

\*\*\*\*\*

# Communal Affairs

---

## RELIGION

**D**URING the period under review (July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954), the trend towards physical expansion of congregations continued. In addition to the establishment of new congregations, many of the older metropolitan congregations sought new quarters on the outskirts of large cities, nearer the new residences of their members. A certain resistance to this expansion was encountered on the part of the general population, especially where large facilities were being planned. Court litigations developed in the suburban areas of Philadelphia, Pa., Dallas, Tex., Pittsburgh, Pa., Indianapolis, Ind., and Cleveland, Ohio. Generally, the courts held in favor of the synagogues. Thus, in Elkins Park, a suburb of Philadelphia, Pa., opponents of a new synagogue took legal action, declaring that they were not opposed to a conventional synagogue, but to the "monstrous design proposed that would attract crowds of curious." This legal action followed the announcement, in June 1954, that the new Beth Sholom synagogue designed by the noted architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, would be based on a modern interpretation of Mount Sinai, consisting of "a small mountain built of rugged, massive slabs of concrete, steel and glass."

There was sharp disagreement among observers on the significance of synagogue growth. Abraham S. Halkin (*Judaism*, Spring 1954), believed that "the increase in the number of synagogues built can . . . be readily ascribed to geographic and social factors rather than to a religious revival." Synagogue affiliation, Halkin felt, was the result of social pressure; the new synagogue building served as a social center for young parents, and the accelerated pace of physical expansion was "almost external or surface-deep." Halkin saw little evidence of "a return to Judaism . . . a readiness to observe," but rather a general desire to participate in community service.

On the other hand, Will Herberg (*Judaism*, Summer 1954), perceived a reversal of the trend toward the abandonment of the Jewish religious tradition. Herberg saw behind the "physical growth" of Jewish religious institutions a discernible "interest in, and concern with religion as manifested by the present student generation."

### *Organization and Planning*

It had been estimated that nearly 3,400,000 of the approximately 5,000,000 American Jews were associated with a synagogue or temple, with the Reform

and Conservative congregations accounting for approximately 500,000 members each, the remainder being affiliated with Orthodox congregations. It was the opinion of this author, based on his experiences with Jews in the armed forces and in several universities, that between 85 and 90 per cent of American Jews had some definite contacts with organized Jewish religion, even though for many they did not extend beyond ceremonials surrounding birth, marriage, confirmation, and death.

During the year under review, the national lay bodies of Orthodoxy, Conservative, and Reform, all performed a variety of functions. Each had refined and developed its services to the individual congregations. These included providing professional guidance on the procurement of rabbis, cantors, teachers, and administrative directors; assisting sisterhoods and men's clubs with programming; counseling member congregations in the building or remodeling of synagogue structures; servicing religious school needs, especially in the publication of textbooks, teaching manuals, and the creation of audio-visual materials; and aiding in establishing adult education programs.

#### ORTHODOX

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (UOJC) admitted seventeen new congregations in 1953-54, bringing its total to 720. In addition, the UOJC regarded itself in November 1954 as "the parent body of over 2,000 traditional congregations" in the United States and Canada. Membership of the UOJC's Women's Branch at the time of its biennial convention in November 1953 was said to be 350,000.

#### CONSERVATIVE

The United Synagogue of America began its forty-second year of activities with a membership of 483 Conservative congregations in the United States and Canada. A total of 570 sisterhoods were affiliated with the National Women's League of the United Synagogue, as of January 1954.

An ambitious program of Conservative regional conferences was undertaken during the year 1953-54, with meetings held in San Antonio, Tex., Miami, Fla., Atlanta, Ga., and Des Moines, Iowa.

#### REFORM

In October 1953, Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) issued a report covering the decade 1943-53. UAHC congregational families had increased from 50,000 to over 150,000; congregations had increased from 300 to 461; the UAHC budget had grown from \$150,000 to \$1,370,000. Sisterhoods numbered 490, with 85,000 members in seven countries; brotherhoods, 275, with over 50,000 members; and youth groups, 370, with over 10,000 members.

At its annual executive committee meeting (June 1954), the UAHC announced the addition of eight new congregations, bringing its membership to 483 temples, an increase of 22 over 1953. It was estimated that an addi-

tional fifty Reform congregations were as yet unaffiliated with a national body.

#### RABBINIC BODIES

The ranks of the rabbinate were increased during the year under discussion, with the accretion of larger classes of theological seminary graduates. The 1954 *Yearbook of American Churches* set the figure for Jewish ordained clergy at 3,965. As of June 1954 the four major rabbinic bodies accounted for 2,402 clergymen: the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, 601; the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Reform), 677; the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative), 598; and the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox), 526.

#### LOCAL RABBINIC ORGANIZATIONS

During the year under review, the membership of the New York Board of Rabbis (NYBR) grew to 650. In March 1954, the NYBR reorganized the Millah Board, whose objective was to maintain the high standards of rabbinical and medical supervision of circumcision.

#### RELIGIOUS COOPERATION

In June 1954 the Synagogue Council of America announced the creation of a National Advisory Council consisting of 100 Jewish leaders from all parts of the United States, whose purpose was to develop a long-range program to assert the primacy of the synagogue in all aspects of Jewish life. Plans were being made for a general assembly to be convoked by the council in November 1954, in connection with the celebration of the tercentenary anniversary of Jewish settlement in the United States. Several meetings of the presidents of the Rabbinical Council of America, the Rabbinical Assembly of America, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis were held. Agreement was reached to publish a joint semiannual rabbinical journal, under Synagogue Council auspices, which, avoiding theological controversy, would deal with practical rabbinic affairs as well as provide useful material for rabbis.

In May 1954, Ira Eisenstein, president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, attacked the American Jewish Committee for its failure to cooperate with the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), and its usurpation of functions belonging to the Synagogue Council of America (see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1954 [Vol. 55], p. 95-96; see also 1953 [Vol. 54], p. 162 and f.) Rabbi Eisenstein urged that religious bodies establish closer ties with the NCRAC.

#### *Religious Practices*

At its biennial convention in November 1953, the United Synagogue of America heard a survey of religious practices among the Conservative lay leadership. It was reported, on the basis of 1,787 replies to 9,100 question-

naires, that 57 per cent did not observe any Friday night Sabbath rituals; 37 per cent observed the dietary laws; 13 per cent recited daily prayers; 60 per cent had no religious education beyond bar mitzvah; and fewer than half of the synagogue board members had an adequate knowledge of the "aims, tendencies, and practices of the Conservative movement."

The National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods revealed in *American Judaism* (December 1953; March 1954) the results of a questionnaire distributed to their Reform constituents. Thirty-one per cent attended the synagogue weekly, 31 per cent attended monthly, 26 per cent seldom, and 12 per cent restricted their attendance to the High Holy Days. Friday evening services had become the norm for Sabbath congregational worship—92 per cent of the Reform congregations polled held Friday evening services, 48 per cent Saturday morning, and 8 per cent Sunday. The reading of the Torah, traditionally performed on Saturday morning, was part of the Friday evening ritual in 58 per cent of the congregations. Eighty-nine per cent of the congregations reported a *kiddush* ritual; 45 per cent used a cantor; 92 per cent introduced the bar mitzvah ritual; and 35 per cent the bat mitzvah ritual. Forty-five per cent favored wearing a *talit* (prayer shawl), and 21 per cent the wearing of a head covering at bar mitzvah ceremonies. Ninety-four per cent preferred the blowing of the shofar (ram's horn) on Rosh Hashonah (rather than the organ substitute). Fifty-one per cent fasted on Yom Kippur. Women continued to play a larger role in Reform congregational life. Eighty-two per cent of the congregations permitted women to assist in the service; 21 per cent allowed women to participate in the Torah services.

There was a greater demand for intensive religious education. While 66 per cent favored the Sunday School, 34 per cent favored two or more days of religious education; 74 per cent favored the teaching of Hebrew. Fifty-nine per cent reported lighting Sabbath candles; 26 per cent performed the *kiddush* ritual; 18 per cent, the blessing of the bread; 4 per cent, grace after meals; 7 per cent, the morning prayer; 33 per cent, the bedtime prayer; 74 per cent held the Passover Seder; 93 per cent ate *matzot* during Passover; 47 per cent placed *mezuzot* on their doors. A considerable proportion of Reform families still observed some elements of the dietary laws: 8 per cent kept *kashrut*; 24 per cent abstained from pork; 8 per cent abstained from shell fish; and 20 per cent did not mix meat and milk foods. Ninety per cent worked on the Sabbath; while 81 per cent celebrated Chanukkah, 21 per cent indicated that they had Christmas trees. Fifty-two per cent favored cremation instead of burial; 50 per cent observed *kaddish* weekly, and 29 per cent daily. The vast majority (84 per cent) were opposed to any restriction on marriage with a convert. Jewish literature had not found its way into most Reform Jewish homes. While nearly all congregants reported that they possessed Bibles and prayer books, 62 per cent indicated that they had few Jewish books, and only 25 per cent had libraries consisting of more than twenty-five Jewish books.

Professor Israel Bettan, authority on Reform Jewish practice (*CCAR Journal*, June 1954), argued that the bat mitzvah ceremony for girls had

no place in Reform Judaism, and merely duplicated the confirmation ritual. Nevertheless, 35 per cent of the congregations observed bat mitzvah rites.

A great preponderance of Reform Jews was opposed to strict codification of Reform law. Only 14 per cent desired the creation of a code, while 96 per cent favored publication of a simple guide that would be suggestive rather than mandatory.

Rabbi Morton Berman, writing in the *CCAR Journal* (October 1953), described the trend towards traditional observance among Reform Jews as the fulfillment of a need to "give Jews outside the State of Israel a sense of belonging and that home-feeling in Judaism which Zionism quickened in American Jews and which Jewish rite can nourish and sustain for them." As in the past, a note of caution was introduced against haphazard reintroduction of traditional rituals. Rabbi David Polish, in the *CCAR Journal* (April 1954), warned that the return of ceremonials should not be on the basis of popularity polls. He recommended three criteria: the extent to which the ceremonies evoked deep emotional response; simplicity; and the expression of a religious truth symbolically.

An increase in attendance from 20 to 160 per cent was reported for the year 1953 by the UAHC.

Reports on the national UAHC project to intensify Sabbath observance indicated some measure of success. New projects were the holding of Sabbath eve dinners in some synagogues to acquaint members with Sabbath home ceremonies, and adult education institutes combined with Sabbath eve worship.

#### MARRIAGE CONTRACT

After many years of discussion regarding the problem of revising Jewish marriage laws, the (Conservative) Rabbinical Assembly of America, at its June 1954 convention, decided on an amended form of the *ketubah* (marriage contract), prepared by Professor Saul Lieberman, the noted Talmudic authority. Under the revised form, the bride and groom would turn over their rights to a Beth Din (court of Jewish law) to enforce family law. The rabbis emphasized that the revision would not only provide for proper safeguards for both parties, but would also be a constructive step in preserving marriages threatened with dissolution. Rabbi Harry Halpern, newly elected president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, announced that the Conservative Beth Din and marriage registry would soon be functioning. The Conservative rabbis passed resolutions on several other matters of Jewish law, including injunctions against participation in cremation rites, and the mechanical recording of Sabbath services. The traditional ban on marriage between a *kohen* (priest) and a divorcee was lifted. In a sharp reaction to this plan, the (Orthodox) Rabbis' Council of Young Israel questioned the authority of the Conservative rabbinate on the ground that they had disqualified themselves as traditionalists by countenancing an abbreviated prayer book, mixed pews, and mixed choirs. The retiring president of the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox), Rabbi Theodore Adams,

characterized the action of the Conservatives as "an attempt to break down basic traditions that are holy."

In their annual meeting (July 1954), the Orthodox rabbis heard the noted Talmudic authority, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, stress the need for vigorous resistance to the modernist trend, as seen in mixed pews and use of the microphone at Sabbath worship. Similarly, Rabbi Oscar Fasman, president of the Hebrew Theological College in Chicago, declared that the Conservative leadership had abrogated its right to deal in the field of *halachah* (religious law). Rabbi Israel Tabak offered a ten-point program for dealing with the non-Orthodox rabbinate which included non-cooperation in ritual functions. He declared that Orthodoxy should not recognize the existence of three branches of Judaism.

### JEWISH EVANGELISM

There was considerable discussion in the Jewish religious community of the question of spreading the teachings of Judaism beyond the confines of the synagogue. The NYBR prepared to follow the plan outlined by Rabbi Robert Gordis (May 1954) to open an information center for those who sought information about the Jewish religion. The UAHC also planned to expand its tract commission in order to make available more literature for the religiously unaffiliated. The Reform group seriously considered launching an aggressive missionary program. An entire session of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) convention in June 1954 was devoted to a proposal presented by Rabbis Albert S. Goldstein and Daniel Davis. Rabbi Goldstein declared that "if we have what the spiritually adrift are looking for, then we stand with open arms to welcome them." Rabbi Davis suggested that the CCAR should "seek and welcome the unsynagogued as well as the unchurched." Rabbi Max D. Einhorn reported a significant number of conversions to Judaism; Rabbi Einhorn indicated that the last 2,000 conversions had been made by Conservative and Reform rabbis, Reform conversions outnumbering those made by Conservative rabbis. According to evidence presented by Rabbi Einhorn, "converts as a group are more faithful to the Jewish religion than born Jews." It was also proposed that a commission be formed to produce literature and instructional guides for rabbis "working with non-Jews" (*Religious News Service*, June 24, 1954).

### RELIGION AND PSYCHIATRY

The new insights provided by modern dynamic psychology influenced the thinking and the educational program of many synagogue groups. Rabbis devoted more attention to the field of pastoral counseling, and in several communities courses were established to equip rabbis to handle problems of pastoral psychology. An entire workshop was devoted to the subject of the role of group dynamics in congregational life at the CCAR annual meeting in June 1954, under the sponsorship of its Committee on Psychiatry. The NYBR Institute for Pastoral Psychiatry held its sixth annual

sessions, including a ten-week course in January-February 1954. A summer course for clinical pastoral training was held at Bellevue Hospital in New York City.

### *Religious Education*

All three religious groups expanded their efforts to reach young people. It was evident, from a survey completed by the Scientific Research Division of the American Jewish Committee, which covered an eastern seaboard community, that Jewish teen-agers had firm commitments to Jewish values, and, in some respects, showed stronger attachments than their parents.

The training of youth leaders was stressed. The Young People's League of the United Synagogue held an institute for leaders of youth in August 1953. The Conservative group also sponsored several summer camps, under a program called Ramah camps. Over 1,000 young people participated in a camp experience, with religious motivation, in which the Hebrew language was the sole one used.

The Reform group, likewise, broadened its efforts on behalf of youth. More than sixty youth conclaves were held during the year under review. The UAHC's Temple Youth organization also sponsored ten regional meetings and two national leadership camp institutes. The latter consisted of a twelve-day period of serious study. According to a report published in December 1953 (*American Judaism*), a total of 6,530 young people participated in the conclaves. Over thirty-five of the group had decided upon a rabbinic career.

The widespread disclosures of juvenile delinquency roused the synagogue bodies to utilize their resources to combat the evil. The Synagogue Council of America Commission on Family and Youth Welfare, convoked a special conference in March 1954 in which religious leaders, social workers, and leading psychologists and experts in youth problems from several cities participated. Religious leaders generally placed the burden of responsibility on the home and sought means for strengthening traditional Jewish family ties. Thus, Rabbi Reuben M. Katz, addressing the (Conservative) Rabbinical Assembly of America convention in May 1954, declared that attempts to "have the synagogue preempt the religious duties and prerogatives of the Jewish home are alien to the Jewish spirit."

The Orthodox group continued its emphasis on an all-day educational program. In June 1954 an organizational meeting was held of the new National Commission for Yeshivah Education, for the purpose of raising standards of all-day schools and establishing closer relations with various state and local educational agencies.

In April 1954, Torah Umesorah, the national society for Hebrew day schools, established a board of license, to standardize requirements for teaching certification. Ten new all-day schools were opened in the school year, bringing the total under Torah Umesorah auspices to 167. These all-day schools were located in seventy cities and twenty-four states.

The major problem in the field of religious education was the shortage of teachers. *The Reconstructionist* (July 2, 1954) described the number of Hebrew school teachers graduated each year as "considerably less than the number of rabbis graduated from our rabbinical seminaries." The editors pointed out that unless stringent measures were taken to alleviate the situation, American Jewry would be faced with a critical shortage of teaching personnel.

#### ADULT EDUCATION

The past year saw an acceleration in the broadening of adult education programs. Many synagogue people shared the view expressed by Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof of Pittsburgh that "the moral tone of our society will not improve until grown-ups devote as much time to religious education as they impose upon their children." There was ample evidence of a new zeal for formal and informal study on the part of adults. The United Synagogue of America held a series of Torah institutes in a number of camps during the summer of 1954. During the winter months, several retreats were conducted, generally on a regional basis. One hundred persons attended the sixth annual Jewish Laymen's Institute in Pennsylvania, sponsored by the brotherhoods of three congregations in Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, Md. (June 1954). Courses offered were in the field of Bible, Talmud, the prayer book, Jewish history, and the Hebrew language.

Sponsorship of Jewish retreats was not limited to religious bodies. B'nai B'rith institutes attracted hundreds of adult students, who spent a period of several days studying under leading Jewish Theological Seminary of America professors. The scope of this program was underscored by the appointment of a full-time director, Rabbi Harold Weisberg, in the spring of 1954.

The National Academy of Adult Education of the United Synagogue initiated a series of newsletters, suggesting new techniques in this area (March 1954).

Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, president of the UAHC, announced that a National Commission on Adult Education, encompassing all the branches of the Reform movement, was about to be launched (June 1954).

Another interesting trend was the proliferation of "Judaica shops," sponsored by congregations or their sisterhoods. By this means, Jewish books and art objects, as well as ceremonial objects, were made readily accessible for the first time to the synagogue-goer, to stimulate the acquisition of Jewish libraries in the homes.

#### *Higher Learning*

The three branches of Judaism all expanded their programs of higher education and rabbinical training.

## ORTHODOX

Yeshiva University, in New York City, enrolled a record number of students during the academic year 1953-54, a total of 2,478 in all departments. Of these, 630 were registered in the Rabbinic School. Thirty-six men received their ordination.

A \$500,000 gift by Max Stern, in March 1954, made possible the establishment of the Stern College for Women of Yeshiva University, a liberal arts school to provide academic training. The Stern College was also expected to house the new Teachers Institute for Women established in September 1953, which was authorized to grant the degree of bachelor of religious education.

Announcement was made of the forthcoming opening of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in the fall of 1955. The Bronx Hospital, built by the City of New York as part of the medical facilities associated with the college, was opened. Sixty per cent of the goal of \$10,000,000 had been raised by the summer of 1954.

A novel course was inaugurated by the School of Education and Community Administration, in which the master's degree would be given to those who completed a two-year training program in administering agencies concerned with the care of the aged. This was the first arrangement of its kind in the United States (September 1953).

The international character of Yeshiva University's student body was revealed in a report on the registrants for 1953-54. Seventeen countries were represented, including Israel, North Africa, South Africa, and several European countries, as well as Brazil and Peru. An Ethiopian student was planning to utilize his training to bring Jewish education to the Jewish community of his native land.

## CONSERVATIVE

The Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTSA) observed its sixtieth annual commencement exercises in June 1954, when nineteen rabbis were ordained. A report covering the previous quarter-century, 1929-54, revealed that the student body of the JTSA had doubled. By June 1954 the Seminary Endowment Fund had reached the sum of \$1,250,000. The JTSA annual budget had grown to \$1,400,000.

## REFORM

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR), which enrolled a total of 165 rabbinic students, including both New York and Cincinnati schools, ordained twenty new rabbis at its June 1954 commencement exercises. In addition, six cantor-educators were graduated at the School of Sacred Music. One hundred and seventy-five students were registered in the School of Education.

In March 1954 a new graduate course designed to encourage students to

embark on careers in the Jewish field was introduced at the New York school of the HUC-JIR. Twenty students were registered at a course for pre-rabbinic students held at Camp Davan Lodge in Towanda, Pa., in the summer of 1954.

The HUC-JIR joined with UAHC in a campaign to raise \$2,195,000 during 1954.

The (Reform) Los Angeles College of Jewish Studies enrolled 108 students, a record number, according to a report released in December 1953.

#### PUBLICATIONS AND SCHOLARSHIP

Yeshiva University published jointly with the Sura Institute for Research in Jerusalem the first issue of an annual for 1953-54 entitled *Sura*, devoted to Jewish scholarship. Publication of an official Rabbinical Council of America prayer book was scheduled for the spring of 1954. The Library of the JTSA had increased from 79,000 in 1928 to 165,000 volumes and manuscripts. In November 1953, an American Jewish History Center was established at the JTSA, to be directed by Allan Nevins, famed historian, and professor of American history at Columbia University. Among the projects to be undertaken at the center was the publication of a series of biographies based on the lives of illustrious American Jews. Professor Nevins, describing the objectives of the new center, stated: "The work will emphasize the integration of the Jews in the American fabric, showing how they contributed to and were changed and colored by the general life of American society" (January 1954).

The (Conservative) United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education embarked on a publication program of pamphlets designed for Jewish parents. Six pamphlets, entitled *Your Child and You*, were issued in 1953-54.

The Conservative movement was saddened by the loss of two of its outstanding scholars, the last of the two eminent authorities brought to the JTSA by Solomon Schechter at the turn of the century: Louis Ginzberg, outstanding Talmudic scholar, and the historian Alexander Marx, who had built the largest Jewish library in the world (see p. 573 and p. 579, for appreciations). Alumni of the JTSA announced plans to raise the sum of \$500,000 to endow a Louis Ginzberg Chair in Talmud, and an Alexander Marx Chair in History (May 1954).

At the Cincinnati branch of the HUC-JIR, the Joshua Liebman Department of Human Relations published a series of pamphlets during the academic year 1953-54 which were to serve as guides in pastoral counseling. The quarterly *CCAR Journal*, in its second year as "a rabbi's magazine," was hailed as an important step forward. The *Journal* dealt with professional problems of the rabbinate, and contained several significant articles on the practical ministry.

#### *Relations with Israel and Jews in Other Countries*

The virtually unanimous support which the American synagogue gave to the State of Israel was maintained during 1953-54 in the face of new

challenges and difficulties confronting the people of the new state. The (Conservative) Rabbinical Assembly of America, at its May 1954 convention, urged the United States government "to press for action to solve the problem of Arab refugees in a manner that will be equitable to the homeless Arabs and the State of Israel." The Conservative rabbinate hoped that Washington would continue "to grant substantial economic aid to all the states in the Middle East in order that they may achieve security and a higher standard of living."

In a similar vein, president-elect Rabbi Barnett S. Brickner, at the June 1954 CCAR convention, suggested that in addition to economic aid, the United States government reconsider its whole arms aid program in the Middle East, in the light of Arab-Israel tensions. He also proposed that the United Nations promote an Arab-Israel peace conference.

Rabbi Joseph Fink reported on his recent visit to Israel, at the invitation of Prime Minister David Ben Gurion. Rabbi Fink, in his June 1954 presidential address, was sharply critical of the anti-Zionist elements in the Reform movement. He attacked the "shortsightedness of those Jews who refuse to see the vital connection between the fate of Israel and the fate of world Jewry," and who, by misreading Jewish history, "lend themselves as weapons in the hands of Israel's enemies."

The problem of religion in Israel, long the focal point for heated debate in American synagogue circles, continued during the year 1953-54, with each of the three religious groups expanding its beachheads established in Israel. Speaking for the Reform group, Rabbi Fink called for creation of a committee of rabbis "to formulate a program that would inspire and stimulate the indigenous extension of liberal Judaism in Israel."

The Orthodox group supported the new Mizrahi-sponsored Bar-Ilan University, whose cornerstone was laid at Ramat Gan, Israel, in July 1953. It was regarded as the first American-sponsored university in the new state, and was to be patterned along the lines of an American liberal arts college. The Mizrahi Organization planned to encourage a maximum amount of student exchange with American universities. The Young Israel movement opened two camps in Israel in June 1954.

The (Orthodox) Rabbinical Council of America, at its July 1954 convention, announced completion of the first wing of its new Yeshivath Hadorom, in Rehobot, Israel. Eighty students had enrolled, and the faculty consisted of four full-time and two part-time instructors.

Much tension was created by the picketing of the Israel Consulate in New York City (February 1954) by ultra-Orthodox elements. Leading Orthodox rabbinic bodies quickly disavowed support of the movement, aimed at abolishing women's conscription in the Israel armed forces. They particularly deplored the "shameful riotous conduct" of the pickets. Rabbi Max Kirschblum and Rabbi Isador Levin, two officials of the religious Zionist movement, stated: "They [the pickets] do not speak for religion. They speak for a minority that refused to countenance the democratic procedures that have always characterized Judaism."

In support of the position taken by the Israel government, Rabbis Theo-

dore Adams and Leo Segal, officials of the (Orthodox) Rabbinical Council of America, on their return from Israel (April 1954) reported the sincere concern of the Israel army for religious observance. They observed that "positive religious values in Israel were many and strong."

The Rabbinical Council of America, at its July 1954 convention, denounced the Soviet Union for using Israel as a pawn in Middle East diplomacy at the same time that the Union and its satellites continued its policy of enslavement of Jews. Rabbi Adams also criticized the United States State Department's policy of refusing permission to American Jews to visit holy places under Jordan rule.

Generally, American Jewish religious leadership rebuffed any suggestion of weakening its ties with the State of Israel. It received coldly the address of Assistant Secretary of State Henry Byroade against "world-wide groupings of people of a particular religious faith" (April 1954). Most religious American Jews agreed with the statement of Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan at the World Brotherhood dinner of the JTSA (May 1954) that Byroade's suggestion was tantamount to a demand that "we disband our brotherhood and renounce our religion."

The New York Board of Rabbis (NYBR) had developed contacts with Jewish religious communities abroad. At the request of the congregation of Madrid, Spain, the NYBR sent Rabbi D. A. Jessurun Cardozo to conduct High Holy Day services for the first time in 400 years. Religious paraphernalia were furnished by American synagogue groups and by Chaplain (Captain) Joshua Goldberg of the United States Navy, who had brought the problem to the attention of the NYBR. Some controversy developed in the wake of the project. Several Jewish leaders, criticizing the project, regarded it as an "instrument of Spanish propaganda." The NYBR insisted on its right to send a rabbi to any community in which he was welcome. The NYBR invited Chief Rabbi Jacob Kaplan of Paris to visit America, where he was given a citation in May 1954 because of his efforts on behalf of the Finaly children (*see* AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1954 [Vol. 55], p. 183-87).

### *Social Action*

Improvement of race relations in the United States continued to be a major concern of the synagogue groups. The CCAR observed Race Relations Sabbath in February 1954, applauding the work of the President's commission to eliminate discrimination in employment involving government contracts. The Reform rabbinate hailed the steps taken to end desegregation in the armed forces and in Washington.

The Supreme Court decision to end segregation in the public schools (May 1954) was enthusiastically received by every branch of American Judaism. Rabbi Leo Jung, an Orthodox leader, called it "a red-letter day in American history and a day of major disaster for Communism." The Conservative rabbinate asked for "early implementation of this magnifi-

cent decision by all the American people." Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, president of the UAHC, regarded the action as "a veritable fulfillment of our own Jewish purpose and of our American dream of destiny."

Threats to civil liberties aroused strong resentment among all religious bodies, Christian and Jewish alike. Invidious references to the late Rabbis Stephen S. Wise and Judah L. Magnes during a hearing of the House Un-American Activities Committee on September 11, 1953, aroused the ire of the Synagogue Council of America, which characterized them as "a cowardly attack." Rabbi Fink, addressing the June 1954 CCAR convention, declared: "We do not feel it is necessary to jettison our cargo of liberty in order to save our ship of state."

The conference accepted the proposals of its Commission on Justice and Peace to seek safeguards for witnesses before Congressional hearings, including the end of one-man investigation, the submission of minority reports, and the withholding of confidential material. The rabbis regarded the phrase, "Fifth Amendment Communists," as a "vicious and unjustified perversion of the law," and denounced government use of professional informers. A resolution calling for the removal of Senator Joseph McCarthy (Rep., Wis.) from his chairmanship of the Government Operations Committee was adopted. The (Conservative) Rabbinical Assembly of America called on Congress "to enact legislation that would restore traditional democratic protection to witnesses before Congressional committees" (June 1954).

A new state law in California, requiring religious groups seeking tax exemption to issue a declaration of political loyalty, brought protests from the Board of Rabbis of Northern California (April 1954). The CCAR, at its June 1954 convention, supported the Board's opposition to such laws.

The National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods (NFTS), affiliated with the UAHC, held a series of meetings in New York in May and June 1954, which included a leadership training institute. Its executive board went on record in support of extended human rights, liberalizing the United States immigration laws, civil liberties, and world disarmament. An intensive program of education in support of the United Nations was developed by the NFTS and its constituents.

In cooperation with the UAHC, the CCAR held a series of regional conferences in March 1954, with much attention paid to the problems of local social action programming.

The (Conservative) National Women's League continued its wide range of activities, but with renewed emphasis on its social action program. Among the issues evoking most concern were the proposed Bricker amendment, United States immigration laws, and civil liberties.

The Women's League continued its strong support of the United Nations, and the elimination of segregation in education. Local sisterhoods were furnished with fact sheets and social action guides to stimulate congregations to communicate their views to legislators.

In support of the objectives of the United Nations (UN), the Synagogue Council of America proclaimed a United Nations Sabbath in October 1953, and called for stronger government support for the UN, the UN Educa-

tional, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the UN International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF). During the High Holy Days 1953, and Passover 1954, Synagogue Council of America pronouncements on international cooperation were broadcast over the Voice of America.

Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, returning from Europe in August 1953, addressed a letter to President Eisenhower, urging him to establish a "religious Point Four Program" to offset the deleterious effects abroad of Senator Joseph McCarthy's activities.

A new development during the year under review was the move to establish social action programs on a local basis. Beginning in November 1953, the UAHC, with the cooperation of the CCAR, issued a new monthly publication, *Social Action in Review*, which provided local congregations with information regarding inter-religious developments in the social action field. Additional bulletins furnished program suggestions on such subjects as genocide and immigration. Plans were offered for establishing local congregational social action groups for the purposes of study and action. A pamphlet, *Social Justice*, containing a compilation of all UAHC pronouncements in this area for the past eighty years, was released in January 1954.

Synagogue groups shared in the apprehensions felt over the safety of Jews in the Iron Curtain countries. The executive board of the UAHC at its annual meeting (June 1954) denounced the Rumanian government for its "spiritual and cultural genocide" against its Jewish citizens, and commended the United States State Department for arousing world public opinion on behalf of the persecuted.

A Senate proposal introduced by Senator Ralph Flanders (Rep., Vt.) to amend the United States constitution to declare, "this nation recognizes the law and authority of Jesus Christ," was vigorously condemned by the Synagogue Council of America. Rabbi Isadore Breslau, testifying on behalf of the Council, termed it "an act of religious discrimination," and pointed to the historic fact that "the founders of our Republic sought forever to keep from our shore the sectarian conflicts . . . and religious warfare that plagued the Old World" (May 1954).

#### RELIGION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

The rabbinate expressed continued concern about the growing sectarian intrusions into public education. Several local boards of rabbis considered action to meet the increased pressure upon the public schools aimed at introducing religious teachings into the curriculum. Rabbi Joseph Lookstein, addressing the fiftieth anniversary convention of the Religious Education Association in Pittsburgh, Pa., in which leading Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish educators participated in November 1953, cautioned against the breakdown of the principle of separation as a result of the new zeal for religious training in the public schools. The Rabbinical Assembly of America, at its May 1954 convention, passed a resolution advising Jewish children not to sing Christmas songs in the public schools.

During the year under review representatives of the New York Board of Rabbis met in a series of conferences with representatives of the Protestant Council and the Catholic Archdiocese in response to a request by the New York City Board of Education, to discuss ways of implementing the New York State Board of Regents' proposal to introduce religious content into the public school curriculum. The three faiths were unable to reach agreement on a program that would steer clear of sectarian involvement.

#### JEWISH SOCIETY FOR SERVICE

The American Jewish Society for Service held its annual work camp at Winchester, N.H., in the summer of 1953. A total of twenty-six participated, twice the number in 1952. Writing in *The Reconstructionist* (March 12, 1954), Hyman R. Sankel, director of the project, described the daily program of the work camp. Modeled along Quaker lines, the program included simple religious rituals, a fifteen-minute period of silence, and a work day devoted to building camp structures to enable 100 underprivileged children, mostly from the New York City slums, to enjoy a summer vacation. Evenings were devoted to educational programs. Sankel saw in the program "an outlet for youth's idealism" and an opportunity to "interpret to our Christian neighbors the noble concepts of Judaism."

#### Chaplaincy

The end of hostilities in Korea in July 1953, while obviously affecting the lives of Jewish men and women in the armed services, did not radically change the pattern of the Jewish military chaplaincy program. In September 1953 there were 150,000 Jewish troops who observed the High Holy Days on four continents. The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) revealed that in 1953 an aggregate total of 961,800 individuals were reached by the chaplaincy program. There was an attendance of 558,200 at 14,600 religious services; 225,600 at group activities; and 178,000 individual counseling and pastoral visits (*JWB Year Book, 1951-53, Part II*).

As in the past, JWB undertook the prodigious task of serving not only the large military installations at home and abroad, but even the most remote outposts of defense.

With the ebbing of active hostilities, there was a greater emphasis on Jewish educational programs. The JWB published several pamphlets on the meaning of the feasts and fasts. Chaplains organized religious classes for children of military personnel. For example, at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., forty children were enrolled, at Pearl Harbor twenty children.

Many of the chaplains indicated that they had substituted group discussion for the sermon at Sabbath services; efforts at audience participation were found to be far more effective in reaching the servicemen.

Writing in *The Reconstructionist* (October 9, 1953), Chaplain Daniel Silver, stationed in Korea, noted that synagogue attendance in military life was proportionately higher than in civilian life, despite the many obstacles,

such as transportation, inherent in military life. Among the factors contributing to the trend was the craving for companionship, seeking the counsel of chaplains, and a kind of social protest. The troops were also attracted by the atmosphere of informality, and the opportunities for personal relations with a rabbi which seemed unavailable in civilian life. Chaplain Silver observed that Judaism appealed to the serviceman "when its more practical, reasonable, undogmatic and this-worldly elements" were stressed. The Jewish serviceman was vitally interested in his faith, he was curious about his Jewishness, but he demanded simple and direct answers to his queries.

The New York Board of Rabbis announced in June 1954 that thirteen full-time civilian chaplains were to be appointed for the New York State mental hospitals.

### *Interfaith Relations*

No significant developments were noted in interfaith relations during the year under review. Reform groups cooperated in bringing the noted scholar, Prof. James Parkes, of England, to the United States. Considered the world's outstanding authority on Christian-Jewish relations, Professor Parkes visited seventeen communities from coast to coast during 1953-54, addressing audiences in leading universities and seminaries.

The area of most potential interfaith cooperation was in the field of social action. Reacting to the step taken by the Velde Committee citing the late Rabbis Stephen S. Wise and Judah L. Magnes as Communist sympathizers (*see above*), the National Council of Churches severely attacked the congressional group for besmirching the character of rabbis not able to defend themselves (September 1953).

Rabbi Theodore Adams, addressing the mid-winter conference of the Rabbinical Council of America (January 1954), advocated formation of an interfaith social action group to enable Catholics, Protestants, and Jews to join in common action. Rabbi Uri Miller, addressing the conference, counseled the rabbis to "rally all religious forces so that fighting Communism, our threat from without, we succumb not to the threat from within."

Hebrew Union College continued its graduate Interfaith Fellowship. During 1953-54, five Christian clergymen held fellowships which enabled them to broaden their knowledge of Semitic languages and various Jewish disciplines.

The Jewish Chautauqua Society, financed by the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods (Reform), expanded its program of sending speakers on Judaism to colleges and universities. In 1953-54, the society provided for fourteen resident lectureships at Christian seminaries and church-supported colleges. Several Reform sisterhoods continued their annual custom of inviting groups of Christian church women to share in a day devoted to a study of the spiritual values of Judaism.

The Hebrew Theological College of Chicago was confronted with a serious community relations problem in connection with its plan to build a campus

at Evanston, Ill. In the face of local community opposition, plans for locating at Evanston were abandoned in June 1954.

### *Public Information*

There was a growing disposition on the part of religious groups to exploit the use of mass media in order to reach a maximum audience. Synagogue groups, while not yet disposed to invest substantial funds, made modest beginnings in the film and television field. The NYBR produced several programs on a number of television networks, including an educational program called *The Fourth R*. In cooperation with the New York chapter of the American Jewish Committee, the NYBR held its second annual TV Workshop (June 1954), in which technical advice was furnished to thirty rabbis in an advanced course dealing with religious television programming.

JTSA's *Frontiers of Faith* television program entered its second year. Kinescopes of over twenty of these programs were made available to religious schools through the United Synagogue Education Department. JTSA's *Eternal Light* series, reaching a radio audience of several million people every Sunday, marked its tenth anniversary in October 1953.

UAHC reported in June 1954 that during the previous three years its audio-visual department had produced two full-length motion pictures, six film strips, and three albums of Jewish history records.

Most unusual utilization of the technological advance provided by television was reported by a synagogue in Jacksonville, Fla. During the High Holy Days of 1953, Congregation Ahavath Chesed installed a mobile television unit provided by a local station, complete with technicians. The overflow congregation, in a separate auditorium, was able to see and hear the regular services on screens lent by local theatres. The *UAHC Service Bulletin* (Fall 1954), revealed that the mood of solemnity was adequately preserved.

The Orthodox group was also keenly aware of the need for utilizing modern mass media in order to convey the teachings of Judaism. Marvin A. Cohen, in his article, "Art, Judaism and the Sound Barrier" (*Young Israel Viewpoint*, January-February 1954), suggested establishing a central bureau of information comparable to those established by other religious groups where "traditional rabbis, psychologists, sociologists, public relations men and women would devise methods of reaching the American Jewish population through the various media of communications with the message of traditional Judaism."

### *Synagogue Architecture*

A high light of the year's activity was the publication of a major work on synagogue architecture. The UAHC's Commission on Synagogue Activities, under the direction of Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, had devoted several

years to a study of the problems of synagogue building, and for some time had offered professional counsel to congregations facing construction problems. The volume, *An American Synagogue for Today and Tomorrow*, edited by Peter Blake, sought to establish "more honest, sincere, genuinely and intrinsically Jewish houses of worship."

### *American Jewish Tercentenary Celebration*

The JTSA's Jewish Museum planned a special tercentenary exhibit for the fall of 1954, to portray American Jewish art work, synagogue designs, and also to show evidence of Biblical themes in primitive American art. Also in the spirit of the tercentenary observance was the introduction of a course at the Women's Institute of Jewish Studies of the JTSA, during the 1954 spring semester, entitled "Three Hundred Years of Jewish Achievement in America."

The Conservative group sponsored an Israel commemoration of the American Jewish Tercentenary with a series of addresses delivered by Rabbi Moshe Davis on the American Jewish scene (August 1954).

The American Jewish Archives, attached to the HUC, planned to mark the tercentenary anniversary with special exhibits describing the growth of Reform Judaism in America.

In preparation for the tercentenary anniversary, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods produced a film strip entitled *Through the Years: Jewish Women in American History*.

MORRIS N. KERTZER

## JEWISH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

IN THE SPRING OF 1954, 399,818 children attended Jewish schools in the United States, according to a Jewish school census carried out by the Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the United States. The study was based on reported actual enrollment from 197 communities which included New York City (the five boroughs) and the counties of Westchester, Suffolk, and Nassau; the other four major metropolitan centers having each a Jewish population of more than 100,000 (Chicago, Boston, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia); four of the six large urban centers having each a Jewish population of between 50,000 and 100,000 (Newark, N. J., Essex County, N. J., Cleveland, Ohio, Baltimore, Md., and San Francisco, Cal.); and 170 intermediate and small communities. These 197 reporting communities were distributed over 40 states and the District of Columbia and comprised an estimated Jewish population of four and one-quarter million, or over 80 per cent of all Jews in the United States.

More than half of the total enrollment (208,057 or 52.0 per cent) were

attending one-day-a-week schools, usually referred to as Sunday schools,<sup>1</sup> and 191,761, or 48.0 per cent, attended weekday schools: weekday afternoon Hebrew schools, all-day schools, and Yiddish schools.

### *Growth of Jewish School Enrollment*

The enrollment for 1954 represented an increase of 63,734 or 19.0 per cent over the estimated enrollment for the year of 1952, the last year when a school census was carried out by the Department of Research of the American Association for Jewish Education (see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK 1953 [Vol. 54], p. 109 and f). The method of gathering data for both years was the same, except that under the Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the United States a better coverage was obtained of the enrollment for the smaller communities. The increase in the enrollment for 1954 was the eighth consecutive annual increase in Jewish school enrollment since the Jewish school census was inaugurated in 1945.

TABLE 1  
GROWTH OF JEWISH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT 1948-54

<i>Weekday School</i> (Enrollment of all-day schools included)			<i>Sunday School</i>		<i>Total</i>
<i>Year</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent of Total</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent of Total</i>	<i>Number</i>
1954	191,761 <sup>a</sup>	48.0	208,057	52.0	399,818
1952	160,077	47.6	176,007	52.4	336,084
1951	141,278	47.2	157,974	52.8	302,454
1950	132,642	50.4	130,574	49.6	266,609
1949	122,109	48.7	128,719	51.3	255,865
1948	118,502	49.5	120,896	50.5	239,398

<sup>a</sup> Of this number, 30,268 were enrolled in all-day schools; certainly no more than 10,000, and most probably fewer, were enrolled in Yiddish-speaking schools, based on the estimate for 1948-49.

### *Enrollment in All-Day Schools*

According to a study made during the school year of 1953-54 by the Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the United States, the total number of children who attended all-day schools was 30,268.

The boys predominated in the enrollment. They constituted about two-thirds (65.9 per cent) of all students; girls constituted slightly more than one-third (34.1 per cent).

More boys than girls were also reported for each level of the all-day school.

<sup>1</sup> In a number of Sunday schools, because of increased enrollment, shortage of classroom facilities, and/or teachers, the attendance was staggered; some classes met on Sundays or Saturdays and others met on one of the weekdays.

TABLE 2

ALL-DAY SCHOOLS, DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENT BY LEVEL OF SCHOOL, 1953-54

Level of School	United States		New York <sup>a</sup>		Enrollment in New York as a Per Cent of Total Enrollment by Level of School
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	
Kindergarten . . . . .	4,133	13.7	2,032	9.5	49.2
Elementary . . . . .	21,259	70.2	15,566	73.0	73.2
High School (Jr. and Sr.) . . . . .	4,326	14.3	3,734	17.5	86.3
Not reported by level . . . . .	550	1.8	—	—	—
TOTAL . . . . .	30,268	100.0	21,332	100.0	70.5

<sup>a</sup> Includes the five boroughs and the counties of Westchester, Nassau, Suffolk.

The proportion of boys in the enrollment of kindergartens was 58.1 per cent. In the elementary schools, the proportion was higher, 65.0 per cent; and in the high schools, it was highest, 76.8 per cent. Proportionately, the participation of boys in the enrollment of the all-day schools increased as the level of the school rose, while the proportion of girls in the enrollment declined with the rise in the level of the school.

*Growth of Jewish All-Day School Enrollment*

The enrollment in Jewish all-day schools in the United States had grown from 18,440 to 30,268, representing an increase of 64.1 per cent since the school year of 1948-49, the last year when a study of all-day schools was made by the Department of Research of the American Association for Jewish Education. New York City contributed the preponderant share, 73.8 per cent, to the total increase in the all-day school enrollment in the United States.

TABLE 3

GROWTH OF ALL-DAY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AND IN NEW YORK CITY,<sup>a</sup> 1948-54

Level of School	United States		Total Increase	New York City			Per Cent of Total Increase
	1948-49	1953-54		1948-49	1953-54	N. Y. C. Increase	
Kindergarten and Elementary . . . . .	15,976	25,942	9,966	10,496	17,598	7,102	71.3
Per Cent Increase . . . . .	—	62.4	—	—	67.7	—	—
High School . . . . .	2,464	4,326	1,862	2,105	3,734	1,629	87.4
Per Cent Increase . . . . .	—	75.6	—	—	77.4	—	—
TOTAL . . . . .	18,440	30,268	11,828	12,601	21,332	8,731	73.8
Per Cent Increase . . . . .	—	64.1	—	—	69.3	—	—

<sup>a</sup> Source for New York data: The Jewish Education Survey for New York sponsored by Jewish Education Committee, and under the auspices of the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

## *Distribution of Sunday and Weekday Afternoon School Enrollment*

For 195 communities, which included all the large urban centers with more than 100,000 Jews, except New York City and Newark,<sup>2</sup> the enrollment data was reported by congregational and noncongregational auspices, congregational orientation, and level of school. The reported enrollment in these communities was 164,425, or 41.2 per cent of the total Jewish school enrollment in the United States. Almost nine out of every ten children who attended Jewish schools in these communities studied under congregational auspices, and one out of every ten studied under noncongregational auspices. There was, however, a significant variation in the proportion of Sunday school and weekday afternoon school pupils who attended schools under congregational or noncongregational auspices. Of the total Sunday school enrollment in these communities, 93.9 per cent were registered in schools conducted by congregations, and 6.1 per cent were in noncongregational schools. Of the reported weekday afternoon school enrollment, 81.9 per cent were in congregational weekday afternoon schools and 18.1 per cent in noncongregational weekday afternoon schools.

Of the aggregate Sunday School enrollment in the 195 communities, 45.2 per cent were in schools conducted by Reform congregations; 34.2 per cent, in schools conducted by Conservative congregations; 12.8 per cent, in Orthodox congregational schools; 6.1 per cent in noncongregational schools; and 1.7 per cent in the intercongregational schools.

Slightly over half (50.7 per cent) of the total weekday afternoon school registration were in Conservative congregational schools; 21.7 per cent were in Orthodox schools, 7.9 per cent in Reform schools, and 1.6 per cent in intercongregational schools. The cooperating congregations of the latter group were in some cases of the same, and in some cases of different orientations.

An analysis of the total enrollment for each congregational group by level of school reveals the following situation: Of the total Sunday School enrollment under Conservative congregational auspices, 81.1 per cent were in elementary schools, 13.7 per cent in pre-school classes, and 4.3 per cent in high school classes. Of the total reported Orthodox congregational enrollment, 69.9 per cent were in elementary schools, 14.3 per cent in pre-school classes, and 2.7 per cent in high school classes. Of the Reform Sunday school enrollment, 83.7 per cent were in elementary schools, 7.6 per cent in pre-school classes, and 8.6 per cent in high school classes.

The proportion of weekday pre-school children varied from 0.3 per cent of the enrollment for the Orthodox schools to 4.8 per cent of the enrollment for the noncongregational schools. The number of pre-school children in the Conservative and Reform weekday schools constituted slightly over 3 per cent of the total weekday enrollment for each group.

<sup>2</sup> For New York City, the information was not available by congregational orientation.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL REPORTED SUNDAY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR EACH LEVEL OF SCHOOL BY AUSPICES AND ORIENTATION

	<i>Nursery and Kindergarten</i>		<i>Elementary</i>		<i>High School</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent of Total</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent of Total</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent of Total</i>
Conservative.....	5,201	42.4	30,729	34.2	1,635	25.0
Orthodox.....	2,020	16.7	9,888	11.0	386	5.9
Reform.....	3,772	31.2	41,882	46.6	4,312	65.9
Intercong.....	417	3.5	1,310	1.5	124	1.9
Noncong.....	742	6.2	5,987	6.7	86	1.3
TOTAL.....	12,152	100.0	89,796	100.0	6,543	100.0

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL REPORTED WEEKDAY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR EACH LEVEL OF SCHOOL BY AUSPICES AND ORIENTATION

	<i>Nursery and Kindergarten</i>		<i>Elementary School</i>		<i>High School</i>		<i>Level of School Not Reported</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Conservative..	884	57.9	25,883	56.4	421	17.4	—	
Orthodox....	29	1.9	8,335	18.1	613	25.3	2,700	
Reform.....	127	8.3	4,071	8.9	41	1.7	—	
Intercong....	25	1.7	593	1.3	241	10.0	—	
Noncong.....	461	30.2	7,037	15.3	1,103	45.6	1,100	
TOTAL.....	1,526	100.0	45,919	100.0	2,419	100.0	3,800	

The elementary weekday afternoon schools, like the elementary Sunday schools, claimed the largest share of the total enrollment within each congregational system. Of the total enrollment in Reform weekday schools, 96.0 per cent were in elementary weekday schools and one per cent in weekday high schools. Of the Conservative weekday enrollment, 95.2 per cent were in elementary schools and 1.5 per cent in weekday high schools. The enrollment in the elementary schools of the intercongregational group was proportionately the smallest, 69.0 per cent. It had, on the other hand, proportionately the highest enrollment in the high schools, 28.1 per cent. A high proportion of the enrollment in the Orthodox and noncongregational schools was not reported by level of school.

## JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES

**T**HE TERM Jewish communal services, as used in this review and as generally understood in the Jewish community, includes a wide network and great variety of programs sponsored by Jewish voluntary groups and supported in some degree by Jewish philanthropic contributions. It covers health and welfare services; projects in the fields of recreation, education, and culture; intergroup relations; international programs of immigration, refugee aid, rehabilitation; and assistance provided by American Jews toward the economic development of Israel. Services are local, regional, national, or international in scope. The majority of these programs come within the scope of Jewish federations and welfare funds, which function in about 300 local communities as instruments for the joint financing, budgeting coordination, and planning of Jewish communal services.

There were no major changes in the basic content and organizational pattern of Jewish communal services during the period under review (July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954). There was, however, an intensification of some of the trends which had been apparent for a number of years. The following were some of the major developments during the year:

- a) Philanthropic contributions to central Jewish campaigns (federation and welfare fund drives) continued to decline, as they had in each year since the peak campaign of 1948. The downward trend was sharper in 1954 than it had been in 1953.
- b) Prompted in large part by this decline in fund raising, there was a more intensive process of stock-taking in order to review existing programs, to achieve economies wherever possible, to determine urgent priority requirements more clearly, and to revitalize the central campaigns.
- c) A unique form of assistance was provided to the State of Israel through a loan of \$65,000,000 advanced by welfare funds to the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), and by the UJA-supported agencies to the State. The purpose of the loan, repayable within five years through deductions from local welfare fund campaigns, was to help Israel refinance its short-term obligations, thus overcoming one of the crucial problems in its financial and economic planning.
- d) After many years of recurrent discussions and negotiations, a merger was achieved of the United Service for New Americans (USNA), the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), and the Migration Department of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), establishing a single, unified international agency to serve Jewish migrants.
- e) There was further growth and development of local health and welfare services, and continued interest in such services at a high level. Major interest continued to center, as it had for some years, on the medical and social problems of older people and their special needs. Growing interest was also apparent in the special needs of children, particularly in regard to emotional and mental disturbances. Similarly, there was a continuation of the trend, also noted for several years, in providing services to the Jewish population as a whole, rather than to a particularly underprivileged group.

f) Programs related to Jewish education and cultural endeavor were receiving growing attention.

g) Jewish communal services shared in the American Jewish Tercentenary celebration. A special national organization—the American Jewish Tercentenary Committee—was formed to sponsor national events and to assist local communities in celebrating the anniversary. Communal agencies and institutions related their work to the concept of a maturing stable Jewish community, enjoying a large measure of economic and social well-being, and engaging in a variety of Jewish communal endeavor designed to meet its own welfare and cultural needs within the framework of the voluntary pattern of American organizational work. The Tercentenary also provided the occasion for a number of special projects and studies devoted to retrospective stock-taking and projection of directions for the future.

### *Central Jewish Community Organizations*

Amounts raised by central community campaigns continued to reflect the declining trend which had been taking place since the peak year of 1948. As Table 1 indicates, the totals raised in 1953 were about 5 per cent less than those raised in 1952. In cities outside of New York the decline was less sharp—a little over 3 per cent. The rate of decline was smaller in 1953 than it had been in 1952. In the spring of 1954, however, there was a further and sharper decline in fund raising totals. Seventy-nine welfare

TABLE 1  
AMOUNTS RAISED IN LOCAL CENTRAL  
COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS  
(*Estimate in thousands of dollars*)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>New York City</i>	<i>Other Cities</i>
1945.....	\$ 71,162	\$36,222	\$ 34,940
1946.....	131,421	44,273	87,148
1947.....	156,589	50,227	106,362
1948.....	200,721	65,157	135,564
1949.....	170,330	63,368	106,962
1950.....	142,192	50,205	91,987
1951.....	136,035	48,187	87,848
1952.....	121,173	43,076	78,097
1953.....	114,816	39,296	75,520

funds (outside of New York) reporting to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), indicated an over-all decrease in amounts raised of 8.3 per cent (compared with 3.4 per cent for the same cities in 1952). There were great extremes of variation among communities. One small community had an increase of 42 per cent whereas another suffered a decline of 35 per cent. Almost one-fifth of all the cities netted as much or more in their 1953 efforts as in 1952, despite the more general downward trend.

If the fall campaigns, whose results were not available at the time of writing (November 1954), were to conform with the experience of spring campaigns, federation and welfare fund drives would obtain about \$105,000,000 in 1954. On the basis of this estimate, the campaigns of 1954 would have raised just about half the amount obtained in the peak year of 1948.

The level of contributions for 1953 represented about 13 per cent less than the totals raised in 1946 when the large-scale campaigns for critical overseas needs had been initiated, but was about 61 per cent higher than the funds raised in 1945, the last year prior to the postwar emergency period. Since the increase in the general price index since 1945 had been 49 per cent, federation and welfare fund collections in 1953 were only about 8 per cent higher than in 1945, in relation to "constant" dollars.

There were significant differences in fund raising experience in communities of varying size. By 1954, the smallest communities, with a Jewish population of under 5,000, had dropped 40 per cent from the level of fund raising in 1946, whereas the larger Jewish population centers had dropped less than 20 per cent during the same period. The reason for this disparity was generally attributed to the fact that the larger communities had a more stable communal organization based on their more highly developed and varied local services and longer history of federated operations, whereas the smaller communities had organized their campaigns largely around overseas emergencies.

#### FACTORS AFFECTING FUND RAISING

The variations among communities were related, in various ways, to the combined effects of economic conditions, the changes in Jewish needs, the psychology of contributors and organizational factors. In a number of areas in the United States and in a number of trades and industries, business conditions were not favorable during the spring of 1954, and philanthropic campaigns were affected adversely. Economic factors probably played a larger role in 1954 than they had in any previous year since the end of World War II.

It was generally recognized, however, that economic factors alone did not fully account for the fund raising trend, but that a distinct shift in the interests and motivations of Jewish contributors had been taking place since 1948, the peak year of central campaigns. Some of the factors were the lessened sense of critical overseas emergency after the successful repulsion by Israel of the Arab invasion; the greater interest in domestic projects; the greater satisfactions, in the absence of an overriding emergency, found by some contributors in individual projects, as compared with the over-all central campaign.

Several attempts were made to gather data which would give greater understanding of these phenomena and provide help to leaders of federations in their attempts to avoid continuing declines in funds. A study conducted for the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in New York<sup>1</sup> revealed that the

<sup>1</sup> *Report, Committee to Study Fund-Raising Procedures and Practices*, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, March 16, 1954.

major motivation of contributors was a sense of identification with the Jewish community. This was also brought out in the pilot studies conducted by the CJFWF (1953) in Albany, N. Y., Camden, N. J., and New Britain, Conn. Community workers testified to a strong acceptance of the role of the central organization in guiding and coordinating communal program—and to a sense of satisfaction gained from participation in Jewish community affairs. The pilot studies did high light the need for improvement in the channels of communication between the individual contributors, organizations and the central body. Closer attention was being paid by communal bodies to programs of interpretation, not only at the time of campaigning, but on a continuous, year-around basis.

#### INDEPENDENT CAMPAIGNS

A study of "multiple appeals" in fifteen cities confirmed the general impression that independent campaigns, not included in the annual central fund raising drives, raised substantial sums. In these cities the total was equal to 70 per cent of the aggregate amounts raised in the central campaigns. In some cities, more money was raised outside the welfare fund than through the central campaign. The independent campaigns were for a variety of local, national and overseas projects. Synagogues and temples were the largest single group. Others represented by considerable sums were hospitals (local and national), Israel agencies, homes for the aged, and educational projects, both local and national. To a very considerable extent these independent efforts were for building funds, and did not therefore represent appeals which would continue in the communities on an annual basis.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION FUNDS

There was practically no change in the distribution of federation funds among the major categories of programs during the calendar year of 1953. In both 1952 and 1953, the UJA received 60 per cent of the totals budgeted, after deductions for administrative and campaign expenses and reserves set aside against possible losses in collections. Because of the over-all decline in funds, however, the total for the UJA was reduced from \$60,000,000 to \$58,000,000. The proportion obtained by all overseas and refugee aid programs was 65 per cent in 1953—slightly less than in 1952, due primarily to a substantial decline in costs of refugee assistance programs in local communities.

It was estimated that federations and welfare funds granted \$4,686,000 to national domestic agencies in 1953, which was about \$120,000 more than had been allotted in 1952. Local services received (for operating purposes) \$1,150,000 more in 1953 than in 1952, and the proportion of the total allotted to this field similarly increased from 26 per cent to 28 per cent. On the other hand, allotments of the central campaigns for local *capital* purposes were reduced, both in dollars and in terms of percentage.

TABLE 2

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

(Estimates in thousands of dollars)

Campaigns, Agencies, Needs, Per Cent	Total		New York City <sup>b</sup>		Other Cities	
	1953	1952	1953	1952	1953	1952
TOTAL AMOUNT BUDGETED . . .	96,244	99,420	31,383	31,249	64,861	68,171
Per Cent . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Overseas and Refugee Needs						
United Jewish Appeal . . . . .	58,064	60,086	19,000	19,750	39,064	40,336
Per Cent . . . . .	60.3	60.4	60.5	63.2	60.2	59.2
Other Overseas Agencies . . . . .	2,335	2,607	—	205	2,335	2,402
Per Cent . . . . .	2.4	2.6	—	0.7	3.6	3.5
Local Refugee Care . . . . .	2,474	3,380	—	—	2,474	3,380
Per Cent . . . . .	2.6	3.4	—	—	3.8	4.9
National Agencies . . . . .	4,686	4,565	750	710	3,936	3,855
Community Relations . . . . .	2,529	2,477	375	360	2,154	2,117
Per Cent . . . . .	2.6	2.5	1.2	1.1	3.3	3.1
Health and Welfare . . . . .	175	193	—	—	175	193
Per Cent . . . . .	0.2	0.2	—	—	0.3	0.3
Cultural . . . . .	423	401	—	—	423	401
Per Cent . . . . .	0.4	0.4	—	—	0.7	0.6
Religious . . . . .	410	400	—	—	410	400
Per Cent . . . . .	0.4	0.4	—	—	0.6	0.6
Service Agencies . . . . .	1,149	1,094	375	350	774	744
Per Cent . . . . .	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1
Local Operating Needs . . . . .	26,992	25,838	11,633	10,584	15,359	15,254
Per Cent . . . . .	28.1	26.0	37.1	33.9	23.7	22.4
Local Capital Funds . . . . .	1,693	2,944	—	—	1,693	2,944
Per Cent . . . . .	1.8	3.0	—	—	2.6	4.3

\* The difference between totals budgeted and totals raised represents "shrinkage" allowance for non-payment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, and contingency or other reserves. The figures for 1953 are preliminary, subject to revision when more complete reports are available.

<sup>b</sup> Figures for New York include the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) 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 (JWB), and in 1952, the American Friends of the Hebrew University.

The pattern of fund distribution varied with the size of community because of differences among communities in the extent of their local programs. The largest cities, with Jewish population of 40,000 and over, gave 62 per cent of their funds to overseas and refugee needs, and 33.5 per cent to local operating and capital requirements. In contrast, cities with a Jewish population of less than 5,000 gave 78 per cent of the total to overseas and refugee needs, and 15 per cent to local programs. It should be noted, however, that the figure of 15 per cent in the smallest communities was somewhat larger than the comparable percentage in 1952, thus continuing a trend toward growing local programs, even in the smallest cities.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS  
FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 64 COMMUNITIES  
1946, 1953

(Amounts in thousands of dollars)

TABLE 3A

INCREASES IN TOTAL  
ALLOCATIONS IN 64 CITIES

Local Service	1946		1953		Amounts Allocated in 1953 (thousands of dollars)	Index of Change 1946 = 100
	Amount	Per Cent	Amount	Per Cent		
Family and Child Services . . . . .	\$2,005	24.9	\$ 2,956	19.6	\$ 2,956	147
Employment and Vocational Guidance . . . . .	275	3.4	446	3.0	446	162
Care of the Aged . . . . .	486	6.0	1,089	7.2	1,089	224
Health . . . . .	1,916	23.8	4,423	29.3	4,423	231
Recreation and Culture . . . . .	1,662	20.6	3,382	22.4	3,382	204
Jewish Education . . . . .	1,076	13.3	2,011	13.3	2,011	187
Community Relations . . . . .	405	5.0	536	3.5	536	132
Other . . . . .	240	3.0	263	1.7	263	110
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>\$8,065</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>\$15,106</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>\$15,106</b>	<b>187</b>

N.B. During this period the United States Consumer Price Index rose by 37.3 per cent.

*Aid to Israel*

Financial assistance to Israel continued on a large scale through a variety of channels, including commercial investment programs sponsored by individuals and groups; the Israel government's bond drive conducted by the American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel (AFDCI); grants-in-aid and technical assistance programs provided by the government of the United States; and philanthropic contributions.

**BOND SALES**

The Israel government's first international bond issue—the Israel Independence Issue—terminated on May 1, 1954. The total realized through this bond issue was estimated at \$137,000,000 in cash sales (\$160,000,000 in pledges) during the three-year period, May 1951 through April 1954.

A second bond issue—the Israel Development Issue—was launched in May 1954 with a goal of \$350,000,000, of which \$75,000,000 was sought in the first year. The new bond contained provisions which were more favorable to the investor than the Independence Issue. In promoting the new bond drive, there was an emphasis on establishing Israel bonds as a permanent aspect of American Jewish communal activity and as a continuous source of borrowing for the State of Israel.

Relationships between philanthropic campaigns and the bond drive did

not change. Some possibilities of greater coordination were explored while the new bond issue was being planned, but no agreement resulted from such discussions. The philanthropic campaigns and the Israel bond drive were conducted under separate organizational auspices. Generally, local agreements prevailed concerning the timing of campaigns and other matters of possible conflict. An exceptional conflict did occur in one community—Toledo, Ohio—in May and June of 1954 because of differences of opinion between the Jewish Federation of Toledo and the AFDCI as to the timing of a public event on behalf of the bond drive. This incident, which involved high officials of the bond organization and the government of Israel, engendered considerable conflict in the local community; but it did not have national repercussions and was not repeated in other cities.

#### PHILANTHROPIC PROGRAMS

When first established in May 1948, the State of Israel was dependent almost exclusively upon philanthropic aid for its foreign exchange resources. Other sources, as enumerated above, had developed since that time. The most recent source was German reparations payments, which Israel began to receive in 1953 (*see below*).

Philanthropic funds continued however to provide a very important source of revenue for Israel. While used directly for welfare programs, they also helped to solve the economic problems of Israel by providing dollars to the government in exchange for Israel pounds required for the activities in Israel.

In 1953, American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF provided over \$67,000,000 for Israel, in comparison with \$65,000,000 in 1952. This increase took place in spite of the general decline in amounts raised, because of the continuing shift in the expenditures by the overseas agencies toward larger outlays in Israel and reductions in other areas.

#### REFUNDING LOAN

The role of philanthropy as an aid in helping to solve Israel's financial problems was given even greater emphasis at the beginning of 1954 by the UJA "refunding" loan.

At the end of 1953, Israel's external debt amounted to about \$400,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 was due to mature in 1954. This short-term debt had for years been a very difficult problem for the government. It had been undermining the credit of the government of Israel, had necessitated excessive costs for debt service, and had presented a great obstacle to the carrying out of orderly planning processes in the government economy. The government of Israel calculated that it would require \$75,000,000 in order to meet its most pressing short-term obligations and to bring its financial situation under control. The philanthropic agencies were asked to advance this amount in the form of a five-year loan.

The plan provided for transferring the proceeds of such loans to the Jewish Agency for Palestine. The Jewish Agency, in turn, exchanged the Ameri-

can dollars in Israel for pounds. As a result, the Jewish Agency secured Israel pounds to conduct its health and welfare programs, and the Israel government secured access to American dollars in order to pay off its most pressing short-term loans.

A total sum of \$65,000,000 was raised by the UJA in this loan program, through loans from local Jewish federations and welfare funds. In most instances, the monies were borrowed from local banks on the credit of the welfare funds themselves, sometimes with individual endorsers. They were to be repaid over a five-year period by deductions which the local communities would make from their collections, against allocations to the UJA.

Philanthropy continued, as in past years, to make direct contributions to the economic welfare of Israel by its own programs and activities. It had been recognized for some time that expansion of agriculture at the most rapid possible rate was a crucial element in the solution of Israel's economic problems. The Jewish Agency for Palestine, which was the major philanthropic organization operating in Israel and the major beneficiary of the UJA, spent the largest part of its budget on the development and expansion of agriculture. It sought to stimulate a "town to country" movement by improving the conditions of life in the rural settlements. Other philanthropic agencies contributed toward vocational training programs, thus helping to solve another of Israel's great economic problems—namely, the absence of a skilled labor force. Other programs were concerned with development and improvement of land. Still others had as their purpose the creation of treatment and rehabilitation facilities in order to help people with handicaps to become productive.

#### REPARATIONS FUNDS

A major event during the period under review was the beginning of German reparations payments. Goods received from Germany on account of reparations were playing an important part in the economic planning of the government. As part of the agreement which had been made with the Bonn Government, the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (CJMCAG), a world-wide body representing Jewish organizations, obtained about 15 per cent of reparations funds for the relief of Nazi victims outside of Israel, and an additional 18.3 per cent for organizations assisting Nazi victims in Israel. During the first year of reparations payments, from October 1953 through September 1954, the CJMCAG allocated about \$20,000,000 to philanthropic agencies. The major beneficiary in Israel was the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Others included the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training (ORT) for vocational training, Oeuvre pour Secour des Enfants Israélites (OSE) for health services, Alliance Israélite Universelle for an agricultural school, and a variety of *yeshivot*, other institutions, and refugee rabbis.

The major beneficiary outside of Israel was the JDC, and additional grants went to agencies in overseas countries under the supervision of the JDC.

There were in addition a number of grants to cultural agencies in the United States and Europe, totalling about \$1,000,000.

### Overseas Agencies

The UJA, the major channel for American Jewish philanthropy to Israel, was reconstituted in 1954 by agreement between United Israel Appeal (UIA), representing the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and the JDC. Instead of the customary one-year contract, the UJA was reconstituted for a five-year period, in consonance with the obligations it had assumed in the re-funding loan.

Provisions for the distribution of funds remained the same as in each year since 1951, except that the new agreement provided that 10 per cent of the funds for each campaign year might "be renegotiated in the event that some unusual emergency arises which may make renegotiation necessary."

The basic formula governing fund distribution between UIA and JDC provided that after allocations to other agencies, and deduction of administrative expenses, 67 per cent of the first \$55,000,000 and 87.5 per cent of all additional amounts were earmarked for the UIA, with the balance for the JDC.

USNA was included in the 1954 UJA campaign, but was not to be included in subsequent UJA campaigns following its merger with HIAS.

It was estimated that pledges to the UJA in 1953 totalled \$68,000,000, compared with \$70,000,000 in 1952. On the basis of the formulas fixed in the agreements constituting the UJA, these totals pointed to allocations for the various beneficiaries after deductions of campaign expenses, as indicated in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4

## ALLOCATIONS FROM UJA CAMPAIGNS, 1952, 1953

<i>Campaign</i>	<i>1952</i>	<i>1953</i>
USNA.....	\$ 755,956	\$ 424,249
NYANA.....	2,348,439	1,169,266
JDC (estimated).....	19,255,972	19,194,241
UIA (estimated).....	44,591,830	44,159,685
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL.....	\$66,952,197	\$64,947,441

The UJA agreements in 1952 and 1953 continued to include a provision setting a ceiling on the Jewish National Fund (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.

### JEWISH AGENCY

The Jewish Agency for Palestine spent I£65,500,000 in the fiscal year ended September 30, 1953, compared with I£45,400,000 in the previous

year. Major expenditures (58 per cent) were for agricultural settlement. Assistance was given to about 400 settlements of all types. Projects included water supply and irrigation facilities, agricultural experimentation, loan funds for cultivation of new crops, etc.

Expenditures for absorption of immigrants accounted for 21 per cent of the total. Almost half of the costs of absorption were for Youth Aliyah programs. Immigration to Israel was 11,867 during the year 1952-53, or virtually at a standstill, in view of an emigration at least as great. Because of a backlog of earlier immigrants needing aid, the Jewish Agency's caseload was much greater—56,573 persons assisted during the year. Youth Aliyah wards were reduced in number from 13,000 on October 1, 1952 to 12,000 a year later. The Hadassah Women's Zionist Organization of America and other organizations supplied 38 per cent of the cost of the Youth Aliyah program, while the Jewish Agency supplied the balance of 62 per cent with funds derived from the UJA. Youth Aliyah operations were conducted in educational (mainly agricultural) institutions and in communal settlements.

Other Agency expenditures included: (a) grants to the Jewish National Fund for land development programs, (b) grants for interest payments on loans and loan repayments, (c) educational and cultural activities, (d) organization and information activities and general administrative expenses.

## JDC

JDC expenditures increased in 1953 for the first time since the peak year of 1947. Expenditures were \$22,187,540 in 1953 compared with \$19,758,882 in 1952. The rate of expenditure in 1954 indicated a further increase.

The increase was accounted for entirely by work in Israel. Malben, JDC's program of services to sick, handicapped, and aged immigrants in Israel, absorbed over 50 per cent of total appropriations, as against 30 per cent in 1952. Malben was being expanded from a bed capacity of 4,700 in 1953 to 5,500 planned for the end of 1954.

JDC appropriations for Europe continued to decline in 1953, as they had in previous years. In 1953, a total of \$2,789,000, only 12 per cent of total appropriations, was spent in Europe. The decline was accelerated by the cessation in 1952 of all JDC operations in Eastern Europe.

In 1953 JDC continued, as in the past, to finance relief programs in Moslem countries, but on an increased scale. During the first ten months of 1954 JDC appropriated \$2,728,049 for the Moslem countries, which represented 13 per cent of total JDC appropriations during that period.

## ORT

Every year since 1947, JDC, by agreement with the World ORT Union, had made grants for the latter's vocational training programs overseas. Beginning in 1953, ORT's Israel programs were included, as well as those in Europe and North Africa. The 1954 program provided that ORT would receive \$1,250,000 from JDC toward its total budget of \$1,920,000. On December 31, 1953, there were about 9,300 trainees in JDC-financed ORT schools, of whom 2,391 were in Israel.

### OTHER UJA PROGRAMS

The UJA's allotments to USNA and NYANA continued to decline in accordance with the decreased volume of Jewish immigration to the United States since 1951. Immigration totalled 5,000 in 1953 and was expected to reach about 6,000 in 1954.

USNA and NYANA were to continue in the UJA in 1954. Following the merger with HIAS and the migration department of JDC, which was completed on August 24, 1954, the newly formed United HIAS Service was to raise its own funds, beginning in 1955. NYANA, which, as a local agency, was not covered by the merger, was to continue in the UJA.

UJA funds were also used for subventions to a number of Zionist organizations for various colonization and constructive projects under their sponsorship. These grants, identical with 1953, were: the Mizrahi Palestine Fund (\$750,000), the World Confederation of General Zionists (\$750,000), the Agudath Israel (\$166,000), the Poale Agudath Israel (\$181,875), and the United Revisionists (\$90,000).

These organizations were included in the UIA on the basis of agreements that none of them would conduct separate campaigns in the United States for projects in Israel.

### OTHER OVERSEAS AGENCIES

Organizations other than the UJA reported total income of \$17,800,000 in 1953, which was virtually identical with the figure for the previous year (*see* Appendix). There was little change in either the programs or financing of these agencies. Hadassah continued to represent the largest program, with income of almost \$9,000,000. Its major projects were medical services and Youth Aliyah. The National Committee for Labor Israel (NCLI) and the Pioneer Women's Organization raised funds on behalf of the various activities of the Histadruth in Israel, such as agricultural settlements, vocational training and educational and cultural activities. The American Fund for Israel Institutions (AFII) conducted a fund-raising campaign on behalf of various Israel institutions, primarily in the field of education and culture. 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.

Efforts continued to integrate the fund-raising drives of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Weizmann Institute for Science, and the Haifa Technion, which had conducted a combined UIT campaign between 1949 and 1951. All three institutions appealed to federations for maintenance grants and for permission to conduct special building fund campaigns. Through the CJFWF, the welfare funds conducted discussions with the institutions, and with officials of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and the government of Israel, in order to achieve either a combined effort, or, at least an agreed-upon formula for the distribution of allocations among the three institutions. At the time of writing (November 1954), these discussions had

not yet reached a conclusive result, although agreement was expected in the near future.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine continued, through its Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns, to limit the extent of American fund raising for Israel. It granted authorizations in 1953 to thirteen organizations,<sup>2</sup> including the FCII, which had been omitted from the 1953 list but included prior to that time. This list was practically unchanged since the committee was formed in 1949. The Jewish Agency exercised controls only on fund raising (timing and scope of campaigns, etc.), and did not extend its controls to questions of budget and program.

#### UNITED HIAS SERVICE

The merger of United Service for New Americans, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), and the Migration Department of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), represented one of the last remaining examples of the bringing together of welfare institutions which had been founded in earlier years under the separate auspices of the German and Eastern European Jewish groups. Attempts to achieve a merger had been made at various times, ever since the resumption of large-scale immigration to the United States during the decade of the 1930's. HIAS, JDC, and the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) had participated in a coordinating committee for German refugees during the period 1934-38. When this coordinating committee was transformed into an operating agency in 1939, in order to handle the increased volume of immigration, HIAS operations were not integrated with the newly formed refugee service because of failure among the organizations to agree on a method of handling the immigrant load. Another effort was made during the postwar period 1946-48 to merge at least the overseas services in order to conduct a unified program for the highly mobile postwar Jewish population in Western Europe, and to deal unitedly with governmental and intergovernmental bodies. These attempts were unsuccessful, primarily because of the inability of the agencies to agree upon a parallel form of coordination in the United States. Since that time inconclusive discussions were conducted periodically. The final merger resulted from many months of continuous negotiations on the part of a small committee representing both agencies.

#### *Domestic Health and Welfare Services*

Health and welfare services were maintained and expanded in 1953, despite the decrease in funds available for distribution by Jewish federations and welfare funds. The volume of service increased in almost every field,

<sup>2</sup>American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc.; American Friends of the Hebrew University; American Fund for Israel Institutions; American Red Mogen Dovid for Israel, Inc. (membership campaign only; no application to welfare funds); American Technion Society; Federated Council of Israel Institutions; Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish National Fund (traditional collections only; no application to welfare funds); Material for Israel, Inc. (materials only); Mizrahi Women's Organization of America (no application to welfare funds); National Committee for Labor Israel (Histadruth Campaign); Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women's League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).

and there was a continuing rise in the number of facilities available for most types of care.

### HOSPITALS

In 1953, there were sixty-four Jewish-sponsored hospitals in operation throughout the United States. With the opening in January 1953 of a Jewish hospital in Detroit, all Jewish communities of over 30,000 population except Washington, D.C., now had a hospital under Jewish auspices.

Fifty-three hospitals reporting to the CJFWF showed an increase of 5.4 per cent over 1952 in total number of patients served during the year (from 416,763 to 439,278).

This represented the continuation of the trend which had been consistent during the entire postwar period. It reflected the continuing expansion of facilities through construction of new hospitals and additions to existing ones.

Some of the continuing trends in hospital care were (a) an increasingly larger proportion of patients in the aged and chronically ill categories; (b) greater integration of hospital services with those of other agencies in providing long-term care; and (c) growing programs of home medical care. There was, on the other hand, a decline in the volume of out-patient service for the second consecutive year.

Within the 5 per cent over-all increase in number of patients served, there was a rise in volume of service given by general and psychiatric hospitals, no change for tuberculosis hospitals, and a decrease in other specialized hospitals.

Reflecting the increasingly nonsectarian character of Jewish hospitals was the fact that the proportion of Jewish patients declined from 48 per cent in 1952 to 40.5 per cent in 1953.

About three-fourths of all hospital income came from payments for service (*see* Table 5). Of these payments, half were provided through "third party" sources, such as Blue Cross, Workmen's Compensation, and private hospital plans. There was a consistent increase in income from such plans.

### FAMILY SERVICE AGENCIES

During 1953, there was a further decline in the number of refugee cases carried by Jewish family service agencies. Despite this decline, the *total* number of open cases in reporting agencies increased slightly (from 44,828 to 45,113) over 1952. Family service agencies were stabilizing, after the contraction which came about when the postwar immigration was reduced. In spite of the decline in immigrant load, newcomers still accounted for 25 per cent of the total caseloads of all family agencies in 1953.

Reflecting the declining refugee caseload, there was a further drop—of about one-third—in financial assistance granted by family agencies. Services for non-immigrant families did not usually entail financial aid. With the decline of the immigrant load came a constantly growing emphasis on counseling services. Some of the greatest demands for services were in aid to

aged people, and in helping families with disturbed children. Programs of family life education, on a group basis, were also developing on a larger scale.

For some time, there had been considerable discussion of the "rationale" for a Jewish family service program. In April 1954 the CJFWF published a report on "The Values of Jewish Family Service to the Client and the Community," the product of a committee which had given long study to the problem. The major conclusion of the committee was that the rationale for a *Jewish* family agency (as against reliance on nonsectarian casework services) lay primarily in the values of the agency as an expansion of Jewish community life, and that there were, in addition, certain benefits gained by the client from a Jewish service.

Questions about rationale and program content remained, however. One of these, discussed prominently by professional social workers at the annual National Conference of Jewish Communal Service in May 1954, was whether the family agencies were adequately meeting Jewish community needs or whether they were too highly specialized in certain limited types of counseling services. There was no general agreement on this question, and it remained as a subject for further exploration.

Fee charging for service continued to increase in 1953, as part of the movement of family service agencies away from an earlier emphasis on economic assistance to underprivileged groups toward a counseling service for all groups in the Jewish population. Fees represented, however, only 2 per cent of family agency income. The bulk of income (90 per cent) was derived from Jewish federations and welfare funds and community chests.

#### CHILD CARE

The long-term decline which had been taking place in the number of children served by Jewish agencies continued during 1953. At the end of that year, there were 5 per cent fewer children under care than at the end of 1952 (4,428, compared with 4,642).

The reasons for this decline were the existence of public assistance programs to care for children in economic need, favorable economic conditions, an emphasis in social work practice on doing everything possible to keep the child in his own home rather than placing him elsewhere, and improved techniques of child care making it possible to reduce the time necessary to keep a child in an agency's care.

There was a growing emphasis on the needs of children with emotional disturbances. A survey conducted by the CJFWF on behalf of the New Orleans Children's Home brought to light the fact that there were little or no treatment facilities available in the southwestern area of the country and that there was a great need felt among leaders of Jewish communal organizations for some positive services in this field. Another survey conducted in 1954, of Bellefaire in Cleveland, similarly reflected the need for the extension of therapeutic programs. These were but some examples of the nationwide concern with a shortage of treatment facilities and services.

A major problem in trying to meet such needs was the high cost of insti-

tutional treatment facilities. Experiments were being initiated in the larger metropolitan communities involving the use of specialized foster homes and small residential treatment centers as possible substitutes for the very expensive existing types of institutional care.

Small group residential treatment centers were in existence or were being developed in eight cities.<sup>3</sup> Specialized foster homes were being used in seven cities.<sup>4</sup>

About half of the income of child care agencies was derived from central philanthropic sources—Jewish federations and community chests. The other major source of funds was public assistance grants, representing 22.5 per cent of the total in 1953.

#### CARE OF THE AGED

The number of persons served by institutions for the Jewish aged rose by 4 per cent in 1953, continuing the rate of increase noted also during the two previous years. By the end of 1953, the number of residents under care in 71 homes reached 9,104.

Construction of new facilities and conversion or remodeling of old facilities continued during 1953–54, with chief emphasis upon facilities for the care of the chronically ill and for acutely ill residents not requiring intensive hospital care. About 4 per cent was added to total bed capacity in 1953. The utilization of bed capacity continued at a high level—92 per cent, with five homes reporting utilization rates of more than 100 per cent, reflecting the use of beds not regularly available.

Homes for the aged obtained the greater portion of their operating funds through payments by or on behalf of residents, reflecting, as did other types of Jewish social service, the declining importance of financial relief in Jewish social service programs. About half of these payments represented Old Age Assistance or Old Age and Survivors Insurance grants received by the residents.

At the General Assembly of the CJFWF in November 1953, a definitive paper was presented, entitled "Care of The Aged in 1954," which described developments that had been emerging during the previous five years or more. Heavy emphasis was placed in this paper on total community planning for the aged, of which institutional care represented but a part. It was pointed out that only 4 per cent of the aged population were in institutions, and that a wide network, of health, casework, group work, rehabilitative, educational and cultural services, calling for a high degree of coordination among *all* Jewish agencies, was required to meet adequately the full gamut of needs of the aged Jewish population. A growing number of communities were beginning to develop comprehensive programs along those suggested lines. Most notable was Cleveland, which decided to organize a central commission on the aged, under federation auspices, as the result of an intensive study completed in the summer of 1954.

<sup>3</sup> Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Newark, New York, St. Louis, San Francisco.

<sup>4</sup> Cincinnati, Columbus, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, New York, St. Louis, St. Paul.

## JEWISH VOCATIONAL SERVICES

There were twenty-three Jewish vocational service (JVS) agencies which reported regularly to the Jewish Occupational Council, their national association. All of the agencies provided individual educational and vocational guidance and job placement services. Virtually all of them had facilities for psychological testing, and fifteen conducted group guidance programs. About half also offered small business consultation, and a few made cash loans or grants for small businesses. Programs included special experimental projects designed to meet the vocational needs of the aged and of persons with physical, emotional, or mental handicaps.

One of the newer forms of service being developed was the sheltered workshop, providing training and employment opportunities for various types of handicapped groups. St. Paul established a sheltered workshop in 1953, bringing to nine the number of JVS agencies now conducting such programs. Five other communities were studying the possibility of a workshop.

Reports submitted to the JOC for the calendar year 1953 showed that approximately 79,500 applications for employment and vocational counseling came into the agencies, an increase of about 2 per cent over the previous year.

Of the applications in 1953, approximately 65,500 were in placement and 14,000 in counseling. The number of placement applications showed a rise of about 2 per cent from 1952, but the vocational guidance figures showed no change.

There was a sharp decrease in the number of job openings, from 72,000 in 1952 to 56,000 in 1953, a drop of 22 per cent. Similarly, the number of job placements decreased by 16.6 per cent, from 24,000 in 1952 to 20,000 in 1953.

These figures reflected the economic changes which took place in 1953. Many of the Jewish JVS agencies were located in industrial areas which suffered recessions in 1953. In view of the fact that such agencies dealt with marginal groups in the labor force, the drop in number of placements was considered to be a normal reflection of the economic situation.

Preliminary reports indicated that this same trend of adverse economic factors was continuing in 1954 and that the decline in openings and placements in 1954 would probably be even sharper than it had been in 1953.

## *Education, Recreation, Culture, and Youth Services*

Jewish community life was characterized by a very large number of educational and cultural activities under a great variety of organizational auspices. Programs included formal and informal education, recreation and group work, Jewish research, youth services, and adult education and social action activities of ideological organizations. In addition, religious congregations were responsible for a very large portion of the total group activity

of American Jewry. Social and cultural activities were apparently a growing aspect of synagogue life.

There was no central resource for collecting data on this tremendous range of activity, thus making a complete record unavailable. Only some aspects could be touched upon in this review. These were primarily the activities of organizations which were in some measure dependent upon the general Jewish contributing public for support, and/or within the reporting system of national service agencies such as the CJFWF and the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB).

#### JEWISH CENTERS <sup>5</sup>

Jewish centers accounted for the major portion of recreational and youth services on the local level. The trends during 1952 (the last year for which information was available) were consistent with developments that had been taking place since World War II. Chief among these were the following: a) Growing emphasis upon programs for younger children on the one hand and the aged on the other. The number of nursery schools and informal play groups under Jewish center auspices continued to rise. The same was true of "Golden Age Clubs" and other forms of recreational activity for the older adult; b) Migration of Jews to suburban areas continued at a rapid pace, giving rise to problems of center organization in new neighborhoods. There was a growth of suburban branch activity and also the removal of center buildings to newer neighborhoods; c) The building of new centers and the renovation of older structures continued during this period.

TABLE 5<sup>a</sup>  
RECEIPTS OF JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES, 1953

<i>Source</i>	<i>Hospitals</i>	<i>Family Agencies</i>	<i>Child Care</i>	<i>Aged</i>
Federations and Welfare Funds . . . . .	\$ 6,458,851	\$4,806,428	\$1,949,741	\$ 1,335,268
Community Chests . . . . .	2,267,050	2,295,571	573,881	565,515
Other Contributions . . . . .	2,302,184	167,374	400,897	1,309,682
Payment for Services . . . . .	57,011,318	173,288	479,722	6,538,408
Public Funds . . . . .	6,819,686	—	1,099,380	—
Other . . . . .	1,948,813	504,078	382,619	737,284
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>\$76,807,902</b>	<b>\$7,946,739</b>	<b>\$4,886,240</b>	<b>\$10,486,157</b>

<sup>a</sup> Figures are incomplete for the entire country, since they include only agencies reporting financial data to CJFWF. It is estimated that reporting agencies served about 90 per cent of the total Jewish population in the United States.

Center membership had increased each year since 1943. It was estimated that total membership in all centers throughout the country was 531,000 in 1952, representing an increase of 3.5 per cent over 1951.

Thirty-five per cent of the total center membership was under fourteen years of age. The increase in center membership since 1945 was estimated

<sup>5</sup> Information obtained from the National Jewish Welfare Board.

at 25 per cent. There was a decline in the number of members in the eighteen through twenty-four age group. This group represented about 10 per cent of the total membership in 1952, compared with 23 per cent in 1947. On the other hand, members twenty-five years of age or over constituted 43.5 per cent of the total membership, compared with 34.9 per cent in 1950.

In spite of the fact that the number of teen-agers was declining, a great deal of attention was paid in center programming to the needs of teen-agers, and center workers reported that this age group presented ever greater problems, reflecting the strains and tensions related to defense mobilization.

Teen-age programs stressed social activities in large groups, as well as small discussion groups dealing with personal problems, problems of Jewish identification, sex education, standards of behavior, etc.

Total operating expenditures of centers (estimated) increased by 9.4 per cent from \$12,763,000 in 1951, to \$13,975,000 in 1952. As Table 6 indicates, there had been almost a three-fold increase in the total expenditures of all Jewish centers since 1941. Corrected for changes in the cost of living, the "real" increase, reflecting expansion of facilities, program, etc., was 51.8 per cent.

Centers derived their income from a variety of sources. In 1952, 40 per cent of total income came from membership dues and income earned by the centers from functions and activities, 52 per cent from philanthropic sources, and 8 per cent from miscellaneous sources. This was about the same pattern of financing which had existed in 1948, except for a slight

TABLE 6

TOTAL, ACTUAL AND ADJUSTED, ESTIMATED OPERATING EXPENDITURES OF ALL JEWISH CENTERS, 1941-1952

	<i>Total Estimated Operating Cost</i>		<i>Adjusted Estimated Operating Cost*</i>	
	<i>Amount (in \$1,000)</i>	<i>Per Cent Change from 1941</i>	<i>Amount (in \$1,000)</i>	<i>Per Cent Change from 1941</i>
1941.....	\$ 5,100	—	\$5,100	—
1942.....	5,250	+ 2.9	4,738	- 7.1
1943.....	5,719	+ 12.1	4,863	- 4.7
1944.....	6,211	+ 21.8	5,197	+ 1.9
1945.....	7,171	+ 40.6	5,868	+15.1
1946.....	8,207	+ 60.9	6,189	+21.3
1947.....	9,361	+ 83.5	6,171	+21.0
1948.....	10,325	+102.4	6,319	+23.9
1949.....	11,276	+121.1	6,969	+36.6
1950.....	11,829	+131.9	7,239	+41.9
1951.....	12,763	+150.2	7,165	+40.5
1952.....	13,975	+174.0	7,744	+51.8

\* The amounts under this heading are adjusted from those in the first column by application of changes in the revised Consumer Price Index.

TABLE 7

PER CENT OF AGGREGATE CENTER INCOME RECEIVED  
FROM PRINCIPAL SOURCES, 1948-52

Source of Income	Per Cent of Total Income Received from Stated Sources				
	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948
Membership Dues . . . . .	12.7	12.3	16.5	17.0	17.8
Activities . . . . .	27.2	25.0	23.3	26.4	23.6
Community Chest . . . . .	18.2	20.4	23.8	23.5	24.6
Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds . . . . .	32.2	33.7	27.4	25.7	22.1
Contributions . . . . .	1.3	1.1	1.5	1.4	2.5
All Other . . . . .	8.4	7.5	7.5	6.0	9.4
TOTAL . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

rise in the proportion provided by philanthropic funds as against the proportion obtained from earned income (see Table 7).

There was a substantial change in the participation by Jewish federations in the financing of centers. In 1948, federations had accounted for 22 per cent of total center income. Their contribution rose to 32 per cent by 1952. In contrast, there was a decline in the proportion of total income supplied by nonsectarian community chests.

#### NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), the national association of all Jewish centers, continued in 1953 its comprehensive program of services to Jews in the armed forces and to Jewish centers, as well as its sponsorship of a number of broad cultural projects, such as the Jewish Book and Music Councils.

Beginning in 1953, the JWB participated in a cooperative "budget review" process initiated by the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC), an informal body made up of officers of Jewish welfare funds in the larger cities exclusive of New York. After reviewing the JWB budget, the LCBC in May 1953 recommended increased support to the JWB to meet its current operating needs and certain priority requirements which it had been unable to meet in behalf of work in the armed forces. While this recommendation had a positive effect in maintaining JWB's income from welfare funds, the JWB did not receive enough income to meet its requirements, and continued to experience a deficit.

During this period, the JWB also continued to participate as one of a group of sectarian agencies in the United Service Organizations (USO), which provided off-the-post recreational programs on a nonsectarian basis to armed forces personnel.

## OTHER NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Some of the organizations and institutions functioning on a national level are listed in the Appendix. In general, these organizations experienced modest increases of income in 1953. The range of activities covered by these various institutions included Jewish research and scholarship (the Conference on Jewish Relations, the Yiddish Scientific Institute, the American Jewish Historical Society, the American Jewish Archives, the American Academy for Jewish Research); publications and informational services (Histadruth Ivrit, the Jewish Publication Society, the *Menorah Journal*); membership programs involving considerable emphasis on youth activities and adult education (the B'nai B'rith National Youth Services, and the Zionist Organization of America); and institutions of higher learning (Dropsie College, and the Jewish Teachers Seminary). The table also includes a number of religious agencies, primarily theological seminaries or national congregational associations. Developments in religious institutions are treated elsewhere in this YEAR BOOK (see p. 230). It may be noted here, however, that the income of these institutions from the institutions' own sources continued to increase in 1953 as it had in 1952, whereas the amounts obtained through welfare funds decreased. Among the national institutions listed in the Appendix tables, religious institutions represented the largest single group.

Next to Jewish centers, projects sponsored by B'nai B'rith probably accounted for the largest volume of youth services. The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations operated on 207 university and college campuses in the United States, Canada, and at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. The foundations provided religious services and programs of Jewish education and activities for Jewish students. The B'nai B'rith Youth Organization reported a membership of 27,000 organized in 1,100 chapters, in 275 communities. Activities included holiday celebrations, Jewish book and music programs, dramatics, round table discussions, religious services, and the like.

A number of domestic cultural agencies were beginning to benefit from funds available through German reparations. The CJMCAG met in March 1954, and decided to set aside \$900,000 for cultural programs, to include religious education (40 per cent), salvation of cultural treasures (20 per cent), and research and publications (40 per cent). Organizations applying for a share of these funds were YIVO, the Conference on Jewish Relations, the Histadruth Ivrit, the American Academy for Jewish Research, and the Congress for Jewish Culture.

In the field of formal Jewish education, an important development was a national study, sponsored by the American Association for Jewish Education, to measure the results of Jewish education in the past, to analyze the goals of Jewish parents today, and to formulate programs for future developments. The study, which was initiated in 1952, was to continue until 1957, at a cost of about \$150,000, through a combination of self-studies in local communities and independent national investigations by a national staff. Pilot studies were conducted in Cleveland, Ohio, and Savannah, Ga.,

during 1953, and were planned for Washington, D.C., Lynn, Mass., and Rochester, N. Y., in 1954.

### *Community Relations*

Community relations programs were conducted by a number of national organizations and by community relations councils in local communities.

The national agencies received, as a group, slightly more income in 1953 than they had in 1952. This reflected primarily the relatively favorable fund-raising experience of the largest agencies—the American Jewish Committee and Anti-Defamation League—which campaigned through the Joint Defense Appeal (JDA).

There were no major changes in the nature of the programs conducted by the agencies, nor in the pattern of organization in this field. The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), which was made up of twenty-seven local community relations councils, one regional council, three state-wide organizations, and six national agencies, functioned along the lines set down by its Plenary Session of September 1952, following the evaluative study and the MacIver Report (*see* AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1953 [Vol. 54], p. 162-77). During 1953, a process of joint program planning was initiated. National member agencies submitted recommended projects and relative priorities for review by the NCRAC as a whole, and a joint program plan was developed for recommendation to all of the agencies, both local and national. The other major aspect of the program agreed upon in 1952 had been a process of reassessment to provide basic evaluations of current programs of Jewish community relations work. During 1953 a special committee on reassessment conducted an analysis of inter-religious activities, and began an examination of activities related to overt forms of anti-Semitism.

The American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, which had withdrawn from the NCRAC because of opposition to decisions growing out of the evaluative study, continued to function in all areas of community relations program. With slightly additional funds available to these agencies in 1953, there were increases in expenditures for informational and educational activities, investigative work, and community service, with decreases in legal and legislative activities, scientific research, and over-all administration.

There was no progress toward the establishment of closer cooperation between these agencies and those in the NCRAC, except that agreement was reached after lengthy negotiations on cooperative sponsorship and financing of a motion picture project—an activity located in Los Angeles, designed to work with the motion picture industry on matters affecting the Jewish interest.

The NCRAC, and the national agencies affiliated with it, participated in the budget review process of the Large City Budgeting Conference. Their minimum budgets were reviewed and approved. Since recommendations of

the LCBC were not binding, each community allocated funds in relation to its own income and autonomous decisions.

The NCRAC itself, which became dependent for a major portion of its financing upon welfare funds following the withdrawal of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, obtained very favorable acceptance in its initial campaign, receiving \$110,000 from local communities in 1953, compared with \$46,000 in 1952.

### *Tercentenary Celebration*

As the review period ended, September 1954, the date for the formal opening of the celebration of the Tercentenary of Jewish Settlement in the United States, was approaching. Virtually all domestic organizations, especially those having an educational or cultural emphasis, had related their activities to the tercentenary in some measure, beginning in 1954. The tercentenary theme was prominent at the two major conferences concerned with Jewish communal service—the professional National Conference for Jewish Communal Service, which met in May 1954, and the General Assembly of the CJFWF in November 1953. Further development of the theme was planned for the 1954–55 conferences as well. The Jewish center movement celebrated its centennial in 1953, relating that anniversary to the larger event.

In the field of Jewish communal service, the tercentenary coincided with a period of re-examination, study, and evaluation, as well as consolidation of past gains. Coincidentally, the William J. Shroder Award, commemorating the founder and first president of the CJFWF, was established in the tercentenary year, to be given annually to two agencies making outstanding contributions to social welfare, one agency in a larger Jewish community (over 20,000 Jewish population), the other in a city with a smaller Jewish population. The first awards were won by Montefiore Hospital of New York for its program of home care, and by the Jewish Federation of Southern Illinois, a federation of over sixty small towns and villages, for demonstrating an effective method of bringing services to isolated rural areas.

Included in the American Jewish Tercentenary Committee's program was a ten-volume documentary American Jewish history, on which work was begun. Some fifteen communities were planning to sponsor and finance the writing of local community histories. Nationally, histories were being written of the federation movement and of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service. Various conferences and meetings were being called to promote projects in American Jewish history, sociology, and scholarship, and the LCBC organized a special committee to explore the possibilities of finding a more effective method of promoting Jewish cultural activity.

While no integrated or large-scale program had yet crystallized (except for the historical project included in the program of the American Jewish Tercentenary Committee), there were many indications of a rapidly growing interest in a more intensive development of American Jewish culture.

# APPENDIX

## RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES

TABLE I

RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS  
FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND OTHER SOURCES, 1953 AND 1952

	Federations and Welfare Funds		Other Contributions		Other Income		TOTAL	
	1953	1952	1953	1952	1953	1952	1953	1952
<i>United Jewish Appeal and Subsidiary Agencies</i>								
United Jewish Appeal <sup>a</sup> .....	\$63,001,175	\$69,752,705	—	—	\$ 172,100	—	\$63,001,175	\$69,752,705
IDCb.....	—	—	—	—	67,055	—	172,100	68,700
United Israel Appeal.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	67,055	11,531
Jewish National Fund.....	—	—	\$ 2,202,863	\$ 2,152,208	—	—	2,202,863	2,152,208
United Service for New Americans.....	—	—	—	—	47,037	42,463	47,037	42,463
New York Association for New Americans.....	—	—	—	—	18,428	19,850	18,428	19,850
American ORT Federation.....	—	—	342,660	252,572	21,837	34,484	364,497	287,056
<b>TOTAL UJA AND SUBSIDIARIES.....</b>	<b>\$63,001,175</b>	<b>\$69,752,705</b>	<b>\$ 2,545,523</b>	<b>\$ 2,404,780</b>	<b>\$ 326,457</b>	<b>\$ 177,028</b>	<b>\$65,873,155</b>	<b>\$72,334,513</b>
<i>Other Overseas Agencies</i>								
Weizmann Institute for Science.....	\$ 165,786	\$ 161,699	\$ 496,953	\$ 644,822	\$ 839	\$ 8,312	\$ 663,578	\$ 814,833
American Friends of Hebrew University.....	413,604	414,129	306,275	237,406	145,421	124,428	865,300	775,963
American Technion Society.....	174,260	170,205	769,603	426,539	—	6,136	943,923	602,880
American Fund for Israel Institutions.....	398,286	332,083	660,809	581,911	—	—	1,059,095	913,994
Federated Council of Israel Institutions.....	128,123	136,129	89,167	28,476	—	—	217,290	164,605
Hadassah.....	°	°	7,518,922 <sup>d</sup>	7,560,420 <sup>d</sup>	1,266,989	1,261,634	8,785,911	8,822,063
Junior Hadassah.....	°	°	39,617 <sup>e</sup>	46,602 <sup>e</sup>	3,682	7,830	45,299	54,432
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society.....	286,195	374,750	667,568	750,334	134,069	135,080	1,087,811	1,260,164
Medical School Campaign.....	°	°	42,901	44,483	22,261	20,845	65,162	65,328
National Committee for Labor Israel <sup>f</sup> .....	371,763	429,231	1,467,185	1,669,763	—	—	1,838,948	2,098,994
National Council of Jewish Women.....	40,000 <sup>g</sup>	40,000 <sup>g</sup>	°	°	178,504	183,231	653,854	669,766
Pioneer Women.....	°	°	1,518,979 <sup>d</sup>	1,444,474 <sup>d</sup>	65,906	76,269	1,584,885	1,520,743
<b>SUB-TOTAL.....</b>	<b>\$ 1,978,017</b>	<b>\$ 2,058,226</b>	<b>\$14,013,329</b>	<b>\$13,881,774</b>	<b>\$1,819,671</b>	<b>\$1,823,765</b>	<b>\$17,811,076</b>	<b>\$17,763,765</b>
<b>OVERSEAS TOTAL.....</b>	<b>\$64,979,192</b>	<b>\$71,810,931</b>	<b>\$16,558,852</b>	<b>\$16,286,554</b>	<b>\$2,146,128</b>	<b>\$2,000,793</b>	<b>\$83,684,231</b>	<b>\$90,098,278</b>

<sup>a</sup> The income is given for the calendar year, not the campaign year.

<sup>b</sup> Includes non-UJA income only.

<sup>c</sup> Records do not indicate what fraction of income came from welfare funds.

<sup>d</sup> Excludes amounts raised for JNF.

<sup>e</sup> Excludes overseas income and governmental income.

<sup>f</sup> Estimated.

## RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES

TABLE 2

RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS  
FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND OTHER SOURCES, 1953 AND 1952

	Federations and Welfare Funds		Other Contributions		Other Income		TOTAL	
	1953	1952	1953	1952	1953	1952	1953	1952
<i>Community Relations Agencies</i>								
Joint Defense Appeal.....	\$1,606,535	\$1,547,447	\$1,730,000	\$1,675,264	\$250,350	\$224,110	\$3,336,535	\$3,222,711
American Jewish Committee.....	—	—	264,519	274,181	4,951	13,819	250,350 <sup>a</sup>	224,110 <sup>a</sup>
Anti-Defamation League.....	—	—	10,775	12,057	149,663 <sup>b</sup>	110,249 <sup>b</sup>	269,480 <sup>a</sup>	288,000 <sup>a</sup>
American Jewish Congress—World Jewish Congress.....	679,053	729,748	352,926	372,728	43,938	43,954	839,491	852,054
Jewish Labor Committee.....	226,726	218,993	—	—	43,938	—	622,590	635,675
Jewish War Veterans of U. S.....	115,949	113,684	12,145	33,845	128,642	126,062	256,736	273,591
National Community Relations Advisory Council.....	110,165	46,375	—	—	34,375	99,500	144,540	145,875
SUB-TOTAL <sup>a</sup> .....	\$2,738,428	\$2,656,247	\$2,370,365	\$2,368,075	\$611,929	\$617,694	\$5,720,722	\$5,642,016
<i>Health and Welfare Agencies</i>								
“City of Hope”.....	\$42,839	\$51,982	\$1,116,395	\$860,800	\$176,984	\$233,489	\$1,336,218	\$1,146,271
Jewish Consumptives Relief Society.....	29,531	29,791	510,339	446,396	72,263	108,721	612,733	584,908
Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital.....	80,494	78,117	199,762	184,670	133,493	96,856	413,749	359,643
National Home for Jewish Children.....	12,562	12,758	258,614	305,731	36,135	24,967	307,511	343,456
SUB-TOTAL.....	\$165,426	\$172,648	\$2,085,710	\$1,797,597	\$418,875	\$464,033	\$2,670,011	\$2,434,278
<i>National Service Agencies</i>								
American Association for Jewish Education.....	\$67,508	\$63,705	\$41,135	\$46,508	\$26,026	\$13,114	\$134,669	\$123,327
Jewish Occupational Council.....	7,570	8,857	—	—	1,650	1,762	9,220	10,619
National Conference of Jewish Communal Service.....	6,305	6,206	5,795	5,063	8,315	8,103	20,415	19,372
National Jewish Welfare Board.....	1,089,510	1,107,533	—	—	45,858	54,937	1,135,368	1,162,470
Synagogue Council of America.....	7,254	6,379	7,479	3,785	7,565	12,003	22,299	22,167
SUB-TOTAL.....	\$1,178,147	\$1,192,680	\$54,409	\$55,356	\$89,414	\$89,919	\$1,321,970	\$1,337,955
<i>Cultural Agencies</i>								
American Academy for Jewish Research.....	\$3,630	\$3,631	\$8,480	\$11,435	\$4,389	\$2,740	\$16,499	\$17,806
Bizaron.....	2,249	2,800	5,961	7,256	13,932	11,625	22,142	21,681
B'nai B'rith National Youth Services Appeal.....	426,219	417,011	1,238,606	1,233,521	54,412	41,114	1,719,237 <sup>c</sup>	1,691,646 <sup>c</sup>
Conference on Jewish Relations.....	2,274	2,924	4,978	5,891	21,590	6,919	28,782	15,734
Dropsic College.....	34,410	37,419	59,524	64,756	35,297	25,375	129,251	127,550
Histadruth Ivrit.....	16,208	17,170	50,593	54,706	103,965	91,226	170,766	163,102
Jewish Braille Institute.....	3,687	3,590	22,012	24,960	3,517	1,039	29,216	29,589

TABLE 2 (Continued)  
 RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS  
 FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND OTHER SOURCES, 1953 AND 1952—Continued

	Federations and Welfare Funds		Other Contributions		Other Income		TOTAL	
	1953	1952	1953	1952	1953	1952	1953	1952
Jewish Chautauqua Society.....	8,014	8,595	99,572	93,474	749	760	108,335	102,829
Jewish Publication Society.....	5,173	—	21,529	16,181	222,091	216,155	248,793	232,336
Jewish Teachers' Seminary.....	2,523	3,826	38,953	36,706	6,080	12,858	47,556	53,390
Menorah Association.....	6,351	f	25,133	32,470	2,507	2,304	33,991	34,774
National Agricultural College.....	14,000	14,387	31,000	31,000	197,350	151,975	242,350	197,362
Yiddish Scientific Institute.....	30,884	32,098	152,963	132,553	—	—	183,847	164,651
Zionist Organization of America <sup>a</sup> .....	f	f	214,701	120,346	594,359	688,868	809,060	809,214*
SUB-TOTAL.....	\$ 555,622	\$ 543,451	\$ 1,974,005	\$ 1,865,255	\$ 1,260,178	\$ 1,252,958	\$ 3,789,805	\$ 3,661,664
<i>Religious Agencies</i>								
Beth Jacob Teachers' Seminary.....	f	\$ 4,800	\$ 24,197	\$ 246,223	\$ 62,469	\$ 51,393	\$ 304,386	\$ 302,416
Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary.....	2,373	2,557	52,933	59,005	—	—	55,306	61,562
Chachmey Lublin Theological Seminary.....	2,572	3,370	4,658	66,991	66,628	5,588	73,858	75,949
Chaim Berlin Yeshiva Mesifita.....	6,875	7,955	118,603	121,791	70,793	55,590	196,271	185,336
Hebrew Theological College.....	32,443	33,138	233,879	217,934	59,515	69,605	325,837	320,677
Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion <sup>b</sup>	69,629	71,968	686,932	611,236	242,803	274,091	999,164	957,295
Union of American Hebrew Congregations <sup>b</sup> .....	120,300	140,955	603,290	585,076	98,096	66,914	831,015	723,957
United Lubavitcher Yeshivah.....	8,796	11,299	1,127,859	1,100,250	253,690	239,171	1,501,849	1,480,376
Mirr Yeshiva Central Institute.....	f	17,300	157,708	137,938	4,423	29,792	375,772	364,240
Mizrachi National Education Committee.....	9,414	f	27,572	41,335	7,112	6,460	164,820	161,698
Ner Israel Rabbinical College.....	7,411	7,087	132,042	160,726	30,329	16,545	169,782	45,878
Rabbinical Seminary of America.....	10,310	16,422	125,488	101,584	31,666	39,566	167,464	157,572
Teshbe Rabbinical College.....	7,882	10,291	146,628	137,876	31,091	29,919	185,601	177,386
Mesifita Yifereih Jerusalem.....	3,545	5,608	139,462	102,004	22,636	19,744	165,643	127,356
Torah Umesorah.....	3,157	2,816	46,158	40,085	4,932	4,642	54,247	47,573
Torah Vodaath, Yeshiva.....	f	f	443,010	488,517	142,825	151,439	585,835	639,956
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations.....	2,915	3,985	11,596	11,521	171,521	142,441	186,032	176,885
Yeshiva University.....	101,943	101,304	655,669	601,345	571,413	423,282	1,329,025	1,125,931
SUB-TOTAL.....	\$ 459,194	\$ 512,852	\$ 5,341,957	\$ 5,173,524	\$ 1,908,415	\$ 1,630,025	\$ 7,709,566	\$ 7,316,401
TOTAL DOMESTIC.....	\$5,096,817	\$5,077,878	\$11,826,446	\$11,259,807	\$4,288,811	\$4,054,629	\$21,212,074	\$20,392,314

\* Only non-JDA income included on this line.

<sup>a</sup> Excludes overseas income of World Jewish Congress.

<sup>b</sup> Excludes "other income" of NCRAC obtained from national agencies, to avoid double counting.

<sup>c</sup> Excludes National Jewish Hospital and Ex-Patients Tubercular Home; data not available.

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

<sup>f</sup> Records do not indicate what part of the total contributions came from welfare funds.

<sup>g</sup> The ZOA has shifted its fiscal year so that the 1952 figures cover only 11 months.

<sup>h</sup> 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 UNITED STATES AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL<sup>1</sup>

**D**URING THE year under review (July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954), the United States policy in the Middle East seemed to be moving in the direction of favoring the Arab countries over Israel, despite the avowed policy of impartiality and strict neutrality toward both Israel and the Arab bloc enunciated by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in his report to the nation on June 1, 1953 (see *AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK*, 1954 [Vol. 55], p. 110-11). Critics of American policy as regards the State of Israel pointed to United States action in three areas as evidence of this alleged favoring of the Arab states: border disputes between Israel and certain of the Arab states; military aid; and economic aid.

### *Border Disputes*

On September 2, 1953, Israel began operations on a canal for the diversion of waters from the Jordan River between Lake Huleh and the Sea of Galilee in connection with a projected hydroelectric power station. Following an investigation of a Syrian complaint about the project, Maj. Gen. Vagn Bennike, then chief of staff of the United Nations (UN) Mixed Armistice Commission, on September 23 asked Israel to stop work until a settlement had been reached between Israel and Syria.

General Bennike's request was supported by the United States, which on September 26 urged Israel to halt the canal operations. Israel, however, refused to comply with Bennike's request, agreeing only to call a temporary halt of work while the project was under review. Hence, Dulles announced on October 20 that the United States had, since September 25, been withholding an allocation of Mutual Security Program funds to Israel. On October 23, Dulles explained that the funds had been withheld "because it seemed to us that the State of Israel should respect General Bennike's decision, and that as long as the State of Israel was acting in defiance of the decision, it was questionable at least as to whether we should make the allocation."

On October 27, however, Israel Ambassador Abba Eban announced in the UN Security Council that Israel was agreeing to a temporary suspension of the project. The next day, when the work was halted, Secretary Dulles recommended to President Dwight D. Eisenhower that a grant of \$26,250,000 in economic aid be made for the first six months of the current fiscal year, on the ground that the policy of the United States to support the UN Truce Supervision Organization in this matter had been realized "and the impediment to the present grant of economic aid to Israel" had been removed.

### KIBYA AFFAIR

While the Israel-Syrian dispute was still under consideration, the Israel raid on the Jordan village of Kibya on October 14-15, 1953, provoked a

<sup>1</sup> See also pp. 472-77.

new controversy. According to the Mixed Armistice Commission, some 250 Israel soldiers attacked the village in a retaliatory action for the murder of three Israelis by Arab marauders some days earlier. In his report to the Security Council on October 27, Major General Bennike said that fifty-three Arab men, women, and children were killed in Kibya and more than forty buildings were destroyed.

The Kibya raid was considered by the foreign ministers of the United States, Great Britain, and France at their conference in London on October 16-18; in their final *communiqué*, the ministers "noted with grave concern the recent incidents culminating in Israeli armed action"; recalling the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950, they "requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the tension between Israel and the neighboring Arab States."

The United States Department of State on October 18 issued the following statement on Kibya:

The United States Government has the deepest sympathy for the families of those who lost their lives in and near Kibya during the recent attack by Israeli forces. The shocking reports which have reached the Department of State of the loss of lives and property involved in this incident convince us that those who are responsible should be brought to account and that effective measures should be taken to prevent such incidents in the future.

The United States Government has been increasingly concerned at the mounting tension along the frontier between Israel and the neighboring Arab States. It is for this reason that it initiated the recommendation and subsequently, in concert with the British and French Governments, decided to request the Security Council to consider, at the earliest possible date, the situation on the frontiers, to include a direct report by Gen. Vagn Bennike, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.

On November 18, the United States, Great Britain, and France circulated a draft resolution which expressed their "strongest censure" of the Israel action and called upon Israel "to take effective measures to prevent all such actions in the future." This resolution, somewhat modified by the addition of a paragraph requesting the chief of staff to report to the UN Security Council within three months, was approved on November 24 by a vote of 9-0, with Lebanon and Russia abstaining.

#### PUBLIC REACTION

Since the withholding of American funds from Israel coincided with the report of the Kibya raid, both events were associated in the expression of views. Though the general press was in the main critical of Israel because of the Kibya raid, a survey of 162 editorials appearing in 132 newspapers published in 99 cities in the United States during this period showed that despite the Kibya incident, 46 per cent of these editorials were generally favorable, 14 per cent were unfavorable, and 40 per cent were neutral. While condemning the Kibya raid, leading daily newspapers like the *Wash-*

ington Post, The New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Milwaukee Journal, and the Kansas City Star declared that the basic cause of border violence that had led to incidents like that of Kibya stemmed "from the unwillingness of the Arab States to recognize Israel as a permanent fact in the Near East." Most newspapers hailed Israel's temporary cessation of the canal project and the subsequent release to Israel of U.S. funds. A similar group of daily newspapers, the weekly *Time*, the nondenominational Protestant weekly *Christian Century*, and some Catholic publications were outspokenly critical of Israel; *Time* (October 26, 1953) declared that Israel had "made peace harder than ever to attain," because of its defiance of the UN and the slaughter in Kibya.

Both the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) and the American Christian Palestine Committee criticized the State Department for withholding aid from Israel because of the dispute with Syria. Jewish organizations took a similar position. The American Jewish Committee, at its executive committee meeting on October 25, 1953, adopted a resolution condemning the Kibya raid, calling for UN action to compel compliance with the armistice agreements, and expressing concern about the withholding of aid. Similar views were expressed by the National Council of Jewish Women and the New York Board of Rabbis. Statements more critical of American policy were adopted by Zionist or pro-Zionist organizations. The American Jewish Congress charged on October 22, 1953, that the "temperamental vindictiveness" of the withholding of American aid gave rise to "fears that the traditional friendship of the American people for Israel is being turned into an official policy of open hostility." The National Zionist Administrative Council, at an extraordinary session on October 25, condemned the withholding of aid as a "hasty and unfair action." However, the American Council for Judaism, in a letter to Secretary Dulles on October 20, approved the State Department's condemnation of the Kibya raid and the withholding of aid as a means of enforcing the UN recommendation.

The announcement of resumption of American aid to Israel on October 28 was praised by several Zionist organizations. The ZOA issued a statement October 29 welcoming this announcement and expressing the hope that the United States would exert every effort toward the establishment of peace between Israel and the Arab states. A similar message was sent to President Eisenhower on October 28 by the American Zionist Council.

While the three-power draft resolution condemning Israel for the Kibya raid was under discussion in the Security Council, it was criticized by the American Zionist Council, the ZOA, the Labor Zionist Organization, Haddassah—the Women's Zionist Organization of America, the Mizrahi Organization of America, and the Jewish War Veterans. The CIO, meeting in convention on November 19, 1953, adopted a resolution calling on the United States to pursue a policy leading toward peace in the Middle East "without impairing the legitimate rights of the countries concerned." "Such peace," the resolution added, "must be based upon the recognition by the Arab states of the existence of the State of Israel."

## OTHER INCIDENTS

When, on March 17, 1954, eleven Israelis were killed in an ambush of a bus in Scorpion Pass in the Negev, the problems of border tension between Israel and its neighboring states reached new intensity. The failure of the UN Mixed Armistice Commission to censure Jordan for this attack, despite Israel's insistence, exacerbated the situation.

But on March 28, 1954, a group of "military-trained Israelis" attacked the Jordanian village of Nahhalin, killing nine persons and wounding nineteen. In Israel's absence, the Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Israel for this attack. On April 8, the United States, French, and British representatives to the Security Council requested a review of the entire frontier situation. General debate began on May 6, continued until May 12, and was not again resumed.

## PROPOSALS FOR PEACE TALKS

The continuous border warfare and the constant threat of open warfare commanded the interest of many Americans and led to the formulation of many proposals for the establishment of permanent peace between Israel and the Arab states. The National Lutheran Council, at its meeting on February 3, 1954, unanimously adopted a resolution which urged the UN General Assembly to issue a "new appeal" for Arab-Israel talks that would lead to peace: "No peace can be found apart from such direct conversations." A similar position was taken at the national conference of the American Christian Palestine Committee in a resolution on February 16, 1954, which supported "our government in its efforts to persuade the Arab States to accept Israel as a free and sovereign nation within the Near East context," and which commended Secretary Dulles "for forthrightly supporting direct negotiations between Israel and Jordan."

The national administrative council of the Zionist Organization of America, meeting in New York on March 21, 1954, called upon the State Department to play a "more constructive role" by concentrating on the fundamental problems of peace. In a message to Secretary Dulles, the American Jewish Committee on April 5, 1954, urged the adoption of a four-point program for peace and stability in the Middle East: the continuation of economic aid to all nations in the Middle East; the recognition that "no military aid should now be given to any nation in this troubled area since armaments can only aggravate the present instability"; the strengthening of the United Nations truce machinery; and the strengthening and expanding, with the cooperation of Great Britain and France, of the guarantees of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.

A more ambitious program for peace in the Middle East was submitted to President Eisenhower and UN Secretary Dag Hammarskjöld on April 16, 1954, by a group of nineteen religious and civic leaders. Entitled *Security and the Middle East: The Problem and its Solution*, this document proposed that the United States help in the establishment of a huge Middle Eastern development fund, on condition that the Arab nations make peace with Israel and absorb into their own economies the 800,000 Arab refugees.

At its national administrative committee meeting on May 22-23, 1954, the American Jewish Congress adopted a statement "On American Policy in the Middle East," and proposed a three-point program: the initiation of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab states; the ending of Arab economic boycotts and blockades against Israel; and the launching of international projects for the fullest utilization of the resources of the region for the benefit of all peoples in the Near and Middle East. A similar proposal was made at the meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis on June 26, 1954.

#### UNITED STATES POSITION

The deteriorating border situation between Israel and the Arab states during this period was of continuing concern to the State Department and the United States delegation to the UN. On April 8, 1954, Ambassador Lodge, speaking in the Security Council on the Israel-Jordan border situation, said: "Let me make clear at once that the United States is seriously concerned when any government—especially any member of the United Nations bound by agreement approved by the Security Council and by her obligations under the charter—presumes to take the law into her own hands in a policy of reprisal and retaliation. We made this perfectly clear at the time that we discussed the Kibya incident in this Council, and I wish to state now that we continue to hold this view. This repeated resort to this policy of reprisal and retaliation must stop." Since Jordan was not a member of the UN, it was obvious that Ambassador Lodge was addressing his warning primarily to Israel. A more impartial tone was taken by the State Department on April 13, when it released a statement of the "views of our Government" with respect to the Israel-Arab border situation and the impending discussion in the UN: "All of our efforts are directed to the ultimate goal of a peaceful adjustment of the relations between the Arab states and Israel. Before the goal is reached, both Israel and the Arab states will have to modify their present attitudes." The State Department spokesman went on to say: "The first step forward should be the renunciation of force as a means to attain political objectives, and the substitution of cooperation by the parties among themselves and with the United Nations truce-supervision organization."

On May 14, 1954, at the end of a four-day conference between American ambassadors to thirteen Middle East countries and State Department officials held in Istanbul, strong support emerged for a joint United States-British-French declaration that these countries would use force to prevent aggression by either Israel or her Arab neighbors. It was felt that such a pronouncement would reaffirm the frontier guarantees of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 and carry them a step further. However, no formal recommendation to this effect was made.

#### BYROADE SPEECHES

None of these pronouncements, however, aroused the same interest and reaction as did two speeches made by Henry Byroade, Assistant Secretary of

State for the Near East and Africa. Speaking before the Dayton World Affairs Council, in Dayton, Ohio, on April 9, 1954, on "The Middle East in New Perspective," Byroade discussed in some detail the conflicting claims of the Arabs and the Israelis. He enunciated the United States attitude in the following paragraphs:

To the Israelis I say that you should come to truly look upon yourselves as a Middle Eastern State and see your own future in that context rather than as a headquarters, or a nucleus so to speak, of world-wide groupings of peoples of a particular religious faith who must have special rights within and obligations to the Israeli state. You should drop the attitude of the conqueror and the conviction that force and a policy of retaliatory killings is the only policy that your neighbors will understand. You should make your deeds correspond to your frequent utterance of the desire for peace.

To the Arabs I say you should accept this State of Israel as an accomplished fact. I say further that you are deliberately attempting to maintain a state of affairs delicately suspended between peace and war, while at present desiring neither. This is a most dangerous policy and one which world opinion will increasingly condemn if you continue to resist any move to obtain at least a less dangerous *modus vivendi* with your neighbor.

In a second address, on May 1, 1954, at the annual meeting of the American Council for Judaism, Byroade referred to his Dayton address, at times reinforcing and at other times modifying his previous statements. With regard to the above-quoted paragraph dealing with Israel, Byroade said that this first sentence had been interpreted by some "as an intrusion into religious matters, improper for a governmental official." He explained that he had not referred to or cast aspersions upon "the natural feeling of affinity one feels for a brother of his own religious faith, wherever he may be," adding that "the principles of the United States on matters of religious freedom are so well-known that this assertion of mine should need no expansion." Nor had he referred to "proper philanthropic support—in its broadest sense—by American citizens of Jewish faith in the economic development necessary to achieve a reasonable standard of living of Israel's people—nor to support of religious, educational and cultural enterprises in Israel." He continued: "There is no divergence between our Government and American citizens of the Jewish faith who are interested in the development and welfare of the State of Israel." What he had referred to, said Byroade, and what was a matter of "grave concern" was the question of immigration into Israel and the continued emanation from Israel of statements calling for greatly expanded immigration. It was the Arab fear that these urgings "in terms of extra millions" would be heeded that Byroade felt Israel should find some way to lay at rest.

On May 5, 1954, following Israel Ambassador Abba Eban's visit to Byroade to protest his speech of May 1, the State Department released a statement summarizing Byroade's reply to Eban's objections. Byroade said he regretted that the Israel Government had interpreted his remarks on the subject of immigration as "intervention in Israel's internal affairs." It seemed to him

that the Israel government "had overlooked the basic point in that portion of the speech, which was that the Arab world does have a fear of Israeli expansion." Byroade further pointed out that he himself had not specified the course of action Israel might choose to lay at rest the Arab fear of an expansionist Israel. He hoped that the Israel government would give serious attention to finding a solution to the problem raised.

Byroade's speech of May 1 aroused considerable criticism from Zionist groups. The American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs issued a statement on May 9, 1954, charging that the State Department had adopted "a new and obviously partisan policy in the Middle East by exerting pressure on Israel to offer concessions to the Arab states on the assumption that peace may be purchased." On the same day, Rabbi James G. Heller, president of the Labor Zionist Organization of America, addressed a meeting in New York City and charged the State Department with "unclarity and misrepresentations."

At the fifty-seventh annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America, June 23-26, 1954, Byroade's views were severely criticized by several speakers. Emanuel Neumann declared that "Byroadeism is the very antithesis of Zionism," and that "it strikes at the very core and heart of our Zionist conception." Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver spoke of the "one or two officials in the Near East Division of our State Department" who had been "echoing" the views of anti-Israel forces. Rabbi Silver declared: "I do not believe that these officials represent the true sentiment of the leaders of our Government who have time and time again given expression of their deep and sympathetic interest for the security and prosperity of Israel."

### *Military Aid to the Middle East*

After the several failures of the United States and Great Britain to interest the countries of the Middle East in a regional security program, a new approach to this problem was described by Secretary of State Dulles in his report to the nation on June 1, 1953. Secretary Dulles said that "while awaiting the formal creation of a security association, the United States can usefully help strengthen the interrelated defense of those countries which want strength, not as against each other or the West, but to resist the common threat." He particularly referred to the northern tier of nations in the Middle East as showing awareness of the Communist danger.

That the United States was moving in a new direction became evident when *The New York Times* printed on November 2, 1953, a dispatch from its Karachi correspondent about impending formal discussions between the United States and Pakistan on a military alliance. At the same time, Pakistan and Turkey were discussing closer collaboration with each other, presumably with the support of the United States. A period of about four months of speculation on American plans for military assistance to various Middle East countries ensued. On February 26, 1954, President Eisenhower released a statement announcing that the United States would comply with Pakistan's request for military assistance. The President also stated that on February 19,

Turkey and Pakistan had "announced their intention to study methods of closer collaboration." (A Turkish-Pakistani mutual defense treaty was signed on April 2, 1954, and ratified on June 12.) President Eisenhower's statement also contained a guarantee that if American military assistance to any country, including Pakistan, "is misused and directed against another in aggression," the United States would immediately take appropriate action "to thwart such aggression." On May 10, a United States-Pakistan military assistance pact was signed in Karachi.

On April 26, 1954, the State Department released a statement that the United States had reached an understanding with the government of Iraq, expressed in an exchange of notes in Baghdad on April 21, granting Iraq's request of March 1953 for military assistance. The exchange of notes included a provision that assistance will be "related in character, timing and amount to international developments in the area." The State Department release also referred to President Eisenhower's statement on the agreement with Pakistan as giving general background on American policy with respect to military assistance to Middle East countries, presumably underscoring the American guarantee that such military aid was not to be used for aggressive purposes.

Apprehensions among Americans that military assistance to the Arab countries for defensive purposes might be used aggressively against the State of Israel were heightened by the report in *The New York Times* of January 10, 1954, that King Saud of Saudi Arabia had urged the sacrifice of 10,000,000 Arabs to "uproot" the "cancer" of Israel. It was further argued that the instability of the several Arab governments, their neutralism in the cold war, and their single-minded hostility toward Israel militated against their receiving American military assistance. Thus, a study by the Brookings Institute, entitled *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy 1954*, declared that "the Arab quarrel with Israel makes the arming of the Arab states a dangerous project, since it could lead, not to improved regional defense, but to an attack on Israel." The American Association for the United Nations, at a meeting on March 2, 1954, adopted a resolution which stated: "Pending a peace settlement [between Israel and the Arab states], we believe that the supply of arms in this region is ill-advised, and dangerous and inimical to a peace settlement."

On February 7, 1954, six Senators and twenty-nine Representatives<sup>1</sup> wrote to Secretary Dulles, requesting a meeting to discuss their "grave concern" over a program of providing military assistance to the Arab countries. They

<sup>1</sup> The signatories were: Senators J. Glenn Beall (Rep., Md.); Paul H. Douglas (Dem., Ill.); Hubert H. Humphrey (Dem., Minn.); Irving M. Ives (Rep., N. Y.); Herbert H. Lehman (Dem., N. Y.); and James E. Murray (Dem., Mont.); Representatives James C. Auchincloss (Rep., N. J.); George H. Bender (Rep., Ohio); Richard Bolling (Dem., Mo.); Emanuel Celler (Dem., N. Y.); Robert J. Corbett (Rep., Pa.); Albert W. Cretella (Rep., Conn.); John D. Dingell (Dem., Mich.); Isidore Dollinger (Dem., N. Y.); Sidney A. Fine (Dem., N. Y.); Samuel N. Friedel (Dem., Md.); James G. Fulton (Rep., Penn.); Louis B. Heller (Dem., N. Y.); Lester Holtzman (Dem., N. Y.); Charles R. Howell (Dem., N. J.); Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N. Y.); Robert W. Kean (Rep., N. J.); Kenneth B. Keating (Rep., N. Y.); Eugene J. Keogh (Dem., N. Y.); Arthur G. Klein (Dem., N. Y.); John W. McCormack (Dem., Mass.); Albert P. Morano (Rep., Conn.); Abraham J. Multer (Dem., N. Y.); Barratt O'Hara (Dem., Ill.); Harold C. Ostertag (Rep., N. Y.); George M. Rhodes (Dem., Penn.); Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (Dem., N. J.); Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. (Dem., N. Y.); Hugh D. Scott, Jr. (Rep., Penn.); and Thor C. Tollefson (Rep., Wash.).

expressed the fear that "stability and unity in this critical and strategic Near East area may be jeopardized rather than advanced by inaugurating major programs of military assistance to any of the Near East Arab states."

The following day, a State Department spokesman replied that the United States was playing no favorites in the issuance of arms export licenses to Israel and the Arab states, and that United States policy on supplying arms to the Middle East had been laid down in the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950. This declaration recognized the need of Israel and the Arab states to maintain armed forces for internal security and national defense; it also specified that countries purchasing arms would be required to give assurances that such arms would not be used to undertake any act of aggression against any other state.

In answer to the request of the Congressmen, Walter Bedell Smith, then Acting Secretary of State, together with Assistant Secretary of State Henry A. Byroade, met with them on March 3. A letter written by Smith on March 8 and sent to those who had signed the letter of February 7 summarized the main points of this meeting. This letter quoted extensively from the Tripartite Declaration and reaffirmed that "any military aid which the United States may consider extending to states in this area will not shift the balance of strength so as to imperil the existence of any one nation." The letter also reaffirmed United States friendship for Israel and its equal friendship for every other state in this area.

Notwithstanding these repeated assurances, protests against arming the Arab states continued to be made. On February 23, 1954, Matthew Woll, chairman of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) International Labor Relations and Free Trade Unions Committee, wrote Secretary Dulles that United States arms to Iraq would "incite violent disorder and increase the likelihood of the resumption of military hostilities in the Near East—specifically against the Republic of Israel." CIO president Walter Reuther wrote that arms to the Arabs would probably be used "for internal aggression within the Near East."

At its annual meeting in New York January 29-31, 1954, the American Jewish Committee adopted a resolution (by a divided vote, 73-24) which declared that "to grant arms to any nation" in the Near East "which has not shown a genuine desire to live at peace with its neighbors" would defeat the American interest for peace and stability in the Near East. The American Jewish Congress and the B'nai B'rith issued statements on January 24 opposing the proposed arms shipments to the Arab states. Some of these protests provided the basis for a letter to Assistant Secretary of State Henry A. Byroade written on January 26, 1954, by Lessing J. Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism. Rosenwald expressed confidence that the American government would abide by the Tripartite Declaration and questioned whether "certain leaders of Jewish organizations who have presumed to advise on this question of United States military assistance for Middle Eastern States have the competence to formulate a decision in terms of the full complexity of American responsibilities in the area."

Additional protests followed publication of the United States agreement to

ship arms to Iraq in April. On April 29, 1954, representatives of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs called on Assistant Secretary Byroade to urge the State Department to reconsider its attitude. On June 22, 1954, in a statement forwarded to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, the National Council of Jewish Women expressed "considerable concern" at the decision to furnish arms to Iraq, pointing out that "the Arab states as a whole have not displayed any sincere desire to join in the collective defense of the free world."

On June 28, 1954, the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, the Senate concurring, adopted a resolution which asked that, pending the outcome of peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab states, the United States "refrain from furnishing armaments of any nature either to the State of Israel or to the Arab States."

### *Arab Refugees*

In October 1953 a group of thirty-five educators, church leaders, and public figures submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations a twenty-five page memorandum, entitled *The Arab Refugee Problem: How It Can Be Solved*. The group urged the adoption of a three-point program: (1) the initiation of a six-year program at a cost of \$800,000,000 to resettle the Arab refugees on a permanent basis in Arab lands capable of receiving them; (2) the establishment of a resettlement fund, to which Israel should be requested to make a "fair contribution"; and (3) the establishment of a Resources Development Commission under UN auspices to carry out a six-year program for the development of the natural resources of the Middle East. As a *sine qua non* of this program, the memorandum proposed that the UN call upon the Arab states and Israel to negotiate their differences and to conclude a peace settlement.

The Special Refugee Survey Commission to the Near East was appointed in October 1953 by Harold E. Stassen, director of the Foreign Operations Administration, in consultation with the Secretary of State. Its members were Edwin L. Mechem, Governor of New Mexico (chairman); P. Kenneth Peterson, member of the Council of State Governments; and James L. Fieser, former vice chairman and general manager of the American Red Cross. It was originally conceived that the commission would visit the Middle East, but this field survey was indefinitely postponed by Stassen. In lieu of a field survey, the commission consulted with Israel, Arab, and UN representatives in the United States, with members of Congress who had recently visited the Middle East, and with officials of nongovernmental agencies operating in the Middle East area. On December 11, 1953, the commission issued an interim report. The commission urged support of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) until June 30, 1955. (The United States representative to the UN voted in favor of this resolution, which was passed by the General Assembly on November 27, 1953.) It regarded a "permanent and practical plan of development" as the answer to the economic side of the refugee problem. While economic development would make peace more pos-

sible, the commission felt the economic solution was not a complete answer to the problem: "The Commission sees no permanent solution to the refugee problem until there is a more favorable political atmosphere leading to a workable peace established between the Arab States and Israel." The commission urged the United States to do all within its power to accomplish this end, and "to show our intention to be impartial and consistent."

A Special Study Mission to the Near East, consisting of Reps. Lawrence H. Smith (Rep., Wisc.), chairman, and Winston L. Prouty (Rep., Vt.), on February 8, 1954, submitted to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a report of their visit to the Middle East from September 27 to November 2, 1953. With regard to the Arab refugees, the study mission recommended: (1) that proposals for action concerning the refugees should be accompanied by proposals for action regarding other phases of Arab-Israel relations, as an inducement to the Arabs to work out a solution; (2) that the status of the refugees as wards of the UN should be ended, thereby facilitating the process of resettlement, and that the United States should give help to the host countries toward this end; (3) that the administration of the refugee camps and of refugee aid should be turned over to the Arab states; and (4) that Israel should pay compensation to the Arab refugees for immovable property, possibly through some funding arrangement because of Israel's limited resources.

On the problem of improving Arab-Israel relations, the study mission recommended: (1) that "the United States should seriously question the advisability of granting aid to nations which do not comply with United Nations decisions or directives"; (2) that "the United States should serve notice that it will not support the return of the Arab refugees to their former homes within the boundaries of Israel under existing conditions"; (3) that the United States should reemphasize the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950; (4) that the United States should press for compensation by Israel to refugees for real and personal property lost; and (5) that the United States should press for the lifting of the Arab blockade of Israel and the Arab boycott of Israel and of United States firms doing business with Israel.

The study mission believed that a regional defense pact should be encouraged by the United States, "only, however, after complete assurance has been given other nations that such forces will be used solely for the purpose of resisting attack." Underscoring the importance of the Middle East for the United States, the report stressed America's humanitarian concern for both the Arab refugees and the State of Israel, declaring "the welfare of the people of Israel is of continuing concern to the United States."

#### ECONOMIC AID TO REFUGEES

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the United States contributed \$15,000,000 to the UNRWA, thus making a total of \$128,500,000 which the United States had paid out to this agency. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, passed by Congress August 19, 1954, and signed by President Eisenhower on August 26, provided that the unexpended balance (\$29,100,000) of the fiscal 1954 grant was to be continued available, and that a new appropriation not to exceed \$30,000,000 could be contributed to the UNRWA.

### *Eric Johnston's Mission*

On October 14, 1953, it was announced in Washington that Eric A. Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America and a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, would go to the Middle East as President Eisenhower's personal envoy to undertake discussions regarding mutual development of the Jordan water resources on a regional basis, with the ultimate purpose of providing new homes and economic opportunities for approximately 900,000 Arab refugees. As the basis for discussion, Johnston took with him a project for the control of the Jordan water system which had been prepared by an American engineering firm, under the direction of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), at the request of the UNRWA. In commissioning the report, the UNRWA had asked the TVA "to disregard political boundaries, and to prepare a report indicating the most efficient method of utilizing the whole of the watershed in the best interest of the area."

According to this plan, which was formally submitted to UNRWA on October 19, 1953, some 234,000 acres of land not now irrigated in the watershed (in Israel, Jordan, and Syria) would be made capable of producing crops all year round. Tentative yearly allocations of water were suggested as follows: 426,000,000 cubic meters to irrigate 104,000 acres in Israel; 829,000,000 cubic meters to irrigate 122,500 acres in Jordan; and 50,000,000 cubic meters to water 7,500 acres in Syria.

Johnston visited the governments of Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Israel to discuss the proposed Jordan Valley project, explaining that none of its details were fixed in a rigid pattern or an ironclad plan. He reported on November 17, 1953, to President Eisenhower that the countries he had visited had promised to give the project the "most careful study."

During the ensuing months, both the Arab states, acting as a group, and Israel submitted to the State Department detailed engineering proposals of their own. These proposals, together with those originally put forward by Johnston, formed the basis for a new series of discussions in June 1954 between Johnston and the representatives of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Israel.

On July 6, 1954, the State Department announced that Johnston had informed President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles that Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Israel had accepted the principle of international sharing of the contested waters of the Jordan River, and that they were prepared to cooperate with the United States government in working out details of a mutually acceptable program for developing the irrigation and power potentials of the river system. Nevertheless, there still remained a number of specific points on which differences had to be reconciled before the project could be realized. The states concerned had, however, requested that the United States continue to exercise its good offices in attempting to reconcile these outstanding differences.

### *Economic Aid*

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, the United States had made \$52,500,000 available to Israel under the Mutual Security Program. Over \$32,000,000 was used to finance imports of food, fuel, fertilizer, essential raw materials, and agricultural and industrial machinery. The remainder was used primarily for development projects in agriculture, industry, and mining. In his report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program, submitted August 20, 1954, President Eisenhower pointed to considerable progress toward stabilization of the Israel economy. He reported that as conditions had improved, the mutual security program in Israel had shifted from emergency supply to basic development projects.

Technical cooperation funds programmed for Israel for the fiscal year 1954 amounted to \$1,500,000, the bulk of which was used for projects in agriculture and natural resources.

The Mutual Security Act of 1954 provided for an appropriation of \$115,000,000 "to promote the economic development of the Near East and Africa, and for other types of assistance designed to help maintain economic and political stability in the area." It was believed that Israel's share of these funds would be about \$40,000,000, and that for the first time since Israel began receiving United States grants, Israel would probably receive somewhat less than the combined total for Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Jordan, and Egypt. On May 13, 1954, the United States concluded an economic aid agreement with Jordan, the first negotiated with an Arab government. Though no specific sum was mentioned, informed officials reported that \$8,000,000 had been tentatively allocated for operations, mainly to develop water and irrigation systems.

### *Organization for Israel*

On January 21, 1954, the America-Israel Society was formally established at a Founders' Dinner given by Governor Theodore R. McKeldin of Maryland. It was incorporated under the laws of Delaware on March 8, 1954. A nonsectarian, nonpolitical association, the society stated that it "seeks to advance fuller understanding through cultural interchange" between the United States and Israel.

On December 5-7, 1953, the first Zionist Assembly, called by the American Zionist Council, met in New York, representing eight Zionist groups: Hadasah, Hapoel Hamizrachi, the Labor Zionist Organization of America, Mizrachi, the Progressive Zionist League-Hashomer Hatzair, the United Zionist Labor Party (Achdut Avodah-Poale Zion), the Zionist Organization of America, and the Zionist-Revisionists of America. There had been some expectation that this assembly would consider the possibility of reorganizing the American Zionist Council "into a body of American friends of Israel," to include also non-party Zionists and non-Zionist supporters of Israel. This expectation had been based on the statements and resolutions issued over a period of several years by the Jewish Agency and the Zionist Organization

directing the Zionist movement to broaden its base by the inclusion of non-Zionists. While the assembly did not propose any such reorganization, it adopted a resolution calling upon Zionist groups "to foster and expand the cooperation already existing between them and non-Zionists on the community and national levels."

In April 1954 the Jewish Agency for Palestine undertook the task of establishing in the United States a permanent organizational framework for cooperation among Jewish organizations on Israel issues that would embrace both Zionists and non-Zionists. Meetings were held on May 10 and May 19 to discuss the advisability of establishing procedure for regular meetings, for the purpose of consultation and exchange of views on issues related to American Jewry's assistance to Israel. Representatives were present from the American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel, the American Jewish Congress, the American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel, the American Zionist Council, B'nai B'rith, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, the United Synagogue of America, and the United Jewish Appeal. The American Jewish Committee resolved not to join this group, but expressed its willingness to meet on an *ad hoc* basis, and to engage in joint action in areas of agreement, as the occasion warranted.

LUCY DAWIDOWICZ