Communal Affairs

RELIGION

Organization and Cooperation

During the year under review (July 1952 through June 1953) all three branches of the American Jewish religious community, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform, expanded their programs and gave evidence of substantial progress. The number of new affiliations, the addition of a considerable number of staff members, and the increased tempo of building programs were clearly discernible symptoms of synagogue development.

Lay Groups

Operating on a budget of $164,000 during the calendar year 1952, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (UOJC) continued its growth. Rabbi Solomon J. Spiro was appointed to the post of program director (September 1952), and by December the staff consisted of eight full-time professional members.

During 1952, 55 congregations became affiliated with the UOJC, and 7 new synagogues were organized, bringing the total number of constituent congregations to 720, the largest of its kind in the United States.

To keep pace with this expansion, the Publications Commission of the UOJC distributed 115,000 pieces of literature, including several manuals for use in various phases of synagogue activity and pamphlets on circumcision, the problem of mixed pews, and the meaning of the Kaddish.

The Women's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations reported a total of 350,000 members. Its 400 sisterhoods were organized into 14 regional chapters. During 1952, 64 sisterhoods affiliated themselves with the national body, including 10 new groups, and plans were announced to add six more national chapters during 1953.

Fifty new affiliates were added to the United Synagogue of America (Conservative) during 1952, bringing its total membership to 460 congregations. The United Synagogue's budget for 1952-53 was $175,000. In May 1953 the Women's League of the United Synagogue reported that its membership had grown to 130,000 women, organized in 560 sisterhoods. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations (Reform) reported a total membership of 500,000, enrolled in 467 congregations. The World Union of Progressive
Judaism reported 460 congregations in the United States of America and Canada, 28 in England, 3 in Israel, 8 in South Africa, and others in France, India, Sweden, and Australia. The American office operated on a budget of $25,000.

RABBINIC BODIES

Early in June 1953, when the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox) held its annual convention, its membership was 505. Of this number approximately 55 percent were graduates of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, and 20 percent of the Hebrew Theological College of Chicago. The Rabbinical Council was the largest body of English-speaking Orthodox rabbis in the world. Its budget for the year 1952 was $22,000. The Rabbinical Assembly of America had grown to a membership of 504 at its June 1953 convention. Its current operating budget in 1953 was approximately $30,000. The sixty-fourth annual convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Reform) in June 1953 reported a total of 637 members with a budget of approximately $30,000.

LOCAL RABBINICAL ORGANIZATIONS

In a score of American cities, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis had been organized into local Boards of Rabbis. Largest of these was the New York Board of Rabbis, with a membership of well over 600 rabbis resident in New York State and adjacent areas. Its major function continued to be the chaplaincy program in civilian hospitals, mental institutions, and prisons in the state of New York. This work was subsidized by a grant from the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York City. Seventy-five chaplains served in 154 institutions, and reached approximately 250,000 Jews during 1952.

TRENDS

The movement of the Jewish population to suburban areas continued to gain momentum. Writing in the March 6, 1953, issue of the Reconstructionist, A. Fleischman noted that as a result of the growth of Jewish communities in the suburbs, many Jews had become religious in practice with little regard to the sectarian distinctions of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. The (Orthodox) Rabbinical Council similarly attributed the falling away of Orthodox loyalties on the part of many Jews who had made new affiliations in these communities, not to religious preference, but to the fact that the Conservative and Reform groups had been pioneers in establishing new synagogue centers in suburban areas. The Rabbinical Council launched a campaign to create new Orthodox congregations in order to win back those whose previous affiliations had been Orthodox.

At a regional meeting in New England (February 1953), the Rabbinical Council discussed the additional problem of communities too small to engage
a full-time rabbi. It was recommended that an "itinerant rabbinical service" be established to meet this need. On the other hand, rabbis expressed some concern over the trend toward supercongregations—synagogues with memberships of over 1,000 families. In some communities (Cleveland, Ohio, and Flushing, N. Y. C.), efforts were made to limit membership.

Cooperation

The year under review saw signs of cooperation among the various religious groups of American Jewry. This was particularly manifest in the continued effective operation of the Division of Religious Activities of the National Jewish Welfare Board in which Orthodox, Conservative and Reform rabbis met to grapple with the Jewish problems arising out of the military needs of the nation. The presidents of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, the Rabbinical Council of America, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, met in April 1953 to discuss the feasibility of joint activities. The possibility of the joint publication of a journal was explored. The Jewish Publication Society suggested that the three rabbinic groups join in sponsorship of a new translation of the Hebrew Bible.

Religious Practice

The general trend toward traditional forms of worship and observance that had marked the postwar years continued at an accelerated pace. This tendency was highlighted at the biennial convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) held in New York City in March 1953, when the Committee on Reform Practices, headed by Rabbi Morton Berman, reported on its second survey.

The survey, based on 14,018 replies from congregants and lay members, revealed that 31 per cent of the Reform Jews attended services regularly; 36 per cent attended occasionally; and 12 per cent limited their attendance to the High Holy Days. Sixty-four per cent of the congregants favored the use of a cantor in the worship service. Home rituals had gained in popularity: 60 per cent observed the blessing of the candles; 74 per cent conducted a home Seder on Passover; over 50 per cent placed mezuzot in their homes, while 80 per cent observed the ritual of lighting Chanukkah candles.

Observers differed in their explanation of this move toward traditional practices. Trude Weiss-Rosmarin, editorializing in the Jewish Spectator (April 1953), ascribed the shift in Reform practices to the fact that liberal congregations were attracting a large number of members who had been brought up in traditional homes.

On the other hand, Rabbi Jay Kaufman of the UAHC pointed to the fact that it was the second generation of Reform Jews who were most frequently eager to accept these new forms. The editors of the Reconstructionist (April 3, 1953) disagreed with the contention that the new pattern of observances represented a return to Orthodoxy. The editors rather saw this development as an adoption of the Reconstructionist philosophy taught by Mordecai M. Kaplan.
A UAHC survey indicated a trend away from suspending religious services during the summer months (a very common practice in the past). Eighty-seven per cent of the congregations reported holding regular services during July and August. In 37 per cent of the temples, sermons were delivered (Synagogue Service Bulletin, April 1953).

NEW NORMS

The report of the Commission on Reform Practice of the UAHC provoked animated discussion. There was much sentiment in favor of creating definitive norms for Liberal Judaism. But the convention deferred action until the 1955 meeting, awaiting further study by the Commission on Reform Practice. The impulse to move slowly grew out of concerted opposition led by Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, of Pittsburgh (whose second volume on Reform Jewish Practice appeared in March 1953).

KASHRUT AND SABBATH OBSERVANCE

Violent controversy flared up in several communities on the issues of kashrut and Sabbath observance by Jewish institutions, and more especially, Jewish-sponsored hospitals. There was a strong movement in connection with the erection of Jewish-sponsored hospitals in Detroit, Mich., and in Long Island, N. Y., to insist on exclusively kosher facilities. Reform and Conservative rabbis joined with Orthodox groups in maintaining this position. The problem of kashrut standards evoked much discussion in Memphis, Tenn., Miami, Fla., Los Angeles, Cal., and other cities. In some cases the local Jewish community council sought to establish order in a situation which had long presented grave community difficulties.

The Rabbinical Council of America established a Kashrut Commission which was to attempt to establish standards for the observance of the dietary laws. Among its responsibilities was that of investigating instances where exorbitantly high prices were tending to discourage observance of kashrut. During the period under review several community councils, including those in Miami, Fla., Detroit, Mich., and Los Angeles, Cal., faced the problem of chaotic conditions in the sale of kosher food, and attempted, in cooperation with the Orthodox rabbinate, to develop standards of observance.

The rabbis of Houston, Tex., in a formal pronouncement (April 1953) called on their congregants to avoid planning social functions on Friday evenings, either as hosts or as guests. The Synagogue Council of America issued a statement to the Jewish veterans' groups (May 1953) urging them not to violate the Sabbath by marching on Memorial Day. In September 1952 the Union of Orthodox Rabbis called for stricter observance of the Sabbath, declaring that "it was not necessary to violate the Sabbath in order to achieve success in the business and professional world."

Many of the national religious organizations passed resolutions calling upon national Jewish agencies not to hold their conventions on the Sabbath. Rabbinic protest was also heard against the Jewish-sponsored Brandeis University for scheduling football games on the Sabbath (National Jewish Post,
August 22, 1953). The Reconstructionist (October 17, 1952) observed that, realistically, it was impossible for most organizations to attract a large attendance during the week, and that the best compromise was to infuse a maximum Sabbath spirit into the planning of convention programs.

Worship

Worship and its place in modern life was the theme of the 1953 convention of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, held at Atlantic City in June. The Assembly heard Professor Abraham J. Heschel decry “spiritual absenteeism” in the American synagogue. Rabbi Eugene Kohn suggested that the mechanization of modern life had even routinized synagogue worship. Several workshops were held to explore means of revitalizing the worship aspect of the synagogue.

Domestic Relations

At a Joint Conference on Jewish Law held in March 1953 at which 200 members of the Rabbinical Assembly met with the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, it was recommended that a national Jewish religious court be established, in cooperation with the Orthodox and Reform groups, to deal with problems of domestic relations. The Orthodox rabbinate opposed the idea, on the ground that Conservative and Reform rabbis were generally not equipped to deal with problems of Halachah (Jewish law). The Union of Orthodox Rabbis, largest body of European-trained Orthodox rabbis, went on record (May 1953) in opposition to the entrance of the Rabbinical Assembly, not only into the area of marriage and divorce problems, but also into the field of kashrut supervision.

Meeting at its biennial convention at Philadelphia, in November 1952, the Women’s League of the United Synagogue decided to extend its efforts to intensify Jewish home life. The feature of the convention was a panel discussion on marriage and the family. The Women’s League continued to supply sisterhoods with valuable guidance material to promote home observances.

Moral Standards

The problem of the breakdown of moral standards in American life was given serious thought by the Conservative group. Several meetings were held by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America to plan for a Conference on Moral Standards in September 1953. One hundred experts were expected to deal with moral standards in the fields of government, business and labor, education, science, creative expression, mass media, family and private behavior, and religious institutions.

Religious Education

The UAHC survey by the Committee on Reform Pracetices cited above reported a noteworthy trend toward the raising of educational standards: 66 per cent of the correspondents expressed satisfaction with Sunday School
education alone, but 30 per cent wanted two or three days of religious school training; 75 per cent wanted their children to be taught the Hebrew language; 86 per cent desired the bar mitzvah ceremony; 41 per cent, the bat mitzvah ceremony for girls.

The UAHC pointed with pride to its work in the field of audio-visual education. Its Audio-Visual Department produced two films, in sound and color, *Reverence in the Psalms* and *Abraham and Isaac*, the latter filmed in Israel. Five new film strips were also in production.

Several Reform educators reported a trend toward maximum Jewish education. One panel discussion group, at the UAHC convention mentioned above, agreed on the inadequacy of the Sunday School for religious training.

Much attention was paid to the problem of Jewish education. Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner, vice president of the CCAR, urged that courses be offered for parents to keep pace with the religious training of the child.

The Yeshiva University (Orthodox) continued to extend its community service program. During the period under review this expansion was notably observed in the Yeshiva University's program of audio-visual education. In December 1952 the University embarked on a project to provide Jewish schools with recordings and film strips and planned to conduct demonstrations and workshops for Jewish educators in the audio-visual field. A film strip on the life of Rabbi Akiba was released. Three recordings were also produced to be used in religious school teaching.

**SEMINARIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION**

Over 2,000 students were registered in the rabbinical seminaries of the United States during the academic year 1952-53, the four major schools accounting for the record number of 1,595 aspirants to the rabbinate.

**ORTHODOX**

The Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, largest of its kind in the United States, with 630 students, held its triennial convocation in March 1953, at which eighty-five rabbis were ordained. Among these were ten graduates who had entered the military chaplaincy. Although academic graduation took place annually, the Yeshiva University, of which the Seminary was a part, followed the practice of granting ordination (*Semichah*) only once every three years. These exercises brought to over 500 the number of rabbis ordained over a period of fifty-six years.

In September 1952 the Yeshiva University opened a new graduate department in mathematics, with courses leading to the Master of Science degree. Ten scholars were named as visiting professors in the new department. The School of Education was also enlarged by the addition of five new faculty members for twenty-two new courses (September 1952).

The outstanding activity of the Yeshiva University was the rapid development of plans to complete the building of its new Medical Center, in cooperation with the City of New York. In August 1952, contracts were approved for the $10,000,000 College of Medicine building. In March 1953,
when the school was named in honor of Albert Einstein, the ceremonies marking this event were widely broadcast on radio and television.

Yeshiva University graduated 164 students in June 1953, the largest number in its history. Recipients of degrees came from South Africa, Morocco, Holland, Canada, and fifteen states of the Union. A total of 2,470 students were enrolled in all its facilities. Its budget was $1,250,500 in 1952.

The Hebrew Theological College of Chicago enrolled over 600 students during the academic year of 1952-53. A branch of its High School Division was established in Los Angeles, with a registration of twenty-two students. The College also sponsored theological courses at the Bachad School in Jamesburg, N. J., in a program to help students preparing to emigrate to Israel to continue their Talmudic studies. A Community Relations Department was opened, to interpret the work of the College to the community.

The Rabbinical College of Telshe, in Cleveland, Ohio, offered a four-year post-graduate course leading to ordination. A total of 180 students were enrolled, including 100 in the graduate school. The College operated on a budget of over $170,000.

Conservative

The Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTSA) opened the 1952-53 academic year with 169 students in the Rabbinical School, 400 in the School of Jewish Studies, and 35 students in the newly organized Cantors Institute. The training school for cantors was officially dedicated in September 1953, and the following month offered a six-year course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Music. The new Seminary College of Jewish Music provided opportunity for advanced study leading to the degrees of Master and Doctor of Sacred Music.

The Pacific Coast branch of the Seminary, the University of Judaism, in Los Angeles, Cal., enrolled approximately 500 students for the academic year.

The JTSA marked the approaching tercentenary celebration of Jewish settlement in the United States by conducting a fourteen-week lecture discussion series, beginning in October 1952, and dealing with various facets of Jewish achievement in American life.

In May 1953, an agreement was reached between the JTSA and Columbia University for the exchange of credits between the two institutions. Under this scheme JTSA students could obtain credit towards Columbia's Bachelor of Science degree for work done in the JTSA, and Columbia students could receive credit towards the Bachelor of Religious Education degree for completing university courses.

Commencement exercises in June 1953, in which a class of nineteen rabbis received ordination, marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Schiff Library. Tribute was paid to Professor Alexander Marx, who had served as librarian during the entire half-century of the institution, and had seen the library grow from 5,000 volumes and 3 manuscripts in 1903 to 155,000 volumes and 9,000 manuscripts in 1953.

The radio and television program of the JTSA was vastly expanded,
notably in the latter field. Particularly successful was the National Broad-
casting Company's "Frontiers of Faith" series directed by Morton Wishen-
grad.

The Cantors' Assembly held its sixth annual convention at Kiamesha
Lake in June 1953. Twenty new members were inducted, making a total of
157.

The Seminary sought a budget of $2,343,000 for 1953, to cover its ramified
activities.

REFORM

The two seminaries for the training of Reform rabbis, the Hebrew Union
College (HUC) in Cincinnati and the Jewish Institute of Religion (JIR) of
New York, which had merged into a joint institution operating separate
schools, drew closer to integration during the period under review. A uni-
fication plan was announced in May 1953 which would substitute a single
curriculum for the current coordinated structure. Under this plan, the two
schools would offer a two-year undergraduate course, in both cities, and the
HUC would provide the next three years' training. A year of internship
would be added. Opponents of the plan regarded it as a retrenchment
measure which would weaken the Reform movement. President Nelson
Glueck, however, observed that the new program would improve the qual-
ity of training.

During 1952-53, 157 students were enrolled at the HUC, and 39 at the JIR.
In June 1953, 13 rabbis were ordained in Cincinnati, 8 in New York City.

Twelve Christian students, holding interfaith fellowships, were registered
at the HUC. Two of these held Rockefeller Foundation grants, while two
others were scheduled to continue their studies in England and Germany
under Fulbright grants.

The third annual commencement exercises of the Hebrew Union College
of Sacred Music were held at New York City in June 1953. Nine cantor-
educators were graduated. The purpose of the school was to assure a con-
tinuous source of cantors and teaching personnel for religious schools, and
to publish new creative works of Jewish music.

In December 1952 the HUC-JIR introduced correspondence courses to
enable pre-theological students to prepare for entrance to the rabbinical
course.

The two institutions received a gift of a thirty acre estate in Towanda,
Pa., from David and Morgan Kaufman, of Philadelphia (February 1953). It
was planned to use the property, valued at $250,000, as an interfaith center,
and as a retreat for students and faculty members.

The HUC-JIR budget for the academic year 1952-53 was $844,500.

Israel

The fifth year of the existence of the new State of Israel found the relig-
ious bodies in America united in urging continued and vigorous support of
every aspect of its development. Israel Independence Day in April 1953 was
marked by special services in synagogues throughout the country. Many rabbis took the lead in urging large-scale participation in the Israel Bond Drive. Synagogues were frequently the focal point for community-wide drives on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal.

The American Council for Judaism, which opened Sunday schools during 1952-53 in Milwaukee, Wis., Westchester, N. Y., New York City, and Chicago, Ill., based on a program of "universal Judaism" and opposition to Zionism, found little encouragement in the attitude of most congregations toward Israel which continued sympathetic.

In April 1953, the UAHC conducted a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, consisting of thirty lay leaders and three rabbis. The members of the group declared upon their return that they saw manifold signs of a desire for religious expression among the Israelis in a form that was not Orthodox. In January 1953 plans were announced for establishing a hostel in Israel for visiting students and faculty members of the HUC-JIR engaged in specialized study. A sum of $150,000 was to be raised.

A similar venture was projected by the United Synagogue of America, which launched a large-scale program of activities in November 1952. Each member of a Conservative congregation was to be taxed in order to create a fund for this purpose. Rabbi Simon Greenberg, the executive director of the United Synagogue, and vice chancellor of the JTSA, left in March 1953 to spend six months in Israel, in order to implement the program. A building project in Israel was also planned.

The JTSA continued for the second year its Seminary-Israel Institute, sponsored cooperatively with the Jewish Agency for Palestine. A lecture series was again held, in February-March 1953, which featured addresses by Israel Ambassador Abba Eban, and the American Hebrew poet, Professor Hillel Bavli.

**ORTHODOX OPPOSITION**

Some Orthodox groups continued to express their opposition to what they regarded as the secular trend in the new state. The Rabbinical Alliance of America, representing over 300 Orthodox rabbis, held a mass meeting in New York City (September 1952) to deplore "the shameful irreligious situation in our Holy Land," and recommended that synagogues contributing to Israel exert pressure in order "to insure the rights of the religious Jew" in the Holy Land. Its executive board issued a strong protest in April 1953 against the arrest and conviction of Rabbi Israel Grossman by the Israel authorities. In a cable directed to the President and the Prime Minister, the Rabbinical Alliance defended the right of Rabbi Grossman to resist the drafting of Israel women into military service.

The larger Orthodox rabbinic body, the Rabbinical Council of America, devoted its attention to the erection of a new Yeshivah in the town of Rehovoth, in Israel, which was to be called Yeshivath Hadorom. It was planned to complete, in 1953, the first building to house the institution. This project was part of a long-range program to develop close ties between the rabbinates of the United States and Israel.
For several years synagogue groups had joined with church bodies in seeking a strong civil rights program for the nation. The period under review saw the focus of attention largely in the area of civil liberties, and more particularly in the encroachment by congressional investigative bodies on the rights of individuals. Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, addressing the annual convention in June 1953, denounced "the state of terror and intimidation created among the seekers of truth" by the methods of Senator Joseph McCarthy (Rep., Wis.), Representative Harold Velde (Rep., Ill.), and others.

Rabbinic bodies were quick to join in the defense of Christian clergymen whose loyalty was impugned. Rabbi Joseph Fink, in his presidential address at the June 1953 annual convention of the CCAR, exhorted his colleagues to support "our colleagues in the Christian faith . . . who have been subjected to unfair and unwarranted attacks by our Congressmen." Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn deplored the attitude of those who lacked "a burning sense of personal obligation to do anything" about the threat to civil liberties. The CCAR then passed a resolution endorsing a statement of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., which had criticized the congressional investigations. The Rabbinical Assembly of America, too, at its June 1953 convention, paid special tribute to Bishop Bromley Oxnam for his "gallant fight against the vicious slanders of some members of the House Un-American Activities Committee."

Among the resolutions passed by the Rabbinical Assembly was an endorsement of the proposal made by Arthur Hays Sulzberger that a political amnesty be granted to those who had divorced themselves from Communist ties "as being consonant with ethical religion, which recognizes the possibilities of repentance as ever present."

CENSORSHIP

The Rabbinical Assembly saw signs of unhealthy hysteria, too, in the field of censorship. The rabbis opposed "the vigilantism of some religious and patriotic groups who have taken it upon themselves to intimidate booksellers and librarians and movie exhibitors." Rabbi Theodore Adams, in his presidential address at the annual convention of the Rabbinical Council of America (June 1953), declared that "there is too much soul-searching of the wrong kind, and there is need to devote more effort to searching our own souls and less to that of our neighbor."

The seriousness with which the rabbis regarded the problem was underscored by the CCAR's Commission on Justice and Peace, which convoked an "Institute on Individual Freedom and National Security" held in March 1953. In the keynote address, James P. Warburg inveighed against the excesses of America's security program which "has reached a point where the majority of American citizens no longer dare to associate, write, speak or even think without having an inner censorship warn them not to express certain opinions" (The New York Times, March 14, 1953). The Institute
passed a series of resolutions supporting collective bargaining and mediation as the keystone of industrial peace, revision of the Taft-Hartley Law, an end to discriminatory bars in unions, the enactment of fair employment practice laws, the end of restrictive tariffs, the revision of immigration laws, and a universal national health insurance program.

**Race Relations**

The CCAR took cognizance of Race Relations Day (February 1953) by issuing a pronouncement entitled *Justice, Justice, Shalt Thou Pursue*. After noting the progress made during the past year in race relations, the rabbis called on the President and Congress "to insure passage of legislation which will establish FEPC on the national level; legislation to outlaw lynching; legislation to abolish the poll-tax; and legislation granting full opportunities to all our citizens in the fields of housing, recreation, transportation and education." The Rabbinical Council of America sought a revision and humanization of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act "in the light of foreign policy and domestic needs of our country." At the same time, it urged support of the Mutual Security and Point 4 foreign aid programs.

**Public Education**

The current attacks on public education found the Jewish religious groups quick to rise to the defense of the public schools. The Commission on Church and the State of the CCAR paid tribute to the public schools for "having fostered reverence for the individual and respect for personality, cultivated tolerance, and promoted fair play." Rabbi Jacob Shankman, chairman of the Commission, characterized as unwarranted the charges made by some groups that the schools were totalitarian and godless.

The Commission criticized Protestant groups who opposed use of public schools for the support of parochial education while favoring their use "for the benefits of religious instruction either in and through the public schools." The Commission particularly complained against the widespread abuse of the released-time program in which the machinery of the school was involved in sectarian education.

Fears were expressed that differences between Christians and Jews in this area could lead to serious tension. Rabbi Theodore Adams, speaking at the New England regional meeting of the Rabbinical Council of America (February 1953), recommended "a specific understanding among the various faiths as to religious teaching in the public schools that would guarantee the rights and views of all."

**Local Activity**

On the local level Jewish religious groups accelerated their social action programs. In New York City, Bishop Horace Donegan's Public Affairs Committee, organized early in 1953, received strong support from the New York Board of Rabbis, whose president, Rabbi Morris M. Goldberg, played an
important role in its activities. The committee was created to grapple with the problems of crime and civic corruption in New York City. At a hearing held in January 1953 the New York Board of Rabbis took an active part in urging the Legislature of New York State to revise the state penal law in order to permit religious Jews and others to conduct business on Sunday.

The New York Board of Rabbis also supported the Gordon Bill to create a commission for the study of the state's divorce laws; went on record in support of Federal Social Security for clergymen; and served in a mediation role in a serious Jewish cemetery strike.

Women's Groups

The women's groups continued to expand their social action programs. At their biennial convention held in November 1952, the Women's League of the United Synagogue adopted a series of resolutions covering civil liberties, immigration, Federal aid to education, religion in the public schools, the Point Four program, the United Nations, genocide, and disarmament.

The Women's League received the American Heritage Foundation Award in December 1952 for "outstanding leadership and performance" in connection with the "Register and Vote" campaign of the 1952 national elections. Among its educational projects in this field was a "Visit the United Nations" project in which hundreds of sisterhoods participated.

Service

The American Jewish Society for Service, whose program was modeled after that of the American Friends Service Committee, announced its plans to conduct two summer work camps in 1953, one for high school students and one for college-age students. The camps proposed to help build community centers and playgrounds for children in two of the Eastern states.

Chaplaincy in the Armed Services

The third and last year of the Korean conflict saw the climax of activities on behalf of the spiritual needs of the Jews in the armed services. In October 1952 rabbinical leaders held a conference at the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., to discuss with top military officials ways and means of improving the chaplaincy program. The Jewish group had been able to fill its quota of chaplains through the cooperation of the three rabbinic bodies under the auspices of the National Jewish Welfare Board Division of Religious Activities (DRA).

Through a self-imposed draft it was possible to provide for efficient and orderly replacement of chaplains who were released after two years of service. The tremendous strides made in the chaplaincy program were highlighted in the report of Rabbi Aryeh Lev, director of the DRA, issued in September 1952. He noted that in World War I there had been only one Jewish chaplain for every 10,000 Jewish troops; in World War II, there was
one rabbi for every 2,000 Jews; and there was one for every 1,000 in 1953. Thirty rabbis were serving overseas (seven in Korea). Over 100 rabbis were in uniform, and an additional 150 civilian rabbis served in military and veterans installations.

Three retreats were held for overseas chaplains. Rabbi Max Davidson and Rabbi David M. Eichhorn conducted a retreat in Germany in July 1952. Rabbi Aryeh Lev conducted one in Korea and another in Japan in November 1952. The DRA and several religious lay bodies, notably the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, carried on an educational program for Jewish troops. The DRA published the first two in a series of nine pamphlets to explain Jewish festivals, customs, and ceremonies (December 1952). The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations offered correspondence courses in Talmud for men in the armed services (September 1952). Its Armed Services Division concentrated on maintaining direct contact with individual servicemen. In 1952 the Division registered 2,506 men who received religious materials, food packages, and other aid from the Orthodox group. The UOJC published a monthly magazine, Hachayil ("The Soldier") with a circulation of 4,000 for Jewish military personnel.

While there was some indication of keen interest in religious matters among servicemen, Chaplain Arthur Herzberg, stationed in Great Britain, reported "an alarming rate of intermarriage, a situation traceable in most situations to glaring lack in the stability and Jewishness of the home backgrounds of the G.I.'s involved" (Torch, spring 1953, published by the United Synagogue Men's Club). Chaplain Herbert Ribner, writing from Chanute Field, an air base in Illinois, painted an even gloomier picture of the religious beliefs of Jews in the armed forces: "Of the approximately 1,200 men I was able to observe, I would classify no more than 10 as positive Jews" (Reconstructionist, February 20, 1953). On the other hand, Rabbi Herzberg described the enthusiasm of Jewish military personnel on a troop transport crossing the Atlantic and the fine spirit engendered by their observance of the Chanukah festival over a period of a week.

Several of the chaplains were decorated by the Army and Navy for heroism and meritorious achievement. In December 1952 the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations presented its 1952 Armed Forces Award to Chaplain Garson Goodman, who served with the First Marine Division in the Inchon invasion and the capture of Seoul.

The Rabbinical Council of America passed a resolution at its June 1953 convention demanding a larger quota of Orthodox chaplains to replace the present arrangement of 33 per cent. This was based on their contention that the majority of American Jews had Orthodox ties.

The far-flung nature of American military operations created several interesting developments. As a result of the efforts of Chaplain (Colonel) Henry Tavel, the valuable Judaica library owned by the Jews of Mannheim, Germany, and salvaged from Nazi destruction, was presented to the HUC Library. In Tokyo, Chaplain David Raab conducted classes in Jewish history, religion, and the Hebrew language for the Japan-Israel Association (founded in 1935). Prominent Japanese leaders participated regularly in Sabbath services and cultural activities.
Another important by-product of the chaplaincy program was the emergence of a body of legal responsa, or decisions on questions of Jewish law, in response to situations created by military life. The Responsa Committee, representing Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis (a unique phenomenon), issued its second volume of decisions in June 1953, covering such questions as the use of photographed Torah scrolls in religious worship, circumcision overseas in the absence of a mohel, and the use of human bone fragments in bone surgery.

Civilian Chaplaincy

The New York Board of Rabbis continued its efforts to train rabbis for chaplaincy service, in order to provide the city and state institutions with rabbis who were properly equipped to handle the complex psychological and spiritual problems of patients and inmates. Its Institute for Pastoral Psychiatry, first of its kind in the nation, was enlarged to three departments: Human Relations, Pastoral Care, and Clinical Pastoral Training. These programs were conducted with the cooperation of leading psychiatrists, social workers, and with such institutions as Bellevue and Mount Sinai Hospitals. Students attending the HUC-JIR were granted academic credit for the courses.

Interfaith Relations

Cooperation between synagogue and church groups was on a fairly high level during the past year. Typical of the cordial relations which existed was the presence of Christian leaders at scores of dedication exercises of new synagogue buildings. Several congregations presented gifts to neighboring Christian institutions. Congregation B'nai Israel (Reform), of Toledo, Ohio, gave a tract of eleven acres to the Ursuline Sisters (January 1953). Temple Emanuel (Conservative), of Newton, Mass., contributed $3,000 to the building fund of Andover Newton Theological Seminary (June 1953). The synagogue had been given classroom facilities in the seminary for the previous four years.

During the Presidential election campaign, Christian and Jewish leaders had joined in a public pronouncement calling on the candidates to avoid appeals to religious or racial bigotry (July 1952). (See American Jewish Year Book, 1953 [Vol. 54], pp. 94, 107.) The appeal received world-wide publicity. It was followed by a post-election statement (November 1952), which paid tribute to "the high plane that was set by the Presidential candidates of 1952."

On the local level, the Jewish Community Council of Rochester, N.Y., joined with the Catholic Diocese and the Church Federation (Protestant) of that city in an interfaith statement on immigration, calling for revision of the McCarran-Walter Act.

There were occasional signs of tension between Jewish and church groups. In April 1953, a controversy developed over the presentation of a crucifixion
film, *I Beheld His Glory*, over television stations, under the sponsorship of the National Council of Churches of Christ. The National Broadcasting Company and the Columbia Broadcasting System rejected the film, on the ground that it might tend to create Jewish-Christian tensions. But this episode was an exception to the general rule of harmonious cooperation between Jewish and Christian religious bodies.

**Adult Education and Youth Activity**

In the field of Reform adult education, Rabbi Gunther Plaut, of St. Paul, Minn., described a congregational project known as a "Return," in which laymen spent a weekend during December 1952 in a woodland lodge in Northern Minnesota, devoted to study, prayer, meditation and discussion.

Reform youth activity, under the direction of the National Federation of Temple Youth, blossomed into new fields. The camp movement was strengthened by the acquisition of a second camp at Saratoga, Calif. (The first was at Lac La Belle, Wis.) There were three youth pilgrimages to the HUC in Cincinnati, in which young people were brought from all over the United States to provide them: "with direct and personal insight into the institutions of Reform Judaism and to kindle their interest in the rabbinate as a career."

The National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs, with an annual budget of $14,000, concentrated its energies on youth-sponsoring programs, extending its work with the Leadership Training Fellowship and United Synagogue Youth groups.

The National Federation continued its adult education program in the form of annual Laymen's Institutes. Congregations in Baltimore, Md., Kansas City, Mo., St. Louis, Mo., Detroit, Mich., and in other communities held weekend "retreats" in which various phases of Judaism were studied under the guidance of outstanding religious leaders. The popularity of these retreats was seen in the fact that several of them attracted as many as 350 to 500 participants.

**Public Information**

The effective use of radio and television by religious groups received further impetus from an Institute on Radio and Television sponsored jointly by the New York Board of Rabbis and the American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with major Jewish religious bodies and the broadcasting networks. In June 1953 fifty-one rabbis attended a three-day course designed to acquaint them with the problems and techniques involved in religious programming in these media.

Jewish groups cooperated with government agencies who sought their counsel in information programs to be beamed to foreign countries. Isaac Franck, executive director of the Jewish Community Council of Washington,
D.C., served as the Jewish consultant to the State Department in its information program. In March 1953 his pamphlet, *Jewish Religious Life in the United States*, designed to interpret American Jewish life to peoples abroad, received wide distribution.

**Art and Architecture in the Synagogue**

The year under review produced some interest in improving the aesthetic aspects of synagogue life. Rabbi Alexander S. Kline, writing in *The Reconstructionist* (June 27, 1952), predicted: "We are on the threshold of something new . . . the integration of modern structural forms with the ancient warmth and beauty of the Jewish spirit." Throughout the nation many new synagogue edifices laid special stress on original art forms. Congregation Beth El in Springfield, Mass., which was opened in June 1953, featured works by Adolph Gottlieb, Ibram Lassaw, and Robert Motherwell. Several synagogues installed magnificent stained glass windows, such as those executed by Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Kayser at Har Zion Congregation, Philadelphia, Pa., and by Louis Roth in the House of Living Judaism, in New York City. The works of A. Raymond Katz, the noted synagogue artist, were dedicated in many synagogues during the year. The UAHC announced at its biennial meeting (March 1953) that the first volume on synagogue architecture ever to be published would be available in the fall of 1953. Plans were under way in March 1953 to reconstruct a replica of the original Congregation Mikveh Israel, oldest in the city of Philadelphia, and one of the first synagogues in America.

**Community Relations**

The national Jewish religious bodies developed closer relations with the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) during the year under review. In adherence to the recommendations made by the Plenary Session of the NCRAC in September 1952, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC), the United Synagogue of America, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (UOJC) appointed delegates to a Special Committee on Reassessment dealing with the community relations values of interreligious activities. Representatives of the three agencies participated in a conference held by this committee early in February 1953 at Atlantic City. In June 1953 a report of the findings of the Special Committee was published that outlined the long-range needs and program recommendations for community relations work in the interreligious area.

In January 1953 the United Synagogue of America and the UOJC were accepted as members of the NCRAC, thus giving all three lay religious bodies equal representation in this organization. The presidents of the three rabbinic bodies meeting in June 1953, in their presidential addresses sharply criticized the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League.
Anniversaries

During the year 1952-53, several congregations observed the one-hundredth anniversary of their founding: Congregation Beth-Or, Montgomery, Ala.; Congregation Oheh Sholom, Harrisburg, Pa.; Temple Isaiah Israel, Chicago, Ill.; The Washington, D.C., Hebrew Congregation; B’nai Israel Congregation, Sacramento, Cal.; Congregation Emanuel, Kingston, N. Y.; and Congregation B’nai Abraham, Newark, N.J.

The fortieth anniversary of the United Synagogue was celebrated throughout the country in February 1953.

Morris N. Kertzer

JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE

The year under review (July 1952 through June 1953) was on the whole a favorable one for the social services sponsored and maintained by the American Jewish community. Throughout the year a general spirit of optimism, related to the current level of economic prosperity, seemed to prevail.

Problems

A number of significant questions were dealt with in the conferences and in the literature of Jewish social work. Why was American Jewry supporting local social services to the extent of $30,000,000 yearly? Which phases of Jewish social services were traditional and which were a response to the current socio-economic climate? What did the supporter and the practitioner of Jewish social service derive from their roles? Who were the clients, and what were their expectations? Interest in these basic problems was not limited to professionals. During the year under review laymen in functional agencies as well as in community organization also dealt with them in a variety of published statements.¹

The organization of Jewish social services in the United States had taken place on a voluntary basis and out of a conviction regarding the communal worth of social services which was only now being analyzed. A variety of papers given at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service in May 1953 presented evidence of this analysis. Mention should be made in particular of the paper by Robert Morris entitled “An

Approach to Determining a Rationale for Jewish Social Services," and the discussions of this paper by Harold Silver, Judah Pilch, and Ezekiel Perlman.

Thus far, comparatively little had been done in the way of a research approach to the questions of the purposes and functions of Jewish social service agencies, but the groundwork had been laid and studies were under way. The CJFWF had sponsored three "pilot studies" which should reveal a great deal regarding community attitudes towards Jewish social agencies; in addition, studies were being carried on by a variety of functional agencies regarding the meaning and value of social services to the persons who were receiving them.

**IMMIGRATION**

Meanwhile the Jewish social services faced daily problems. One of the most important was that of immigration, with which Jewish social service had long been preoccupied. Since the Thirties, this problem had been an acute one.

However, during 1952-53, immigration to the United States almost came to a halt, with the result that the immigrant case loads of family agencies diminished considerably.

While the number of immigrants had fallen considerably, there was little reason for thinking that service to Jewish immigrants would not continue to be a major concern of American Jews in the future. Both the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) and the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), which carried the responsibility for assisting Jews abroad to emigrate, possessed relatively stable structures which could be utilized as problems arose. The United Service for New Americans (USNA) and its New York branch, The New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), which had been organized on a temporary basis, had built up an enormous structure for dealing with problems of refugee immigration. This agency was set up primarily to assist refugees in getting established after they had arrived in this country. Within a short span of time, this organization had undergone many transformations, and at the time of writing was preparing to reduce itself considerably. It was generally agreed, however, that the immigration services should be thought of as a permanent, though fluctuating, aspect of Jewish social services, and that planning in relation to them should be carried out in long-range perspective.

**POPULATION CHANGES**

Several other significant questions were related to changes in population. An example was the increase in recent years in the number and proportion of aged persons in the total population of the United States. More and more, provision had to be made for the care of the aged; there was a necessary extension of institutional facilities and other services designed to meet the physical, residential, and psychological needs of the older persons.

---

3 Ibid.
4 Conducted in Albany, N. Y., Camden, N. J., and New Britain, Conn.
On the other hand, the rise in birth rate following World War II had led to a need for extended school facilities and, in time, would undoubtedly have a great effect on all agencies working with children. The population of children's institutions and child care agencies had decreased considerably in recent years; however, this decline appeared to be associated with the growing ability of child care workers to serve more children in shorter periods of time. Meanwhile the need for child guidance and psychiatric services, for children who were placed outside of their homes as well as those at home, was increasing greatly, and agencies providing this type of service were faced with long waiting lists. It was expected that this problem would become more intense in time.

Distribution

The shift of the younger Jewish residents of large metropolitan cities, like New York, Chicago, and Boston, to suburban areas necessitated certain adaptations on the part of agencies providing services for this part of the population. Some of the services sought by these younger Jewish suburban families were the same as those needed by their parents who had lived in crowded urban areas; but there was undoubtedly much greater recognition and acceptance by this group of the need for psychological services, such as marital counseling and child guidance, while there was little need for relief services, as such. This new group freely sought the services of family and child guidance agencies, as well as recreational and health ones. In many instances, fees were being charged for these services, and in some agencies, the fee scales called for full payment of the cost of services by those who could afford to do so. While comparatively well situated economically, however, most of these families could not afford more than a part of the cost of service, and the agencies had to call upon the central financing organization for subsidy.

As the use of services provided by philanthropic organizations increased among this group, it was anticipated that the extent of their contributions also would increase. Fund-raising methods with such groups, which were users of services as well as sponsors, had to be quite different from methods used where one group of the population gave essentially for another group.

As a consequence, there were signs of a recognition of the need for a considerable transformation in the social service picture in locale, fund raising, and in the emphasis in budgeting to meet the costs of more skilled and professionally trained workers, rather than simple relief expenditures. Long waiting lists were developing in many of the service agencies, creating a problem which appeared to be almost insoluble. No matter how much the budgets of such agencies were increased, adequate financing on a private philanthropic basis seemed almost impossible.

Sectarian Basis

This gave rise to the question as to whether such community services as marital counseling and child guidance ought to be offered on a private sectarian basis. However, there appeared to be very little doubt on this subject
in the minds of the users of these services. Few clients, if any, questioned why such needs should be met by Jewish agencies; they seemed rather to assume that the Jewish community ought to be interested in the psychological as well as the physical welfare of its members. Once having used such a service satisfactorily, most clients seemed to feel closer to the Jewish community as a whole than ever before.

Integration

Another major problem was that of integration into the total American health and welfare scene. The Jewish social services were for the most part very similar to those offered by other sectarian and nonsectarian groups, and had to be considered as a part of the total health and welfare program of the United States. There was, therefore, a great need to integrate the Jewish social services with all others. It was generally agreed that mere duplication of services being offered satisfactorily under non-Jewish auspices should be avoided, and certain communities and agencies were examining their present programs from this standpoint. They were raising basic questions regarding the distinctive Jewish component in the services offered by Jewish agencies.

In the Jewish casework and counseling agencies, the basic helping processes were much the same as those found in non-Jewish casework and counseling agencies. Many Jewish workers, however, had found that they could offer a special understanding of the psychology of the American Jew. Was this sufficient to warrant a distinctively Jewish counseling agency? Whether or not it was, the important thing was to find out what the difference between counseling in the Jewish agency and the non-Jewish agency consisted of; a good beginning had been made in investigating this question.

Several other significant problems that Jewish social agencies faced during 1952-53 can receive only incidental mention here. These were the development of professional standards and the relation of trade unionism to such standards, the clarification of the role of the central community agency, and the problem of the prestige of social service in the thinking of the American Jewish community.

The Clientele

Prior to the assumption of the maintenance relief case load by public agencies, there had been little question that the clientele of Jewish agencies consisted, in the main, of that portion of the Jewish population which was disadvantaged economically; consequently, the services of the agencies were adapted to the needs of this group. Many casework agencies, however, were
now operating programs of community service that were adapted to the needs of all economic classes, including the few who could afford the full cost of the service offered.

It was also apparent to persons familiar with the case loads of social agencies that there was an increased number of persons with definite emotional needs who were applying for service. As a result, the case loads of many agencies were made up predominantly of people with emotional needs. Through training in the schools of social work, through psychiatric seminars and other in-service training programs, the professional staffs of most casework agencies, and for that matter, other types of agencies too, were gradually being equipped to meet such needs, with the result that the primary emphasis of the social agency was in dealing with emotional problems. The special problem of the Jewish agency was to recognize and to deal, to whatever extent possible, with the peculiar emotional problems of Jewish individuals and families. The recognized task of current research was the isolation and description of such problems.

Organization of Jewish Social Work

The Jewish social services were organized in a variety of ways, locally through federations and community councils, and nationally, except for the recreational services, through two principal membership organizations, the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, and the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF). Another important national service organization, the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), served as a coordinating body for group work and recreational services. Other organizations coordinated such specialized fields as overseas needs and community relations.

Through the General Assembly, the annual conference of the CJFWF, laymen participating in the social services had an opportunity to meet with other laymen and with professionals of their communities to discuss problems of community organization, financing, local-national relations, overseas needs and programs, etc. In November 1952 the twenty-first General Assembly met for a three-day series of meetings in which the problems of large, intermediate, and small communities were considered by lay and professional delegates representing every section of the country.

National Conference of Jewish Communal Service

The National Conference of Jewish Communal Service (NCJCS) was a forum for professional Jewish social workers. More than 1,300 agencies and individuals were members of the conference, which met annually in association with the National Council for Jewish Education and the National Association of Jewish Center Workers. The members of these two affiliated groups all held membership in the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service; they participated through the executive, program, and other
committees and, in general, played an extremely vital role in all conference activities.

Aside from its annual meeting, the NCJCS served Jewish professional workers through its publication, The Jewish Social Service Quarterly, and through the occasional publication of other significant material. The NCJCS was sponsoring a history of its activities as represented in significant papers given over a period of fifty years. Through a committee on central Jewish archives, NCJCS sponsored the collection of material on Jewish social services which had archival value. Another committee on international Jewish social work coordinated the activities of the NCJCS with those of the International Conference of Jewish Social Work. The NCJCS had taken responsibility at times for the administration of various funds, such as a fund for books on social service for Israel. In November 1952, it accepted responsibility for the administration of the Joseph E. Kappel Memorial Award.

During 1950 and 1951 the NCJCS had carried out a self-study that resulted in its name being changed from the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare to the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service. Its by-laws were revised to make for the widest possible participation on the part of Jewish social workers and others interested in the Jewish social services.

Local Services

During the calendar year 1952 there was a general expansion of local services. Nearly 45,000 cases received counseling and concrete services from Jewish family agencies, and 20,000 more persons than during the previous year (a total of 413,679) were treated in Jewish hospitals. There was a 20 per cent increase in the number of children admitted to child care agencies, and a 4 per cent increase in the number of persons cared for in Jewish homes for the aged. At least eighteen communities were adding new facilities for the chronically ill and aged. Direct assistance to immigrants dropped 16 per cent.

| TABLE 1 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **JEWISH FAMILY AGENCIES, 1951-52** |
| **Total Open Cases** | **% Change from 1951** | **Expend. for Fin. Assist.** | **% Receiving Fin. Assist.** | **% Receiving Pub. Assist.** |
| **1952** | **-1b** | **$3,965,205.00** | **31.4** | **7.3** |

---

*Total for 68 Agencies*

*Accounted for by the drop in immigrant case load. Other types of cases handled by Jewish family agencies increased considerably.*
TABLE 2
CHILDREN'S AGENCIES, 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Ch. in Care</th>
<th>No. in Foster Homes</th>
<th>No. in Inst.</th>
<th>No. With Parents</th>
<th>No. in Homes of Other Relatives</th>
<th>Under Direct Care of Another Agency</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,532*</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
HOSPITAL SERVICES, 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>No. of Jewish Census 1/1/53</th>
<th>Census 12/31/52</th>
<th>Total Pats. During Year</th>
<th>Admissions and Live Births</th>
<th>% Jewish</th>
<th>Bassinet Complement 12/31/52</th>
<th>Live Births During Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12,046</td>
<td>12,652</td>
<td>422,222</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>68,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9,209</td>
<td>9,792</td>
<td>422,888</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>67,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4
JEWISH HOMES FOR THE AGED, 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Residents 1/1/53</th>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Total Under Care</th>
<th>Deaths and Discharges</th>
<th>Residents 1/1/53</th>
<th>Net Gain or Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,399*</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>10,928</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>8,753</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SERVICES FOR THE AGED

Two developments in the field of services for the aged were beginning to become significant. The first was an increasing emphasis on medical care for the chronically ill. Many of the homes for the aged were including or were planning to include services for the chronically ill, in addition to institutional care of the aged. The second development was that of providing care for the aged outside the institution's own building. In some cases, special facilities were rented outside of the home for the placement of elderly people. In others, individuals remained in their own homes, but received supervision and attention from the personnel of the institution. A residential program consisting of foster home care for the aged had been run successfully by the Jewish Community Services of Long Island since 1949, and

* Total for 66 agencies. The downward trend in evidence since the Thirties in the field of child care showed a slackening in 1952 with a decline of 1 per cent, as compared with 8 per cent in 1951. There was little change in the number of children receiving care at the beginning and end of 1952, but there was a sharp increase in the number accepted for care during the year, with a decrease in the average time each case was handled.

* Includes national TB, local TB, chronic, psychiatric, and other special hospitals.

* Total for 68 homes. There was considerable expansion in this field, with the opening of a new home in Washington in the fall of 1952 and increases in bed complements in Baltimore and Atlantic City. In Philadelphia two of the existing homes were merged and moved to a new building in April 1952. The new institution provided more facilities than the two old ones were able to give.
many family agencies in the United States showed a definite interest in the development of this type of program.\(^8\)

**Immigrant Services**

As indicated above, Jewish immigration continued to decline. During the calendar year 1952 there were approximately 7,200 immigrants as compared with over 38,000 in 1949. Direct assistance to immigrants had declined considerably—sixty agencies reporting total expenditures of $2,792,799 during 1952. This compared with $3,269,243 in 1951. The number of immigrant cases carried by fifty-six family agencies (excluding NYANA)\(^9\) declined by nearly 11 per cent. However, immigrants still continued to be a substantial part of case loads of family agencies. During 1952, they constituted more than 40 per cent of all active cases, and more than 60 per cent of all direct financial assistance cases; they received more than 75 per cent of the money spent for direct financial assistance.

**Financing the Jewish Social Agencies**

The operating funds of Jewish family service and child care agencies, homes for the aged, and hospitals, amounted to over $105,000,000 in 1952. Of this amount, $30,000,000 came from philanthropic contributions ($22,000,000 from central funds and $8,000,000 from other sources); $64,000,000 came from payment for services; and public funds amounted to $9,000,000. The remainder came from investments and other sources.

**TABLE 5**

**Receipts of Jewish Social Service Agencies, 1952**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Receipts</th>
<th>From Fed. and Welfare Fund</th>
<th>From Community Chests</th>
<th>Payment for Services</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Public Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Agencies</td>
<td>$9,504,272</td>
<td>$6,335,810</td>
<td>$2,315,318</td>
<td>$124,137</td>
<td>$195,733</td>
<td>$533,274</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>6,690,821</td>
<td>2,432,177</td>
<td>647,916</td>
<td>595,282</td>
<td>1,109,062</td>
<td>246,544</td>
<td>$1,659,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>9,688,327</td>
<td>1,516,193</td>
<td>462,657</td>
<td>5,599,992</td>
<td>1,667,532</td>
<td>441,953</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>79,738,778</td>
<td>6,805,757</td>
<td>1,794,057</td>
<td>57,309,429</td>
<td>4,796,381</td>
<td>2,087,962</td>
<td>6,945,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HERBERT H. APTEKAR**

**JEWISH VOCATIONAL SERVICE**

During the period under review (July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1953), the economic outlook and employment situation in the United States were generally favorable. The economy was mixed, geared neither to all-out war production nor to civilian peace-time production. In certain areas and in

---


\(^9\) NYANA showed a drop of more than 50 per cent in the number of cases served and in expenditures during the calendar year 1952, as compared with 1951.
certain occupations an over-supply of workers obtained, in others there was a shortage; but in the major manufacturing and commercial areas there was a sufficient reservoir of manpower to staff the nation’s defense factories, furnish an adequate supply of personnel for the armed services, and still produce consumer goods.

The national employment figure stood at 62,200,000 during the year, an all-time high. Unemployment at 1,400,000 represented a postwar low. Business in the aggregate was quite good, although some industries not directly involved in defense activity saw the profit margins narrowed between higher costs and weakening market prices. A good deal of uncertainty existed in regard to the effect that the conclusion of the Korean war might have upon the general economy.

Despite generally favorable—if uneven—conditions, there was no lessening of activity among Jewish Vocational Service (JVS) agencies, whose services were coordinated through the national Jewish Occupational Council (JOC). In fact, as Table 1 below indicates, the volume of service during 1952 increased over the calendar year 1951 in all categories.

In some communities waiting lists were smaller; but the agency facilities were being fully utilized, and there was no diminution of the rate at which new applicants came to the agencies for service. This was largely due to the fact that disadvantaged job seekers, to whom JVS agencies devoted their primary attention, required help even in a loose labor market. For vocational counselees whose problems related to the choice of a career, the economic situation might affect the educational alternatives but not the amount of service they required from vocational agencies.

**Basic Services**

Of the twenty-three JVS agencies reporting through the JOC, all rendered individual educational and vocational guidance and job placement services. All but one had psychological testing facilities. Fifteen of the agencies conducted group guidance programs. Sheltered workshops were operated by eight of the agencies. Specialized vocational libraries were available in twenty-one of the offices. Three of the agencies were utilized on a formal basis to screen applicants for local scholarship funds. Eleven of the agencies offered small-business consultation, and a few also made cash loans or grants for small business. Two of the agencies investigated complaints of discrimination in employment.

**Practices and Policies**

The agencies gave preference in their individual services to “problem” cases, marginal workers, and other hard-to-place persons. The categories varied among the communities, but included refugees, over-age workers, mentally retarded persons, emotionally disturbed workers, physically handicapped clients, prison parolees, and social agency referrals. Additional attention was given to individuals who might not belong to any handicapped group,
but whose individual problems constituted a severe disadvantage in the job market.

Generally, the minimum age for applicants was fourteen years for guidance service and sixteen years for placement. The agencies used highly skilled professional personnel; were flexible in their approach to individuals and to general community problems; and worked closely with the network of community social services, educational, health, and welfare agencies. Basic to JVS philosophy were these beliefs: That satisfactory work adjustment was a major factor in the individual's total adjustment to life; that other personal problems were aggravated by occupational maladjustment; that the presence of satisfactory and useful working conditions lessened other difficulties; and that the fact that Jews faced restricting conditions in employment and education could be overcome, in part, by professional attention to work adjustment problems.

During the years 1948-53, the JVS agencies had achieved coordinate status with the older and more established fields in the family of Jewish communal service. They had concentrated their attention not only on professional competence, but also on the type of problems that made the greatest demand for services upon the Jewish community.

Volume of Activity

Reports submitted to JOC for the calendar year 1952 showed that approximately 78,000 applications for employment and vocational counseling came into the agencies, increasing the 1951 figure by more than 11 per cent. Of this number, approximately 64,000 were in placement and 14,000 in counseling. The counseling load constituted an increase of 40 per cent over the previous year. Employers utilized the agencies for 72,000 job openings, an increase of 3 per cent. The number of job placements (24,000) was at the same level as the preceding year.

Although not shown in the tables below, there was a decrease of approximately 10 per cent in the total number of immigrants served, reflecting the drop in migration and the restriction resulting from immigration legislation. The total figure showed service to 16,200 immigrants, as against 18,000 in 1951. This was a relatively small decline in proportion to the decreased immigration, and did not reflect the service demands, which came in large measure from a "hard-core" immigrant group with multiple handicaps. The proportion of the reduction was more marked in the United States, and the over-all decline would have been greater except for the experience of the Canadian agencies, Montreal and Toronto, where a considerable volume of activities with refugees still continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Served</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Placement</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Guidance</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Openings Received</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placements</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1

VOLUME OF ACTIVITIES OF JVS AGENCIES, 1951, 1952 (ROUND FIGURES)
TABLE 2a

FEDERATION EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, NEW YORK,

DISTRIBUTION BY AGE OF APPLICANTS FOR JOB PLACEMENT AND THOSE PLACED, 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>No. Served</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. Placed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,767</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively small number of youngsters served, and the relatively high proportion of placements for those available, reflected the manpower drain of the armed services, the improved employment conditions, and the fact that the reduced birthrate during the depression years of 1929-39 was finally being felt.

TABLE 3

FEDERATION EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,

DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMARY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF APPLICANTS REGISTERED FOR Placement and Job Placements, 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Placed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof., Tech., Managerial</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Work</td>
<td>8,394</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Clerks</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,767</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparatively high figures for older persons served reflected the fact of a steadily aging population. The “favorable” percentage placed of this difficult group represents sustained agency attention to the problem of older workers.

Space does not permit an analysis of the occupational and industrial spread in tables 3 and 4. It is to be noted, however, that they reflect the industrial structure of New York City.
TABLE 4

FEDERATION EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
DISTRIBUTION OF JOB PLACEMENTS BY INDUSTRY, 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Communications</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Real Estate</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trends**

In general, the agencies continued their service and demonstration functions, expanding the developments which had been reported over the past few years. More attention was paid to the establishment of formalized working relationships with other Jewish communal agencies, and in particular many of the agencies developed direct service to hospitals on an individual and group basis. Montreal formalized programs of cooperative relationships between the JVS and the Jewish day schools, involving guidance programs for graduates; Toronto developed cooperative programs between the JVS and the Jewish Youth Council; Kansas City, between the JVS and homes for the Jewish aged, and the JVS and the psychiatric department of the Menorah Hospital and New York City, between the Federation Employment Service (FES) and the Jewish Board of Guardians, dealing with the vocational service needs of Jewish inmates at state prisons; between the FES and the Hillside Hospital, dealing with the vocational service needs of discharged patients; and between the FES and Beth Israel Hospital, in the field of geriatrics.

**Sheltered Workshops**

The use of sheltered workshops for severely disabled persons constituted a major proportion of the JVS workload. In addition to several JVS agencies already operating sheltered workshops, two communities, Newark and Detroit, opened sheltered facilities during the period under review, on September 15, 1952, and early in 1953, respectively. In both instances, although developed as community-wide projects, the JVS agencies administered the program. A third community, Kansas City reported the completion in the winter of 1953 of a survey on the need for a workshop. A similar survey on this subject was under consideration in St. Louis.

**The Aged**

JVS agencies continued their efforts to provide vocational guidance services for older persons. The Los Angeles JVS in a special study noted that one-third of all of its placements during the year were workers over forty
years of age. FES in New York launched a special demonstration project on January 16, 1958, to find suitable part-time employment for persons who were on either social security, pensions, or old age relief. One hundred applicants ranging in age from sixty to eighty years were included in the project. In less than six months' time, with the help of a part-time professional, FES reported that 40.7 per cent of the individuals had been placed on jobs. The program was developed on a community level and involved the geriatrics clinic of the Beth Israel Hospital and Federation's Central Bureau for the Jewish Aged as cooperating services in the experiment. Early reports from the employers, physicians, and clients indicated satisfactory results with the program.

**Fee Charging**

During the previous four years (1949-53) eight JVS agencies had adopted a policy of charging fees for guidance based on ability to pay. On November 1, 1952, Denver and in July 1952, St. Louis, also reported initiating fee-charging services.

**Foundation Support**

The Chicago agency continued a special program supported by a foundation. Two additional agencies reported grants from foundations for special projects, the Pittsburgh JVS for work with the cerebral palsied on April 1, 1953, and FES of New York for work with the aged on January 16, 1953.

Montreal and Toronto, in addition to a large immigrant workload, reported increasing service demands for counseling and employment. In both instances the reports for 1952 showed service figures to be for the largest number of applicants in the history of the respective Canadian agencies. Montreal continued its successful workshop experience, and in addition reported a cooperative program for counseling graduate students from five Jewish day schools.

The New York Association for New Americans launched an intensive rehabilitation program in July 1952 for their "hard-core" cases aiming toward total self-support of the family.

In January 1953 the Houston agency completed a study of placements, which showed clearly that the total effect was a saving in relief monies for the Jewish community. FES, which had served veterans at the end of World War II under contract with the Veterans Administration, renewed its contract with the government to serve Korean veterans in November 1952.

**Jewish Occupational Council**

The JOC continued to serve as the coordinating arm for Jewish vocational services throughout the country. The agency provided statistical reporting services, personnel service, field service, and consultation for the various communities. In October 1952 and February 1953 it also coordinated plans
for Eastern and Midwestern conferences for JVS professional practitioners, and completed studies on personnel practices in JVS agencies, professional practices and policies, and services available. Studies on sheltered workshops under JVS auspices, and on the integration of Jewish immigrants into the American economy, were also initiated by the JOC in March and April 1953.

ROLAND BAXT

THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The objectives of American policy in the Middle East as a whole were outlined by Henry A. Byroade, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, in an address he delivered before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations on December 5, 1952. They were: the desire to see governmental stability and the maintenance of law and order; the promotion of peace in the area among the Middle Eastern states themselves, as well as better understanding between them and the Western powers; the creation of conditions which would bring about a rise in the general economic welfare; the preservation and strengthening of democracy's growth; the encouragement of regional defense measures against aggression from the Soviet world.

This policy had been developed largely since 1947, when the United States attempted to apply to the Middle East its containment policy in order to prevent that area from falling within the Soviet sphere of influence. The unresponsiveness of the Arab countries to the initial American attempts at mutual security led directly to the initiation of economic aid programs. These, too, were regarded suspiciously by the Arab states. The failure of the Western powers to stem the continuing spread of anti-Western sentiment in the Arab-Moslem world and to work out an acceptable plan for Middle Eastern regional defense, following Egypt's rejection on October 15, 1951, of the joint United States, British, French, and Turkish proposals for its participation in a Middle East Defense Command, was recognized by the United States Department of State. Harry N. Howard, United Nations Adviser for the Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, writing in the Department of State Bulletin, December 15, 1952, admitted that "American policy has been criticized on the ground that it has been too negatively military in character; that it has relied on dollars to 'buy friendship'; that it has been too closely identified with the interests of other great powers in this area."

One of the serious obstacles in the way of Arab-American trust was the alleged favoritism shown by the United States to Israel, as charged by the Arab countries. This problem was discussed in various publications (Time and Life), and in a widely syndicated series of articles by Stewart Alsop written during and after a tour of the Middle East in the fall of 1951. In these articles, the United States was criticized for favoring Israel over the Arab states and for having failed to win Arab cooperation against the threat of possible Soviet aggression.
With the election of a Republican administration in November 1952, it was reported unofficially that the incoming President and Secretary of State would try to reshape American policy in the Middle East with the aim of producing more of a balance between American attention to Israel and American attention to the Arab nations.

**Evolution of the Republican Administration's Policy**

At the national party conventions held July, 1952, both the Democratic and Republican parties adopted planks favorable to Israel, and both urged the Arab states and Israel to settle their differences and establish peace. Subsequently, during the Presidential election campaign, both major party candidates expressed themselves in favor of continued American aid to Israel. In a letter to Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, dated October 17, 1952, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the successful Republican candidate, particularly stressed the need for Arab-Israel peace, and stated that "one of the serious stumbling blocks" in the way of peace was the problem of Arab refugees.

During the first few months after the Republican administration took office, official statements on the Middle East were carefully scrutinized by observers to determine whether a change of policy was in the making. In one such statement, issued by the White House after President Eisenhower had received Prince Faisal Al Saud, Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia, on March 2, 1953, the President "expressed his concern over some evidence that there had lately occurred a deterioration in relations between the Arab nations and the United States" and said that it would be "his firm purpose to seek to restore the spirit of confidence and trust which had previously characterized these relations."

The first clear indication of the new administration's policy toward the Middle East appeared in Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' report to the nation on June 1, 1953, upon his return from a three-week trip to the Middle East. In this report, he discussed, among other subjects, the areas of friction between Israel and both the Arab states and the Western world, and presented the viewpoint of the administration on how to achieve peace in the Middle East.

On the question of Jerusalem, Dulles declared that "the world religious community has claims in Jerusalem which take precedence over the political claims of any particular state." This declaration for a form of internationalization of the Holy City he modified with the note that "some political status in Jerusalem for Israel and Jordan" was not necessarily excluded.

Dulles suggested that some of the Arab refugees could be settled within Israel, but went on to add: "Most, however, could more readily be integrated into the lives of the neighboring Arab communities." Because "the Arab peoples are afraid that the United States will back the new state of Israel in aggressive expansion," Dulles urged that "the United States should seek to allay the deep resentment against it that has resulted from the creation of Israel." Granting also that the Israelis feared "that ultimately the
Arabs may try to push them into the sea," he reaffirmed the stand of the present administration behind the tripartite (United States, France and Great Britain) declaration of May 25, 1950, which guaranteed that these nations would "immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations" to prevent any violation of frontiers or armistice lines. Dulles emphasized that his intention in reiterating the government's support of the 1950 declaration was to reassure the Arabs of American support. He then stated the principle of exact neutrality: "And the leaders of Israel themselves agreed with us that United States policies should be impartial so as to win not only the respect and regard of the Israeli but also of the Arab peoples. We shall seek such policies."

In speaking about the need for establishing peace, Dulles emphasized that he favored direct negotiations, a position long held by Israel; he also indicated that the United States would intervene whenever feasible to help settle conflicts: "The parties concerned have the primary responsibility of bringing peace to the area, but the United States will not hesitate by every appropriate means to use its influence to bring a step-by-step reduction of tensions in the area and the conclusion of ultimate peace."

Dulles' report received generally favorable comments from the nation's press; several leading newspapers (The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Cleveland Plain Dealer, for example) expressed themselves with satisfaction at the implementation of a long-awaited policy of impartiality in an area where friendship for and cooperation with the Western world were of paramount importance.

**Arab Refugees**

The Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa conducted hearings on May 20, 21, and 25, 1953, on the problem of Arab refugees from Palestine. The study was undertaken because of United States concern at the pitiful plight of the refugees; the apparent lack of progress in the settlement of the situation and the increased requests for funds; the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East; and the importance of the refugee problem in the unabating hostility between Israel and the Arab states.

The subcommittee met once in executive session with the Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and Africa, Henry A. Byroade. The individual members also discussed the matter on several occasions with Dulles. At the public hearings, the following witnesses were heard: Walter Bedell Smith, Acting Secretary of State (in Dulles' absence); Arthur Z. Gardiner, politico-economic adviser for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs in the State Department; Stephen Penrose, president of the American University of Beirut; George M. Barakat, president of the National Association of Federations of Syrian and Lebanese-American Clubs; Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, director of the Catholic Near East Welfare Society; Clarence E. Pickett, honorary secretary of the American Friends Service Committee; John B. Blandford, Jr., former director of the United Nations Relief and
Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA); Millar Burrows, of Yale University’s graduate school; Stewart Herman, on behalf of Lutheran World Relief; Mary Roos, who worked, through the World Council of Churches, among Arab refugees; and Rev. Karl Baehr, executive director of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

In its report, published July 24, 1953, the subcommittee did not attempt to assign responsibility for the situation of the Arab refugees. The subcommittee also declined to pass on the feasibility of resettling refugees within Israel, except to say that such a solution could not handle more than a small proportion of their total number. The report, nevertheless, stressed that “Israel has a responsibility to join in doing its best to find a solution for the present problem, which keeps alive a strong anti-Israel feeling where it might not exist otherwise.” The subcommittee further felt that the Arab states “should develop definite proposals for refugee self-employment and rehabilitation outside of Israel,” and that the Arab states could not “escape responsibility to their fellow Arabs by failing to cooperate fully with the United Nations in projects designed to resettle refugees and make land available for refugee settlement.”

In conclusion, the report discussed American interest in the area, and stated that the United States did not “wish to see the internal order and independence of the countries of the Near East threatened by economic chaos, Communist penetration or military hostilities.” It pointed out that since 1949 the United States had authorized the appropriation of over $153,000,000 as its contribution to the relief and rehabilitation of the Arab refugees, and that authorization was pending for an additional appropriation under the Mutual Security Program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. The subcommittee expressed the opinion that American aid could not continue indefinitely, and that unless considerably more progress would be shown in the near future, Congress would not be justified in continuing aid for this program through the UN.

Jerusalem

As early as 1949, Israel began to transfer some of its government departments from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The General Assembly of the UN considered such action to be in contravention of its Statute on Jerusalem and passed a resolution on December 9, 1949, directing the Trusteeship Council not to permit any actions taken by an interested government which would divert it from adopting and implementing the statute. Nonetheless, the Israel Knesset passed a proclamation on January 23, 1950, declaring that Jerusalem had resumed the status of the capital of the Jewish state from the moment that it had been created.

On May 4, 1952, the Israel government announced its decision to move its Foreign Office to Jerusalem. The United States (as well as other Western powers) opposed the move. On July 9, 1952, the American Embassy at Tel Aviv delivered an aide-memoire on the proposed move to the Israel government, declaring that since the United States felt that the question of
Jerusalem should still be considered by the UN, "the United States Government would not view favorably the transfer of the Foreign Office of Israel to Jerusalem." The note also indicated that the United States had no intention of transferring its embassy to Jerusalem.

It was believed that the American objection, as well as that of other powers, had halted Israel from making this move. But a year later (on July 10, 1953), Israel informed the State Department that its Foreign Office would be moved to Jerusalem on July 12, 1953. On July 11, 1953, the State Department released a statement to the effect that the United States did not plan to transfer its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, on the ground that "this would be inconsistent with the United Nations resolutions dealing with the international nature of Jerusalem," and furthermore that "it would not observe the solution regarding Jerusalem which was set forth in the Secretary of State's address of June 1, 1953."

**Economic Aid Under the Mutual Security Program**

On July 15, 1952, President Harry S. Truman signed the Appropriations Bill of the Mutual Security Program, which authorized the expenditure of $6,081,947,750 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, for military, economic, and technical assistance to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries and most of the other countries throughout the world not under Soviet domination. The appropriation authorized for Israel was $70,228,000 for aid in the relief and resettlement of Jewish refugees and $2,772,000 for technical assistance. The Middle East section of the Mutual Security Program also contained an appropriation of $60,063,250 for aid to the Arab refugees and $21,750,000 for technical assistance to the Arab states. This bill also designated the sum of $499,116,500 for military aid to the Middle East, 10 per cent of which might, at the discretion of the President, be used for assistance to Israel and the Arab states.

The funds earmarked for the Arab refugees were allocated as the United States contribution to the UNRWA.

Final agreements regarding the release of the funds were signed by representatives of the United States and Israel governments on August 17, 1952, and governments began discussing plans for the expenditure of the funds.

A report on the mutual security program that President Eisenhower presented to Congress on August 17, 1958, for the six months ending June 30, 1953, indicated that of the $70,228,000 in special aid funds, roughly $44,600,000 was expended for current consumption items. The largest portion, about $23,000,000, was used to buy foodstuffs. Other commodities purchased included fuel, fertilizer and fodder, pesticides, raw materials, and medical supplies. Resettlement and capital development items totaled $25,600,000. The two largest items of these expenditures, totaling about $11,500,000, were for irrigation equipment—principally materials for manufacturing irrigation pipe, motors, and pumps—and for housing construction. Power and industrial equipment, farm machinery, transportation equipment, and similar items accounted for the balance of expended funds.
Only $16,000,000 of the appropriation of $60,063,250 for Palestine refugee relief and rehabilitation had been paid to UNRWA by June 30, 1953.

On August 7, 1953, President Eisenhower signed the foreign aid bill, authorizing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. This bill did not provide specific allocations to individual countries, but limited itself to listing over-all appropriations to regions, the exact amount for each country within the region to be determined by the State Department.

Thus, special economic aid to the Arab states, Israel, and Iran was $135,000,000. Even if Israel should receive, as in the past, approximately the same appropriation as the Arab states, the amount would still be less than the grant-in-aid for the fiscal year ended 1953. The appropriation for the Near East and Africa for technical assistance was $33,792,000. Assistance for the Arab refugee relief and rehabilitation program through the UNRWA was $44,063,000, a reappropriation of the balance of the unexpended funds left over from the 1953 fiscal year. The sum of $30,000,000 was appropriated for military aid to the Near East and Africa; $312,713,221 of unobligated balances were also carried forward.

On May 14, 1953, Israel Minister of Finance Levi Eshkol and Israel Minister of Commerce Peretz Bernstein asked Harold E. Stassen, Mutual Security Administrator, while he was in Jerusalem with Secretary of State Dulles, to help raise a long-term loan in the United States to convert Israel's short-term debts into long-term obligations. If the loan could be obtained from private sources, the Israel officials believed it might be guaranteed by Mutual Security Act (MSA) funds. This request was subsequently refused. Furthermore, an amendment was added to the MSA for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, which specified that none of the MSA funds, nor any of the counterpart funds generated as a result of MSA aid, should be used to make payments on account of the principal or interest on any debt of any foreign government. United States and Israel economists were discussing clarification of this amendment with regard to its implications for Israel.

The Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United States and Israel, which had been signed in Washington on August 23, 1951, by the then Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Ambassador Abba S. Eban was ratified by the Senate on July 21, 1953, by a vote of 86 to 1. (The vote pertained to five other treaties as well; the negative vote was cast by Senator Patrick McCarran [Dem., Nev.].) The treaty, similar to many in effect between the United States and other countries, aimed at the regulation and promotion of economic and cultural relations between the two countries.

Lucy Dawidowicz
Political Action

During the Presidential campaign in the summer and fall of 1952 both Zionist and non-Zionist groups in the United States had foreseen the possibility of a change in American policy toward Israel in the event of a Republican victory. Thus the American Zionist Council (AZC), the public relations arm of all Zionist organizations in the United States, had noted that the expression of friendship for Israel in the Republican plank was more cautious than that in the Democratic one. The AZC ascribed this to a partisan Republican opposition to the more friendly policy toward Israel pursued by Democratic President Harry S. Truman (AZC Bulletin, August 15, 1952).

When the Republican administration led by President Dwight D. Eisenhower came into office in January 1953, American Jewish groups anxious for the welfare of Israel endeavored to secure assurances that Israel interests would not suffer as the result of the new American government's concern for protecting the Arab countries of the Middle East from Communism. The two particular subjects of their concern were military and economic assistance. On August 22, 1953, the AZC had urged the Truman administration to extend military assistance to Israel under the terms of the Mutual Security Act. It had also on December 31, 1952, protested against contemplated arms shipments to Egypt and other Arab states by both the United States and Great Britain, urging that no arms be sent to Egypt until the regime of Premier Mohammed Naguib should undertake to abandon its blockade of, and enter into peace negotiations with, Israel. Similarly, on March 3, 1953, the AZC called upon Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to reply to the Soviet attack on Israel (see p. 277) by strengthening Israel and withholding arms from Egypt and other Arab states until they should abandon their anti-Israel campaign. On March 23, 1953, representatives of the AZC met with President Eisenhower and, inter alia, urged continued aid for Israel on the level of fiscal years 1951 and 1952.

Representative of the activities of the non-Zionist groups in behalf of Israel were the meetings and correspondence during the period under review between Jacob Blaustein, president of the American Jewish Committee (AJC), and President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, and Assistant Secretary of State Henry Byroade. Subjects discussed were Washington's policy regarding military aid to Israel and its Arab neighbors, grants-in-aid for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, the blockading by Egypt of the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping, the refusal of Arab countries to trade with Israel, and the fundamental problem of peace in the Middle East (reported at the AJC Executive Committee Meeting, May 2-3, 1953).

On June 26, 1953, the American Jewish Committee protested to Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, about the anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish views expressed in the United Nations by representatives of Arab nations.

In June 1953 a group of United States attorneys urged the Egyptian gov-
ernment to lift its blockade on Israel-bound vessels using the Suez Canal, as a step vital for the peace and welfare of the Middle East.¹

**Ideological Problems**

There were further attempts to clarify the relationship between the State of Israel on the one hand, and the world Zionist movement on the other, during the period under review.

**STATUS OF WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION**

In August 1951 the Twenty-third World Zionist Congress had been the scene of an extended debate over the question of legalizing the status of the World Zionist Organization (WZO) vis-à-vis the State of Israel. It was finally agreed that the practical program undertaken by the WZO made it essential that the State of Israel "through an appropriate legislative act" grant the WZO legal status.

During the summer of 1952 a bill to achieve that purpose was introduced into the Knesset. Passed at its first and second readings on August 13, 1952, the bill was suddenly withdrawn by Premier David Ben Gurion, on behalf of the government, before it could be submitted to a third and final reading and probable passage. According to newspaper reports, the difference between the government and the Knesset concerned the characterization of the WZO; the proposed bill described the WZO as the "representative organization" of the Jewish people, while the government preferred the formula "authorized agency," presumably out of deference to non-Zionist Jewish friends of Israel.

Eventually, on November 24, 1952, a bill known as "The Zionist Organization-Jewish Agency for Palestine Status Law" passed the Knesset. As finally adopted, the new law declared that the State of Israel recognized the WZO as the "authorized agency." It also expressed hope for "the participation of all Jews and Jewish bodies in the upbuilding of the State and in assisting mass immigration thereto" and recognition of "the need for uniting all Jewish communities to this end." To achieve such a unity it suggested that the framework of the WZO be enlarged (presumably by incorporation of the non-Zionist Jewish agencies at present outside of the WZO), and indicated that such an enlarged body would enjoy the same status being granted the WZO.

**REACTIONS**

The original draft of August 13, 1952, was hailed by the leaders of the Zionist Organization of America, and the American Mizrachi Organization, and regarded with misgivings by the AJC. The AJC had adopted a resolution on October 14, 1951, reading in part:

We urge upon the State of Israel the impropriety of a) granting any kind

¹ For an account of the relations of the American government to Israel, see p. 109.
of diplomatic recognition to any nongovernmental body; b) granting any kind of political status within Israel to any non-Israeli organization or nongovernmental body.

At its annual meeting in January 1953, the AJC noted with satisfaction the refusal of the government of Israel to grant the WZO recognition as the representative of the Jewish people the world over.

**American Council for Judaism**

The American Council for Judaism (ACJ) attacked the granting by the government of Israel of official status to the WZO-Jewish Agency, as a clear indication that such “so-called non-Zionist” American agencies as the fund-raising United Israel Appeal were really under Zionist, i.e., Israel control. In the ACJ opinion, the activities of the Zionist movement in the United States had now legally become those of the authorized agency of a foreign state; the ACJ wondered whether these Zionist organizations ought not to be registered with the United States government as the agents of a foreign government (*Council News*, December 1952).

The ACJ, which reported a membership of around 15,000 in May 1953, was involved in several controversies both within the Jewish community and outside it. On July 17, 1952, during the Presidential campaign, the ACJ submitted a memorandum to the Democratic Resolutions Committee calling the attention of the Democratic Party to “the demonstrable fact that no Jew and no organization of Jews can speak for all Americans of Jewish faith.” When Herbert T. Schaffner appeared before that committee to emphasize the absence of a “Jewish vote,” Senator Herbert H. Lehman (Dem., N.Y.) vigorously pointed out that neither the Congress of the United States, nor the Democratic administration, nor the Democratic Party, had made any attempt to appeal to or appease a “Jewish vote . . . in connection with Israel or any other question.”

Publicity issued to the Houston, Tex., daily papers by the Southwest Regional Conference of the ACJ in November 1952 led the Jewish Community Council (JCC) of Metropolitan Houston to adopt a resolution characterizing the ACJ publicity as “impugning the patriotism and questioning the validity of the citizenship of large numbers of . . . fellow Jews,” and condemning this type of release as “irresponsible . . . harmful to the Jewish community at large.” Lessing Rosenwald, president of the ACJ, immediately denied that the ACJ statement had impugned the patriotism of large numbers of American Jews. However, he noted that there was nothing in the JCC’s resolution suggesting that anything the various Council spokesmen had said was untrue. Like the American Jewish Committee, Rosenwald declared, the ACJ believed in the principle that organizations were responsible to their voluntary memberships for their public statements, and not to the “Jewish community.”

**Organization and Coordination**

On November 23, 1952, Prime Minister David Ben Gurion of Israel and leaders of four major Zionist groups in the United States formulated a plan
for transferring certain activities from the Jewish Agency to the American Zionist Council. According to the new plan, the AZC would take over the coordination of Zionist communal fund raising for Israel, Jewish and Hebrew education, youth work and pioneer training, and Zionist participation in Jewish community life. The Jewish Agency was to confine its activities in New York to the control of fund campaigns, economic activities, and purchasing. This plan required the consent of the membership of the various American Zionist groups before it could be put into effect.

Rabbi Irving Miller of the ZOA, in discussing this plan on December 7, 1952, pointed to a meeting he had with Ben Gurion in October 1952. At that time Ben Gurion had favored the establishment of a confederation of Zionist parties. Rabbi Miller had opposed this proposal as in effect aiming at the dissolution of all Zionist groups in the United States. At a subsequent meeting Ben Gurion and American Zionist leaders had agreed to compromise on the enlargement of the AZC's scope.

In January 1953 Miller announced that the ZOA was now ready to proceed with the enlargement of the AZC on a gradual scale on the basis of the existing composition of the AZC executive and other governing bodies, maintaining the status quo in regard to structure and leadership.

On February 25, 1953, the AZC voted to proceed with the implementation of the enlargement agreement. It was decided to convene an assembly of all Zionist groups in the United States for the week beginning December 5, 1953, in order to achieve common action on problems of common interest—particularly those areas which had been ceded to the AZC by the Jewish Agency.

On August 23, 1952, following the announcement that the ZOA had established a new Commission on Israel in the Middle East, Harold P. Manson presented the new body's proposed program. He made it clear that the new commission did not propose to trespass upon or duplicate the activity of the AZC. Rather, it was to seek to develop a better understanding of Israel's political problems within the ZOA . . . "to restore to Zionist public relations that element of mass participation which gave a special tone and character to its work in the past." The new commission planned to organize a series of seminars on Israel on the college campuses to counteract "the serious penetration of Arab propagandists."

As part of this program to strengthen the ZOA's position among young adults, the National Young Zionist Committee of the ZOA, the administrative body of thirty Young Zionist districts of the ZOA, organized in 1950, with a membership estimated at from 2,000-3,000, called on April 21, 1953, for a larger membership in order to strengthen the ZOA.

In July 1953 the Pioneer Women, the women's branch of the Labor Zionist movement of the United States, with a membership of more than 40,000, became a national affiliate of the American Jewish Congress.

**Political Involvement in Israel**

The ZOA's open support of the Israel General Zionist and Progressive parties as part of the World Confederation of General Zionists continued to
be a source of friction between the Labor Zionist government of Israel and the ZOA. On November 6, 1952, Rabbi Irving Miller of the ZOA sharply rejected Premier David Ben Gurion's assertion that elements in the ZOA had tried to "smear" the State of Israel during the discussions of the bill providing special status for the WZO-Jewish Agency (see above). On January 18, 1953, in hailing the new coalition government of Israel in which Mapai and the General Zionist were the principal parties, Miller emphasized that the ZOA would not "surrender its right" to hold and express its critical opinions with respect to political developments in Israel. And, in fact, on May 28, 1953, Miller did support the stand taken by the General Zionist Party of Israel, which withdrew from the government coalition over the issue of the flying of the Socialist flag and the singing of the Internationale in the public schools administered by the Labor Zionist Histadruth in Israel.

The ZOA was not alone in its opposition to Ben Gurion's attitude to American Zionist groups. On November 15, 1952, Rabbi Max Kirshblum, president of the (Orthodox) Mizrachi Organization of America, called upon Ben Gurion to "stop his cold war against American Zionism." The Mizrachi Organization, too, made efforts to aid those elements in Israel with whom it was sympathetic. Thus, a session of its annual convention held November 12-16, 1952, "studied methods of providing machinery by which American Jews could make investments in Israel aimed at strengthening the religious sector." The same convention of the Mizrachi dealt with the problem of establishing more effective working relationships with the Hapoel Hamizrachi, the religious labor group in Israel.

In June 1953 the Progressive Zionist League-Hashomer Hatzair was carrying on special projects for the sixty-seven kibbutzim (collective settlements) of the Kibbutz Artzi-Hashomer Hatzair movement in Israel. It was mobilizing American support for the establishment of new factories in three of the kibbutzim and helping them through cooperative investment in partnership with specific kibbutzim; it was also supplying agricultural and industrial equipment for the other kibbutzim.

**Economic Aid**

As of April 28, 1953, American Jews had contributed almost one-half of the billion dollars in aid raised for the State of Israel since its establishment in May 1948. Of the $416,000,000 raised by American Jewry, more than two-thirds went to the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), of which the United Israel Appeal (UIA) was the major beneficiary.

The balance of the billion dollars raised for Israel included: $135,000,000 from the United States Export-Import Bank; $138,000,000 in United States grants; and $311,000,000 from State of Israel Bonds, loans, private investments, and philanthropic campaigns in other countries.2

---

PRIVATE INVESTMENT AND TRADE

As of June 1953 private trading activities between the United States and Israel totaled more than $100,000,000 annually; more than 1,000 American firms were doing business with Israel. To encourage the growth of such activities, in June 1953 an American-Israel Chamber of Commerce and Industry was incorporated as an American membership association under the laws of the State of New York. Sponsored by the Manufacturers' Association, Chamber of Commerce, and Farmers' Federation of Israel together with American business concerns, the new association aimed to serve as a non-governmental body to bring business men of the United States and Israel into direct contact for such purposes as trade promotion, information, market research, and arbitration.

Similarly, the United States Mutual Security Agency in July 1953 established a Contact Clearing House Service to encourage and help United States private enterprise to explore specific opportunities for investment in Israel, by bringing together individual American and foreign firms.

On March 15, 1953, the ZOA formed an economic committee to carry out a program for promoting private investment in Israel, coordinating its activities with those of the Palestine Economic Corporation (PEC) and the Investment Center in Israel.

PEC

The PEC, established in 1926 as an American development and investment company in Israel, had grown until it had vital interests in thirty undertakings of such major industries as rubber, paper, and banking, and a total capital, surplus, and reserves at the end of 1952 in excess of $10,000,000. Since 1946 PEC's more than 8,000 stockholders had been receiving regular dividends of 4 per cent on the par value of their stock. In June 1953 the PEC announced the establishment jointly with Jacques Torczyner of the PEC Diamond Corporation, Inc., to increase the sale and distribution in the United States of diamonds manufactured in Israel.

AMPAL

Since the organization of AMPAL—American Palestine Trading Corporation in 1942 it had granted credits and made investments for the development of Israel totaling more than $76,000,000. During the calendar year 1952 AMPAL made investments and long, medium, and short-term loans to its clients totaling $29,268,085.17. Of this sum more than $20,000,000 went to the government of the state of Israel, more than $4,000,000 to the National Committee for Labor Israel, $1,800,000 to the Jewish Agency for Palestine and Palestine Foundation Fund, $1,050,000 to the Zim-Israel Navigation Company, Ltd., and $968,157.25 to the Workers Bank, Ltd. Other institutions to benefit were the Jewish National Fund of America, the Israel Maritime Company, the American-Israel Petroleum Corp., Israel Industrial and Mineral Development Corp., the American-Israel Shipping Co., The State of Israel Debentures and Sifrei-Israel, Inc.

Social Services

American Jewish organizations were extremely active during the period under review in maintaining and extending their social welfare activities in behalf of Israel, particularly in the fields of health and medical aid, vocational education, immigrant assistance, and youth work. Active in this work were Hadassah, the Women’s Zionist Organization of America, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), the National Council of Jewish Women, the Pioneer Women of America, the American ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training), the Jewish Labor Committee, and the Palestine Lighthouse, Inc.

By March 1, 1953, Hadassah, with a national membership of 300,000 in 1,185 chapters, had raised and expended $80,000,000 for the maintenance of its program in Israel since its founding in 1892. Its budget for 1952-53 was $9,000,000. The principal items in the 1953 fiscal year budget were: $3,000,000 for the Hadassah Medical Organization; $2,300,000 for Youth Aliyah; and $1,175,000 for the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center and Medical School.

During 1952 Pioneer Women raised $1,400,000 for the activities of the Moetzet Hapoalot (Working Women’s Council), its sister organization in Israel. Of this sum, $900,000 was for social welfare and educational activities, and $500,000 for the shipment of materials, clothing for immigrants and equipment for 300 social service institutions in Israel. These organizations maintained 65 per cent of the social services in the maaborat camps, among the immigrant women, children, and adolescents. During 1952 Pioneer Women reported a membership of 40,000 (3,000 new members) in its 435 clubs. A group of American women sailed for a year’s service in Pioneer Women’s service program in Israel in August 1952.

In cooperation with the United States Technical Cooperation Administration and the Israel government, the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) sponsored an American specialist to teach beginning social workers in Israel during the academic year from the fall of 1952 to the fall of 1953. Sections of the NCJW served 206 youth installations in Israel which were under the auspices of the Ministries of Education and Culture and of Social Welfare, with monthly shipments of work and play material.

Health and Medical Services

In September 1952 Hadassah reported that it had transferred part of the network of preventive medicine establishments that it had built up in Israel to the Ministry of Health. During the first year of government operation Hadassah would continue to cover the entire budget; during the following years it would gradually taper off its financial support, withdrawing it com-
Completely in 1956. Hadassah was also gradually transferring to the government of Israel the operation of the recreation and school lunch programs it had originally established and operated.

These transfers were to enable Hadassah to concentrate on converting a number of its remaining installations in the Jerusalem area into community health centers. In February 1953 Hadassah launched a private experiment in a community health plan. This plan provided comprehensive promotive, preventive, diagnostic, and curative mental and physical health services for specific local communities, using the family as the unit of service. It was hoped that the projected Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center, for which $10,000,000 had been raised, would serve as the parent body of the various local health centers, to which they would make referrals.

As of March 1953 Hadassah maintained seven hospitals in Israel, as well as a social service and convalescent home and a child guidance clinic. The same month Hadassah announced the establishment of a $500,000 medical fellowship program to raise the standards of medicine and science in Israel to levels prevailing in the United States through enabling promising young Israel specialists to pursue intensive courses of study in leading American universities. In April 1953 the Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical School in Jerusalem agreed to accept American medical students for enrollment. A new department of psychiatry at the school was made possible by a grant of $150,000, secured through the efforts of Dr. Israel S. Wechsler, of the American Friends of the Hebrew University.

MALBEN PROGRAM

Since its establishment in 1949, the JDC-sponsored Malben program for aged, ill, and handicapped newcomers to Israel had provided care for 1,000 tuberculosis patients, 700 victims of chronic diseases, and 500 invalids needing custodial care in special centers (there were 90 institutions for these categories of patients). In addition, 1,100 old and friendless immigrants were provided for in homes for the aged, while 130 handicapped children and nearly 500 mentally disturbed patients were institutionalized. Nevertheless, Malben was faced with a waiting list of more than 5,000 persons, and was increasing its building program to provide facilities for an additional 2,000 "hard core" immigrants. In all, Malben had served 24,000 patients since its inception. Malben's program was urgently needed because of the disproportionate number of incapacitated aged persons among the immigrants to Israel; approximately 45,000 men and women over sixty years of age had reached Israel during the period between the establishment of the State of Israel in May 1948 and May 1953.

During the period under review, the Jewish Labor Committee was building a medical center in the Negev at a cost of about $75,000 and was assisting the Sick Benefit Fund of Israel in building a dormitory and training institute for nurses.

The Palestine Lighthouse, Inc., maintained a Jewish Institute for the Blind in Jerusalem and the Seeing Eye Dog Foundation in Israel. During 1953-54 it planned to establish a sheltered workshop for blind adults, a rehabilitation center, and a residence for the aged blind.
Vocational Training

As of February 1953, the program of the World ORT Union, of which the American ORT Federation was an important section, extended into 17 localities, and 1,943 students were enrolled in 27 vocational training schools. ORT worked closely with the Ministry of Labor, Histadrut, Mizrachi, and other governmental and community organizations in the field of adult vocational training. Seven short-period workshops were established during 1952 for accelerated, intensive courses, and ten proficiency courses gave workers the practice and knowledge with which to improve the quality and output of their labor. In June 1953, the American ORT Federation adopted a comprehensive program for equipping ORT schools in Israel with machines, tools, and supplies.

Hadassah undertook a rural vocational educational program at the beginning of 1953, and had opened two new model schools planned and designed with the help of American authorities by May 1953. These schools aimed to develop interest in agriculture among immigrant youth, and enrolled several thousand young people who had entered Israel under Youth Aliyah auspices.

Youth Work

As of July 1953, Hadassah had brought 62,000 refugee youngsters into Israel at a cost of $20,000,000 from 70 different countries in its Youth Aliyah program begun in 1934. In January 1953 Youth Aliyah was still responsible for 13,500 young people whom it was absorbing at the rate of 500 per month. Youth Aliyah planned to change its program in North Africa in order to facilitate immigration to Israel. Parents would be asked for permission to send youngsters under fifteen to Youth Aliyah centers in Israel for two years' training before they themselves emigrated to Israel.

In 1950 the World Federation of YMHA's and Jewish Community Centers, connected with the National Jewish Welfare Board of the United States, had established a Beth Hanoar (Youth House) in Jerusalem; during the period under review it continued to sponsor and support it, as well as the similar Jewish centers established in eight other localities in Israel. It was planned to organize a national council of these centers.

Cultural, Educational, Scientific and Technical Activity

The American Fund for Israel Institutions (AFII) maintained fifty-two cultural, scientific, educational, and social welfare institutions in Israel. On April 5, 1953, ground was broken in Tel Aviv for the construction of a cultural and civic center to be built at a cost of about $2,500,000. In May 1953, the Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress presented the Louise Waterman Wise Youth Center in Jerusalem to the State of Israel, for the use of the government's Department of Education and Culture to train youth leaders and teachers.

In June 1953 the Jewish Labor Committee was financing the building of
the Abraham Reisin House in Tel Aviv, to serve as a popular cultural center, subsidizing the Franz Kursky library and archives, and projecting the construction of the I. L. Peretz Yiddish library in Tel Aviv.

The United States Information Media Guarantee Program (see American Jewish Year Book, 1953 [Vol. 54], p. 161) during the nine-month period from June 1952 through March 1953 had made it possible for Israelis to use their own currency to buy $700,000 worth of American books, $270,000 worth of pocket editions, and $40,000 worth of magazines and newspapers.

Fifty national Jewish organizations participated in the Books for Israel project initiated by the United States Department of State in January 1953.

In October 1952 the ZOA formed a Committee for Hebrew Language and Culture, to promote a program to strengthen the cultural links with Israel. Its aims were: to support the speaking of Hebrew among youth in the United States; to adapt Israel textbooks and readers for use in American Hebrew schools; to introduce courses on Zionism and Israel into day schools and Sunday schools; to foster the teaching of Hebrew in high schools and colleges; and to organize Hebrew-speaking circles and study groups.

**Educational and Religious Activity**

A number of American Jewish bodies directly and indirectly aided the activities of educational and religious groups in Israel with whose aims and needs they sympathized.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) gave assistance to the Leo Baeck School in Haifa, and raised funds and materials to help make possible a new building to house the school. In addition, the CCAR donated representative books on Liberal Judaism to fourteen major libraries in Israel.

In December 1952 Pioneer Women established a scholarship plan for the six agricultural schools of the Moetzet Hapoalot.

The Jewish Agency in New York cooperated with a number of Jewish and educational groups in promoting study visits to Israel for seventy-five American university youths in the summer of 1953.

In the fall of 1953 the Board of Superintendents of the public schools of the City of New York cooperated with the Israel Office of Information in offering an in-service course for teachers on the civilization and culture of Israel. During 1951 and 1952 several hundred persons had participated in these courses.

As of June 1953 the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) had given forty scholarships to mature and experienced persons from Israel to study in the United States. The NCJW was also active in assisting the School of Education of the Hebrew University through financial grants, purchase of books, development of an audio-visual center, and training of faculty members in the United States in educational administration and adult education.

As of June 1953 the Ford Foundation had granted $500,000 to twenty-four projects for research in Israel.
Religious Groups

The (Orthodox) Mizrachi Organization of America expected to be able to open the Bar-Ilan University under construction near Tel Aviv in September 1954. The university, whose cornerstone was laid in the summer of 1953, was needed to ease the shortage of university opportunities for young Israelis.

In June 1953 Mizrachi also announced the formation of a national committee to aid the Rabbi Kook Institute in Israel.

In the spring of 1952 the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations had acquired a building for its activities in the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Extensive alterations were under way to adequately provide for an enlarged program.

In the spring of 1953, leaders in American Jewish education participated in a special seven-week study tour in Israel under the auspices of the World Zionist Organization, the American Association for Jewish Education, and the National Council for Jewish Education.

The United States Committee on Sports in Israel carried on an active program in connection with the development of recreation and sports in Israel.

In March 1953 the United Synagogue of America established the United Synagogue Israel project, whose purposes were: to build and maintain a residence hall in Jerusalem for the use of American Jewish scholars and students as well as for Conservative laymen during their stay in Israel; to publish volumes in Hebrew and English, expressive of the thinking of American and Israel Jewry; to help communities in Israel to build synagogue centers; and to encourage organized pilgrimages to Israel under United Synagogue auspices. Funds for this project were to be raised through the cooperation of Conservative congregations in the United States and Canada. As of June 1953 one hundred congregations had agreed to participate.

During the period under review the Rabbinical Council of America sponsored the Yeshivath Hadarom in Rehovoth, Israel, whose purpose was to train Orthodox rabbinic and educational leadership. The first in a series of contemplated buildings had been constructed by June 1953 with funds raised by the Rabbinical Council.

The American constituents of the World Union for Progressive Judaism (the CCAR, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion) cooperated in a Committee for Liberal Judaism in Israel, whose plans were still in the formative stage.

Scientific and Technical Assistance

In April 1953 the Association for the Advancement of Science in Israel, an American branch of the parent association in Israel, was founded, in order to give to Israel the benefit of the scientific advances made in the United States. The New York Academy of Science assisted in the founding of this association, as did a number of prominent scientists.

American professionals interested in working in Israel were enabled to refer to the Professional and Technical Workers Aliyah of the Jewish Agency in New York, which was arranging a series of special projects for the con-
tractual employment of Americans in Israel. One such project already worked out offered American industrial engineers a one-year contract with all expenses paid. Negotiations for a similar arrangement for doctors and nurses were under way with the larger Israel medical service organizations in the spring of 1953.

JACOB SLOAN

FINANCING OF JEWISH COMMUNAL PROGRAMS

Philanthropic contributions by American Jewry for Jewish communal programs at home and overseas continued at a high level during the period under review (July 1952 through June 1953). As in past years, the major programs—especially for overseas needs—continued to rely primarily on the centralized structure of local federation and welfare fund campaigns for the largest portion of their incomes. Amounts raised in these central campaigns continued to reflect the declining trend which had been taking place since the peak year of 1948. As Table 1 below indicates, the totals raised in 1952 were about 8 per cent less than those raised in 1951, a decline sharper than that which had taken place in 1951 as compared with 1950.

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>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>125,772</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>78,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political Influences

At the beginning of 1953, the central community fund-raising drives were affected by events overseas. Developments in the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries indicated a trend toward the use of overt anti-Semitism as an instrument of governmental policy.¹ At that time the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) called for increased funds in order to bring assistance to those Jews of Eastern Europe who might be able to leave for other lands. The UJA also emphasized that Israel would be facing political pressures of

¹ See p. 263.
unpredictable magnitude and seriousness as the result of Soviet policy, and urged American Jewish contributors to build Israel's strength so that its position could be maintained in the uncertain period which seemed to lie ahead.

This sense of urgency probably played some part in temporarily halting the rate of reductions in contributions. Perhaps of greater significance than political factors were the organizational steps that many Jewish communities took during 1953 to strengthen their campaigns. In many cities, Jewish communities paid greater attention to careful campaign organization, beginning their preparations many weeks or months in advance of the campaign period. They made efforts to stimulate and reawaken the interest of volunteer leadership, and especially the larger contributors, in the maintenance of strong central organizations, and to raise sufficient funds to carry out the many long-range responsibilities to which the federations and welfare funds were committed.

**Campaign Results**

Central community campaigns conducted in the spring of 1953\(^1\) raised overall about 3 per cent less funds than in 1952. However, one-third of these cities raised sums either the same as or larger than those they had raised in 1952. In addition, communities did not vary as widely as they had in previous years. At the time of writing, six out of every ten communities that had reported their 1953 spring campaign results indicated that they had ranged from a gain of 15 per cent over the previous year to a loss of 5 per cent.

If the fall campaigns, whose results were not available at the time of writing, were to conform with the experience of spring campaigns, federation and welfare fund drives would obtain about $120,000,000 in 1953. On the basis of this estimate, the campaigns of 1953 would raise about 40 per cent less than in the peak year of 1948. As Table 1 shows, the level of contributions in 1952 was lower than in any year since 1946, when the large-scale campaigns for critical overseas needs had been initiated. However, 1953 contributions were still about 70 per cent higher than in 1945, before the postwar emergency campaigns began.

**Number of Contributors and Size of Contributions**

The number of contributors to federation and welfare fund campaigns during the review period remained virtually the same. Reports filed with the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) by some 85 cities showed that these communities received an average of 27 contributions per 100 Jews, demonstrating that American Jews were continuing their high rate of participation in the central community-wide drives. The cities reported a loss of only 2 per cent in the number of contributions received in 1952, as compared with those received in 1951.

---

\(^1\) About 75 per cent of all Jewish federation and welfare fund campaigns were conducted in the spring of the year, about 25 per cent in the fall.
As in each of the years since 1949, the declines in amounts contributed occurred primarily in the brackets of the largest donations. In the over-all decline of 8 per cent in totals raised in 1952, funds from donors of $5,000 or more decreased 18 per cent. Although such contributors constituted less than one-half of one per cent of the total contributing group, they accounted for one-third of the total raised; their decline therefore had a marked effect on the total results of the campaigns. In 1948, 6.5 per cent of all contributors had made gifts of $500 or more that accounted for 76 per cent of the totals raised. By 1952, these contributors composed 4.5 per cent of all givers, and their contributions represented 70 per cent of the total funds.

**Distribution of Federation Funds**

Overseas programs continued to be the major beneficiaries of central community campaigns. At the same time, the proportion of the total allotted for these purposes further declined, and grants for local purposes correspondingly increased.

Of the totals budgeted—after deductions for administrative and campaign expenses and reserves set aside against possible losses in collections—$69,200,000, or almost 70 per cent, was allocated in 1952 for overseas and refugee needs\(^2\). This compared with $79,400,000 made available in 1951, and represented a drop of 13 per cent. In 1951, overseas and refugee programs had absorbed 72 per cent of the total, and in 1948, 81 per cent.

Part of this change reflected a decline in the amounts that local communities spent for programs of financial assistance and other immigrant services. There had been a continuous decline in such expenditures since 1950, with the steady drop in immigration as the United States Displaced Persons' program moved toward termination. By 1952, only 2.8 per cent of the totals budgeted by local communities were used for refugee aid.

The UJA, again the largest welfare fund beneficiary, received allotments totalling an estimated $63,800,000 in 1952, representing 64 per cent of the total. The UJA adhered to its policy of "pre-campaign budgeting"—i.e., of negotiating with many communities in advance of the campaigns in order to obtain agreements concerning the percentage which the UJA was to receive of the totals raised. Through such agreements, the UJA sought to stabilize its share of the total funds available and to avoid a reduction in its allocations disproportionate to the reductions in over-all fund raising. Because of fixed commitments in other areas, however, UJA allocations were reduced more sharply than most of the other items on the communal budget.

It was estimated that federations and welfare funds granted $4,780,000 to national domestic agencies in 1952, or slightly less than the $4,860,000 allotted in 1951. However, this group of programs received a slightly larger share of the total: 4.7 per cent in 1952, as compared with 4.5 per cent in 1951. The major percentage increase was in allotments for national community

\(^2\) See Table 2.
relations organizations, whose absolute receipts remained the same while the over-all totals were lower3.

Local services received allotments that were both absolutely and proportionately larger. This was true both of their grants for maintenance purposes and of their allocations for special capital purposes—primarily building needs.

**TABLE 2**

**DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS RAISED IN LOCAL CENTRAL COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS**

*(Estimates in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaigns, Agencies, Needs, %</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York Cityb</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1952 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT BUDGETED.</strong></td>
<td>99,880</td>
<td>110,918</td>
<td>67,130 75,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas and Refugee Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>63,767</td>
<td>72,099</td>
<td>42,517 48,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>63.3 64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>2,429 2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>2,786 4,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,068 2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>229 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>407 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>517 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>852 788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>22,985</td>
<td>24,085</td>
<td>12,401 13,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>18.5 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Funds</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>2,920 2,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.4 3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The difference between totals budgeted and totals raised represents "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, and contingency or other reserves. The figures for 1952 are preliminary, subject to revision when more complete reports are available.

b Figures for New York include the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugee costs in New York City were borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of the UJA nationally. Most overseas and domestic agencies which were normally included in welfare funds conducted their own campaigns in New York. The New York UJA included the following beneficiaries (in addition to the national UJA): the American Jewish Congress, the National Jewish Welfare Board, and In 1952, the American Friends of the Hebrew University.

**ALLOCATIONS FOR LOCAL SERVICES**

In local communities, services of varying types were supported, in part, by Jewish campaigns. The types and extent of services varied from community

---

3 This analysis is based on Table 2, which shows the amounts allocated by local welfare funds of the basis of campaign pledges received. The figures deviate to some extent from those listed in the Appendix tables, since the latter are based on the actual cash receipts of the national agencies, rather than on pledged allocations.
to community, with the larger cities maintaining a wider range of services than the smaller localities. In the great majority of communities Jewish health and welfare agencies received all or some part of their financial needs by participating in nonsectarian community chests. However, Jewish fundraising campaigns gave considerable supplementary amounts to activities partially supported by the chests or for certain types of Jewish sectarian programs mostly of a cultural character, which were not generally eligible for community chest support.

The trends in expenditures for local needs were reflected in a study by the CJFWF which was in progress at the time of writing (October 1953). Data were compiled from a representative group of sixty-nine cities (exclusive of New York) for the years 1946 through 1952. In these cities, grants for local purposes rose by 82 per cent during the six-year period—from $8,178,000 in 1946 to $14,861,000 in 1952. The increases were particularly marked in the field of health, reflecting the growing investment in Jewish hospital programs during the postwar period. Other fields where budgeted amounts rose by 80 per cent or more were: care of the aged, Jewish recreation and cultural programs (primarily Jewish community centers), and Jewish education.

Taking these cities as a whole, hospitals and other health services were the major beneficiaries, receiving 30 per cent of total expenditures in 1952. Community centers received 22 per cent of the total, relief and related services 19 per cent, and Jewish education 13 per cent. This distribution reflected primarily the pattern of the larger cities, where the largest expenditures occurred. In smaller communities (with Jewish populations of less than 15,000), community centers and Jewish education received from 60 to 70 per cent of all local expenditures, as compared with 30 to 40 per cent in the larger cities. Conversely, health and welfare services were the primary beneficiaries in the large cities, but received a lesser proportion of the totals in the smaller communities.

**TABLE 3**

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 69 COMMUNITIES, 1946, 1952

(Amounts in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Service</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief and Related Services</td>
<td>$2,009</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Guid.</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of the Aged</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$8,178</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Table 3. During this period the United States consumer price index rose by 36.1 per cent.*
FINANCING OF JEWISH COMMUNAL PROGRAMS

TABLE 3A

INCREASES IN TOTAL ALLOCATIONS IN 69 CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amounts Allocated in 1952 (thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Index of Change 1946 = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relief and Related Services</td>
<td>$2,851</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Vocational Guidance</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of the Aged</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4,455</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$14,862</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NONFEDERATED SOURCES OF FINANCING

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

National domestic and overseas agencies reporting regularly to the CJFWF recorded total income of about $33,000,000 in 1952 from sources other than welfare funds (see Appendix). The major source of this income was 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 all-inclusive Jewish welfare fund. In addition to contributions, various national agencies derived income from endowments, earnings, and other miscellaneous sources.

Local health and welfare agencies received the major portion of their financing in the form of direct payments for service, which accounted for about 60 per cent of their total income. For a number of years payments for services had been rising, reflecting the improved economic condition of the population served by local agencies, as well as the growth of group insurance programs, which were a major factor in meeting hospital costs.

Other sources of direct income included public tax funds (8 per cent), contributions from individuals, auxiliaries, and the like (8 per cent), and income from investments and other miscellaneous sources (3 per cent). Federated funds in the form of allocations from Jewish federations or from non-sectarian community chests accounted for 21 per cent of the total income of these local services.

No estimates were available of the funds raised by those Jewish religious and secular institutions, local or national, which were not related to central Jewish community organization, and therefore did not participate in the

---

5 This total is somewhat exaggerated since a number of agencies did not separate the amounts received from welfare funds from other monies.

6 For other discussions of fee payment, see p. 98 and p. 108.
reporting system of the CJFWF. Undoubtedly, these sums were substantial, particularly in New York City.

BUILDING FUNDS

The post-World War II period of American Jewish philanthropy witnessed the development of numerous building projects, undertaken to renovate existing institutions, or to establish new ones. These projects aimed to meet needs which had built up during the previous period of economic depression and war when many existing institutions had deteriorated or had become obsolete due to Jewish population shifts and other demographic changes.

During the period under review there was a continuation of building and of fund raising for capital purposes. Religious institutions, Jewish hospitals, homes for the aged, and community centers were the major projects included in these plans. Studies were under way to determine the extent of these projects, but at the time of writing available data were too incomplete to make possible over-all estimates and analyses. In a number of cities allocations out of regular annual federation and welfare fund campaigns enabled communities to meet some portion of their building requirements. However, by far the major portion of building fund projects were financed through special fund raising campaigns.

Aid to Israel

The American community contributed financial assistance to the country of Israel through three major channels—the government of the United States, which gave grants-in-aid and sponsored technical assistance programs; investment funds, whose major channel was the State of Israel Independence Issue (Bond Drive); and philanthropic contributions. American Jews were involved, on an organized communal basis, primarily with the two latter efforts.

Philanthropic campaigns and the Israel Bond Drive continued during the period under review as separate organizational undertakings. In a few small cities, a central administration administered both philanthropic contributions and bond sales, but this arrangement was the exception. Generally, local communities conducted separate efforts, with agreements concerning the timing of the campaigns and other matters of possible conflict. There were intermittent discussions in regard to establishing machinery to coordinate the Israel Bond Drive and the UJA (the major philanthropic campaign on a national basis), but no mutually acceptable formula was found.

BOND SALES

The volume of bond sales diminished during the review period. In September 1953 the American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel (AFDCI), the sponsor of the Israel Bond Drive, announced that a total of $160,000,000 had been subscribed since the Israel Bond Drive's formal initiation in May 1951. Of this total, $125,000,000 in bonds had actually been
purchased and paid for; the balance ($35,000,000) represented commitments to purchase bonds in the future. A year earlier, in September 1952, the total commitments had been $140,000,000, of which $85,000,000 had been obtained in cash purchases.

With the Israel Bond Drive due to expire in May 1954, another bond issue was being planned, as well as provisions for maintaining the value of the bonds sold in the first issue. As of October 1953, no concrete plans had been formulated, but the general decision had been made that the government of Israel would float another bond issue in May 1954.

PHILANTHROPIC AID TO ISRAEL

Since the establishment of the State of Israel in May 1948, American philanthropy had been an important element in the economy of the country by providing a major source of foreign purchasing power. Before the development of governmental aid from the United States and before the launching of the Israel Bond Drive, philanthropy had provided far the bulk of Israel's foreign exchange resources. Although by 1953 the government of Israel was receiving direct income which it could channel into its programs of economic development, philanthropic funds continued to play a unique role for the country as a whole, and in the maintenance of the specific programs administered by Jewish nongovernmental organizations operating in Israel. Some of these, such as the Jewish Agency program for agricultural development and the Jewish National Fund program of land development, were also significant in the general building of Israel and its economic resources. Other programs served certain special purposes in the fields of health and welfare, education, and culture.

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

The UJA continued to provide the major channel for American Jewish philanthropy for Israel during 1952-53; as in past years, it also financed programs of assistance to Jews in other overseas areas and to Jewish immigrants in the United States. The UJA was reconstituted in 1952 and in 1953, as in each year since 1939, by agreements between the United Israel Appeal (UIA), representing the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC).

Provisions for the distribution of funds as embodied in these agreements remained the same as in each year since 1951. After allocations to the United Service for New Americans (USNA) and the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), 67 per cent of the first $55,000,000 raised and 87.5 per cent of all additional amounts were earmarked for the UIA.

It was estimated that pledges to the UJA in 1952 totaled $70,000,000, compared with $80,000,000 in 1951. On the basis of the formulas fixed in the agreements constituting the UJA, these totals pointed to allocations for the various beneficiaries, after deduction of campaign expenses, as indicated in Table 4 below.

Beginning in 1952, the Jewish National Fund (JNF) was no longer a partner in the UIA as it had been in previous years. The JNF continued to raise
funds in the United States through traditional collections and obtained an allocation in Israel from the Jewish Agency, financed in large part through UIA collections. The UJA agreements in 1952 and 1953 continued to include a provision setting a ceiling on the JNF traditional collections, similar to one which had been in each UJA contract since 1944. This provided that if the JNF should raise more than $1,800,000 net, after deduction of expenses not to exceed $300,000, the UIA should turn over to the UJA an amount equivalent to such excess, which should be considered the income of the UJA.

TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USNA</td>
<td>$1,293,282</td>
<td>$755,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYANA</td>
<td>5,081,782</td>
<td>2,348,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDC (estimated)</td>
<td>20,040,566</td>
<td>19,256,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIA (estimated)</td>
<td>50,083,965</td>
<td>44,597,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$76,499,595</td>
<td>$66,958,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a These figures are lower than those quoted in the American Jewish Year Book, 1953 (Vol. 54), because the result of the 1951 UJA campaign is now estimated at $80,000,000, as compared with the earlier estimate of $85,000,000.

JEWISH AGENCY

The Jewish Agency for Palestine, the major beneficiary of UJA funds, spent $45,400,000 in the fiscal year ended September 30, 1952. During the following six-month period from October 1952 through March 31, 1953, the Jewish Agency expended $25,600,000 for its program. In addition, the Jewish Agency repaid $1,700,000 in 1951-52, and $3,300,000 during the first six months of 1952-53, on account of obligations incurred in previous years when operating deficits had been very much larger.

In general, the Agency’s operations achieved greater financial stability during 1952-53 because of sharp decreases in immigration. The Agency was able both to achieve a better balance between income and expenditures, and to shift its emphasis increasingly away from the emergency care and maintenance of immigrants to the support of agricultural projects in which immigrants could be absorbed productively.

Of the total of $45,400,000 that the Agency spent in 1951-52, about $24,700,000 were spent on the agricultural program. This represented 54 per cent of all expenditures. Immigration and absorption activities absorbed 26 per cent of the Agency’s total expenditures and it granted 9 per cent to the JNF for projects involving the development of land and other natural resources. The Agency distributed 11 per cent among various programs, including economic activities, education and cultural work, various aspects

Because of sharply rising prices during this period, the higher rate of expenditures in 1952-53 did not represent a greater volume of activity. The Israel price index rose from 100 in September 1951 to 185 in September 1952 and 194 in March 1953.
of organizational and administrative activities, and interest payments on past loans.

During the six-month period from October 1952 through March 1953, the Agency placed an even greater emphasis on agriculture. Fifty-eight per cent of its total expenditures of that period went into such programs, whereas the percentage it expended for immigration and absorption was reduced to 23 per cent. The Agency's allotment to the JNF during this period represented 6 per cent of the total. The interest on loan payments was 4 per cent; the balance of 9 per cent of Agency expenditures was distributed among other activities.

**AMERICAN JEWISH JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE (JDC)**

The expenditures of the JDC continued to decline in the review period, as they had in every year since 1947, when the peak of $69,200,000 had been reached. Appropriations were $20,500,000 in the calendar year 1951, and $20,100,000 in the calendar year 1952.8

Since 1951 Israel had represented the largest area of JDC operations. JDC expenditures in Israel amounted to almost $9,000,000 in the calendar year 1952, or about 45 per cent of the total expenditures. In Israel, JDC conducted the Malben program of medical and welfare services for aged, sick, and handicapped immigrants, the second largest medical program in the country.

JDC appropriations for European areas continued to decline, as they had in previous years, absorbing $6,260,000 of the total in 1951 and $5,060,000 in 1952. By 1952, Europe represented 25 per cent of JDC appropriations, compared with 30 per cent in 1951. A further reduction in European grants was indicated for 1953, because JDC activities in Hungary, which had been the largest remaining area of its operations in Eastern Europe, had ended. The JDC also continued to finance programs of medical care and education in Morocco, Tunisia, Iran, and other Moslem countries.

**ORT**

In each year since 1947 the JDC, by agreement with the World ORT Union, had made grants for vocational training programs in Europe and North Africa. In 1953, for the first time, JDC also agreed to include ORT's program in Israel in its subvention. The 1953 agreement provided that ORT would receive from the JDC a minimum of $1,100,000, plus a percentage of all sums raised by the United Jewish Appeal over $70,000,000, up to a maximum of $1,500,000.

With funds obtained from the JDC and others raised independently in other countries, ORT spent a total of $2,750,000 in 1952. Its major area of operation was in Israel, where it spent $940,000. Other major areas in which ORT operated were Western Europe and North Africa.

The American ORT Federation and Women's ORT conducted membership campaign activities in the United States, collecting maximum contributions of twenty-five dollars per person.

---

8 The 1952 figure is tentative, prior to audit.
USNA and NYANA

The UJA's allotments to USNA and NYANA continued to decline very sharply in conformance with the trend in Jewish immigration to the United States.

For its national program of migration assistance, resettlement, reception of immigrants at ports of entry and similar services USNA expended $785,000 in 1952 compared with $1,450,000 in 1951.

Similarly, NYANA reduced its expenditures for financial relief and casework assistance to immigrant families in New York City from $4,892,000 in 1951 to $2,566,000 in 1952, and further reduced them to $656,600 for the first six months of 1953. This reflected the drop in the caseload from 1,734 active family service cases at the end of 1951, to 588 in 1952, and 429 at the end of the first six months of 1953.

Other UJA Beneficiaries

On the instructions of the Jewish Agency, UIA included a number of other beneficiary organizations, which received annual allocations on the basis of agreements that these organizations would not conduct separate campaigns for funds in the United States. The beneficiaries were Zionist groups which were active in colonization and other constructive projects. The purpose of the grants was to support the specific projects rather than the general organizational activities of the groups. Table 5 below indicates the beneficiary agencies and the amounts allocated in 1952 and 1953.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary Agency</th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mizrachi Palestine Fund</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Confederation of General Zionists</td>
<td>$562,500</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agudath Israel</td>
<td>$150,166</td>
<td>181,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poale Agudath Israel</td>
<td>$181,875</td>
<td>181,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Revisionists</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Overseas Agencies

Organizations other than the United Jewish Appeal reported total income of $17,400,000 in 1952 (see Appendix). This represented a small decline from the income of the same group of agencies in 1951. Hadassah represented by far the largest program in this group, with income of almost $9,000,000. Medical care accounted for more than half of its program in Israel.

In June 1952 Hadassah began construction on a new medical center, which was to provide a permanent replacement for the facilities which had been lost on Mt. Scopus. It was anticipated that this large-scale building project, whose cost was estimated at $10,000,000, would be completed by 1957.

Hadassah continued its fund-raising program in the United States on behalf
of Youth Aliyah, the youth immigration and training program of the Jewish Agency, towards which it collected almost $2,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; and for a variety of other purposes, including child welfare and vocational training, the Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical School, Jewish National Fund, and the Hadassah Supplies Bureau.

The American Committee for the Hebrew University, the American Committee for the Weizmann Institute, and the American Technion Society continued to conduct their own campaigns during this period. The UIT campaign (see American Jewish Year Book, 1953 [Vol. 54], p. 187), in which they had been joined for fund-raising purposes, had terminated at the end of 1951, and efforts made since that time to reconstitute the partnership did not prove successful. Conversations, however, were continuing in an effort to find some basis for cooperative fund raising. The CJFWF took an active interest in this problem and sought ways of bringing the three groups together.

The total income of the three institutions was $1,978,000 in 1952, representing an increase over the total obtained in 1951 ($1,883,000), when the three institutions were together in the UIT campaign. This increase was due to a number of factors, including an intensification of efforts, especially by the American Technion Society, to obtain contributions for building purposes.

All three institutions presented to the American contributing public a picture of rapidly expanding needs in the fields of their respective activities in Israel, and particularly the need to obtain large-scale funds for building purposes. They sought approval from local communities to conduct special campaigns, apart from their normal allocations received through the welfare funds, in order to obtain funds for building purposes.

Other overseas programs continued in 1952-53 with relatively little change from the previous year. HIAS's expenditures continued to decline both overseas and in the United States, reflecting the smaller number of Jewish immigrants. HIAS did continue to make grants for certain projects in Israel, including a free loan fund for assistance to immigrants and a temporary shelter program for unattached immigrants. HIAS expenditures in Israel were increasing yearly, as expenditures in other overseas areas declined.

The National Committee for Labor Israel (NCLI) and the Pioneer Women's Organization continued to raise funds on behalf of the various activities of the General Federation of Labor (Histadruth) in Israel. The NCLI collected somewhat less than in 1951, the Pioneer Women slightly more. The funds these organizations obtained went to support a variety of Histadruth projects, including agricultural settlements, vocational training, and educational and cultural activities. The Pioneer Women also participated in collections for Youth Aliyah and the JNF.

The American Fund for Israel Institutions (AFII) conducted a fund-raising campaign on behalf of 52 beneficiary institutions in Israel and six special projects. These institutions had a variety of purposes including education, social welfare, and cultural projects. During 1952-53 there was some shift of emphasis in the AFII program. Since the government of Israel was taking increasing responsibility in the field of social welfare, the AFII was reducing its
support to such institutions, and concentrating on educational and cultural projects.

The Federated Council of Israel Institutions (FCII) acted as the representative of a large number of yeshivot and social welfare institutions of a traditional type in seeking support from local federations and welfare funds.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine continued through its Committee on Control and Organization of Campaigns, to limit the extent of American fund raising for Israel. It granted authorizations in 1953 to twelve organizations, excluding only the FCII from its 1952 list (see American Jewish Year Book, 1953 [Vol. 54], p. 187). The Jewish Agency exercised controls only on fund raising (the timing and scope of campaigns, etc.), and did not extend its controls to questions of budget and program.

Domestic National Programs

Fifty-one organizations and institutions concerned with various types of Jewish domestic programs, such as community relations, health and welfare, cultural, religious, and educational activities, reported a total income of $20,700,000 in 1952—virtually the same as for 1951 and 1950. About one-fourth of these sums was contributed by federations and welfare funds. The organizations themselves raised the balance through direct fund-raising campaigns addressed to individual contributors interested in their specific programs.

Although the total income of domestic agencies had not varied since 1950, an examination of Table 2 in the Appendix indicates that groups of agencies and individual institutions within a given field differed in income among themselves. The amounts available for community relations programs for national service agencies and for secular cultural projects decreased in 1952. On the other hand, the income available to religious agencies, and to a lesser extent to health and welfare institutions, increased. The religious institutions accounted for the largest number of agencies and the largest amount of income in these groups. The increase of $500,000 in income reported in this field pointed to the fact that such institutions were still benefiting from the trend toward increasing their funds.

All agencies in the field of community relations had reduced income in 1952. The total declined from $5,890,000 in 1951 to $5,622,000 in the following year.8

8 After a long period of study and debate, the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) in September 1952 adopted a plan of coordination which was not acceptable to the American Jewish Committee (AJC) and the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL). As a result, both of these agencies withdrew from the NCRAC. Informal efforts were made to explore the possibilities of conciliation, which might lead to a restoration of cooperation among all national agencies in this field, but such efforts did not prove successful during the period under review.

The national agencies remaining in the NCRAC were the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish War Veterans of America, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The membership was broadened in 1953 with the inclusion of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations and the United Synagogue of America. These national organizations, together with the twenty-nine local community relations councils affiliated with the NCRAC, began early in 1953 to implement the new procedures which the plenum had adopted. A joint plan for
National Hospitals

National hospitals on which reports were available indicated income about 9 per cent higher in 1952 than in 1951, derived primarily from their own fund-raising campaigns. Federations and welfare funds supplied only about 7 per cent of the total.

Two of the institutions which had traditionally specialized in the treatment of tuberculosis were expanding their programs into other fields of medicine. The "City of Hope" of Los Angeles continued to implement its plan to develop a national medical center. It increased the number of beds for cancer patients from twenty-four in 1952 to fifty in 1953, and established a new heart surgery department with related research projects in March 1953. The Jewish Consumptive Relief Society of Denver extended its program to include nontuberculous chest diseases. On the other hand, the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital of Hot Springs, Ark., discontinued its general hospital program in September 1952, and restricted its services to the treatment of arthritis and related ailments.

Educational, Cultural and Religious Institutions

Table 2 in the Appendix lists the large number of organizations, both secular and religious, concerned with promoting programs of formal and informal education, rabbinical training, congregational activities, recreation and group work, Jewish research, and other aspects of group activity having a cultural emphasis. There were no major changes in these fields of work during the review period.

Plans were under way for the celebration of the tercentenary of Jewish settlement in America, scheduled to begin officially in September 1954. An American Jewish Tercentenary Committee of a broad representative character, including all sections of American Jewish organized life, began to function actively in the early part of 1953. Many organizations were planning their specific contributions to the tercentenary occasion. A number of special events and publications were under consideration.

Community relations work was approved in January 1953. It comprised a set of recommendations for the guidance of the national agencies and local councils in regard to major public issues to receive priority attention in the coming year, specific projects and activities to be sponsored, and the respective responsibilities to be undertaken by the various agencies in relation to them. In addition, the NCRAC initiated a reassessment process, designed to examine and evaluate the underlying assumptions and directions of major fields of community relations work. The Reassessment Committee issued its first report (on Inter-religious activities) in the spring of 1953. (See NCRAC publications, "Joint Plan for Jewish Community Relations 1953," March 1953, and "Community Relations Values of Interreligious Activities" June 1953.)

The AJC and ADL, while not participating in the NCRAC, proceeded to establish joint operating committees to coordinate their work in six fields where they were both active. This was a pattern of coordination which the AJC and ADL had proposed, during the NCRAC evaluative study, as an alternative to the plan which the NCRAC finally adopted.

Because of critical problems in the field of United States immigration policy, the community relations agencies achieved a degree of coordination on this problem. They held periodic meetings for informal clearance on policies and procedures. As a result, some unity was retained in representing Jewish views to governmental authorities on immigration matters.
A further development in communal budgeting for national agencies occurred in the spring of 1953, through a cooperative "budget review" process initiated by the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC), together with a number of national agencies. The LCBC, an informal body made up of officers of Jewish welfare funds in the larger cities (exclusive of New York) had been organized in 1948 for joint discussions and budgetary hearings with national agencies. It had played an active role in stimulating the NCRAC evaluative study and was represented on the study committee. From time to time the LCBC had also made recommendations to its parent bodies as to the budgetary needs of national agencies.

In 1953, the LCBC conducted a systematic review of the budgets of the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, the NCRAC, and the National Jewish Welfare Board. Each of these agencies submitted full statements of projected programs and needs to the LCBC and joint discussions were conducted, resulting in cooperative agreements between the LCBC and these agencies as to their requirements in 1953, within the realistic fund-raising expectations of 1953 campaigns. Although complete reports were not available, it was indicated that the agencies participating in this budget review would receive slightly larger grants from welfare funds in 1953 than in 1952.

Arnold Gurin
TABLE I

RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES

| Overseas Total | Project Work | American Friends of Hebrew University | American Jewish Committee for Overseas Education | Overseas Aid Committee | Jewish National Fund | National Council of Jewish Women | United Jewish Appeal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$252,770</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Work</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of Hebrew University</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee for Overseas Education</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Aid Committee</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
<td>$253,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Receptations and Werasa Funds an Other Sources, 1952 and 1953

Appendix
FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE 1 (Continued)

b Excludes income obtained through UIT.
1 Excludes $7,600 collected in 1952 and $37,245 in 1951 from foreign countries.
1 Includes $125,820 collected from NY-UJA in lieu of an independent campaign in NYC.
* Income from Philharmonic Tour; however expenses for the tour were $392,184, making a loss of $71,333 for the tour.
1 Records do not designate what part of income was allocated from federations and welfare funds.
6 Excludes $79,121,6 raised in 1952 and $818,277 raised in 1951 for Jewish National Fund.
7 Excludes $7,014 raised for the JNF and $25,000 granted by Senior Hadassah.
* Excludes $11,521 raised for JNF and $24,532 granted by Hadassah.
1 Excludes $33,172 in 1952 and $84,232 in 1951 contributed by other countries.
* Excludes $217,754 in 1952 and $237,603 in 1951 which was received from IRO and other governmental agencies.
* Excludes $447,439 in foreign contributions in 1951 and $405,832 in 1952.
* Estimated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Federation of Century City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Federation of Long Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Federation of Queens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Federation of Suffolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Federation of Westchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Federation of West Long Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Federation of Westchester and North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Jewish Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2 (Continued)

Receipts of National Jewish Agencies for Domestic Programs from Federations and Welfare Funds and Other Sources, 1952 and 1951—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Braille Institute</th>
<th>3,590</th>
<th>3,660</th>
<th>24,960</th>
<th>41,478</th>
<th>1,039</th>
<th>1,184</th>
<th>29,889</th>
<th>46,322</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>8,595</td>
<td>7,924</td>
<td>93,474</td>
<td>88,516</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>102,829</td>
<td>97,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Society</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,181</td>
<td>21,845</td>
<td>216,155</td>
<td>200,064</td>
<td>232,336</td>
<td>221,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers' Seminary</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>36,706</td>
<td>37,113</td>
<td>12,858</td>
<td>12,721</td>
<td>53,390</td>
<td>54,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menorah Association</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>32,470</td>
<td>32,111</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>3,851</td>
<td>34,774</td>
<td>35,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural College</td>
<td>14,387</td>
<td>13,472</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>29,233</td>
<td>151,975</td>
<td>185,927</td>
<td>197,362</td>
<td>228,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish Scientific Institute</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>120,346</td>
<td>270,172</td>
<td>688,882</td>
<td>830,126</td>
<td>809,215</td>
<td>1,100,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>32,036</td>
<td>32,549</td>
<td>132,553</td>
<td>129,920</td>
<td>164,651</td>
<td>162,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$547,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>$577,826</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,020,661</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,033,328</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,266,433</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,399,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,834,164</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,010,378</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religious Agencies

| Beth Jacob Schools, National Council of | $3,858 | $3,413 | $106,877 | $101,759 | $44,204 | $34,790 | $154,939 | $139,962 |
| Beth Jacob Teachers' Seminary | 4,800 | 4,850 | 246,223 | 204,645 | 51,393 | 53,635 | 302,416 | 263,130 |
| Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary | 2,557 | 2,715 | 59,005 | 56,865 | 5,588 | 5,155 | 61,562 | 61,400 |
| Chajm Lublin Theological Seminary | k | k | 66,991 | 61,755 | 5,588 | 4,755 | 79,949 | 70,171 |
| Chaim Berlin Yeshiva Mesilla | 7,856 | 7,029 | 121,791 | 132,974 | 55,590 | 49,913 | 185,336 | 189,906 |
| Hebrew Theological College | 33,138 | 35,960 | 217,934 | 227,869 | 69,605 | 37,124 | 320,677 | 300,953 |
| Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion | 71,968 | 65,814 | 611,236 | 562,980 | 274,091 | 285,737 | 957,295 | 914,530 |
| Union of American Hebrew Congregations | 71,967 | 65,814 | 585,076 | 542,491 | 66,914 | 99,043 | 723,557 | 708,248 |
| Jewish Theological Seminary | 140,955 | 127,274 | 1,105,300 | 1,073,729 | 239,171 | 200,573 | 1,480,376 | 1,407,485 |
| United Lubavitch Yeshivah | 11,299 | 12,372 | 323,149 | 296,268 | 29,792 | 18,329 | 364,240 | 324,969 |
| Mirer Yeshiva Central Institute | 17,300 | 17,945 | 137,938 | 188,100 | 6,460 | 7,301 | 161,698 | 206,045 |
| Mizrahi National Education Committee | k | k | 41,335 | 43,458 | 4,543 | 7,301 | 48,875 | 50,759 |
| Ner Israel Rabbinical College | 7,087 | 7,326 | 160,726 | 114,599 | 16,545 | 19,899 | 184,358 | 158,823 |
| Rabbinical Seminary of America | 16,422 | 11,509 | 131,199 | 127,741 | 9,951 | 6,648 | 157,572 | 149,898 |
| Telshe Rabbinical College | 10,291 | 9,555 | 137,876 | 133,500 | 29,219 | 25,971 | 177,386 | 169,026 |
| Mesilla Tifereth Jerusalem | 5,608 | 7,004 | 102,004 | 118,459 | 19,744 | 18,513 | 127,356 | 144,376 |
| Torah Umesorah | 2,846 | 2,750 | 40,085 | 34,243 | 4,642 | 6,288 | 47,573 | 43,281 |
| Torah Vodaath, Yeshiva | k | k | 488,517 | 432,295 | 151,439 | 156,900 | 66,956 | 580,285 |
| Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations | 3,985 | 3,778 | 21,673 | 14,995 | 138,639 | 125,036 | 164,297 | 143,809 |
| Yavneh Hebrew Theological Seminary | 1,125 | 1,087 | 32,147 | 36,791 | 13,521 | 14,377 | 46,793 | 51,168 |
| Yeshiva University | 101,304 | 105,786 | 601,345 | 592,823 | 423,282 | 314,699 | 1,125,931 | 1,013,308 |
| **Sub-Total** | **$517,835** | **$492,049** | **$5,333,377** | **$5,105,662** | **$1,654,333** | **$1,475,821** | **$7,505,545** | **$7,073,532** |
| **Total Domestic** | **$5,180,404** | **$5,799,377** | **$11,545,478** | **$10,996,666** | **$3,998,630** | **$3,799,939** | **$20,722,513** | **$20,591,982** |

* Preliminary figures.
* Campaign costs for NYC are excluded for both 1951 and 1952; as this information has not been made available for 1952; the fund-raising campaign cost was $199,000 in 1951.
FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE 2 (Continued)

*Only non-JDA income included.

• Includes $370,177 for 1952 and $422,678 for 1951 contributions from New York UJA, but excludes welfare fund grants retained by local divisions.

• Excludes income from overseas campaigns of World Jewish Congress which was $136,722 in 1952, and $126,021 in 1951.

• These totals exclude the "Other Income" of NCRAC (which was obtained from national agencies) in order to avoid double counting.

• The National Jewish Hospital and the Ex-Patients' Tubercular Home failed to supply information for 1952 and were, therefore, eliminated from this table.

• Includes $341,959 in 1952 and $398,847 in 1951 from New York UJA.

• Excludes grants of $200,000 each year from the Anti-Defamation League.

• Records do not indicate what part of the total contributions came from welfare funds.

• The ZOA has shifted its fiscal year so that the 1952 figures cover only 11 months.

• The Hebrew Union College and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations ran a joint campaign which they shared equally; each also had an independent income. The joint campaign collected $1,219,536 in 1952 and $1,128,540 in 1951.

• A small sum received for tuition is included as "Other Contributions" rather than "Other Income" because the audit does not separate these items.
AMERICAN REACTION TO SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Ever since 1947, when the Soviet Union began its campaign against “cosmopolitanism,” many observers had believed that the Soviet government was preparing to embark upon an anti-Jewish campaign. This belief was strengthened in the fall of 1948 when the Soviet campaign against “Jewish bourgeois nationalism” and Zionism was initiated by Ilya Ehrenburg. The period under review (July 1, 1952 through June 30, 1953) provided abundant confirmation of the anti-Jewish character of the new Communist line.

During the trial of Rudolph Slansky and thirteen other leading Czech Communists in Prague on November 20, 1952, the anti-Semitic implications of Communism became unequivocal. In quick succession there followed during the winter of 1952-53 the purges of leading Jewish Communists in East Germany, the flight of East German Jewish refugees to West Berlin, and the anti-Jewish purges in Hungary and Rumania. These culminated in the arrest of the Moscow doctors on charges which implicated almost every major Jewish organization throughout the world. In the United States (as indeed throughout the free world) fear and foreboding for the fate of the Jews behind the Iron Curtain became uppermost in the minds of most Jews. A questionnaire distributed by the American Jewish Committee’s Department of Scientific Research during March and April 1953 among Jewish residents in a typical middle-sized Jewish community on the Atlantic seaboard revealed that about 80 per cent of the respondents were “very disturbed” by the open anti-Semitic turn of events in Eastern Europe, and about 14 per cent were “somewhat disturbed.”

Protests and Statements

With the memory of Nazi Germany’s murder of 6,000,000 Jews still fresh in their minds, American Jews were in the main convinced that only a tremendous worldwide protest could stop the further development of the Communist anti-Semitic campaign.

Jewish Organizations

Jewish organizations were naturally the first to react to the violent outbreak of Communist anti-Semitism.

While some of the statements, declarations and resolutions limited themselves to expressions of abhorrence and protest, appealing for worldwide denunciation of Communism and Communist anti-Semitism (for example, the declaration issued at the American Jewish Committee annual meeting, January 30, 1953, and the statement issued by the National Community Relations Advisory Council on December 3, 1952), other resolutions urged specific actions on the part of various public bodies. The Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (November 25, 1952), the Jewish Labor Committee (Decem-

---

1 For detailed accounts of these events, see p. 263.
ber 21, 1952), the American Jewish Congress (February 24, 1953), the Synagogue Council of America (February 3, 1953) and the Rabbinical Council of America (January 22, 1953), all demanded that the UN investigate and act on the charge of Soviet anti-Semitism. The Jewish Labor Committee also addressed a memorandum on January 21, 1953, to the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Georgi N. Zarubin, demanding a halt to the anti-Semitic campaign and all deportations.

The National Jewish Youth Conference (January 30, 1953), and the Women's League for Israel, were among organizations to urge Congress to pass resolutions of protest.

Zionist and pro-Zionist groups linked the demand for free emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union with statements of Israel's willingness to accept and the Zionist movement's readiness to aid such emigrants (Pioneer Women [Labor Zionist], January 30, 1953; the Zionist Organization of America [General Zionist], February 15, 1953; the United Jewish Appeal, February 15, 1953; and the American Financial & Development Corporation for the Israel Bond Drive, March 6, 1953).²

Most local Jewish community councils issued statements of protest, many of them (e.g., Boston, Mass., New Orleans, La., and Newark, N.J.) sending copies to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the United States State Department, and Henry C. Lodge, United States ambassador to the UN.

Protestant and Catholic Protest

Non-Jewish religious organizations also voiced their abhorrence of and protest against the Soviet anti-Semitic campaign. These included the Catholic magazine Commonweal (February 20, 1953); the Supreme Directorate of the Catholic Daughters of America (March 3, 1953); and the Michigan Catholic, a diocesan newspaper (March 1953); National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (January 28, 1953); the Congregational Christian Churches and its Council for Social Action (February 4, 1953); the National Lutheran Council (April 1953); and the National Conference of Christians and Jews (February 21, 1953). Commonweal, in its issue of February 20, 1953, published a statement of protest signed by 35 prominent Catholics and by the editors of the journal. The signers, who included a Cabinet member, two Senators, and presidents of three colleges and of seven national Catholic organizations, called "upon the conscience of the world through governments and the United Nations to protest against the outrageous new anti-Semitism of the Communist world."

Nonsectarian Organizations

The labor movement was particularly concerned with the manifestations of Soviet anti-Semitism, and issued pronouncements to that effect (the Inter-

³On the other hand, Emanuel Sherer, a leader of the Jewish Labor Bund, argued that the Zionists were utilizing the Prague trial for the furtherance of Zionist ideology (Jewish Newsletter February 2, 1953); the American Council for Judaism (March 2, 1953) drew the same inference.
The Congress of Industrial Organizations, at its 14th Constitutional Convention, December 1-5, 1952, passed a resolution denouncing the "latest use of anti-Semitism in the Czechoslovak trial" and urging "the American government to bring the Soviet dictators before the bar of world opinion through the United Nations and other appropriate international bodies, in order to obtain the verdict of the civilized world upon this latest offense against mankind."

On February 12, 1953, the Nation Associates initiated a statement signed by fifty-one prominent church and civic leaders which was addressed to President Eisenhower. A week later, on February 19, 1953, another group of fifty-one church and civic leaders sent an appeal to the President that differed from that of the Nation Associates only in its opposition to any United States move to sponsor the resettlement of Jewish refugees from Soviet areas in Israel—on the ground that would "undoubtedly alienate not only the Arab states adjacent to Israel, but, indeed, the whole Moslem world."

On March 18, 1953, 136 American physicians joined in signing a letter to the UN Secretary General Trygve Lie, calling for the immediate establishment by the UN of an international committee to investigate Soviet accusations against the Moscow doctors. (A similar recommendation was made on March 27, 1953, by the World Medical Association, meeting in Lisbon, Portugal.)

Other nonsectarian groups which issued sharp condemnations of the Soviet anti-Semitic policy included the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Americans for Democratic Action, the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, and Freedom House.

**Community Action**

The first public meeting to protest Soviet anti-Semitism was called by the Jewish Labor Committee on December 21, 1952, in New York City. Attended by over 1,500 people, the meeting represented the protest of Jewish labor elements in New York. Messages were received from President Eisenhower, Walter P. Reuther, president of the Congress for Industrial Organizations, and other government and labor leaders. President Eisenhower's message declared:

Once again the evil of totalitarianism stands nakedly revealed to all the world. The trial in Prague of Rudolph Slansky and his associates was the mockery of civilized and humanitarian values. Slansky and his associates were used to rule Czechoslovakia in the interests of Soviet Communism until, it seems, even they were no longer pliant tools and could serve their masters better by being executed. But their trial and execution, like every undertaking by a dictatorship, had to be a political act. This particular political act was designed to unloose a campaign of rabid anti-Semitism through Soviet Russia and the satellite nations of Eastern Europe.
The Communists, like the Russian Czars and the German Nazis, are using the Jews as scapegoats for the failure of their regime.

On January 6, 1953, a meeting of representatives of thirty-five national Jewish organizations, called by the American Zionist Council, was held in New York City.

At this meeting, an *ad hoc* committee was appointed "for the purpose of considering all positive action to be taken to mobilize public opinion and action in the United States, in order to combat the attacks against the Jewish people emanating from Prague and other countries in Eastern Europe."

At a plenary meeting held on February 4, 1953, the group agreed to call a public meeting on February 16 in Manhattan Center under its auspices.

The meeting, attended by about 3,500 persons, adopted a resolution condemning the Soviet Union and its satellites for using anti-Semitism as a political instrument, and asking those countries to permit the emigration of Jews to Israel.

In New York City, the Jewish War Veterans called an outdoor protest meeting in Union Square on April 16, 1953, in which about 5,000 persons participated. In Brooklyn, N. Y., a protest meeting was held on March 22, 1953, under joint Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, and labor sponsorship. Similar meetings were held in Chicago, Ill.; Hartford, Conn.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Boston, Mass.; Newark, N. J.; Miami Beach, Fla.

On January 23, 1953, about 150 persons picketed the headquarters of the Soviet Union's UN delegation in New York. The demonstrations were under the auspices of the Committee to Combat Soviet Religious Persecution and Genocide, a coordinating body of several Jewish and non-Jewish fraternal and labor groups. On January 30, 1953, members of the Social Democratic Federation, the Socialist Party, and the Jewish Labor Bund picketed the offices of the Communist *Daily Worker* and *Morning Freiheit*. They were joined by members of Labor Zionist organizations.

**Jewish Agency World Conference**

After several weeks of discussion, the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine on February 13, 1953, invited Jewish organizations in thirty-eight countries to participate in a conference planned for March 10 in Zurich.


*The American Jewish Committee declined to co-sponsor this meeting on the grounds that it was not being prepared as nonsectarian, as originally planned. Subsequently, thirty-one organizations sponsored the meeting, including several (the Workmen's Circle, New York Board of Rabbis, and the Zionist Youth Council) that had not participated in earlier discussions.*
Switzerland, "to consider the plight of Eastern European Jewry and to set forth the reaction of authorized Jewish representatives." The invitation also proposed that the conference "demand the right for Eastern European Jews to emigrate, stressing the readiness of Israel to receive them." Almost all organizations accepted the invitation. On March 5, however, the Jewish Agency decided to postpone the conference in view of the news of Stalin's fatal illness.

Press, Radio and Television

From the start of the Prague trial on November 20, 1952, the American press devoted considerable space to reporting the anti-Jewish events behind the Iron Curtain. Many of the nation's newspapers devoted at least one editorial to the subject, some publishing several. While there was unanimity in condemnation of and abhorrence for the expressions of Communist anti-Semitism, there was a variety of opinion on the implications of the campaign. The most popular interpretations were: (1) that the Communist anti-Semitic campaign was primarily designed to bring the Arab world closer to the Soviet orbit; (2) that it was a broader effort to align all anti-democratic forces throughout the world against the West, with which Jews were identified; and (3) that it was chiefly intended to ease internal tensions within the Communist world by exploiting Jews as scapegoats for government failures.

These views were also expressed in the nation's periodicals, most of which devoted at least one major article to these events. Radio and television news broadcasts presented much factual information. Commentators and news analysts discussed the implications of Soviet anti-Semitism and there were numerous forums and panel discussions on the subject.


The subject of Communist anti-Semitism was also featured in broadcasts emanating from Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America. Many civic, fraternal and political organizations arranged lectures and discussions on the subject.

Resolutions by Federal and State Legislative Bodies

On February 16, 1953, Sen. James E. Murray (Dem., Mont.) introduced a resolution on behalf of himself and Sens. Dennis Chavez (Dem., New
Mexico), Lister Hill (Dem., Alabama), Harley M. Kilgore (Dem., W. Va.), Wayne Morse (Indep., Ore.), Joseph R. McCarthy (Rep., Wis.), Edward J. Thye (Rep., Minn.), Paul H. Douglas (Dem., Ill.), Guy M. Gillette (Dem., Ia.), Hubert H. Humphrey (Dem., Minn.), Estes Kefauver (Dem., Tenn.), Herbert H. Lehman (Dem., N.Y.), John O. Pastore (Dem., R.I.), John Sherman Cooper (Rep., Ky.), Henry M. Jackson (Dem., Wash.), John F. Kennedy (Dem., Mass.), Mike Mansfield (Dem., Montana), William A. Purcell (Rep., Conn.), Irving M. Ives (Rep., N.Y.), Robert C. Hendrickson (Rep., N.J.), Matthew M. Neely (Dem., W. Va.), and Prescott Bush (Rep., Conn.). The resolution expressed the Senate's profound sense of shock at the persecution of the Jews in the USSR and urged the Government of the United States to convey its grave concern to the Government of the Soviet Union and to request that prompt steps be taken to remove all cause for fears about the future security of the Jews in the Soviet Union. That same day, Sen. Hendrickson, on behalf of himself and Sen. Homer Ferguson (Rep., Mich.), and H. Alexander Smith (Rep., N.J.), introduced another resolution which was limited to a condemnation of the USSR and its satellites for its anti-Semitic campaign. This resolution, like the first, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

On February 25, 1953, Sen. Alexander Wiley (Rep., Wis.), chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, favorably reported on an amended resolution which condemned religious and ethnic persecution of various groups in the USSR and its satellites and urged the President to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the UN. Discussion on this resolution took place the following day. Passed by a vote of 79 yeas, with 17 senators absent, the resolution (S. Res. 84) as finally amended read:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups, such as the persecution of Greek Orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic, and Balkan States and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages, in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them as may be suitable under its charter.

In the House of Representatives, eighteen resolutions with varying texts were presented during the period from January 22 through July 29, 1953. Introducing these resolutions were Reps. Emanuel Celler (Dem., N.Y.), Hugh J. Addonizio (Dem., N.J.), Kenneth B. Keating (Rep., N.Y.), Isidore Dollinger (Dem., N.Y.), Edna F. Kelly (Dem., N.Y.), Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (Dem., N.J.), Sidney A. Fine (Dem., N.Y.), Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. (Dem.,
Reaction of American Communists

When the Slansky trial began, the American Communist press at first denied the Jewishness of the defendants and disclaimed responsibility for reports which they alleged originated from "capitalist, anti-Soviet" sources. Once it became apparent, however, that these reports were authentic, the Communists tried to play down the anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist elements in the trial. By the middle of December 1952, the Communists had a complete line on the Prague trial and the subsequent events. Published first in the January 1953 issue of the Communist monthly *Jewish Life,* and then widely distributed as a pamphlet entitled *The Truth About the Prague Trial,* the line rejected charges of Communist anti-Semitism, and declared that all the allegations against the defendants were true—that in short Zionists and Israelis were indeed the subservient tools of American intelligence.

As the weeks passed, elaborations on this line began to appear which themselves contained anti-Jewish invective. An article in the *Daily Worker* of March 8, 1953, for example, stated:

Such is the program of the U. S. war clique, shamelessly aided by the treacherous groups of wealthy Jews in its ranks, and those of their partners in the labor movement like David Dubinsky's Jewish Labor Committee. They are truly "coining profits out of the ashes of Auschwitz."

The subject of Communist anti-Semitism was apparently a difficult one for the Communists to solve, especially for themselves, and in fact, led to several defections from the Party. But the upheaval was still greater among persons who had traditionally been nonparty supporters of the Soviet Union. A prominent example was James Waterman Wise, who wrote as follows in an article entitled "Hitler Over the Kremlin" (*Opinion,* January-February, 1953):
These lines are hard to write. They constitute not only the personal admission that I was wrong in a conviction earnestly held, but that the basis of that conviction was utterly false. I refer, of course, to the status of the Jews in the Soviet Union, and to Russia's adoption of anti-Semitism as a political instrument.

Disagreement on Communist anti-Semitism alienated Communists from the rest of the membership in various organizations, particularly in trade unions. This was especially the case in the so-called "Jewish trades" in the garment industry, where the Communist minorities who opposed resolutions condemning Communist anti-Semitism were branded as "red fascists." In one local of the CIO's Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, Louis Hollander, general manager of the union's Joint Board, warned that support of Communist anti-Semitism would entail suspension from the union.

Discussion in United Nations

Prior to the opening of the seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations (UN) on February 24, 1953, it was believed that Communist anti-Semitism would be the subject of an official complaint against the Soviet Union. On February 10, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, ruler of the Dominican Republic, said that his country planned to bring the question before the UN. There was also some speculation that Israel would raise the subject.

The matter was not, however, formally placed on the UN agenda, though it was discussed several times by the various delegates in connection with other questions. The first comment was made by U.S. representative Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., in his statement on the Korean situation, on February 25, 1953. The pertinent passage was:

Mr. President, peace not only depends on collective security; it must also be based on equal treatment of human beings. As long as there is racial or religious discrimination, just so long is the day of peace postponed. Conditions are not perfect in any country in this regard, but in many lands—I know this is true in my own—great and successful advances are being made.

We have, however, observed with indignation the persecution of Christians, Moslems, and Jews that has been taking place in the Soviet Union for some time. That discrimination is not only wicked; it will also in the end prove to be totally ineffective, because there is an undefeatable quality in human nature which will always resist totalitarian attempts to destroy religious and ethnic freedom.

On March 24, 1953, during a debate on a Czechoslovak complaint that the United States was interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies, Golda Myerson of Israel took the floor to give a brief blanket denial of the Soviet bloc's charges against the Zionist movement. She said then that her delegation would deal more fully with the subject later on. Polish delegate Julius Katz-Suchy replied to Mrs. Myerson by sustaining the Soviet charges against the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and "Zionist" organizations.

The next day, March 25, United States delegate Lodge, Britain's Sir Gladwyn Jebb, and Canada's David Johnson, continuing the debate on
Czechoslovakia's complaint, mentioned, in passing, the Communist persecution of religious minorities. On March 26, Czechoslovakia's Vaclav David and the Soviet Union's Andrei Gromyko replied to Mrs. Myerson's charges; France's Henri Hoppenot mentioned the "hideous spectre of anti-Semitism" behind the Slansky trial. Uruguayan delegate Enriques Fabregat also briefly referred to discrimination in Czechoslovakia. Six Middle Eastern states—Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Syria—abstained from voting on the Czechoslovak complaint on the grounds that the vote of rejection of the Czechoslovak complaint that they had originally intended might be interpreted as a rejection of the accusations of subversive Zionist activities, as well.

On April 13, 1953, in the discussion of a Polish proposal on measures to avert war and strengthen peace and friendship among nations, Panamanian representative Eusebio A. Morales referred to the Soviet Union's retraction of the charges against the doctors; he pointed out that it had been no slander to accuse the Soviet Union of fostering racial hatred. Mrs. Myerson briefly commented that anti-Jewish discrimination in any form was incompatible with the strengthening of international peace. Later that day, the Cuban delegate Emilio Nunez-Portuondo declared that the main obstacle between peoples was the racial and religious persecutions carried out by the Communist governments; he then went into a lengthy discussion of events in those countries. He was followed by Joaquin Salazar, representative of the Dominican Republic, who charged that anti-Semitism had become the order of the day in international Communism. Rebuttal to these charges came from Polish delegate Skrzesezewski, who said that the previous speakers had slandered the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies and claimed that complete freedom for all religious and racial groups existed in Poland.

On April 14 and 15, delegates from the Arab countries attacked Israel and Zionism and sustained the Soviet position. Speakers included Abdullah I. Bakr of Iraq, Edward A. Rizk of Lebanon, and Farid Zeineddine of Syria. The following day, on April 16, Israel's Abba S. Eban replied to the Arab accusations and also charged that the Communist anti-Jewish campaign increased tensions in the Middle East.

There was no further reference to the subject of Communist anti-Semitism in General Assembly discussions.

**Reaction to the Reversal**

On April 4, 1953, Pravda, the organ of the Soviet government, announced that the charges against the Moscow doctors were being dropped. American press reaction to this abrupt turnabout was cautious. Commenting on the statement in Pravda that one of the objectives of the "fabricated plot" was to inflame "national hostilities," The New York Times stated on April 7: "Against the background of this official admission let us hope that Communist propaganda here and abroad will cease to insult our intelligence by continuing to insist that there is no racial discrimination or prejudice" in the Soviet Union. The New York Post declared on April 6 that "we dare not
embrace wistful conclusions or let down our guard." Many papers inter-
preted the reversal as an attempt on the part of the new Soviet leaders to
consolidate their position within the country and as evidence of an internal
struggle for power.

A similar position was taken by the Anti-Defamation League (April 6,
1953), the American Jewish Committee (May 2, 1953), and the Jewish Labor
Committee (April 17, 1953), all of whom expressed the view that anti-
Semitism in the Soviet Union and its satellites was a continuing problem,
subject to official exploitation according to the regimes' needs.

Lucy Dawidowicz