisdictional disputes

(3) sheer duplication of services

(4) competition among the agencies for funds, leading to exaggerated claims of achievement

(5) the tendency of the national agencies to be more concerned with the needs of their constituencies than with the needs of the community relations councils (CRC's) and the total Jewish community

(6) the inability of the NCRAC to carry out its aims and objectives (as stated on p. 168)

MacIver's major recommendations drawn up to deal with these problems can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. That the NCRAC set up a "Standing Committee for Over-All Strategy" in the field of community relations. This Committee was to be aided in its task by an "inter-agency research committee" to be devoted to "the common research and evaluation problems of the agencies as a whole."

2. That the "specialized" agencies be assigned responsibility for carrying on the work "of their particular areas"; and concomitantly, that separate departments devoted to this same work in the "general" agencies be eliminated. Thus, he recommended that the Jewish Labor Committee become the exclusive agent in the field of labor; that the Jewish War Veterans work with veterans (with the American Jewish Committee and the ADL maintaining a liaison office with the JWV); that the Union of American Hebrew Congregations have "provisional exclusive charge of the interfaith field" ... (on the understanding that it would join with the NCRAC in taking steps to secure representation from the Conservative and Orthodox groups).

3. That the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League
divide responsibility for activities in the youth field, intercultural education, and other areas in which they were presently active and where no specialized agency existed within the framework of the NCRAC.

4. That in civil rights activity, where "ideological differences have special significance," assignments to the national agencies should be made on a case-by-case basis.

5. That there be set up a single system of general fact-finding and investigation of "subversive" activities and organized anti-Semitism in place of the two departments maintained by the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League.

6. That the NCRAC be strengthened to enable it to function as the instrument through which all agencies could work for the "common cause," recognizing that they exist "not in their own right" but as "agencies of the communities whose cause it is." That, accordingly, NCRAC should have the clear responsibility for developing program plans, evaluating the agencies' activities, and recommending allocations or assignments of work.

To ensure the NCRAC's "power and authority" to carry out this responsibility, MacIver proposed that it act on the basis of majority vote. He also proposed making the voting procedure in the Executive Committee of the NCRAC the same as that in the Plenary Session \(^5\) so that the local agencies would have the majority of votes and the national agencies would no longer be able "to vote down decisions affecting them."

7. That the local community relations councils be further developed and strengthened. Observing that for the most part community relations problems were found in the communities and that it was there they must be solved, MacIver urged that the national agencies reorient themselves so that they make their primary obligation service to the local communities rather than to their constituencies. MacIver cautioned against the national agencies' conducting local activities in conflict with the local community relations councils' policies and programs.

8. Finally, MacIver suggested "tentatively" and only as "a general formula" requiring fuller study, that each community "allocate an inclusive sum" to all the community relations agencies and that "the apportionment of this sum be entrusted to a special committee representative equally" of the CRC's, the national agencies, and the welfare funds.

He emphasized particularly the need of the local welfare funds for objective evaluation of the various agencies' programs and financial requirements.

Reactions to the MacIver Report

By the fall of 1951, several months after the release of the MacIver report, all the agencies represented on the Evaluative Studies Committee had sub-

---

4 The votes on the Executive Committee were evenly divided among the communities and the national agencies as follows: American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, and Jewish War Veterans, two votes each; local community relations councils, ten votes (total). In the Plenum, on the other hand, the local agencies had 47 votes and the national agencies 30.
mitted statements indicating their views as to its recommendations. These statements were then considered at two separate meetings of the Evaluative Studies Committee held prior to the November 1951 NCRAC Plenary Session to formulate recommendations for the consideration of that larger body.

LARGE CITY BUDGETING CONFERENCE

The LCBC accepted MacIver's findings and recommendations as "the valid foundation for a continuing process of re-examination and re-orientation" on the part of the national and local Jewish agencies in the community relations field. It urged the adoption of certain general principles laid down by MacIver as a guide to further action, and suggested the following as "essential starting points for developing an improved system of program-making": (1) continuing reassessment and planning of over-all strategy; (2) "over-all approach to program-making . . . looking toward the development of a comprehensive and integrated plan of organization within which specific areas of work would be delegated to specific national agencies"; (3) emphasis on the primacy of the local community relations councils; (4) strengthening of the NCRAC to give it appropriate powers and authority to enable it to serve as "the agency responsible for over-all program planning, coordination, and policy-making in the field of community relations"; (5) relating financing to joint program planning by regarding the total funds available for national community relations activities "as a unit, to be distributed on the basis of an integrated program of activities."

"SPECIALIZED" AGENCIES

The "specialized" agencies (which MacIver had characterized as the "group appeal" agencies)—namely, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations—accepted the MacIver report generally, and specifically endorsed those recommendations which assigned to them increasing responsibility for relations with their opposite numbers in the American community.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCILS

The reactions of the local community relations councils were scattered and varied, although most of those that did express themselves appeared favorably disposed toward the MacIver recommendations. They were in unanimous agreement with the report's emphasis on the importance of the community relations councils and MacIver's position that a major responsi-

6 While the MacIver report was being studied by the national agencies, the Anglo-Jewish and Yiddish press devoted considerable attention to it—both in criticism and in support. The criticism was levelled mainly at MacIver's analysis of the nature and causes of anti-Jewish prejudice and his concept of Jewish life in America. MacIver, however, was widely supported for his attack upon "waste" and "duplication"; and his recommendations for a division of labor among the agencies were regarded by some commentators as a needed step in the direction of the eventual establishment of a central organization for American Jewry. A particularly extensive analysis of the report, especially the theoretical concepts expressed in it and their relation to the Reconstructionist program, was prepared by Abraham G. Duker for the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation (Jewish Community Relations; an analysis of the MacIver Report. New York, the Foundation, 1952).

7 The Evaluative Studies Committee also held a special meeting on June 12–13 at which time the agencies were given an opportunity to question MacIver, for purposes of clarification, on many of the views and recommendations in his written report.
bility of the national agencies should be to sustain, strengthen and serve them.

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

The American Jewish Congress also endorsed the report in general. However, it differed with certain of MacIver's concepts with respect to Jewish life in America and particularly with his rejection of the idea that there is or should be a "Jewish community" in America. Congress emphasized its view that "only within the framework of such a community, democratically organized," can American Jews "cope with the problems by which as Jews, they are confronted."

However, Congress supported to a considerable extent many of the report's practical conclusions and recommendations, including the idea of continuing reassessment, the need for creation of an over-all strategy group, and the proposals for enhancing the authority of the NCRAC. It raised a question as to the qualifications of some of the present local community relations councils, pointing out that where these councils "do not function democratically or are not fully representative of the community they have no right to claim and cannot expect to command the authority" MacIver proposed for them.

On the matter of assigning areas of work among the various agencies, Congress recalled that for a number of years within the NCRAC it had similarly urged allocation of functions to the member agencies on a continuing basis. It stated that it considered some decision in this area to be "the most important preliminary step towards ending much of the confusion which prevails in the field at the present time."

It called attention to its special competence and large experience in the legal and legislative aspects of community relations work, stating that it had deliberately refrained from other activities so as to be able to concentrate its energies and resources in this area.

Accordingly, it criticized MacIver for failing to allocate this area of work to it and rejected categorically his reasoning for this. MacIver proposed assigning this legislative and litigative activity on a case-by-case basis to the several agencies, because, among other reasons, he believed that here "genuine differences of ideology are involved" and "Congress has shown consistent intransigence in its attitude toward the viewpoints of [other] agencies." To this Congress replied that all other areas of work in which MacIver strongly recommended allocation were "no less likely to be affected by ideological considerations" and stated that there could be "no question whatever that similar allocation was much more feasible in the legal field where review and supervision... is a relatively simple and practical procedure."

With respect to financing, the American Jewish Congress reiterated the position it had taken over the years, namely, that the present system of fund distribution required revision "so that a greater measure of objectivity and fairness be introduced into the fund-raising process."

Maclver did assign to the American Jewish Congress responsibility for "reporting" to communities on matters pertaining to the legal and legislative field but not the drafting of bills, preparation of amicus briefs, etc.
The most vigorous opposition to the MacIver report was recorded in the two statements submitted by the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). The American Jewish Committee in general supported MacIver's philosophy of Jewish life in America, and concurred particularly with MacIver's view that the goal of American Jews should be "effective participation in the larger community life while freely and openly retaining their cultural and religious values." The Committee stated that this belief found expression in many of its current activities in the area it designated as "Jewish civic relations." The Committee, however, expressed the view that most of MacIver's practical recommendations directly contradicted his own theory and philosophy.

The ADL's statement took exception to many of MacIver's interpretations of Jewish life and disagreed with MacIver and those who proposed that the theoretical and ideological sections of the report could readily be divorced from the recommendations for reorganizing the community relations field. According to the ADL, the validity of the recommendations was adversely affected by what it believed to be "unsound thinking" on the nature and causes of anti-Semitism, the "separatist" elements in Jewish life and the obstacles Jews imposed upon themselves to friendly relationships with non-Jews.

Both the Committee and the ADL were severely critical of the major practical recommendations. Both agencies strongly opposed the recommendation that the NCRAC be strengthened so that it might have the "power" and "authority" to serve and to represent the entire "Jewish community." The NCRAC, they claimed, would then no longer be a "coordinating" and "advisory" council, but a governing agency which could, if it chose, override the views of its constituent organizations and dictate to them the policies and programs they should pursue.

The Committee and the ADL argued that each of the constituent agencies was an autonomous organization and had its own membership to which it was primarily responsible and responsive. They could not and should not be expected to be subservient to any "superbody" presuming to speak for all of "American Jewry." They pointed out that different organizations existed in Jewish life to express the different views that American Jews held on the many problems affecting them.

In support of this position the AJC cited MacIver's own caution in an early section of his report:

It is a gross misconception to think of the Jewish people, in this country or elsewhere, as forming a monolithic cultural entity. On the contrary, there is the widest divergence of attitudes, interests and ideologies between different subgroups. Yet in certain appeals made on behalf of the Jewish people, no less than in some of the propaganda against them, there is the assumption that the Jewish people are a unity in interest and objectives. This assumption easily leads to a false impression of the relation of the Jews to the greater community.

MacIver's recommendation that the NCRAC assume responsibility for evolving "over-all strategy" in the Jewish community relations field appeared
to both agencies to give currency to the notion that "the Jewish people are a unity in interest and objectives."

On the matter of reassessment, ADL stated that since it was primarily a "Jewish defense agency" its goals were clearly set forth and its need, therefore, for "continuous reassessment" is "questionable."

Both agencies questioned the adequacy, and in some instances, the accuracy of the report. They pointed out that MacIver himself had admitted that lack of time prevented him from making any real assessment of the agencies' programs, and they insisted that such an assessment was essential before MacIver's recommendations for allocation of areas of work could be given serious consideration. Without it, they posited, no one really knew the extent of the alleged duplication, i.e., how much was actually wasteful, and how much actually desirable in the interests of experimentation and improved techniques "in a field where there were as yet no final answers."

The Committee and the ADL both asserted that MacIver's recommendations, while offered in the expectation of increasing efficiency and effectiveness in the community relations field, would, if adopted, have quite the opposite effect.

Replying to MacIver's statement that each of the specialized agencies "either are or can be equipped" to carry on the new assignments proposed for them, they suggested that this procedure may well prove extremely costly to the community and to the community relations program itself. Taking away "major activities from those agencies with proven competence and existing resources" and assigning them "instead to agencies which must yet acquire that competence and those resources, cannot be other than wasteful and inefficient," the AJC's statement contended.

On the matter of the local community relations councils, both agencies contended that MacIver did not adequately study these local organizations nor did he attempt to evaluate their competence and effectiveness in broad-scale community relations work. Because of the "fragmentary information" MacIver appeared to have, the ADL "seriously questioned" the validity of some of his recommendations in this area.

On the proposal with respect to budgeting and financing, the AJC cited "numerous objections" to the general formula outlined by MacIver and proposed that further study be given to the problem here, as in other areas.

**Subsequent Decisions**

With the various agencies' statements in hand, the Evaluative Studies Committee then attempted to draft a set of general recommendations based upon some principles offered by MacIver. The ways and means of putting these principles into practice, it was decided, should be left for later study following the November 1951 Plenary Session.9

The recommendations submitted by the Evaluative Studies Committee to the Plenary Session established the need for (1) a process of reassessment;
(2) a “continuing process of joint program planning” within the framework of the NCRAC with the objective of “the development of integrated program for the field as a whole, with logical and practical division of labor among the national agencies within the framework of generally accepted policy”; (3) the need for “cooperation and harmony between national and local agencies” and the establishment of local CRC’s where necessary; (4) the strengthening of the NCRAC; (5) the revising of present methods of financing so that they could be more closely related to the joint planning and programing described above.

NCRAC PLENARY SESSION, 1951

At the Plenum itself, the discussion was vigorous. Explicitly incorporated into the proposed resolutions, embracing the points mentioned above, was the provision that “the autonomy of the member agencies would be fully respected and maintained”—this at the insistence of the Committee and the ADL.

The Committee and the ADL also declared that they regarded the proposed resolutions as but a set of principles to guide a continuing study process. In connection with the resolution on joint programing and division of labor, they took the position that increased effectiveness must be the basic criterion in its implementation.

To clarify their position still further, both agencies asked that the record incorporate the following statement:

We understand that the Committee on Evaluative Studies will approach the question of division of responsibilities with an eye to the effectiveness and efficiency of the work and not as an end in itself. We ourselves will approach these questions in that spirit.

The resolutions were then adopted unanimously.

Shortly thereafter, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, at its General Assembly on December 2, 1951, unanimously approved the principles adopted by the NCRAC Plenum. In one of its resolutions, moreover, it stated that as a result of the NCRAC action

... a framework has been established ... [for] the strengthening of the NCRAC as the instrument of all the national and local agencies for overall planning in Jewish community relations, with the power and authority required to formulate policies and programs, to work out divisions of labor, and to act on its majority decisions.

Almost immediately the Committee took strong exception to this resolution,10 emphatically denying that any such “framework” was implicit in the resolutions they had agreed to. If it had been, the Committee contended, it would never have supported the resolutions, for it was irrevocably opposed in theory as well as in practice to the creation of a central authoritative agency presuming to speak for “organized Jewry.”

10 In a resolution adopted at its 45th Annual Meeting, January 28, 1952.
EVALUATIVE STUDY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

In the meetings of the Evaluative Studies Committee that followed, critical points of disagreement became quickly evident. Most of the Evaluative Studies Committee took the position that the action at the NCRAC Plenary Session constituted a mandate to proceed immediately with the development of a concrete plan for division of labor among the agencies.

Accordingly, several suggestions for dividing up community relations work among them were considered. One followed the main lines of Maclver's recommendations. Another suggested that the field be divided into its several major aspects, i.e., counteraction against anti-Semitism, promotion of civil rights and related activities, long-range educational programs designed to improve intergroup relations—and that each agency be assigned the primary responsibility for a given area.

With respect to these and similar proposals the Committee and the ADL adhered firmly to their original position that effectiveness of community relations work was the goal to be sought and therefore no "logical or practical divisions of labor" could be achieved without first determining to what extent there was actual duplication in the areas in question, and the capacities of various agencies to take on the work being proposed for them.

Accordingly, they proposed that the Evaluative Studies Committee itself arrange a series of conferences to be participated in by all agencies working in a given area. Thus, all agencies having any program in the veterans' field would be convened and asked to present the details of their operations. The agencies operating in other fields (labor, interreligious activities, etc.) would be convened similarly. Examination of this information, the Committee and the ADL maintained, would provide an intelligent basis for joint program planning.

This proposal was rejected at a meeting of the Evaluative Studies Committee on March 2, 1952. At that meeting, moreover, it was agreed (with the Committee and the ADL dissenting) that the national agencies should proceed immediately to develop concrete proposals to effect divisions of labor.

The Committee and the ADL together then convened such conferences as they could with appropriate interested agencies. As a result of these conferences, they developed a plan for coordination in the six major fields of activity cited in the MacIver Report and submitted it to the Evaluative Studies Committee at its meeting on May 3-4, 1952.

The proposal of the Committee and the ADL called for the establishment of a series of committees in each of the following fields—labor, veterans, interreligious activities, intercultural education, civil rights, investigation. Each of these committees was to be made up of the agencies having programs in these areas and each committee would be responsible for planning in its particular area and for recommending divisions of work to attain "sound sharing of responsibilities."

Although these committees would not be committees of the NCRAC as such, their work would be regularly reported to the NCRAC and would be subject to review by the appropriate NCRAC committees. NCRAC would thus be responsible for considering major policy questions in each field of
work, although it would have little, if any, responsibility for supervising, evaluating, and assigning programs on a day-to-day basis.

The other members of the Evaluative Studies Committee, while recognizing some merit in certain of the details of this proposal, nevertheless rejected it on the grounds that it could not be considered to be an implementation of the previously adopted NCRAC resolution calling for a "logical and practical division of labor for the field as a whole."

They pointed out that the Committee and ADL proposal was not a plan for division of labor but, at best, a proposal calling for closer cooperation among the agencies, one result of which might be increasing assignment of tasks or specific responsibilities.

They also objected to the fact that each agency would continue to operate in all fields in which it presently operated, for what was contemplated in the Committee and ADL proposal was that divisions of labor within a particular field would grow out of joint program planning if and when all the agencies concerned agreed that such assignments would increase effectiveness.

The final and most vigorous objection raised was that the NCRAC would be weakened as an instrument of joint program planning since the proposed committees would function outside of it.

The Evaluative Studies Committee then adopted (May 3-4, 1952), over the objections of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, a Report on Joint Program Planning and Division of Labor, which included the following provisions:

1. Joint program planning was to be the responsibility of all the agencies acting through the NCRAC. Each agency was to report all of its plans and programs to the NCRAC, on the basis of which methods of cooperation, assignment of duties and over-all strategy would be arrived at by majority vote.

2. Each national agency was to have a "distinctive" responsibility for "a major area of function or service, the complementary areas together forming the entire field of Jewish community relations work."

Thus contacts and relationships with labor, veterans' groups, religious organizations, etc., were to be the respective provinces of the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, and a group representing all three wings of Judaism. Responsibility for legal and legislative services was to be assigned to the American Jewish Congress. Responsibility for counteraction against anti-Semitism and the promotion of intergroup activities was to go jointly to the Committee and the ADL, subject to those agencies' recommendations for a subsequent division of responsibility between them.

"Programs of research and of social action or campaigns involving the community at large" . . . were regarded as "the common responsibility of all agencies, each of whom would make its contribution in accordance with its distinctive function."

3. Representations before public bodies and negotiations "of a major character" affecting American Jews were to be assigned on an ad hoc basis by the NCRAC to an "individual" or "individuals" of its choice.

---

11 The vote was seven to two, with the Jewish Labor Committee abstaining.
The implementation of these recommendations was to come about "through a continuous process of examination and inter-consultation within the NCRAC." Lines of jurisdiction, staff required, resources available and similar problems were to be considered in the course of such a process.

**NCRAC PLENARY SESSION, 1952**

These recommendations were formally presented at the NCRAC Plenary Session on September 6-8, 1952. Representatives of the Committee and the ADL also submitted a revision of their proposals to the delegates in advance of the Plenum.

The major debate centered around the Evaluative Studies Committee proposals. When it became apparent that there was opposition to them on the part of some of the local as well as national agencies, a proposal was introduced as a compromise which offered the following concessions to the AJC's and ADL's positions:

1. Assignments were to be made within a given area of work, rather than of whole areas.
2. All assignments were to be made for a one-year period, subject to review and reconsideration annually.
3. The right of the NCRAC to designate the agency or agencies to make public representation and/or to conduct negotiations with other groups was withdrawn.

Also, explicitly restated was the right of each autonomous member agency to "accept or reject" the plans recommended by the NCRAC "in accordance with NCRAC procedures."

**COMMITTEE AND ADL WITHDRAWAL FROM NCRAC**

The Committee and the ADL, however, declared that this proposal violated, just as clearly as did the earlier Evaluative Studies Committee proposal, the fundamental principles they considered essential to any satisfactory solution. These principles may be summarized as follows:

1. Diversity within Jewish life must be permitted to flourish. No one agency can or should dictate to others, policies and programs that presume to reflect and to serve "American Jewry."
2. Cooperation among the agencies must be developed on a voluntary basis. Any attempt to superimpose, by a majority vote, a master plan for all community relations work, far from increasing efficiency and effectiveness, could endanger the progress made to date and jeopardize future gains in the community relations field.
3. Community relations work cannot be parcelled out according to some mechanical formula. The problems it deals with are rarely "exclusively veterans" or "exclusively labor," or exclusively any other special group. They cut across all groups in the population; they embrace any and all aspects of American life—the school, the community, the church, the factory.

---

[12] The proposal is known as the Barr Plan, having been introduced by Joseph Barr, a national executive committee member of the Jewish War Veterans.
4. A coordinating agency, which was what the NCRAC was and must remain, derives its authority only from its member agencies. Its functions must be limited to facilitating joint program planning in those areas where all its agencies are in agreement as to goals and methods.

5. The agencies involved are each autonomous. Each has a primary responsibility to its members who have joined it because it best expressed their views about Jewish life in America. The members of each autonomous agency must continue to determine the purposes and policies of their organization. If that organization should be made subservient to another body with "authority" and "power" to dictate its policies and program, it could no longer properly fulfill its responsibility to its own members.

The Barr proposal was voted upon and adopted (by a vote of 54 to 17, with 6 abstentions). Following the vote the Plenum adopted a resolution expressing the hope that "all constituent agencies of the NCRAC will accept the judgment of the majority" and remain within the NCRAC. The representatives of the AJC and ADL, however, pursuant to their announced positions prior to the voting, upon the adoption of the Barr proposal stated that they were now compelled to recommend the withdrawal of their agencies from the NCRAC. Their official withdrawal was announced on September 22.

The spokesmen for the majority vigorously criticized the Committee and ADL position, pointing out that joint program planning and division of labor were in accord with the purposes of the NCRAC from its inception. They maintained that by withdrawing at this time both agencies were in effect repudiating an agreement to which they had subscribed some eight years earlier. Moreover, they recalled, the NCRAC had always had the right—granted it by its member agencies—to reach decisions by majority vote, a right which it had previously refrained from invoking in the interests of harmony. Furthermore, since all members explicitly retained the right to dissent from majority decisions, the NCRAC was not departing from its advisory character.

Finally, the Committee and the ADL were accused of attempting to weaken rather than to strengthen national coordination by proposing to carry on major aspects of coordination outside of the NCRAC.

The Committee and the ADL remained adamant in their view that the alleged compromise advanced all of the same propositions for centralizing authority which they had been consistently rejecting since 1944. They asserted that then, as now, they had advocated an arrangement by which voluntary joint programming could progress. They insisted that they had never favored subjecting the policy decisions made by their own members to the approval or disapproval of the NCRAC.

They viewed the right of dissent as but an illusory right, for in the proposed setting a dissenting agency would inevitably be regarded as a dissident voice in an otherwise harmonious situation—even as an agency thwarting the will of "organized Jewry." Furthermore, since a budgetary committee was to assign funds in accordance with the majority decisions, how practical

---

13 Voting in the negative, in addition to the Committee and the ADL (who had five votes each) were the communities of Milwaukee (two votes), Oakland (two votes), San Francisco (two votes), and Cincinnati (one vote, the other vote going to the majority). Abstaining were the agencies from the Southwest region, Minnesota and Youngstown (each two votes).
—or effective—could an act of dissent be? A majority decision that required an agency to yield a portion of its personnel and resources, could by that same action render that agency incapable of registering its dissent.

Finally, they maintained that strengthening the NCRAC is achieved not by giving it more "power" and "authority," but rather by improving its coordinating procedure and enabling it properly to carry out its advisory function. This the AJC and ADL attempted to do by holding the agencies themselves responsible for ironing out differences in their day-by-day operations and leaving the NCRAC free to facilitate the planning and joint action of its member agencies in the vital areas of work.

As this article goes to press these are the issues and the conflicts that are being aired in community after community throughout the country. Regardless of its ultimate outcome, every agency in the field of Jewish community relations work is destined to feel the impact of this controversy for some time to come.

Selma G. Hirsh

FINANCING OF JEWISH COMMUNAL PROGRAMS

The period under review (July 1951 through June 1952) saw no major changes in the pattern of Jewish communal fund raising or in the programs supported by American Jewish philanthropy. The relative stability of programs and finances which had been noted in the previous year continued. Changes of a more gradual, long-range character were, however, taking place. Jewish federation and welfare fund campaigns, which continued to be the major source of funds for Jewish philanthropic purposes, were able to raise less money than in the previous year. A consistent decline in the amounts raised by these central community campaigns had begun in 1949 and was continuing in 1951 and 1952. The decreases were generally moderate, but the persistent nature of the declining trend, unaccompanied by any similar decrease in program needs, raised significant problems both for the central organizations and for the local, national, and overseas agencies which depended upon them for support.

Central Community Campaigns

Central community campaigns conducted in the spring of 1951 experienced an average decline of 4 per cent, ranging from an increase of 31 per cent over 1950 to a decline of 39 per cent. In the fall of 1951, the experience was less favorable. Reports from sixty-one cities available at the time of writing (October 1952) indicated that results were 9 per cent below the amounts raised by the same cities in 1950.

By the spring of 1952, sharper decreases were taking place in a greater number of communities. In 114 cities whose reports were available at the

1 About 75 per cent of all Jewish federation and welfare fund campaigns are conducted in the spring of the year. About 25 per cent of all cities conduct their drives in the fall.
time of writing, 10 per cent less was raised in the spring of 1952 than in the spring of 1951. Experience ranged from 18 per cent more than the previous year to a drop of 44 per cent in one community. Fifty per cent of these cities experienced declines of 11.5 per cent or more in amounts raised.

### 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>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>143,147</td>
<td>51,160</td>
<td>91,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>137,159</td>
<td>49,311</td>
<td>87,848</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.*

The total of $136,792,000 (estimated) raised in 1951 through central campaigns was roughly comparable with the amounts raised in 1946, which was the first year of great expansion in postwar programs of relief and rehabilitation overseas. It represented a decline of about one-third from the peak fund-raising levels of 1948. On the basis of the experience in the first half of the year, it appeared that amounts raised in 1952 through central campaigns would total about $125,000,000.

### REASONS FOR DECLINE IN FUND RAISING

Insufficient data were available to determine with any degree of accuracy the reasons for reductions in totals raised. Economic factors undoubtedly played a part. While business activity and profits in the general economy continued at high levels during this period, certain consumer industries and trades in which a large proportion of Jewish contributors were engaged experienced a mild recession. Competent observers agreed, however, that economic factors were not fully responsible for cutbacks in welfare fund contributions, but that changes were taking place in contributors' attitudes.

To a considerable extent, these results reflected changes in the giving of the relatively small number of large contributors. In postwar campaigns, the scale of top giving had risen strikingly. In 1948, contributions of $500 or more accounted for 76.3 per cent of the total raised in 100 cities. Much of this giving was based on emergency overseas needs, and the reductions which began in 1949 probably reflected a readjustment of giving to more normal patterns. They may have also reflected a shifting in contributors' interests to causes not included within the scope of annual welfare fund campaigns, such as building fund drives for Jewish institutions or nonsectarian projects. During this period, large-scale fund raising was taking place not only in all sec-
tors of Jewish organized activity but throughout the American community. Institutions of higher learning, to take but one example, were facing severe financial problems and were intensifying their fund-raising drives. Since no method was available for obtaining information on the total giving by Jews to all causes—Jewish and non-Jewish—it was impossible to determine whether an absolute decrease was taking place in philanthropic giving by Jews, or whether there was simply a shift in the causes supported.

Another factor of importance was the development of the Israel Bond Drive, launched officially in May 1951. While bonds represented an investment rather than philanthropy, they provided a new channel for voluntary aid by American Jews to Israel and therefore appealed to the interests of the same individuals and organizations who were contributors to community philanthropic campaigns on behalf of Israel and other causes.

The losses in welfare fund giving were less severe in the lower categories of contributions (under $500) than in the top brackets. There was some decline in the total number of contributors to welfare fund campaigns, but this was relatively small. Between 1939 and 1948, the number of contributors to central Jewish community campaigns had risen by 141 per cent, and by 1950 the increase over 1939 was still 125 per cent. In 1950, reports from 76 cities indicated an average of 30 contributors per 100 Jews with an average gift per contributor of $136. Ninety per cent of all the funds raised that year in this group of 76 cities was obtained from gifts of $100 or more, supplied by 20 per cent of all the contributors.

Distribution of Federation Funds

At the time of writing, complete reports were not yet available on the distribution of 1951 campaign funds to the various groups of beneficiaries—local, national, and overseas—included in federation and welfare fund drives. Preliminary estimates indicated that in welfare fund communities outside of New York City, about 74 per cent of the net funds available were distributed for overseas and refugee needs, compared with about 78 per cent for these purposes in 1950. Domestic national agencies received about five per cent of total allocations in both 1950 and 1951, whereas local institutions and services obtained approximately 21 per cent in 1951, as compared with 17 per cent in the previous year.

This shift of four percentage points in the total distribution from overseas and refugee services to local community services reflected a trend which had been apparent since 1949, when the totals raised by federations and welfare funds began to decline. Within this smaller total, local services tended, on the whole, to receive, each year, about the same or slightly larger amounts than the previous year. On the other hand, costs of refugee care in the local communities began to decline after 1950, when the Displaced Persons immigration program moved toward termination. The United Jewish Appeal,

---

2 Net funds refer to the amounts allocated to beneficiary agencies, after deduction of local campaign and administrative costs and amounts reserved for uncollectible pledges and contingencies.
although continuing as the largest beneficiary of the welfare funds, received less in terms of percentages in relation to the total in each year after 1948.

The need to achieve an effective balance in the financing of all the causes included in central campaigns and the difficulties of doing so under conditions of declining total funds constituted a problem which received continuous attention and examination. In many cities, local programs were reviewed intensively with a view toward effecting savings in costs or finding alternative sources of income outside the welfare fund. In general, the controversial climate in which this problem had been discussed in 1949 was replaced by an atmosphere of mutual discussion and planning. The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) continued to seek acceptance of the principle that all beneficiaries should share to a reasonable extent in the decline of funds. It continued to request “pre-campaign” budgeting arrangements which would establish, in advance of the campaign, the proportionate shares of the various beneficiaries in the event of campaign losses. The UJA position received generally sympathetic consideration, although local budgeting practices continued to vary very widely and no uniform pattern was followed.

**Distribution of Funds for Local Services**

The amounts allocated by federations and welfare funds for local services and the programs for which these expenditures were made varied in relation to the size of different communities, the extent of local institutional development, and the availability of financing through nonsectarian community chests. In most cities support was available through the community chests in which Jews participated as individuals, along with the rest of the community, for health and welfare services under Jewish agency auspices. The chests supplied major financing for family and child care services (other than refugee care), a considerable portion of the subsidies received by community centers, and participated to a lesser extent in the support of homes for the aged and hospitals. It was estimated that local Jewish institutions and agencies received about $10,500,000 from community chests in 1950 and preliminary figures indicated a slight increase in those funds for 1951. In cities having community chests, the latter supplied about 48 per cent of the total funds distributed through central Jewish community sources for nonrefugee local programs.

For several years, there had been a trend toward supplementation, out of Jewish campaigns, to local agencies normally deriving their support from nonsectarian community chests. This was due to the inability of the chests in a number of cities to meet the full budgeting needs of local agencies, as approved by the Jewish federation. Such supplementation accounted for some

---

3 For a discussion of local services see pp. 109-53.

4 These comments are not applicable to Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, and New York, which do not conform with the prevailing pattern of community chest-Jewish federation relationship. There is no over-all community chest in Baltimore. In that city and in Boston Jewish campaigns are the only central source of philanthropic funds for Jewish programs. In Chicago and New York, there are limited nonsectarian funds which provide a relatively smaller proportion of total financing than is true in most other cities. New York is the only city where there are now two separate Jewish central campaigns—by the New York Federation for local needs and by the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York, which is primarily for overseas and refugee needs.
of the increase in local allocations since 1949. The bulk of local financing, however, was accounted for by the support of agencies which did not normally receive chest support.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 51 COMMUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Welfare</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Service</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes both federation and community chest funds. Local services for refugees are excluded. Data derived from unpublished study by Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

As indicated in Table 2, there was little change between 1950 and 1951 in the distribution of centrally raised funds for local purposes. Health programs (primarily Jewish hospitals) represented the largest single category of expenditures in both years (27-28 per cent); group work services (Jewish community centers) accounted for another 21 per cent. There was a slight decline in the relative share of support obtained by family and child welfare services and a rise in costs for care of the aged. Jewish education, which had been receiving increasing attention in the past several years, accounted for 14 per cent of the total. Variations in cities of differing size were reflected in the fact that hospitals received the largest proportionate share in cities with a Jewish population of 15,000 and over, whereas Jewish centers and Jewish education accounted for the bulk of the funds distributed in communities with a Jewish population of 5,000 or less.

Non-Federated Sources of Financing

Substantial sums were received by Jewish agencies from sources other than central financing. Since not all of these funds are centrally recorded, no estimate could be made of the over-all total.

National domestic and overseas agencies reporting regularly to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) recorded total income of about $33,000,000 in 1951 from sources other than welfare funds, compared with $30,500,000 received by the same agencies in 1950 (see Appendix). The major source of this income was from contributions raised by these agencies directly in their own independent campaigns. Much of this fund raising took place in New York City, which did not have an inclusive

---

8 These figures are higher than those reported in the 1952 edition of the American Jewish Year Book because of more complete reporting at the present time.
Jewish welfare fund. In addition to contributions, various national agencies derived income from endowments, earnings, and other miscellaneous sources.

Central sources of financing accounted for about 23 per cent of the costs of local operating programs in the health and welfare fields.6 Payments for services and governmental grants were important sources of income for these agencies, in addition to direct contributions they received individually rather than through federated appeals.

No estimates were available of the sums raised by Jewish religious and secular institutions, either local or national, which were not related to central Jewish community organizations and therefore did not participate in the reporting system of the CJFWF. Undoubtedly, these sums were substantial, particularly in New York City.

**Building Funds**

Only scattered and partial information was available on fund raising for building purposes. Following the end of World War II, numerous building projects were undertaken to renovate existing American Jewish institutions or to establish new ones. A generation of depression and war had created a backlog of building needs. Many institutions had deteriorated or required replacement, having become outmoded by population shifts and other demographic changes in the Jewish community. Synagogues, hospitals, community centers, and homes for the aged were the major projects undertaken in local communities.

Building programs were not confined to the local scene. Nationally, large-scale programs were undertaken after the war by Jewish specialized national hospitals and educational institutions, both religious and secular. Several important building projects were also undertaken in Israel with American Jewish financing—notably the Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical School and the Weizmann Institute of Science. During the period under review, active fund raising was under way by Hadassah for a new medical center and by the American Technion Society for expansion of the Haifa Institute of Technology.

Although much of this building, and much of the fund raising had been completed by the middle of 1952, there were many substantial projects still under way or which were still in the planning stages. It appeared that the financing of building projects would continue to be a matter of serious concern to the Jewish community for some years to come. At the time of writing, the CJFWF was engaged in a study seeking to compile systematic information on the extent and character of building fund drives since 1950.

**Israel Bond Drive**

In October 1950, a conference sponsored by leading national organizations had launched a “four-point program” of American aid to Israel, including

---

philanthropy, sale of Government of Israel Bonds, private investments, and United States governmental assistance. Developments during the review period in regard to investments and governmental assistance are described elsewhere in this volume. From the point of view of Jewish community financing, the UJA and the Bond Drive were the most significant elements in the four-point program.

The Independence Bond Issue was launched in May 1951. By the end of September 1952, it reported total subscriptions or pledges to subscribe of $140,000,000, of which $85,000,000 represented actual cash purchases. At the time of writing, there was no basis for predicting the amounts which could be expected from the sale of bonds in the second year of the drive. However, the Government of Israel, in projecting its estimates of foreign exchange income for the fiscal year 1952-53, was anticipating receipts of $48,000,000 from this source.

It was not known to what extent the sale of bonds had affected philanthropic contributions. There were instances of reductions in contributions specifically attributed to bond sales, and there were some contributions to philanthropy in the form of Israel Bonds, but these tended to be the exception rather than the rule.

Coordination between philanthropic and bond drives was achieved in most local communities on the basis of local agreements between the respective sponsoring groups. In some of the smaller cities, bond sales were conducted by the same lay and professional personnel which was responsible for welfare fund drives, although not necessarily under the official auspices of the welfare fund. Local agreements generally dealt with the timing and publicity of the two drives, established in such a manner as to minimize conflict.

INDIANAPOLIS INCIDENT

This generally cooperative pattern had its exceptions which, though few in number, caused sharp conflict for brief periods of time. The most serious incident occurred in Indianapolis in March 1952. The American Financial and Development Corporation For Israel (AFDCI), sponsor of the Israel Bond Drive, organized a meeting in Indianapolis at that time for the purpose of selling bonds. This was done over the opposition of the Indianapolis Jewish Federation and the local coordinating committee which had decided that this period should be reserved for the Federation campaign. The Federation considered the AFDCI's action a violation of local autonomy and appealed to the Israel Ambassador and to the Israel Minister of Labor (who had been invited to speak at this function) to respect the local community decision and to convert the proposed meeting to one on behalf of the Federation campaign, of which the United Jewish Appeal was the major beneficiary. This request was refused and the conflict became public both in the press of Indianapolis and in Jewish newspapers and periodicals throughout the country. A compromise proposal offered by the Israel Ambassador that the Minister of Labor appear under the joint auspices of the Bond Drive and the Federation was rejected by the latter. The conflict was not reconciled and the meeting took place, as scheduled, over the Federation's public opposition.

See pp. 159-60; and 434-35.
In the course of this controversy, there was a crystallization of the underlying concepts held by the two sides on the question of coordination between bond sales and philanthropy for Israel. The AFDCI based its action on the following premises: 1. that it was an agent of the Government of Israel, responsible to the Government and not to the American Jewish community; 2. that since bonds constitute an investment and not a contribution they must be sold throughout the year; and 3. that effective cooperation had been achieved where the welfare funds actively supported the bond drive and failed where the welfare funds were indifferent or antagonistic.

The position of the Indianapolis Federation, representative of the prevailing viewpoint among the local central philanthropic organizations, was based on the concept that the Bond Drive, like philanthropy for Israel, depended essentially on the voluntary organizations of the Jewish community, and that these organizations could meet both responsibilities only if they were permitted to determine their own procedures in each local community.

Although this difference of opinion was never resolved, tensions subsided and there was no repetition of the Indianapolis incident. Efforts continued to achieve a pattern of coordination nationally, but, by the fall of 1952, no national agreement had been made.

During the second year of its existence, it appeared that the Bond Drive had established itself as an important continuing activity of American Jews, serving as an additional source of funds for Israel.

**Overseas Philanthropic Programs**

The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) continued in this period as the major channel for American Jewish philanthropy for Israel and other overseas areas. The greater part of its funds were raised on behalf of philanthropic programs in Israel. The UJA was reconstituted in 1951, as in each year since 1939, by agreement between the United Israel Appeal (UIA), representing the Jewish Agency for Palestine and the Jewish National Fund, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC).

The 1952 agreement provided for the same distribution of funds as in 1951. After allocations to the United Service for New Americans (USNA) and 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 UIA. The 1951 UJA campaign raised an estimated $85,000,000, resulting in the following allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USNA</td>
<td>$2,222,306</td>
<td>$1,293,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYANA</td>
<td>$9,656,000</td>
<td>$5,081,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDC (estimated)</td>
<td>$20,100,000</td>
<td>$20,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIA (estimated)</td>
<td>$50,500,000</td>
<td>$54,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures are lower than those quoted in the American Jewish Year Book 1952 (Vol. 53) because the result of the 1950 UJA campaign is now estimated at $85,100,000, compared with the earlier estimate of $88,000,000.*
The Jewish National Fund (JNF), by action of the World Zionist Congress, was no longer a partner in the UIA, as it had been in previous years. Because of this, attempts were made by the JNF to remove from the 1952 UJA agreement the "ceiling" established in previous UJA contracts which had limited the amounts it might retain from its own traditional collections in the United States. In the UJA negotiations, however, it was finally agreed to retain this "ceiling," in view of the fact that the JNF was still to receive grants in Israel from the Jewish Agency for Palestine and was therefore still a beneficiary of UJA funds. It was therefore agreed that the UIA would reimburse the UJA for any funds raised by the JNF traditional collections in excess of $1,800,000, plus expenses of no more than $300,000.

JEWISH AGENCY

The Jewish Agency for Palestine, the major beneficiary of UJA funds, spent $104,608,742 in the fiscal year ended September 30, 1951 (the last full year for which figures were available). The major categories of expenditure were: $51,796,226 for agricultural settlement (50 per cent); $35,781,934 for transportation and care and maintenance of immigrants (34 per cent); $9,248,030 for Youth Aliyah (9 per cent); and $7,832,552 (7 per cent) for all other activities, including educational, cultural, and other minor programs as well as administration and interest on bank loans.

Income of the Jewish Agency, from all sources, totalled $62,572,635 in 1950-51, of which $53,274,432 was obtained from philanthropy abroad and the remainder from governmental and intergovernmental sources and from earnings in Israel. The large discrepancy between income and expenditures—a deficit of over $42,000,000—was met by borrowing.

In the fiscal year ended September 30, 1951, the Jewish Agency processed 227,653 immigrants. This was the heaviest volume of immigrant absorption which the Agency had ever borne. In the following year, for which expenditure data were not yet available, immigration declined sharply (to about 1,000 per month by August 1952), and it was anticipated that the Agency would be able to stabilize its program and to reduce to some extent the large short-term indebtedness which it had built up during the period of mass immigration.

JEWISH NATIONAL FUND

The JNF spent $52,845,475 in the fiscal year 1950-51. Its income was derived primarily from the UJA campaign, supplemented by traditional collections in the United States and other countries.

According to the new definition of relationships between the JNF and the Jewish Agency, as established by the World Zionist Congress in August 1951, the JNF was to receive an allocation of about $9,000,000 for 1951-52 from the Jewish Agency for its traditional functions of land purchase, afforestation, and land improvement.

8 Israel pounds converted at the official rate of $2.80.
9 The number of new immigrants entering Israel during this period was 203,000.
The expenditures of the JDC continued to decline in this period as they had in every year since 1947, when they were at a peak of $74,400,000. Appropriations were about $21,600,000 in the calendar year 1951 and were being made at the rate of $19,300,000 in 1952. This declining trend reflected the diminishing responsibility of JDC in all European areas and in the financing of immigration to Israel. The latter responsibility was transferred to the Jewish Agency in 1951. The JDC's work in Israel and in Moslem countries was, however, continuing on the same scale as in the previous year and accounted for almost half of JDC's expenditures in 1951 and 1952.

**ORT**

In each year since 1947, the JDC, by agreement with the World ORT Union, had made grants for ORT's vocational training program in Europe and North Africa. In 1951, the amount was set at a minimum of $850,000. The American ORT Federation and Women's ORT conducted membership activities in the United States, collecting maximum contributions of $25 per person. ORT's vocational training program in Israel, which was expanding, was not included in the JDC grants but was financed through funds raised by ORT in other countries, with some supplementation from American ORT membership sources. It was expected that the JDC would make a grant in 1953 for ORT's program in Israel.

**USNA and NYANA**

Allotments from the UJA to the two agencies—USNA and NYANA—concerned with services to Jewish immigrants declined steadily after 1949, which marked the peak of Jewish immigration under the Displaced Persons program. USNA expenditures for its national program of migration and resettlement services fell from $2,341,000 in 1950 to $1,455,000 in 1951 and to $502,000 for the first six months of 1952.

Similarly, NYANA expenditures for financial relief and casework assistance to immigrant families in New York City were reduced from $9,654,000 in 1950 to $4,892,000 in 1951 and $1,555,000 for the first half of 1952. By June, 1952, NYANA had an active caseload, in its Family Service Division, of 1,113 cases, compared with a peak of 8,871 cases in February, 1950.

**OTHER UJA BENEFICIARIES**

On the instructions of the Jewish Agency, the United Palestine Appeal made the following allocations in 1951 to various ideological groups for their colonization and other constructive projects in Israel: Mizrachi Palestine Fund, $850,000; World Confederation of General Zionists, $935,000; Agudath Israel, $178,750; Poale Agudath Israel, $199,250; United Revisionists, $87,900.

The allocations were made on the basis of agreements that the organizations would not conduct separate campaigns for funds in the United States in 1951.
OTHER OVERSEAS CAMPAIGNS

As Table 1 of the Appendix indicates, reports available for overseas agencies other than the UJA showed a total income of $17,415,775, representing a moderate increase over the amounts received by the same agencies in 1950 ($16,879,621). The increase from 1950 to 1951 was accounted for primarily by Hadassah, whose income rose to $8,291,288 in 1951, compared with $7,822,883 in 1950.

Hadassah's program of medical and welfare work in Israel continued to be the largest Israel project supported by American Jews except for the UJA. Hadassah's program included, as in previous years, the development of medical services, with stress on the raising of funds to build a new Medical Center in Jerusalem to replace the former facilities on Mt. Scopus; contributions of funds to the youth immigration and training program of the Jewish Agency (Youth Aliyah); and child welfare and vocational training activities. Hadassah's funds were obtained from collections by its local chapters throughout the United States, with federations and welfare funds participating to a relatively small extent (estimated at no more than 10 per cent).

The American Committee for the Hebrew University, Weizmann Institute, and Haifa Technion (UIT), which had conducted a joint campaign in 1950 and 1951 on behalf of Israel's three major educational and scientific institutions, was dissolved in 1952, and each of the three groups conducted its own fund-raising activity in 1952. The dissolution came about because of the disappointing results of the joint drive, especially in New York City, and because of the inability of the three groups to agree on a distribution of the funds raised. In 1952, the Hebrew University and the Haifa Technion intensified their American fund-raising efforts. The University sought funds to alleviate the serious financial crisis in which it found itself, while the Technion stressed the needs of its expanding program for the training of engineers and other technical workers in Israel and began to organize a building fund drive to construct larger facilities.

HIAS, by agreement with the Jewish Agency for Palestine, initiated a new program of shelter care for unattached immigrants, spending about $120,000 in 1951, out of reserve funds.

Other overseas programs continued without significant change in regard to either program content or amounts raised.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine continued, through its Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns, to control and limit the extent of American fund raising for Israel. It granted authorizations, in 1952, to thirteen organizations. The controls exercised by the Jewish Agency were limited to fund raising (timing and scope of campaigns, etc.), but did not extend to questions of budget and program.

Domestic National Programs

Fifty organizations and institutions whose records were available reported a total income of $21,053,863 in 1951 for a variety of domestic national programs in the fields of community relations, health and welfare, cultural, reli-
gious and educational activities (see Table 2 of the Appendix). The same agencies had reported an income of $20,350,270 in 1950, thus pointing to an over-all increase of about 4 per cent for the entire group in 1951. There were increases in all fields of activity except community relations, where income declined from the previous year.

The major domestic development in the organized Jewish community during this period was the evaluative study of the national community relations agencies, conducted under the auspices of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC). This development is reported in a separate article of this current Year Book and will therefore not be included in the review of financing. It should be noted, however, that the study was closely related to financial questions. The Large City Budgeting Conference, an informal body made up of officers of Jewish welfare funds in twelve large cities outside of New York, had been organized in 1948 for joint discussions and budgetary hearings with national agencies. It was instrumental in launching the community relations study and, during this period, continued to urge a procedure for budget review of the needs of the community relations agencies, through a central national committee which would develop recommendations for the guidance of local federation groups in determining their annual allocations to the national agencies. Pending completion of the evaluative study, the federations generally provided the same amounts to these agencies as they had in 1950. In New York and Chicago, however, the Joint Defense Appeal (JDA), the fund-raising arm of the American Jewish Committee and Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, did not renew its agreement with the UJA and conducted its own campaigns. In the first year of independent fund raising (1951), the JDA raised less in these cities than it had previously obtained from the central fund-raising organization, thus accounting for the decline in total income shown in Table 2.

National hospitals specializing in treatment of tuberculosis, arthritis, and other specific diseases, had about 10 per cent more income in 1951 than in 1950, as a result of increased contributions obtained in their own direct appeals, outside of federations and welfare funds. With the exception of the National Jewish Hospital, all of the institutions in this group experienced operating deficits. Those which had had reserves after the war used most of these funds for renovations and additions to their facilities. The National Jewish Hospital and “City of Hope” of Los Angeles continued building fund drives which they had initiated in 1945 and 1946.

The various national agencies, under either secular or religious auspices, concerned with such programs as cultural development, research, education, and youth activities, continued to operate during this period, at income levels slightly higher than those of the previous year. The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) was affected by the mobilization of the armed forces. In addition to participation in the nonsectarian United Service Organizations (USO) program for recreational and morale services, JWB expanded its program of religious and morale services to the Jewish members of the Armed Services and received some increases from welfare funds in 1951 for

10 See p. 162 and f.
those purposes. Religious institutions, whose support came primarily from direct appeals to congregational groups, made gains of about 5 per cent in total income for operating purposes, but the efforts of the largest institutions in this group to increase their building and endowment funds on a substantial scale did not make significant progress. Operating deficits were incurred by all three major theological seminaries, necessitating withdrawals from capital funds.

One of the newer areas of activity for Jewish philanthropy since World War II were nonsectarian institutions of higher learning sponsored by Jewish groups. Brandeis University and the Chicago Medical School were two such institutions which continued their efforts to build financial support both for operating and capital needs.

A major new project which was beginning to move forward in the middle of 1952 was the Yeshiva University Medical School. In December 1950, Yeshiva University had obtained permission from the New York State Board of Regents to grant medical and dental degrees. This was followed in June 1951 by an offer from the City of New York for Yeshiva Medical School affiliation with a new public hospital being constructed by the City. The offer was accepted and the newly organized Yeshiva Medical School initiated a campaign for funds to establish the school. The ultimate cost was estimated at $25,000,000, but the immediate goal was for the $10,000,000 required to open the school of medicine. By April 1952, Yeshiva University reported that $2,375,000 had already been pledged for the project.

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 1951 AND 1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Jewish Appeal and Subsidiary Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>$80,083,865</td>
<td>$89,008,993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Distribution Committee</td>
<td>$688,800b</td>
<td>$642,200b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Israel Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keren Hayesod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Service for New Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Association for New Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Ort Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UJA AND SUBSIDIARIES</strong></td>
<td>$80,792,665</td>
<td>$89,651,193</td>
<td>$2,273,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Overseas Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Com. for University Institute Technion</td>
<td>$799,368</td>
<td>$545,969</td>
<td>$5,112</td>
<td>$276,761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weizmann Institute of Science</td>
<td>26,271</td>
<td>197,608</td>
<td>293,350</td>
<td>252,526</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of Hebrew University</td>
<td>31,780</td>
<td>218,934</td>
<td>206,078</td>
<td>333,552</td>
<td>72,526</td>
<td>48,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>36,115</td>
<td>295,883</td>
<td>142,034</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institutions</td>
<td>343,533</td>
<td>330,562</td>
<td>545,657</td>
<td>484,705</td>
<td>320,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Council of Israel Institutions</td>
<td>165,936</td>
<td>137,743</td>
<td>15,302</td>
<td>27,860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah</td>
<td>NRm</td>
<td>NRm</td>
<td>7,492,456</td>
<td>6,841,325</td>
<td>798,832</td>
<td>981,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Hadassah</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>67,867</td>
<td>86,237</td>
<td>9,052</td>
<td>14,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society</td>
<td>448,674</td>
<td>555,844</td>
<td>852,798</td>
<td>864,529p</td>
<td>102,925</td>
<td>73,162p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School Campaign</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>69,455</td>
<td>228,510</td>
<td>26,131</td>
<td>12,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel</td>
<td>493,674</td>
<td>535,629</td>
<td>1,884,443</td>
<td>2,064,807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women</td>
<td>35,000v</td>
<td>33,000v</td>
<td>428,198</td>
<td>345,150</td>
<td>159,486</td>
<td>153,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Women of America</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1,166,717</td>
<td>997,604</td>
<td>56,298</td>
<td>54,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,527,223</td>
<td>$2,591,404</td>
<td>$13,337,316</td>
<td>$12,945,600</td>
<td>$1,551,236</td>
<td>$1,342,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERSEAS</strong></td>
<td>$83,319,898</td>
<td>$92,242,597</td>
<td>$15,610,399</td>
<td>$15,258,287</td>
<td>$2,393,977</td>
<td>$2,418,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE 1

a Cash basis; income for subsidiary agencies does not include income derived from the UJA.

b Special emigration drives.

c Excludes $712,400 in foreign contributions and $4,076,400 in IRO payments.

d Excludes $840,300 in foreign contributions and $4,575,400 in IRO payments.

e Excludes $1,382,847 in Latin American and Canadian contributions.

f Excludes $1,506,000 in Latin American contributions.

g Women's ORT Federation.

h Includes estimated $40,000 from Labor ORT and other ORT affiliates.

i Exclusive of income obtained through UIT.

j Excludes $37,245 in foreign contributions.

k Excludes $70,355 in foreign contributions.

1 Income from Israel Philharmonic tour.

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

n Excludes $818,277 in JNF collections and contributions in kind $422,141.

o Excludes $918,981 in JNF collections and contributions in kind $627,059.

p Excludes $84,232 in foreign contributions.

q Excludes $71,072 in foreign contributions.

r Excludes $237,603 in IRO payments.

s Excludes $113,668 in IRO payments.

t Excludes $447,439 in foreign contributions.

u Excludes $442,546 in foreign contributions.

v Estimated.
<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*</td>
<td>$2,064,134</td>
<td>$1,626,015</td>
<td>$12,565</td>
<td>$3,702,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress—World Jewish Congress*</td>
<td>830,839</td>
<td>10,126</td>
<td>96,255</td>
<td>937,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>228,538</td>
<td>457,385</td>
<td>22,954</td>
<td>708,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Relations Advisory Council</td>
<td>45,775</td>
<td>15,333</td>
<td>86,250</td>
<td>132,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,169,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,246,429</strong></td>
<td><strong>$354,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,769,855</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>$64,362</td>
<td>$840,633</td>
<td>$150,378</td>
<td>$1,055,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Patients TB Home</td>
<td>10,054</td>
<td>106,322</td>
<td>46,549</td>
<td>162,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Consumptives Relief Society</td>
<td>30,356</td>
<td>378,107</td>
<td>48,536</td>
<td>455,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>83,107</td>
<td>218,837</td>
<td>155,282</td>
<td>457,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
<td>71,556</td>
<td>1,164,615</td>
<td>272,622</td>
<td>1,508,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Home for Jewish Children</td>
<td>17,458</td>
<td>263,652</td>
<td>20,195</td>
<td>301,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$276,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,972,166</strong></td>
<td><strong>693,562</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,942,621</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Service Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$67,204</td>
<td>$70,672</td>
<td>$13,004</td>
<td>$150,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>87,999</td>
<td>97,257</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td>195,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>13,049</td>
<td>20,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board*</td>
<td>1,132,669</td>
<td>1,130,333</td>
<td>43,104</td>
<td>1,275,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council</td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>5,397</td>
<td>16,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,320,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,137,727</strong></td>
<td><strong>215,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,673,924</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Research</td>
<td>$3,785</td>
<td>$3,459</td>
<td>$1,913</td>
<td>$10,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal</td>
<td>448,714</td>
<td>1,115,291</td>
<td>29,729</td>
<td>1,593,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Relations</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>6,697</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>12,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
<td>37,486</td>
<td>56,384</td>
<td>26,572</td>
<td>120,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadruth Ivrit</td>
<td>17,277</td>
<td>53,629</td>
<td>85,287</td>
<td>155,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>8,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>7,924</td>
<td>88,516</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>97,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers' Seminary</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>40,077</td>
<td>22,721</td>
<td>64,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,166,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>$95,796</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,478,879</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Agencies—Continued</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menorah Association</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>8,861</td>
<td>32,111</td>
<td>29,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural College</td>
<td>13,472</td>
<td>18,135</td>
<td>29,333</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish Scientific Institute</td>
<td>32,549</td>
<td>32,296</td>
<td>129,920</td>
<td>151,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** | $571,553 | $572,207 | $1,595,047 | $1,526,952 | $368,538 | $400,622 | $2,535,138 | $2,499,781 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Agencies</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Jacob Schools, National Council of</td>
<td>$3,413</td>
<td>$2,833</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Jacob Teachers’ Seminary</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>204,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>58,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chachmey Lublin Theological Seminary</td>
<td>3,261</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>61,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaim Berlin Yeshiva Menasha</td>
<td>7,014</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>132,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chofetz Chaim Yeshiva</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>33,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College—JIR</td>
<td>131,627</td>
<td>112,615</td>
<td>1,100,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>127,274</td>
<td>120,231</td>
<td>1,079,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubavitcher Yeshivot</td>
<td>10,372</td>
<td>11,484</td>
<td>296,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>17,598</td>
<td>206,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizrahi National Education Committee</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>43,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ner Israel Rabbinical College</td>
<td>7,231</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>114,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>11,509</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>127,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telshe Rabbinical College</td>
<td>9,555</td>
<td>8,786</td>
<td>133,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tifereth Jerusalem Misfeta</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>118,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>35,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Vodaath Yeshiva</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>422,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>14,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavne Hebrew Theological Seminary</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>36,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>105,786</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>592,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** | $474,104 | $442,262 | $5,124,054 | $5,004,950 | $1,534,167 | $1,389,133 | $7,132,325 | $6,836,345 |

**Total Domestic** | $5,812,083 | $7,480,166 | $12,075,423 | $9,959,767 | $3,166,357 | $2,910,337 | $21,053,863 | $20,350,270 |

* Figures for JDA are on a cash basis; includes UJA of Greater New York which transmitted $1,799,584 for the 1950 campaign ($1,526,788 transmitted in 1950 and $272,796 in 1951). JDA campaigned independently in New York and Chicago in 1951.

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

* Includes UJA of N.Y.: $418,540 in 1950 and $409,115 in 1951 on cash basis. Excludes welfare fund grants retained by local divisions which Congress estimates at over $100,000 annually. Excludes foreign income of World Jewish Congress.

* Totals exclude “Other Income” of NCRAC (obtained from national agencies) in order to avoid double counting.

* Includes one-time grant by Los Angeles Jewish Community Council.

* Includes grants by local vocational agencies.

* Includes UJA of N.Y.: $400,644 in 1951 and $310,207 in 1950 on cash basis.

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