RELIGION

General Religious Situation

Evidence continued to mount during the period under review (July 1, 1955 through June 30, 1956) of a widespread and deep interest in religion throughout the United States, particularly among young people.

Religion and the Youth

James L. Stoner, director of the University Christian Mission of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (NCCC), a federation of thirty Protestant and Orthodox bodies, reporting on a series of talks he had held with students and faculty members at 300 colleges and universities (The New York Times, October 22, 1955), noted that there were 3,000 student religious groups with 1,200 full-time employees, where there had been 200 such employees twenty years before, in the 1930's. In many schools a higher proportion of students was enrolled in religion courses than could be attributed simply to the increase in the student body. Educational institutions both large and small, from New York University (with a student population of 59,161) to Carleton College in Northfield, Minn. (student population, 860) had organized departments of religion. More than 1,200 of the nation's 1,900 colleges and universities now had a "religious emphasis week" of some sort. Typical of the recognition by secular universities of the relevance of religious instruction in a university education was a special arrangement between the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTSA), and Columbia University, under which students were allowed to receive credit from Columbia for courses taken at the Teachers Institute.

Citing studies he had conducted in a typical Southwest city and similar studies in the Midwest, Professor Carson McGuire, director of the laboratory of human behavior at the University of Texas, asserted that "85 per cent of young people have some sort of religious affiliation, a proportion which is significantly greater than the 59.5 per cent of adults in the United States claimed as church members." He stressed that "children are also more religious than their parents in the sense of seeking a faith and set of beliefs they can live by." In a private communication to the author (June 27, 1956), Professor McGuire noted that he believed the proportion of young people affiliated in some manner in churches might be higher in the Southwestern area covered in his report than in many other parts of the country. Reverend Stoner, in his interview quoted in The New York Times (see above), had
also pointed out that student interest in religion was “perhaps a little greater in the Midwest” than elsewhere in the United States.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

The NCCC announced on September 9, 1956, that more than 100,000,000 persons were affiliated with churches or synagogues in the continental United States.

Church membership had increased by 2.8 per cent during 1955, as compared with a 1.8 per cent increase in population, according to the NCCC. These statistics were gathered by the council from 258 religious bodies reporting a total membership of 100,162,529, or 60.9 per cent of the population. The NCCC reported that the 60.9 per cent of the population with formal religious affiliation compared with 57 per cent in 1950, 49 per cent in 1940, and 36 per cent in 1900. A century before, in 1855, less than 20 per cent of the American population had been church-affiliated.

On October 8, 1955, the information service of the NCCC published a list of cautionary exceptions for the use of such statistics. It noted the lack of annual compilations of church statistics gathered by uniform methods; varying definitions of membership; and the lack of systematic inquiry concerning such matters as the “reasons for the marked gains in church membership since 1940.”

AUTHENTICITY OF RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

In fact, the question whether the obvious growth of interest in religious instruction and affiliation was a genuine religious revival or not remained a moot one. Some serious-minded religionists of the three dominant faiths thought that, while statistically a success, the revival was spiritually a failure. Eugene Carson Blake, president of the NCCC, questioned whether the country was witnessing a religious revival or “a moral bust.” (Look, September 20, 1955.) The Catholic magazine America denied that the United States had “gotten religion,” warning that “much complacency melts away when it is recalled that recent graphs of organized crime, narcotics traffic, juvenile delinquency, and prison populations parallel the same upward trend [as religious affiliation].” And Jewish sources reflected the same incredulity. The Reconstructionist (February 18, 1955) summarized the attitude in the words: “To say that a large number of Americans believe in God tells us nothing about the quality of their belief.” Rabbi Roland B. Gittelson, on June 2, 1956, directly made the charge that “many persons had turned to religion to escape from the reality of modern life.” Will Herberg, in his article, “Triple Melting Pot” (Commentary, August 1955), pointed out that large-scale religious affiliation was accompanied by a trend toward secularism, and that it was necessary to define just what it was that people meant when they identified themselves religiously.  

1 The information service itself listed the total estimated Jewish population of the United States as members of Jewish congregations—though it was common knowledge that large numbers of American Jews were unaffiliated.
2 Herberg developed his ideas on the current religious situation in the United States in Protestant, Catholic, Jew (1955), a book that aroused much comment.
RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION CONSTRUCTION

Whatever the motivation for their religious interest, church and synagogue-goers continued to invest large sums in the construction of buildings to house religious institutions. Per capita contributions in 1955 to religious causes in general was reported by the NCCC on September 9, 1956, as $48.81 a year, an increase of 7 per cent over 1954. The New York Times, on December 10, 1955, provided some documentation for this phenomenon. Its informed estimate based on personal talks was that, since 1950, $250,000,000 had been invested in religious building projects in the metropolitan New York area. At least $50,000,000 of the total had been earmarked for building by Protestants, and $10,000,000 by Jews. The buildings involved included new houses of worship, new schools, and other religious institutions.

RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

Another evidence of an increased interest in religion was the continued popularity of Bibles and Bible-related books: commentaries and concordances, historical, archaeological, and theological interpretations, atlases and indexes, and Bible books for children. Thus, by October 1956 the Revised Standard Version of the Bible had sold some 5,000,000 copies since its publication in 1952; the Doubleday Image Books, Confraternity New Testament for Catholic readers was published in October 1956 in a first edition of 50,000 copies; and the twelve-volume Interpreter's Bible, which offered the King James and Revised Standard translations in parallel columns, in addition to extensive exposition and exegesis, had sold over 500,000 volumes since publication began in 1951.

The Jewish Publication Society (JPS) in its annual report for 1955 noted an “encouraging increase” in the distribution of the Bible and other works of Jewish interest. The JPS Bible sold 41,271 copies in 1955, as compared with 35,421 in 1954, and 26,430 in 1953, with a total of 638,789 in print. Pathways Through the Bible, by Mortimer J. Cohen, another perennial bestseller on the JPS list, sold 12,347 copies in 1955, as compared with 10,788 in 1954, and 9,606 in 1953 (the total printing was 95,750).

Lay Organizations

During the period under review (1955–56), there was no special study of the membership and numbers of chapters of Jewish lay religious organizations in the United States. The following information is incomplete and very approximate. The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (UOJC) had 700 congregations; the United Synagogue of America (Conservative), 559 congregations representing over 200,000 families; and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) (Reform), 530 congregations representing over 255,000 families.

REGIONAL LAY GROUPS

In September 1955 the metropolitan council of the (Conservative) United Synagogue of America was reorganized with the aim of extending the services of the United Synagogue to all Conservative synagogues in the New York area.
On March 10, 1956, Rabbi Bernard Segal, executive director of the United Synagogue, declared that the roster of Conservative congregations in the New York area had risen during the previous five years from 68 to 125; the total membership affiliated with these congregations was now approximately 60,000 families. An additional seventy-five Conservative congregations were in the process of formation.

Rabbinic Organizations

In describing the religious situation in the United States during 1955, the NCCC had reported that there were 353,695 ordained persons ministering to congregations, 222,018 of them with active charges. In 1954 there had been 342,442 ordained persons, 213,167 of them with active charges. On the basis of the incomplete and tentative data available, and allowing for some duplication of membership, it appeared that approximately 2,500 of these ordained persons were rabbis connected with congregations. The combined membership reported by the five national rabbinical organizations exceeded 3,000, but many of these rabbis did not serve congregations. The membership figures were: Rabbinical Council of America, 660; Rabbinical Alliance of America, 500; Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, 650 (all three Orthodox bodies); Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative), 625; Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) (Reform), 715.

Rabbinical Collaboration

As in previous periods, during 1955–56 one of the problems vexing rabbinical groups (particularly the Orthodox) was the extent to which they might in all conscience collaborate with other rabbinical groups.

The ultra-Orthodox Rabbinical Alliance of America pressed hard for Orthodox rabbis to disassociate themselves entirely from coordinated activity with rabbis from other wings of Judaism. On July 28-29, 1955, the Rabbinical Alliance, in common with the two other groups (the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, and the Rabbinical Board of New York) represented in the Joint Orthodox Chaplaincy Board, protested to Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York City against “ignorance of and discrimination against the organized Orthodox rabbinate of New York City.” They urged that all possible steps be taken to insure the recognition of the Joint Orthodox Chaplaincy Board by the New York City administration, which recognized the New York Board of Rabbis (NYBR). The Rabbinical Alliance also called upon its membership not to belong to any rabbinic group which had Conservative and Reform rabbis among its members, particularly the NYBR.

On March 6, 1956, the Rabbinical Alliance released the text of an interdiction signed by the deans of ten Orthodox rabbinical seminaries forbidding Orthodox rabbis to participate in the NYBR. As a result, all of the alliance's members who had previously belonged to the NYBR resigned. The Agudath Israel, representing the extreme wing of Orthodoxy, expressed its support of this interdiction.

There was a difference of view on this question within the Rabbinical Council, which consisted mainly of graduates of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan
Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University. The Rabbinical Council president, Rabbi David B. Hollander, favored withdrawal from the Synagogue Council of America, the coordinating body of the three wings of Judaism, on the grounds that membership on religious bodies that included other wings of Judaism gave status to non-Orthodox rabbis, confusing the laity. On the other hand, the Rabbinical Council vice president, Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, maintained that progress in such areas as kashrut had been made possible only by the cooperation of the three wings of Judaism. In April 1956 the executive committee of the Rabbinical Council decided to continue its representation on the Synagogue Council of America. In addition, the national executive committee disassociated itself strongly from the action taken by its New York metropolitan region in disaffiliating from the NYBR. The executive committee declared that such regional action could not in any way be considered the official policy of the Rabbinical Council.

Religious Practices and Jewish Law

Each of the three branches of American Judaism continued its efforts to formulate the basic principles of its movement, particularly in respect to religious observance. This effort reflected both the variety of practices within each of the religious movements, and the felt need to rationalize a characteristic approach to Jewish tradition and law.

The Orthodox rabbinate was most concerned with the difficulty of resolving questions of Jewish law along traditional and authoritative lines. The Rabbinical Alliance convention in the spring of 1956 resolved that its president appoint a special Bais Din committee to establish a Jewish court of law to study and pass on rabbinical questions of law and related problems, and to have this court function as the final recognized authority for the entire membership.

The (Conservative) Rabbinical Assembly convention in April 1956 adopted a proposal advanced by Rabbi Jacob B. Agus calling for the creation of a continuing conference for the clarification of Conservative Jewish ideology. The hope was that out of this conference, together with congregational forums, a handbook of guiding principles would emerge for Conservative Jews.

In June 1955, at the CCAR convention, Rabbis David Polish and Frederic A. Doppelt presented a sampling from a forthcoming Guide for Reform Judaism, intended for laymen, which they were preparing jointly. The guide, when completed, was to cover every aspect of Jewish life; it was to indicate in considerable detail those religious principles recommended for observance as being in the spirit of Reform Judaism.

In this connection, Rabbi Leonard J. Mervis reported on an informal survey which he had conducted among Chicago Reform colleagues on their attitudes toward the increasing use of ritual in Reform congregations. The majority of the rabbis consulted endorsed the prevailing trend toward ceremonialism in Reform Judaism.

Confirmation

The practice of having confirmation ceremonies for Jewish girls was the subject of adverse comment by the Rabbinical Alliance. This organization
adopted a resolution at its 1956 convention noting that such bat mitzvah celebrations had become a very real question in Orthodox synagogues; it called for the appointment of a special commission to study the problem of bat mitzvah, together with that of the Hebrew education of Jewish girls, and to make positive recommendations.

**Calendar Reform**

In May 1956, the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) voted to postpone indefinitely a proposal to reform the civil calendar. This proposal had been opposed by Jewish groups as threatening hardship to Orthodox Jews, by producing a “wandering Sabbath.” (See American Jewish Year Book, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 194-95.)

The calendar reform plan had originally been introduced to ECOSOC in 1953. Twenty-four governments had gone on record as opposing the proposal, seven countries declared they would withhold approval unless religious authorities agreed, and only one country had come out in favor.

**Domestic Relations**

In April 1956 the Rabbinical Assembly renewed for an additional three years the arrangement by which the assembly and the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America continued the National Beth Din (“Jewish Court of Domestic Relations”). Rabbis from various parts of the country reported that the new Conservative ketubah, or marriage contract (see American Jewish Year Book, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 193-94), had been used in thousands of marriages. Under the terms of this ketubah, both husband and wife agreed before marriage to present any domestic difficulties to the National Beth Din before resorting to divorce action.

In 1955 Yeshiva University published a pamphlet entitled New Provisions in the Ketubah: A Legal Opinion, by A. Leo Levin, professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania, and Rabbi Meyer Kramer. This Orthodox opinion criticized the Conservative ketubah as “not a legally binding contract; court enforcement of a financial award made in order to compel the granting of a religious divorce would offend against the First and Fourteenth Amendments and would be unconstitutional.”

In January 1956 the NYBR announced its continued support of the Gordon-Peterson Bill, which called for the creation of a commission to study the divorce laws of the state of New York (see American Jewish Year Book, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 202). The NYBR was making a special study of a recommendation by the New York State Catholic Welfare Committee, submitted in a letter to Assemblywoman Janet Gordon on August 24, 1956, that compulsory reconciliation services be set up in the courts before any divorce or separation action could be begun. At a public hearing before the joint legislative committee on matrimonial and family laws held on August 2, 1956, Rabbi Eugene J. Sack, representing the NYBR, urged a detailed study of the extent of fraud and perjury involved in divorce cases in New York State.

**Dietary Regulations and Practices**

In 1956 the Rabbinical Alliance set up an investigative committee to “bring clarification into the kashrut situation in America.” This committee
was to serve only as a clearing house, whose first objective would be to investigate various catering establishments serving the New York City Jewish community.

The UOJC reported that during the calendar year 1955, 113 products manufactured by 34 companies in 58 plants had been added to the list of foods certified and endorsed as kosher.

In September 1956 the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York announced that kosher-catered food had been made available in six New York City hospitals under Jewish auspices. Strictly kosher food was available in five other such hospitals. In addition, kosher-catered meals were available in three New York City hospitals under non-Jewish auspices.

On April 8, 1956, a proposed bill to further regulate slaughter houses so that more humane methods were used, was withdrawn from consideration by the New York State Legislature. Senator Pliny W. Williamson (Rep.), author of the bill, was prevailed upon to withdraw it by the NYBR, on the ground that special state laws in regard to “humane methods for slaughter” always were used by anti-Semites as a means to attack the Jewish method of slaughter.

On May 9-10, 1956, hearings were held in the United States Senate on a bill introduced by Senator Hubert Humphrey (Dem.) aiming to establish humane methods for the slaughter of livestock and poultry; the bill specifically exempted Jewish ritual slaughter. The Senate passed a resolution favoring the bill as proposed by Senator Humphrey. However, the Humphrey bill did not reach the House in 1956, because it was submitted on the last day before Congress closed.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE

On March 22, 1956, 250 rabbis representing Conservative, Orthodox, and Reform Judaism urged Mayor Robert Wagner of New York City to “protect the rights of the Jewish citizens of this city” by requesting immediate amendment of the city’s Sabbath Law. A proposed local law allowing stores to operate on Sunday if they closed on another Sabbath encountered opposition in the city council. The matter was referred to the city council’s rules committee for study.

SURGICAL PRACTICES

The New York State Assembly twice during its 1956 session rejected a bill sponsored by Genesta M. Strong that would have liberalized the provisions for authorizing the dissection of dead bodies. The principal opponents of the bill were Jewish legislators, who protested that it violated religious principles against disturbing the repose of the dead and the sanctity of the human body.

WOMEN IN THE SYNAGOGUE

Two contrary tendencies with regard to re-evaluating the role of women in the synagogue were evident during 1955–56. A growing number of Orthodox congregations (sixteen, according to a communication by Rabbi David B. Hollander, president of the Rabbinical Council) had reinstated the mechitzah, or special pews for women. In one case that was tried in the Macomb
County, Mich., Circuit Court, the attorneys for the synagogue minority requesting the mechitzah had successfully cited a relevant decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1954. The Supreme Court had ruled that: "While it is true that the membership [of the church in question] is a self-governing unity, a majority of its membership is supreme and is entitled to control its church property only so long as the majority remains true to the fundamental faith, usages, customs and practices of this particular church, as accepted by both factions before the dissension."

On the other hand, in June 1956 the Reform rabbinate again discussed the advisability of granting women the right to read from the Torah during services; the question of the advisability of discussing the ordination of women as rabbis was also again under consideration (see American Jewish Year Book, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 195).

Primary and Secondary Religious Education

At the end of May 1956, the Mizrachi National Education Committee (MNEC) reported that sixty Jewish all-day schools had been established throughout the United States in the period 1940–55; of these ten were high schools. Over 100,000 students were reported to be attending a total of 150 day schools and 170 yeshivot ("talmudic academies") affiliated with the MNEC.

The Mizrachi committee was concerned about the acute need for larger numbers of competently trained nursery and kindergarten teachers. In an attempt to meet this need, the MNEC conducted seminars for teachers during the summer and winter of 1955. It had also, in 1953, set up an institute for Hebrew pre-school education, which had since become an integral part of Yeshiva University.

Significantly, the MNEC had concentrated its activities in the suburbs where the Jewish population was moving. Thus, in 1955, there were ten day schools in the Long Island suburbs of New York City, and five more were in the process of organization. Isidor Margolis, the MNEC's executive director, foresaw the organization of fifty new yeshivot in the period 1955–60. To develop religious and lay leadership for this promising future, the MNEC had formed a National Commission for Yeshiva Education, composed of representatives of the principals, teachers, laymen, and parents active in yeshiva education.

Orthodox religious groups were eager to influence young people in extracurricular activities. Thus, the Rabbinical Alliance, Rabbinical Council, UOJC, and the UOJC Women's Branch established a National Synagogue Youth Commission of the UOJC in March 1956. Its major activities were to be: to establish a network of summer camps; to intensify the activities of the UOJC-sponsored National Conference of Synagogue Youth; to develop Torah study programs; to provide opportunities for synagogue youth to spend time at yeshivot; to explore new avenues of approach to teen-age religious programming; and to organize synagogue youth groups.

In the spring of 1955 the Commission on Jewish Education of the Rabbinical Assembly began a survey of the current status of Jewish education in the Conservative movement. The results were reported in the Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly for 1955. The schools replying to the question-
naire were divided into three categories, according to the size of the sponsoring congregations: small congregations with a membership of up to 200 families; medium congregations, with 200 to 500 families; and large congregations with more than 500 member families. Thirty-nine small congregations, forty-five medium and thirty-five large congregations were covered by the survey.

Nearly 90 per cent of the schools reporting stated they had raised their standards in such matters as hours of instruction, and requirements for bar mitzvah. A few schools reported the abolition of the Sunday school.

Three-fourths of the elementary schools operated on a three-day-a-week schedule, and 15 per cent operated four days a week. Forty per cent had six hours of instruction per week, 30 per cent a maximum of four and one-half hours. The three-day-a-week system prevailed in 80 per cent of the medium congregations, and 70 per cent of the large. On the other hand, the four-day-a-week system had been introduced into 23 per cent of the small congregations. Less than half of the medium and large congregations offered six hours or more of instruction weekly.

Fifty per cent of the medium congregations, one-third of the large, and one-third of the small congregations did not accept children above the age of nine (the maximum age requirements applied both to girls and boys). However, girls above this age limit were accepted into the religious schools in departments other than the elementary (Hebrew) department. Approximately two-thirds of all the schools, and in each category of school, required attendance of five years or more for graduation; 20 per cent required attendance of only three or four years.

One-third of the congregations accepted three years of Hebrew training as a prerequisite for bar mitzvah; 42 per cent required four or more years; and only 10 per cent of the small and 3 per cent of the large congregations accepted less than three years. Nearly all the schools required of the girl becoming bat mitzvah the same number of years of preparation as they did of the boy becoming bar mitzvah.

Nearly all the congregations maintained a Sunday school; only one of the large congregations reported no Sunday school. Ninety-three per cent of the small congregations, 81 per cent of the medium-sized, and 77 per cent of the large congregations did not expect to eliminate the Sunday school in the near future.

About one-third of all the congregations reported nursery schools, and a somewhat higher proportion reported kindergartens. Only 3 per cent reported foundation schools. There were high schools in about one-third of all the congregations; of these, 60 per cent offered a maximum of four-and-one-half hours of instruction weekly.

Half of the schools used teachers without a knowledge of Hebrew in the non-Hebraic subjects; and nearly 60 per cent of the schools were compelled to have some unlicensed teachers on their staffs.

During the year ending May 1956, the American Council for Judaism (ACJ) reported the development of its religious education program (see American Jewish Year Book, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 196-7). Five new textbooks had been produced; two new Schools for Judaism had been established and operated by parent-teachers, in Denver, Colo., and East Rockaway, N. Y.
there had been a "substantial" growth of congregations in Westchester County, N. Y., and Highland Park, Ill., where ACJ Schools for Judaism had previously been organized. A new monthly newsletter, Education in Judaism, and an Inter-School Memoranda and Interschool Information Bulletin were being published and distributed. An annual teachers' institute had been held to provide the parent-teachers and congregational leaders with the opportunity to counsel with leading religious educators.

Seminaries and Higher Education

In March 1956 Yeshiva University ordained 181 Orthodox rabbis who had been graduated from the university during the previous three years. In June 1956, the JTSA ordained 20 Conservative rabbis, and the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) graduated 20 Reform rabbis.

On September 10, 1955, the national planning committee of the JTSA adopted plans for developing the JTSA as a Center of Human Brotherhood. The over-all plan, to be carried out within the coming ten years, was for work in six major areas: Biblical and Talmudic study; research in ethics and the transmission of ethical ideas; Jewish education; study of the nature of human motivation; research into better understanding among all peoples; and the common study by scholars of all groups of contemporary problems.

To meet the rising national need for rabbinic leaders by new congregations, the HUC-JIR board of governors at its annual meeting in the summer of 1956 re-established its New York school as a full graduate school with a five-year program leading to ordination of Reform rabbis. A Los Angeles, Calif., branch of the HUC-JIR was also established, with the first two years of rabbinic training leading to a Bachelor of Hebrew Letters degree being made available, particularly to university graduates. The goal was to graduate some fifty Reform rabbis annually "within a reasonable number of years."

Scholarship

The Christian Century noted on February 15, 1956, the continuing overwhelming popular interest in one aspect of religious scholarship—the interpretation of the Dead Sea scrolls first discovered in 1947. Many churches were scheduling meetings and lectures on the subject of the Dead Sea scrolls, in an attempt to take advantage of this tremendous public interest.

In February 1956 three churchmen warned scholars and public alike not to be carried away by the fancied implications of the Dead Sea scrolls. Monsignor John J. Dougherty, professor of sacred scripture at the Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, N. J., Dr. Samuel Sandmel, professor of Bible at HUC-JIR, and Dr. John Sutherland Bonnel, a Presbyterian minister, underlined the incompleteness of present studies, the disagreement among competent and informed scholars on such basic points as translation of words, and the extreme tentativeness of every hypothesis advanced. They particularly warned against a premature acceptance of the Dupont-Sommer theory—the claim, taken over by Edmund Wilson, that the discoveries proved that Jesus had deliberately modeled himself after a great Essene teacher who immediately preceded him in Palestine. An international scholarly sym-
posium to assess the Dead Sea scrolls after a decade of investigation and study was to be held in New York in September 1957, under the sponsorship of the HUC-JIR.

The Dead Sea scrolls were published in 1956 in *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, with a translation, introduction, and notes by Theodor H. Gaster; 50,000 copies were printed in a paper-book edition, and another 15,000 copies in a hard-cover edition. Within one month of publication the unprecedented number of 23,000 copies of the paper-book edition, and 12,000 of the hard-cover edition, had been sold.

The interest in American Jewish history, stressed in the celebration of the American Jewish Tercentenary during 1954–55, found its expression in two activities by religious seminaries during 1955–56.

On December 1, 1955, a conference was held in Cleveland, sponsored jointly by the American Jewish History Center of the JTSA (established in December 1953), the Western Reserve Historical Society, and Western Reserve University. Its purpose was to discuss the writing of regional history, and to consider the results of a two-year study of Jewish life in six American communities. The first case study, of the Jewish community of Cleveland, was published in 1956. Others under way embraced the Jewish communities in Milwaukee, Wis.; southern Florida, especially Miami; agricultural sections of New Jersey, focusing on Vineland; Montreal, Canada; and southern California, especially Los Angeles. The center, under the directorship of Professor Allan Nevins of Columbia University, had adopted a comprehensive plan so that the articles, local histories, and biographies written would fit into a broad pattern, and prepare the way for a sound general history. It was anticipated that five to seven years would be required to complete the studies of six communities.

On February 15, 1956, a second conference took place in Miami Beach, Fla., on “The Writing of Southern Regional History with Emphasis on Religious and Cultural Groups.” The conference was sponsored jointly by the University of Miami, the Historical Association of Southern Florida, and the American Jewish History Center of the JTSA.

On April 9, 1956, an advisory council was formed to help locate periodicals for the American Jewish Periodical Center, established by the HUC-JIR to microfilm more than a century of Jewish periodical publications in America. Jacob R. Marcus, HUC-JIR professor of history and director of the American Jewish Archives, became director of the center, on a grant from the Jacob R. Schiff Fund. It was intended to microfilm every Jewish periodical published in the United States from 1823 to 1925, as well as a selected group of journals after 1925. These microfilms were to be made available to recognized institutions, libraries, and scholars on an inter-library loan basis.

An expanded program of graduate study for those men in the active ministry who wished to renew systematic scholarship was initiated in the fall of 1955 by the HUC-JIR in New York. While primarily for HUC-JIR alumni, this program would be open to graduates of all accredited theological schools.

On February 27, 1956, through the grant of a subvention from Louis M. Rabinowitz, the NYBR sponsored the Rabinowitz Lecture Series. The aim of this series was to bring to the rabbinate and laity some of the outstanding scholars in history, theology, literature, and archaeology.
Religion and Mental Health

The plans for a Human Brotherhood Center at the JTSA advanced in September 1955 (see above) included endowment of a chair in mental health. The mutual relevance of religion and mental health had been stressed for many years in articles, books, and sermons.

On May 26, 1956, the Information Service reported that a new organization "engaged in research and education in all relationships between religion and health, and especially mental health," had opened in New York City. Named the National Academy of Religion and Mental Health, its president was Kenneth E. Appel, president of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, professor of psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania, and past president of the American Psychiatric Association. On the advisory council were Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant theologians and clergymen. This academy was to sponsor research in relationships between religion and mental health, conferences, scholarships, publications, as well as consultative and advisory service.

Military Chaplaincy

In February 1956, the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) reported the completion of five years since the fall of 1950 of a voluntary draft system through which all rabbis upon ordination became subject to chaplaincy duty. During this five-year period the three major rabbinical associations constituting the JWB's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy (CJC) had brought 203 rabbis into the chaplaincy. Of these, 131 had already completed their chaplaincy service, and 72 others were still in active service. In addition, 21 had become Jewish career chaplains. Another 44 were being prepared for chaplaincy service.

Set up by the (Reform) CCAR, (Conservative) Rabbinical Assembly, and (Orthodox) Rabbinical Council of America, and administered by the CJC, the chaplaincy availability program consisted of a voluntarily imposed draft under which the rabbinical groups and their associated rabbinical seminaries (HUC-JIR, JTSA, and Yeshiva University) required that every rabbinical student upon ordination make himself available for at least two years of chaplaincy service. The CJC, through the JWB, was the official agency recognized by the United States Department of Defense for giving ecclesiastical endorsement to all Jewish chaplains. Each of the three major rabbinical groups took an equal share of the annual quota.

JWB's Armed Services Division, assisted by the CJC, was also pioneering in organizing local pre-induction orientation programs for Jewish teen-agers soon to enter military service. These programs were a joint effort of synagogues, Jewish community centers, and armed services committees, whose leadership was used on the panels of experts who counseled the pre-inductees.

On February 1, 1956, Rabbi Aryeh Lev submitted a director's report to the CJC summarizing activities for 1955. It noted that 3,000,000 men had been drafted (including Jews) in 1955, and almost 20,000 Jewish veterans had passed through the Veterans Administration hospitals.
The CJC had served chaplains with religious supplies, program aids, and personal contacts, besides prayer books, calendars, mezuzot, kosher food, sacramental wine, audio-visual aids, Sunday School texts, model radio presentations, Jewish periodicals, altar cloths, marriage canopies, and even Torah Scrolls. For new chaplains a fourteen-volume basic library in Judaica had been made available, and, for chaplains overseas, a large sampling of new Jewish literature.

New material published in 1955 included an Armed Forces edition of The Jewish Songster, and a calendar for 1956. The CJC helped the military authorities prepare a new Jewish section for the Armed Forces Hymnal, used by Jewish laymen in the military in the absence of a Jewish chaplain. The end of 1955 found the CJC engaged in preparing the manuscript for a new edition of a prayer book to be printed at government expense. The edition was to run into 100,000 copies.

Rabbi Lev noted that the part-time chaplaincy had grown steadily. Civilian rabbis served the great majority of domestic federal installations as part-time chaplains. This aspect of chaplaincy was expected to remain significant, since it served the needs of veterans to a considerable extent.

### TABLE 2
**Growth in Part-Time Chaplaincy Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Domestic Installations Served</th>
<th>Part-Time Chaplains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civilian Chaplaincy**

In 1955-56, 163 hospitals and institutions in New York State were served by the NYBR chaplaincy corps of 93 rabbis. In 1956, for the first time, the NYBR supplied eighteen state mental institutions in New York State with Passover food, and Passover sedarim were arranged under the guidance of chaplains there. It was estimated that the religious needs of approximately 250,000 men, women, and children in these institutions were being met annually.
Religion and Public Education

Religious groups in the United States remained divided over the advisability and extent to which teachings about religion, or values traditionally associated with religion, might be introduced into the public schools. On the whole, Catholic groups were in favor, Protestant groups hesitant, and Jewish groups opposed (see p. 137-39).

In the fall of 1956 Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in a communication to the author, analyzed the current situation in regard to the teaching of moral and spiritual values in the public schools throughout the United States.

Some of the school systems Rabbi Gilbert found to be "boldly sectarian." Thus, Character and Religious Education in the Elementary Curriculum, issued in 1940 by the Meridian, Miss., Public Schools, maintained that "religious education must be included in the daily program of the public schools. . . . There should be religious pictures on the wall. . . . The teacher should believe what she teaches."

Similarly, the Guide on Moral and Spiritual Education in Elementary Schools, adopted in 1953 by the San Diego, Calif., Board of Education, urged the school to encourage children to participate in church activities, and teachers to affiliate themselves closely with the churches and synagogues of the community. The St. Louis Public School Journal of January 1954, made it mandatory for the teacher to "endeavor to develop in his pupils principles of morality, love of God, and love of man." The Resource Bulletin on Moral and Spiritual Values, issued by the division of instruction of the Fairfax County Schools, Fairfax, Va., in September 1958, suggested that the teacher "begin the day with some type of inspirational program . . . have a blessing before meals . . . discuss what churches in the community have done for better living."

Rabbi Gilbert noted that a number of guides showed an awareness of the complexity of the problem. For example, the Los Angeles city schools' publication on Moral and Spiritual Values in Education, issued in 1954, declared: "We may not all define God in the same terms, but at least we can agree that faith in God means faith in a power greater than ourselves, and that is the important thing."

In contrast with these guides, which overtly suggested that it was the function of the public school to teach a belief in God, other guides, in Rabbi Gilbert's view, took a more subtle and sophisticated approach. Asserting that reverence for God and religious faith was one of the significant values in the American heritage, these guides held it to be the responsibility of the public school to insist that faith in God was among the values long held important by the American people.

Thus, in Nebraska, in a program developed by the Nebraska Department of Public Instruction in cooperation with the American Legion in 1954, references to the deity appearing in such basic American documents as the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution were stressed and discussed in full so that the students might come to understand
that their rights and their responsibilities were based upon their creation by God.

A similar approach was taken in a special curriculum bulletin issued by the department of instruction of the Cincinnati Public Schools in May 1954; and in a publication issued in 1955 by the division of education of San Mateo, Redwood City, Calif., entitled *Moral and Spiritual Values in Education for Elementary Schools*.

Rabbi Gilbert pointed out that not all teachers were convinced that God was the source of all values, or that God as the sanction for values should be taught in the public school. In a survey made in 1954 by the State of Utah Department of Public Instruction, Utah superintendents and teachers were asked whether the school should positively attempt to give a religious sanction to chaste living. The educational personnel were divided in their views; half were in favor, and half opposed.

However, Rabbi Gilbert concluded by noting that there were several guides that reflected a profounder understanding of the difficulties involved in transmitting values and in changing character. Examples of such programs were the Openmindedness Study of the curriculum office of the Philadelphia Public Schools issued in 1951, the program of Moral and Spiritual Values in Education developed by the Commonwealth of Kentucky in 1955, and the Explorations in Character Development undertaken by the Albany Unified School District, Albany, Calif., in 1950 under the direction of Hilda Tabba, professor of education at San Francisco State College. The Albany and Philadelphia programs were based on an awareness that values were not communicated by didactic teaching or through isolated experiences in formalized reverence, but rather emerged in the daily interpersonal association of student to parent, peers, and teacher.

Writing in *Religious Education* (July–August 1956), J. Mansir Tydings described the Kentucky program. This program was noteworthy in that it rejected both sectarianism and the idea of trying to teach a "nonsectarian" religious common denominator. Teachers of different religious commitment (and those with none) were encouraged to help boys and girls arrive at their own right decisions, based on sanctions deriving from law, justice, property rights, personal integrity, and group approval. (The pupils' own personal religious convictions were not excluded.) The Kentucky program did not teach about religion, but attempted to study all subject matter thoroughly and realistically, taking account of religion fully and fairly wherever it occurred.

**Social Action**

The most important social issue facing American clergymen, as well as lay people, during 1955–56, was that of the implementation of the United States Supreme Court decision of 1954 in respect to educational desegregation.

Rabbi Eugene Lipman, executive secretary of the commission on social action of the UAHC, writing in the *Jewish Frontier*, November 1956, noted that only a few Jews had joined White Citizen Councils, but few Jews in the Deep South were willing to identify themselves publicly with the struggle to eliminate segregation. "To do so, they feel, would call down upon them the
furies of hatred which now buffet the Negro community, would open the Pandora's box of long dormant anti-Semitism.” Rabbi Lipman cited instances of Southern rabbis who had attempted to justify desegregation. He concluded that “most Southern rabbis are frustrated and torn by the conflicting demands of their timid laymen and the nagging dictates of their conscience.”

On March 1, 1956, 100 students, professors, and other personnel of the HUC-JIR protested the arrests of Negroes in the bus boycott dispute in Montgomery, Ala.

Israel

The concerns of Jewish and non-Jewish religious bodies in Israel revolved during 1955–56 around political, economic, humanitarian, and domestic Israel issues.

On the political front, Nelson Glueck, president of the Reform HUC-JIR, on October 15, 1955, denounced proposals that Israel cede part of the Negev desert to neighboring Arab states in return for Western guarantees of her borders; and on November 14, 1955, the National Council of Young Israel (NCYI) urged President Eisenhower to provide defensive arms for Israel. On July 18, 1956, the NCYI requested President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles to “effectuate an immediate change in any treaties or agreements containing such discriminatory clauses” as those countenancing the boycott by Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries of American Jews (see p. 218-19). On November 10, 1955, an Agudath Israel delegation asked the State Department to “save Israel from its endangered position provoked by Communist maneuvering in the Middle East.” The NYBR during 1955–56 issued a series of resolutions and sent several telegrams to the President and the State Department, asking them to abandon their “policy of opportunism and self-interest” in connection with Egypt and its “war-like policies to Israel,” and rather to base American policy upon moral and ethical considerations. The Rabbinical Alliance appealed to President Eisenhower in the spring of 1956 to take every measure to safeguard Israel’s security. The Mizrachi Organization of America strongly urged the United States to make available to Israel adequate military means for self-defense against aggression.

The problem of Arab refugees and that of the internationalization of Jerusalem continued to agitate non-Jewish religious groups. On March 25, 1956, Our Sunday Visitor, the largest Catholic weekly in the United States, editorialized that “justice for the 900,000 Arabs driven from their homes by the Jews” and internationalization of Jerusalem were basic for easing the mounting tension between Israel and the Arab world. The editor went on to accuse American Jews of divided loyalty.

Commonweal, a liberal Catholic weekly, in its April 20, 1956 issue repudiated the charge that some American Jews held a first political loyalty to Israel as “dangerous nonsense.” Commonweal pointed out that “Catholics should be particularly wary of such charges of divided loyalty; certainly the same charge has been made against Catholics so often that one would expect a Catholic editor to hesitate about using it against the Jews.”

Our Sunday Visitor itself, on June 10, 1956, published as a guest editorial one of the many comments it had received on its March 25 editorial. Entitled
"The Story of Israel in Its Eighth Year," it presented "in the interests of fairness . . . another point of view." The anonymous author compared American Jewish help to Israel with American Irish Catholic help to the Irish Free State.

Within the religious Jewish community, in April 1956, the NYBR issued a statement signed by 1,350 Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis condemning the American Council for Judaism, which had leveled a similar charge of dual loyalty against American Jews who supported Israel politically, as misrepresenting Jewry and Judaism in respect to Israel.

Some Orthodox Jewish groups in the United States, such as Agudath Israel and the NCYI, repeated during 1955-56 their charges that the Jewish Agency was engaging in the "spiritual brainwashing" of North African emigrants to Israel (see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 201); 80 per cent of these emigrants were being sent to settlements in Israel under the auspices of non-religious parties. The Israel consul in New York stated that the Jewish Agency Executive, to meet this objection, had decided to form a special committee of the Agency at which all parties would be represented, whose purpose would be to find a more acceptable arrangement for the resettlement of new immigrants.

An interesting development in the relations between American Jewish religious bodies and religious Jews in Israel was the establishment of two congregations in Israel, one in Jerusalem, the other in Haifa, along Conservative lines. These represented an innovation in Israel, where all congregations had traditionally been strictly Orthodox. Rabbi Alfred A. Philipp of the Emet Ve'emunah Synagogue in Jerusalem communicated with the (Conservative) United Synagogue of America on July 2, 1956, expressing his congregation's interest in affiliating with the American Conservative movement. The New Carmel Congregation in Haifa reported to the February 1956 meeting of the executive council of the United Synagogue that it had held its first services on Rosh ha-Shanah, 1955. More than 100 persons had sought admission to the congregation for Yom Kippur. The congregation was still without a rabbi.

All three Jewish religious groupings in the United States, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform, initiated institutions of higher learning in Israel during 1955-56. In September 1955, the (Orthodox) Bar Ilan University opened in Ramat Gan, a suburb of Tel Aviv, to the first group of 125 students, including 25 Americans.

On November 16, 1955, the United Synagogue of America endorsed a plan to establish a division of the (Conservative) JTSA in Israel. Future graduates of the JTSA would be required to spend a year of study in the Israel division as a prerequisite to ordination in the rabbinate. It was anticipated that the Israel school would be able to accommodate about thirty rabbinic students annually. (About twenty-five students were graduated yearly from the JTSA.)

In the summer of 1956, Nelson Glueck, president of the HUC-JIR, indicated his intention to hold Sabbath services in the library of the projected American School of Archaeology in Jerusalem. The school was to be attended mostly by graduate students, professors, and ministers of all faiths.

The Israel rabbinate immediately organized resistance to what it regarded
as an infringement by Reform Judaism on Israel Orthodoxy. On July 29, 1956, opposition by religious representatives on the Jerusalem Municipal Council forced postponement of the issuance of a building permit for the school. On July 30, the chief rabbi of Israel issued a formal prohibition against the establishment of the school. On August 12, in a last attempt to prevent the issuance of the building permit, Rabbi Yekutiel Halberstam attempted to persuade Prime Minister David Ben Gurion to intervene, and Mayor Gershon Agron of Jerusalem to withhold his approval of the permit. However, the same day the Municipal Council voted the permit. (See also p. 390.)

Public Information

American religious bodies exploited the mass media of communication, radio, television, and advertising, to educate and influence the American public for religious ends.

The extent of this work may be gauged from the fact that business and industry contributed $6,000,000 worth of free advertising in November 1955 to persuade Americans to attend church and synagogue. Twenty-four national religious bodies supported the Religion in American Life committee's campaign conducted by the Advertising Council.

Among Jewish religious groups, the JTSA had been producing the "Eternal Light" weekly radio program since 1944, and had been participating in the "Frontiers of Faith" television series devoted to studies of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism on alternate weeks. During 1955–56, the JTSA formed a national committee on television to act as a coordinating council for religious programs, and to formulate policy for future JTSA television programs.

In December 1955 the UOJC began sponsoring its own weekly radio program as part of a membership drive. Though conducted in Yiddish, the program was to feature guest speakers in English.

In April 1956, the NYBR joined the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York in sponsoring television programs of public interest to describe Jewish activities in the fields of health, chaplaincy, and social welfare. The NYBR noted that there were television programs on every major Jewish holiday. The NYBR sponsored a children's religious program, "The Fourth R," as well as the "Look Up and Live" and "Along the Way" television programs.

The American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with the NYBR, held its fourth rabbinical workshop on June 11-12, 1956, to give rabbis a working knowledge of how to use television. Representatives of the religious departments of each of the three major television networks participated.

Jacob Sloan
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES

The purpose of this article is to review the major developments in the field of Jewish communal service during the period under review (July 1, 1955 through June 30, 1956). Since data must be drawn from the separate reports of about 150 overseas and national agencies, 250 federations and welfare funds, and 800 local agencies, those reports have been utilized which most closely approximate the period under review, although they coincide with this period infrequently. The work of an agency is continuous, and references are required to developments which occurred prior to July 1955 or which continue beyond June 1956. Because all agencies do not report all relevant data on a timely basis, some estimating has been required.

Comparisons are made of the most recent two years' experience of agencies. For technical reasons, the samples selected in each of the articles in this series may vary, and those attempting to link the data over a longer time-span than specifically indicated must exercise due caution.

The present-day Jewish federation came upon the American scene around the turn of the century. The Jewish welfare fund emerged about thirty years ago and was built upon the earlier successful experience of federations. Originally existing as parallel structures, although frequently staffed jointly, the federation and welfare fund tended to merge over the years, so that by 1956 all but a few cities were conducting unified activities. The local responsibility of the federation and the overseas and national responsibility of the welfare fund are generally looked upon as coordinate tasks.

The Jewish federation and welfare fund organizes annual fund-raising campaigns. It distributes the proceeds to Jewish services in the home city, nationally and overseas, through a process of budget review. The 217 federations and welfare funds in the United States associated in the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) conduct their activities in almost 800 communities inhabited by 95 per cent of the total Jewish population, and supported by an estimated total of over 1,000,000 contributors.

The remaining 5 per cent of the population is spread through thousands of small cities, and their limited concentration has not made possible the organization of year-round communal structures. Despite this spread, local committees are organized for fund-raising purposes in at least 800 additional areas. However, their loose structure frequently necessitates their skipping campaigns in some years. The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) is the major beneficiary of such campaigns, although a small number of other appeals are frequently included.

Each federation and welfare fund is autonomous, and determines for itself its specific structure and scope of activity. Although there is a core group of activities and agencies included by all of them, there are variations in the extent of coverage (e.g., some welfare funds exclude congregational institutions on the theory that their support is a responsibility of the congregational groups themselves rather than the total Jewish community). The objective is to combine fund-raising activity rather than to monopolize it, and some insti-
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Institutions continue separate fund raising, frequently by arrangement and co-operation with welfare funds.

An agency budget is concerned with the human need behind the dollar. It is a maxim in budgeting that program and finances are indivisible. This integration of program and finances is reflected in the summary of developments in Jewish communal service which follows.

Central Jewish Community Fund Raising

Spring 1956 campaigns conducted by Jewish federations and welfare funds were unique in a number of ways: They registered the first significant increases since the downward trend between 1948 and 1954; they were able to do so at the same time as they provided $40 million in new borrowing for the UJA; and they occurred concurrently with a step-up in sales of Bonds for Israel. With a 19 per cent increase for 1956 indicated on the basis of spring campaign results (based on 84 campaigns which had raised 65 per cent of the total raised in 1955 outside of New York City), 1956 campaign results were expected to approximate $128 million, assuming that fall campaigns and the New York City campaign followed the spring trend.

These results began to become evident in the fall of 1955, when fifty-nine campaigns increased their totals by 18 per cent, compared with the earlier spring campaigns, which had increased by one per cent.

The groundwork for the 1956 increase was laid in 1955, when campaign results were stabilized for the first time since 1948. At the conclusion of the 1955 campaigns there was widespread confidence in communities that 1956 campaign results would increase. A drive for a Special Survival Fund was announced in November 1955 by the UJA with an objective of raising $25 million over and above the estimated pledge total of $60 million annually which UJA had attained in 1955 and 1954. Latest data indicated that there would be an increase of about $18 million in campaign results of welfare funds, of which UJA might secure about $16 million over and above its normal allocations. One of the difficulties arising out of the Special Survival Fund campaign was that increased contributions for UJA were frequently earmarked, while there could be no earmarking for losses incurred as a result of deaths, removals, and business reverses. As a consequence, some communities were faced with a need to adjust the "normal" UJA allocation in order that normal allocations for some other agencies might not be reduced in a year of rising campaign results.

Almost $1.4 billion was raised by central Jewish community organizations in the decade which ended in 1955. Peak results of over $200 million were attained in 1948, reflecting response to the needs of Jewish displaced persons and to the opportunity for mass immigration to the newly proclaimed State of Israel. There was a lull in immigration to Israel between 1951 and 1954. Immigration, mainly from North Africa, rose moderately in 1954 (17,250 immigrants), increased sharply in 1955 (37,528 immigrants), and was averaging 4,365 monthly in the first half of 1956. Restrictions on mass emigration were imposed by the Moroccan government in mid-1956, with consequent uncertainty regarding the number of individual emigrants who might leave
North Africa for Israel in the subsequent period. Moderate rises were beginning in immigration from Eastern European countries.

In 1945, the last year prior to the postwar emergency period, a total of $57 million was raised. In 1955, the total of $110 million was almost double the 1945 amount. However, the rise in the price level of about 37 per cent meant that the constant purchasing power of pledges in 1955 was about 40 per cent higher than in 1945.

Giving and Givers

Reports filed with CJFWF by sixty welfare funds outside of New York City indicated that, on the average, 26 per cent of the total Jewish population of all ages contributed to welfare fund campaigns in 1955.

However, 89 per cent of the amount raised was provided by 17 per cent of the contributors. The average per capita gift for the total Jewish population covered by these sixty campaigns in 1955 was $28.60. (By contrast, the average per capita gift to community chests and united funds in 1955 for 1956 needs had been $4.47, although the degree of coverage, 25 per cent, had been about the same.)

Independent Campaigns

Each federation and welfare fund is autonomous and determines for itself the scope of services which it finances through allocations from central funds. There are ten non-local agencies which are included almost universally by welfare funds. Twenty other agencies are included by half or more of all welfare funds; other agencies receive less extensive inclusion.

Agencies conduct independent fund-raising campaigns in specific cities where they are not included in welfare funds. The general rule is that a beneficiary agency has to waive independent fund raising in localities where it receives an allocation from the welfare fund, unless specific arrangements to the contrary with the welfare fund are made.

Extensive independent fund raising continued in many communities. In 1955 some sixty-five agencies raised $37 million independently, compared with $35.3 million raised in 1954.

Welfare funds frequently define their responsibility in terms of the total Jewish community, hence exclude efforts considered to be the responsibility of limited groups or special interests. Involved in the total of $37 million raised independently are:

1. Drives for Israel authorized by the Jewish Agency for Palestine Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns raised $14 million. That committee has authorized thirteen campaigns, including the UJA and other beneficiaries of welfare funds, and has prevented the mushrooming of scores of additional drives for Israel.

2. Since the New York UJA includes only National UJA, American Jew-

---

1 Exclusive of the capital fund campaign of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York City.
2 United Jewish Appeal, Joint Defense Appeal, National Jewish Welfare Board, Hebrew University in Jerusalem, American Fund for Israel Institutions, B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, United HIAS Service, American Jewish Congress, and American Association for Jewish Education.
ish Congress and National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), the way is left open for independent fund raising by other non-local agencies in New York City. While no accurate estimates are available regarding the totals raised in New York City, partial information suggests that at least one-third of the total of $37 million is raised in New York City.3

3 National hospitals are not included in most of the larger welfare funds which support local Jewish hospitals. They raise about $5.2 million independently.

4 American universities in this country are not included by welfare funds (or by community chests). Brandeis University and the Einstein Medical College raised $4.2 million independently.

5 The national Reform and Conservative religious organizations raise about $2.7 million from their congregational membership. An additional 10 per cent is secured from welfare funds, but such allocations are for activities related to the total Jewish community (e.g., "Eternal Light" radio program, interfaith activities).

6 Membership organizations raise funds within their own membership for their own program. Hadassah, the National Council of Jewish Women, Pioneer Women, and Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training (ORT) raised $9 million. The fraternal order of B'nai B'rith provided $1.7 million from its membership toward the work of the B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, Anti-Defamation League, and Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital. These organizations also receive part of their income from welfare funds.

The figures cited above are not additive since some of the categories overlap.

Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies (generally arranged by agreement with federations) raises smaller sums for operating purposes—187 local hospitals, family agencies, child care agencies, and homes for the aged raise a total of $3.4 million independently. Contribution income of local community centers is probably an additional $160,000.

Capital fund campaigns for local institutions, mainly synagogues and temples, continued to be extensive, but the national congregational groups do not publish annual statistics regarding the extent of fund raising for such purposes.

While the ratio of Jewish welfare fund drives to independent drives was about 3 to 1 ($110 million against $37 million) in 1955, this was a much different ratio from that which prevailed in the nonsectarian field: in 1955, community chests and united funds raised for 1956 needs about $340 million, contrasted with $245 million raised independently by thirteen major agencies.4

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

There was little change in the pattern of fund distribution in 1955. Of the amount remaining for distribution by welfare funds (after provision had

This is the ratio which generally prevails in fund raising as between New York City and the remainder of the United States.

Complete data on amounts raised independently is not available. But the total of $245 million is an understatement in view of the existence of at least 600 nonsectarian national agencies seeking funds.
been made for local administrative costs and normal shrinkage of pledges), the UJA received 58 per cent, or almost one per cent more than in 1954 (see Table 3). The UJA percentage share had been declining for several years, but the 1955 experience indicated an upward turn which was expected to rise even more sharply in 1956, as a result of the collections in that year for the UJA Special Fund. The rise in 1955 occurred in the face of some shifting of funds from UJA to United HIAS Service (UHS), as a result of the transfer of a portion of UHS financing from UJA to welfare funds directly. This change also accounted for the greater part of the 7 per cent rise experienced by other overseas agencies. On the other hand, funds provided for local refugee care continued to decline. They fell 15 per cent in 1955, and reflected the continuing reduction in immigrants arriving in the United States and the lesser needs of aid by immigrants already here.

National domestic agencies were allocated an estimated $4.5 million by welfare funds in 1955. This was slightly more than the entire group of agencies had secured in 1954.

Local services received, for operating purposes, about $27.6 million in 1955 from funds raised by federations, or about 2 per cent less than in 1954—making 1955 the first recent year in which the over-all total provided for local services declined. The reduction was chiefly in allocations to hospitals, with a slight decline in allocations to aged homes. In these cases, this development was facilitated by the rise of income from recipients of service and from public assistance (tax) funds. This reduction in Jewish federation income was partially offset by further rises in chest income for local Jewish services. Reports from ninety-three cities showed that while federation allocations fell by 4.4 per cent in 1955, chest allocations rose 4.7 per cent.

Allocations for local capital purposes were reduced from $1.57 million in 1954 to $1.48 million in 1955. Most local capital fund campaigns were not part of the central annual drive conducted by federations and welfare funds (although usually by agreement with federations and welfare funds), and were, therefore, not reflected in Table 3.

The pattern of income of agencies from welfare funds differed widely from the pattern of the agencies' own independent fund-raising efforts. (This was also related to the fund-raising experience of agencies in New York City, where the relative shares of funds secured by most national and overseas agencies depended on the effectiveness of their fund-raising efforts, rather than on a process of central budgeting based on review of program and finances.)

Table 4 indicates the pattern of distribution of funds by federations in 1955, and that of independent fund raising, by fields of service. It indicates that the UJA and national service agencies secured a greater share of their funds from federations, while overseas campaigns other than UJA, and those for health, cultural, and religious agencies, relied more heavily on independent campaigns.

Local programs were most highly developed in the larger centers of Jewish population. As a result, the share of funds for local services was higher in the larger cities than in the smaller ones. Cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over allocated 59 per cent of their budgeted funds to UJA and other overseas and refugee needs, and 35 per cent to local operating and capital
needs in 1954; smaller communities (under 5,000 Jewish population) allocated 72 per cent to overseas needs and 20 per cent to local needs. However, in the smaller communities the trend toward growing local programs continued.

**Aid to Israel**

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States is channeled through the UJA and other overseas agencies and through the Israel Bond Drive. United States governmental assistance and restitution from Germany are the other major external sources of aid to Israel. These "fundamental four" sources of foreign currency supplement Israel's own earnings abroad. American sources provided one-third of Israel's total foreign currency income of $419 million for the fiscal year ending March 30, 1956. (The proportion had been higher in the preceding year because of the receipt of the proceeds of the 1954 UJA Refunding Loan.) Together with restitution income, these four sources of income provided 55 per cent of total foreign currency income.

Israel's own earnings are largely in the form of exports of goods and services, supplemented by foreign investments and private transfers of funds. To the extent that these sources rise and are not offset by rises in imports, government expenditures, and new borrowing, the need for American funds, including philanthropy, is lessened. While Israel exports reached a peak of $88 million in 1954, or almost 30 per cent of imports of $296 million, exports remained stable at $88 million in 1955 in the face of a rise in imports to $338 million. This retrogression was caused by rises in world prices, increased domestic consumption, and increased government consumption for national security.

**Philanthropic Programs**

Philanthropic funds continued to be an important source of income for Israel. While the fundamental use of these funds was for welfare programs, the exchange of dollars for pounds was helpful to the State of Israel in making available foreign currency.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF had available for overseas purposes some $80 million in 1955, including about $65 million for Israel purposes. This total was expected to be well over $100 million in 1956 as a result of the UJA Special Survival Fund and new borrowings.

A major development in the Israel programs supported by philanthropic funds was the resumption of large-scale immigration in 1954. The Israel authorities arranged for the admission of 30,000 immigrants from North Africa during the year ending September 30, 1955. This total increased to about 52,000 in the year ending September 30, 1956. The Moroccan government ordered a change from group visas to individuals visas in 1956. The effects on volume of immigration were not yet known.

The Malben program of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) expanded its facilities for care of the aged and handicapped among the immigrants, while other American-supported agencies contributed
to Israel’s needs in the fields of health, vocational training, and higher education.

A special five-year loan project for the UJA was undertaken by welfare funds just prior to their annual spring campaigns in 1954. Under the plan, the sum borrowed for a five-year period—$62.8 million—was transmitted through the UJA and the United Israel Appeal (UIA) to the Jewish Agency, which exchanged the dollars for pounds and drew upon the pound balances to carry out its welfare activities in Israel (immigration, absorption, and land settlement). The dollars received by the Israel government were available to it as a foreign currency pool to meet its then current dollar shortage, thus changing short-term debts to medium or long-term debts.

By September 30, 1955, the Jewish Agency had drawn the equivalent of at least $35 million for use in its program. The withdrawal rate was higher than the repayment rate in the United States as a result of the flow of North African immigration which was higher than originally planned for.

The 1954 loan was refunded in 1956, and welfare funds provided an additional $40 million in new borrowings, bringing the total debt to $75 million. This loan was to provide for additional costs of North African immigration while it was possible to arrange mass movements.

**Bond Sales**

The three-year flotation period of the Israel Independence Bond Issue of the Israel government ended in May 1954 with reported sales of $145.5 million; of this, $3.6 million in bonds was converted within the ensuing year into the Israel Development Issue, which was floated in May 1954. During the four calendar years 1952–55, a total of $12 million in bonds was transmitted to the UJA in payment of pledges. By the end of 1955, outstanding bonds of the first issue totaled $120.4 million.

Sales of the second bond issue (Israel Development Issue) from May 1954 totaled $41.4 million by April 1, 1955, $71.7 million by December 31, 1955, and $82.5 million by March 1956. At the completion of five years of bond sales in March 1956, total sales were reported at $230 million; the total rose to $249.8 million by the end of October 1956.

Proceeds of bond sales provided 35 per cent of income to Israel’s development budgets in this five-year period. In 1955–56, bond revenue was utilized as follows: agriculture, 42 per cent; industry, 25 per cent; housing, 17 per cent; and transportation, 16 per cent.

The State of Israel designated the Development Corporation of America to replace the American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel as sole underwriter of Israel bonds effective May 16, 1955. With the change in leadership, the efforts of the bond drive and the welfare fund campaigns for UJA were coordinated more closely.

**Reparations Funds**

Payments from Germany under the collective restitutions agreement constituted the largest single source of foreign currency for Israel during 1955–56 (almost $90 million).
Individual restitution payments reached Israeli citizens at a rate of $2 million a month in 1955 and 1956, with an increase anticipated as a result of a 1956 liberalization of the indemnification law by the West German parliament.

In January 1956, the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (CJMCAAG) made the third yearly allocation of funds put at its disposal by Israel from collective restitutions payments. Of $10 million allocated for relief of Nazi victims outside of Israel, $6.7 million was granted to the JDC for relief and rehabilitation; about $6.9 million was granted to the JDC for relief and rehabilitation, including about $1.3 million allocated to communal and social welfare agencies in twelve countries of Europe, administered mainly through the JDC. There was also a number of grants for cultural and educational reconstruction in Europe and the United States, totaling about $1.8 million, including about $440,000 for transplanted yeshivot and cultural agencies in the United States. About $12 million went to relief programs in Israel, with the Jewish Agency as the major beneficiary.

The CJMCAAG received requests for over $30 million from some 400 organizations in various countries, about three times as great as the amount available outside of Israel. With the termination of the JDC guarantee of the deficit of UHS in 1956, a request for a CJMCAAG allocation for UHS was anticipated for 1957 for its international program of aid to Nazi victims. Welfare funds in the United States did not apply for funds for local refugee programs.

Overseas Agencies

The UJA is the major channel for American Jewish philanthropy to Israel and to other overseas areas where assistance is required. The UJA raises funds, mainly through allocations by Jewish welfare funds, for the UIA, the JDC, and the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA).

UJA receipts were distributed in accordance with a formula effective through 1958, which provided that UIA was to receive 67 per cent and JDC 33 per cent of the first $55 million raised, after deduction of campaign expenses and allocations to NYANA. For sums in excess of $55 million, UIA was to receive 87.5 per cent and JDC 12.5 per cent. Ten per cent of the funds for each campaign year might be “renegotiated in the event that some unusual emergency arises.”

UJA is the largest beneficiary of funds raised by welfare funds. In small nonfederated communities, the UJA deals with local leaders, who take responsibility for conducting local campaigns for the UJA.

UJA estimated its total pledges for 1955 at $60 million, which was also the 1954 level. Cash received in 1955, regardless of campaign year, totaled $58.8 million. In 1954, the special loan project of the UJA had raised $62.8 million. After repayment of principal and interest, the UJA had succeeded in providing $78.5 million in 1954 from allocations and from loans for transmission to Israel, $13.6 million for the JDC Malben program in Israel, North Africa, and other overseas areas, and $1.5 million for NYANA (including the United Service for New Americans).

By contrast, the UJA provided in 1955 $20.5 million for cash transmission
to Israel, after deducting installment payments on loans; $17.4 million for the JDC program; and $0.9 million for NYANA, etc. It was against this background that the UJA appealed to welfare funds to refund and increase the 1954 loan; the result was new borrowings of over $40 million in 1956.

The welfare fund achievement for 1956 for UJA was expected to make available the largest cash sums since 1948: $56 million in "normal" campaigns, $16 million for the UJA Special Survival Fund, and $40 million in new borrowings, less repayment of loans due. Many welfare funds departed from past practice to permit earmarking of gifts to the UJA Special Survival Fund because of the emergency.

**UNITED ISRAEL APPEAL**

The UIA functions in the United States by the authority given to it by the Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund) to act as the latter's fundraising agency in the United States for funds destined for the Jewish Agency for Palestine. All of the UIA's funds received from UJA, after deduction of expenses, are transmitted to the Jewish Agency, and allocations to other beneficiaries are made at the latter's direction.

Before 1952, the Keren Kayemeth (Jewish National Fund-JNF) had been part of the UIA structure, and had shared funds equally with the Keren Hayesod. Since 1952, the JNF has been receiving annual allocations in Israel directly from the Jewish Agency (about $3,250,000 in 1954–55). Under the UJA agreement, the JNF is permitted to raise $1,800,000 annually from "traditional collections," after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Excess collections beyond this limit are considered to be equivalent to UJA income, with UIA responsible for turning over the excess funds to UJA.

Receipts of the UIA in 1955 were $36.6 million, compared with $30 million in 1954. Receipts in 1954 had been abnormally low, because of delays in securing short-term bank loans by communities on current pledges; these delays were related to the efforts to secure five-year loans for the special loan project of the UJA. Deductions will be made by UIA from income allocable to the Jewish Agency over the next five years to repay the $75 million loan.

On behalf of the Jewish Agency, the UIA allocated $1,932,000 in 1955 to the Mizrachi Palestine Fund, Agudath and Poale Agudath Israel, the World Confederation of General Zionists, and the United Zionist Revisionists. The funds were earmarked for "constructive enterprises," and each of the groups waived its rights to independent fund raising in the United States for their Israel projects. This arrangement eliminated a substantial number of campaigns previously conducted.

**JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE**

The Jewish Agency spent £110 million in the fiscal year ending September 30, 1955, compared with £89 million in the previous year. In 1954–55 the largest single amount was spent on agricultural settlement (62 per cent). Expenses for immigration, absorption, and Youth Aliyah made up 19 per cent of the total. The Hadassah Women's Zionist Organization of America and other organizations continued to supply about one-third of the cost of Youth Aliyah, with the Jewish Agency supplying the other two-thirds.

Other Jewish Agency expenditures included grants for: 1) the JNF for
land development programs; 2) interest payments on loans and loan repayments; 3) educational and cultural activities; 4) organization and information activities, and general administrative expenses.

Receipts of the Jewish Agency in 1954—55 were £74.4 million, compared with £90.7 million in 1953—54. The operating deficit of £35 million in 1954—55 was covered mainly by new loans.

Contributions (85 per cent from the United States, 15 per cent from other overseas drives) were about 60 per cent of receipts in 1954—55, while income from collective restitutions was about 30 per cent. Both of these major sources of income had declined in 1954—55.

The number of Jewish Agency-sponsored immigrants was 11,988 in 1953-54. It rose to 31,929 in 1954-55, and was expected to reach about 52,000 in 1955-56, mainly from North Africa.

**American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee**

JDC spent $29 million in 1955, compared with $20.6 million in 1954. Appropriations of $25.1 million were voted by JDC for 1955 and $24.6 million for 1954. Unexpended appropriations are adjusted in subsequent periods when final accountings for actual expenditures are made. Because of its world-wide operation, there is a time lag in receipt of records of actual expenditures for some overseas areas.

The JDC Malben program of service to sick, aged, and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to absorb the largest single share of appropriations—about 40 per cent in 1955. Together with its program of aid to 132 yeshivot and other traditional institutions in Israel, JDC had obligated itself to spend about $10.8 million in Israel in 1955. Malben assisted 19,400 persons in 1955, including 6,879 institutionalized patients. Facilities for 1,600 additional beds for the aged were provided in 1955, with a total capacity of 7,710 institutional beds projected for the end of 1956.

Relief, health and educational programs in Moslem countries, mainly North Africa, expanded in 1955 and 1956 as a result of unsettled conditions affecting the status of the local Jewish populations. JDC appropriated $3.7 million in 1955, compared with $1.9 million in 1953, for work in Moslem areas.

JDC appropriations for Europe, which had risen in 1954 for the first time since 1950, changed little in 1955. They were $4.2 million in 1955, exclusive of relief in transit and reconstruction of community institutions. The rise was related to the availability to the JDC for the first time in 1954 and 1955 of $6.7 million annually in funds from the CJMCAG for aid to victims of Nazism.

Although JDC had relinquished the work of its migration department with the creation of UHS, it continued to carry financial obligations arising from its agreement to underwrite UHS deficits in 1955 and 1956 up to $1 million annually.

Cash receipts of JDC in 1955 were $28.8 million, compared with $20.6 million in 1954. The rise in UJA receipts in 1955 was largely accounted for by nonreurrence of delays due to the 1954 UJA loan project.
ORT

Since 1947, the JDC has had an agreement with the American ORT Federation and the World ORT Union, under which ORT’s vocational training activities overseas are subventioned by the JDC. It guarantees a minimum of $1,450,000 from JDC for ORT’s activities in Western Europe, Israel, North Africa, and Iran in 1956, compared with $1,390,000 in 1955. (The total ORT budget for 1956 provides for expenditures of about $4,000,000. Actual expenditures in 1955 were $3,700,000.) As under previous agreements, the American branches of ORT may continue to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25, which are used to supplement other ORT resources.

In 1955, a total of 18,705 trainees attended ORT courses and other programs financed by JDC, including 8,631 trainees in Western Europe, 5,550 in Moslem countries, and 4,794 in Israel. ORT in Israel received an allocation of £185,000 from the CJMCAG in 1955.

OSE

The Oeuvre de Secours aux Enfants Israélites (OSE), established in 1912 in Eastern Europe, is an organization devoted to protecting the health of Jews. Its operations, which stress preventive, curative, and convalescent services for children are now concentrated in France, North Africa, and Israel. In France and North Africa the work of the local OSE branches is subsidized by JDC, with funds made available from JDC appropriations to the particular country. OSE has taken over health services to emigrants in Morocco and Tunisia which were formerly provided by the Jewish Agency.

NEW YORK ASSOCIATION FOR NEW AMERICANS

NYANA continued to be a direct beneficiary of UJA, as heretofore, for its program of aid to immigrants in New York City. UJA allocations to NYANA decreased from $1,004,000 in 1954 to $677,000 in 1955. Jewish immigration to the United States decreased from 5,500 in 1954 to 4,200 in 1955. The number of displaced persons in the total and the active caseload of NYANA decreased in 1955. Arrivals under the Refugee Relief Act were small in number during 1955.

OTHER OVERSEAS AGENCIES

Overseas agencies other than the UJA reported total income of $17.9 million in 1955, compared with $18.2 million in 1954.

UHS voluntarily submitted its budgets for cooperative review with the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC), an informal grouping of welfare funds in eighteen large cities. The LCBC recommended that welfare funds consider, for allocation purposes, a UHS budget of between $2,185,000 and $2,485,000 for 1956, based on varying estimates of immigration. Welfare fund allocations to UHS more than doubled in 1955, compared with grants to HIAS in 1954.

UHS assisted 2,841 Jewish immigrants to migrate in 1955, compared with 3,933 in 1954. It expected to assist a total of 4,400 migrants in 1956. Arrivals in the first half of 1956 totaled 1,796, with a monthly arrival rate of 400 as of August 1956. Assisted arrivals in the United States were 60 per cent of the
total Jewish immigration. The indicated increase in immigration for 1956 was chiefly of immigrants from North Africa to Latin America.

Maintenance appeals of the American Friends of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the American Technion Society were merged beginning in 1955, as the result of an agreement reached in Jerusalem in November 1954 among officials of the institutions, the UJA, the Jewish Agency, the government of Israel, and the CJFWF Committee on National-Local Relations. A merger of capital fund drives had not been effected. The American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science entered into an agreement with the government of Israel and the Jewish Agency for Palestine whereby it ceased all appeals to welfare funds for a share of the proceeds of 1955 and 1956 campaigns. Weizmann Institute funds are derived from Jewish Agency and Israel government grants, from an annual fund-raising dinner, and from an investment program.

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, continued to raise the largest sum among non-UJA overseas agencies ($8.3 million in 1955), mainly through membership activities. Its major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah.

The National Committee for Labor Israel, and Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, raise funds for activities of the Histadrut in Israel in the areas of education, vocational training, health, and immigrant welfare.

The American Fund for Israel Institutions (AFII) raised funds on behalf of fifty cultural, social, and educational agencies in Israel. With a reduction in the number of its beneficiaries, the AFII was beginning to shift its emphasis to a cultural exchange program.

The Federated Council of Israel Institutions (FCII) seeks funds for seventy-eight Orthodox institutions—yeshivot, as well as orphanages, homes for the aged, hospitals, and the like. Many FCII beneficiaries also seek funds separately in the United States.

The Jewish Agency Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns continued to authorize a limited number of campaigns for Israel. Authorization was denied groups whose projects had questionable validity, that duplicated existing services, or for other reasons. Limitations were placed on the scope of membership activities related to projects in Israel. The committee continued its program of educating the contributing public to the primacy of UJA needs for Israel.

Community Relations

Programs designed to improve group relations are primary functions of five major national agencies. More limited activities in this area are also conducted by other agencies whose major programs are centered in other areas.

---

6 Authorized agencies for 1956 were: American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund-raising dinner only); 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); Mizrachi Women's Organization of America (no application to welfare funds); National Committee for Labor Israel (Histadrut Campaign); Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women's League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).
The largest agencies in the national community relations field also conduct activities in other fields (cultural and educational, overseas affairs, and service to membership). On the local scene, many areas are served by local community relations councils or committees, including all major groups in the community related to this interest. Regional offices are also maintained by the national agencies.

The American Jewish Committee (AJC) and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) raised most of their funds through the Joint Defense Appeal (JDA), and shared equally in the proceeds. The JDA agreement also provided for a grant by ADL to B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal. Separate fund-raising by ADL from B'nai B'rith lodges, and by the American Jewish Committee from "special contributions" are limited to $250,000 annually for each agency.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), serving as a coordinating and clearance agency for projects and policies, consists of six national agencies, twenty-nine local community relations councils, one regional, and four state-wide organizations. During 1955, the NCRAC developed a third joint program plan for recommendation to all of its national and local member agencies. The JDA agencies had withdrawn from the NCRAC in 1952.

National community relations agencies had receipts of $5,970,000 in 1955, compared with $5,666,000 in 1954. Increased income was attained in 1955 by all operating agencies. The NCRAC sought no increase in its budget in 1955.

The NCRAC, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee (JLC) and Jewish War Veterans (JWV) again participated in 1955 and 1956 in the cooperative budget review process of the LCBC. Recommendations for approved budget levels for these agencies were among the elements considered by each community in arriving at local decisions about funds' distribution.

National Health Agencies

Six national health agencies raised $6,895,000 in 1955 compared with $6,688,000 in 1954, with almost 80 per cent raised by the two largest hospitals: the City of Hope in Duarte, California, and the National Jewish Hospital in Denver, Colorado. Four of the agencies had originally been devoted exclusively to tubercular care. With improved methods of treating tuberculosis, there had been a shift in emphasis to include heart, cancer, research, and treatment of asthma in adults. The percentage of service to Jewish patients continued to decline in recent years. It ranged from 13 per cent for the National Jewish Hospital to 60 per cent for the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital.

Most fund raising by these agencies was conducted outside of the welfare fund framework. Their increasing receipts paralleled the recent fund-raising experience of nonsectarian "dread disease" campaigns (cancer, heart, polio).

National Service Agencies

There are five national organizations that furnish service to local agencies in the specific fields of Jewish community centers, programs for the armed forces, Jewish education, religion, and vocational guidance. These agencies serve as coordination and consultative bodies for their respective fields.
The JWB is by far the largest of these agencies. The JWB received $1,267,000 in 1955 out of a total of $1,456,000 for the five agencies. The national association of Jewish centers, the JWB, also conducted a program of services to Jews in the armed forces, participated in nonsectarian United Service Organization (USO) programs, and sponsored a number of broad Jewish cultural projects. The JWB again participated in a cooperative budget review process with the LCBC in 1955 and 1956 which resulted in recommendations regarding its budgetary needs.

A national study of Jewish education conducted by the American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE), was planned for completion during 1957. Studies of two pilot communities (Cleveland and Savannah) had been completed in 1954; studies of Akron, Ohio, and Binghamton, Buffalo and Rochester, N. Y., were completed in 1955, and surveys were under way in additional communities. AAJE services local communities with studies in educational trends, stimulation of student enrollment, recruitment and placement of teachers, and pedagogic materials.

Other national service agencies are the Jewish Occupational Council, which serves local Jewish vocational service bureaus; the National Conference on Jewish Communal Service, which serves as a forum for exchange of experience of professional workers in all fields of Jewish communal service; and the Synagogue Council, which represents its affiliated Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbinical and congregational associations.

Cultural Agencies

Jewish cultural agencies are defined in this context as those which are primarily concerned with efforts in the field of Jewish scholarship, including research, training, and publication. Each of the Jewish cultural agencies conducts separate, limited activities. While eighteen agencies in this field received $8,820,000 in 1955, compared with $7,966,000 in 1954, the three largest (Brandeis University, B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, and the Zionist Organization of America) accounted for 80 per cent of the funds. Half of the remaining agencies had incomes ranging from $20,000 to $60,000.

Four higher educational institutions are included in this group: Brandeis University (liberal arts), the National Agricultural College, Dropsie College (graduate studies in Semitic culture), and the Jewish Teachers Seminary and People's University.

Religious Agencies

Religious institutions seek support from the total Jewish community on the ground that they are training rabbis, Hebrew teachers, and religious functionaries to serve in cities throughout the United States; in many cases these individuals come from different cities to pursue their studies.
Some of the programs conducted by the major seminaries involve interfaith activities designed to promote better understanding between Jewish and Christian spiritual leaders.

Yeshiva University established the Albert Einstein Medical School, which began functioning in the fall of 1955 with an entrance class of fifty-five.

The fostering and coordination of religious day schools is a major function of the Mizrachi National Education Committee, the United Lubavitcher Yeshivoth, the National Council of Beth Jacob Schools, and Torah Umesorah. All but Torah Umesorah concentrate on serving a particular network of Orthodox all-day schools.

The three congregational associations: the (Reform) Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, and the (Conservative) United Synagogue of America, also seek public support to supplement funds raised through congregational membership. The related rabbinical associations seek support for relief funds for aged and retired rabbis.

Eighteen national religious agencies raised $10,342,000 in 1955, compared with $8,971,000 in 1954. All but three of the agencies increased their income in 1955, with the largest increases attained by the three major drives: Yeshiva University and Einstein Medical School, the combined campaign of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion-Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

**Financing Local Services**

Jewish federations supplied about $30.7 million in 1955 ($31.6 million in 1954) to local services in the fields of health, family and child care, refugee aid, Jewish centers, Jewish education, care of the aged, and community relations. Federations constituted the major source of contributed income for these agencies.

Community chests provided an additional estimated $12,000,000, in most cases through Jewish federations, but in some cases directly to local functional agencies. Community chests generally restricted their support to agencies operating in the fields of health, family and child care, care of the aged, and Jewish centers. The major share of contributed income even in these fields came from Jewish federations; federations had, in addition, the exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

Table 5 indicates how central communal funds (federations and chest income via federations) were distributed in ninety-three communities among various fields of local service in 1954 and 1955. The following observations are based on an analysis of the data for this group of cities, with selected references to earlier studies where relevant.

The total dollar allocations for local services decreased slightly (about one per cent of amounts budgeted) between 1954 and 1955. This was the first de-
cline in the last decade. It was made possible by reduced needs for local refugee care and a drop in federation allocations to hospitals and aged homes (offset by other income). The rise in costs continued for other local fields of service.

Federations and welfare funds decreased their support of local Jewish services in 1955 by 4.1 per cent (primarily because of lowered refugee costs), while community chests increased such support by 4.7 per cent for the areas of service receiving chest support. This continued a trend which became evident in 1950. Prior to that time federation support had increased more sharply than chest support.

Federations in about half of the communities studied were not receiving chest support. In some communities such support went directly to the local agencies, while in the smallest communities services theoretically eligible for chest support had not been developed, or were supported entirely from Jewish resources.

SHIFTS IN EMPHASES OF SPECIFIC LOCAL PROGRAMS

**Health and Hospital Programs.**—These programs have emerged as the largest single category of local federation beneficiaries, with 92 per cent of the allocations to these programs occurring in the very largest cities (with Jewish population of over 40,000). Funds granted have more than doubled since 1946, as year after year saw steady and substantial rises in allocations, until the allocation for health alone in the largest cities averaged 33 per cent of all allocations for local purposes in 1955. While income from “third party” payments—Blue Cross, tax support, etc.—has increased, the costs of operation have risen even more sharply. “Third party” payments have, however, helped prevent greater increases in allocations by federations.

New and extended facilities, particularly for the chronically ill, have played a part in the rise in costs. In some cities, chests do not include hospitals in their allocations. The hospitals have a nonsectarian admission policy, with 56 per cent of care extended to non-Jewish patients.

**Refugee Programs.**—These programs are financed locally, although they are sometimes considered to be a local extension of an overseas problem. Postwar immigration began in volume late in 1946, reached its peak in 1950, and declined steadily afterward. As refugees were resettled in American cities, these costs mounted sharply. By 1950, they were nine times as high as they had been in 1946. The subsequent decline has been a steady one. While refugee costs accounted for 23 per cent of all local allocations in 1950, they accounted for only 6 per cent by 1955.

**Recreational Programs.**—These programs are conducted mainly by Jewish community centers. According to the National Jewish Welfare Board, there were some 345 such centers in 215 cities with a membership of over 550,000. Federation allocations to centers rose by almost 5 per cent in 1955, and have more than doubled since 1946 in a steady year-by-year rise.

Unlike hospital programs, center programs generally received relatively little income from fees, since fees have been kept at a level judged low enough to admit all who seek to use the facilities. In a number of cities, however, income from fees and memberships represents a substantial part of the total income. Chests shared in the support of centers in many communities.
Family and Child Care Agencies.—The existence of these agencies has eased the problems of communities in resettling refugees. Agencies with trained casework staffs have been able to absorb efficiently and quickly the immigrants arriving in their communities with social and economic problems. During the peak of the refugee load, the normal program was displaced to some extent. With the refugee load diminishing, the family and children's agencies have readjusted their operations to provide increased service to native-born families and children, particularly with regard to services to the aged, to disturbed children, and in family counseling programs.

Allocations to these agencies rose by one per cent in 1955. Between 1946 and 1955 the casework agencies allocations increased by 59 per cent—two-thirds of which was offset by the price level increase in this period.

Jewish Education.—Allocations to local Jewish schools and bureaus of Jewish education were provided by Jewish federations and welfare funds. A rise of 4 per cent occurred in federation allocations in 1955. A slow, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education since 1946 paralleled the over-all increase in local allocations. While the rise had lagged in earlier years, since 1950 the rate of allocations to Jewish education had moved forward faster than the rate of rise of the overall allocations. Jewish schools received tuition fees, but these fees were usually set below actual tuition costs.

Aged Homes.—Allocations to homes for the aged had almost tripled between 1946 and 1954, rising steadily each year as the proportion of aged in the population continued to increase. In 1955, allocations for aged care declined for the first time (by 2 per cent) as payments on behalf of residents increased. Although the two-year rise was greater than the over-all rise in total allocations, an even greater rise in costs had been avoided by public old age assistance (tax) funds.

Community Relations.—Programs designed to improve intergroup relations and to deal with specific instances of anti-Semitism exist primarily in the larger centers of Jewish population. The local activities financed by federations and welfare funds received increased allocations from 1946 to 1948, and smaller shares after 1948. The level in 1955 was one per cent above the 1954 level.

In some areas, local and regional community relations programs are financed by national agencies (mainly ADL) as part of a national network of regional offices. Such programs continued to receive increased grants from national agencies. As a result, combined local service by local and national agencies actually increased.

Employment and Vocational Guidance.—These programs are designed to assist Jews in finding employment and in guiding Jewish youth and others in the selection of a trade or profession. They exist mainly in the larger cities. A complementary program, financed by the B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, operates a series of vocational service bureaus.

Local allocations for vocational programs rose by 3 per cent in 1955. The rise since 1946 has been a moderate one, below the over-all rise in local allocations. This lag may have partially reflected an improved employment market. Jewish vocational services had been a mainstay of the resettlement programs for newcomers. As in the case of family agencies, vocational agencies were currently concentrating increasingly on services to the native-born Jewish community.
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TABLE 1
AMOUNTS RAISED IN LOCAL CENTRAL COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS, 1945–55
(Estimate in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>$71,162</td>
<td>$36,222*</td>
<td>$34,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131,421</td>
<td>44,273</td>
<td>87,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>156,589</td>
<td>50,227</td>
<td>106,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200,721</td>
<td>65,157</td>
<td>135,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>170,330</td>
<td>63,368*</td>
<td>106,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142,192</td>
<td>50,205</td>
<td>91,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136,035</td>
<td>48,187</td>
<td>87,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121,173</td>
<td>43,076</td>
<td>78,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>115,266</td>
<td>39,746</td>
<td>75,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>107,548</td>
<td>37,994</td>
<td>69,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955*</td>
<td>109,995</td>
<td>40,400</td>
<td>69,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 1946–55</td>
<td>$1,391,270</td>
<td>$482,633</td>
<td>$908,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes capital fund campaigns of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York: $14,264,000 in 1945, and $11,000,000 in 1949.

b Totals exclude about $5.7 million raised annually in smaller cities having no welfare funds, but include about $4.5 million in multiple-city gifts which are duplications as between New York City and the remainder of the country.

TABLE 1-A
SALES OF ISRAEL BONDS, 1951–56
(in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cash Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951 (May 1-Dec. 31)</td>
<td>$52,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>47,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>36,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>37,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>42,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 (Jan. 1-Dec. 20)</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$267,577*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total includes "cash-ins" for bonds used in payment of welfare fund pledges, conversion of first bond issue to second bond issue, and the like.
# TABLE 2

## MAJOR INDEPENDENT FUND-RAISING CAMPAIGNS, 1954 AND 1955

*(in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Funds Raised Independently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah *</td>
<td>$7,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University b</td>
<td>2,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University and Medical School c</td>
<td>1,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope d</td>
<td>2,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal Agencies e</td>
<td>2,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund b</td>
<td>2,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital e</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew College-Jewish Institute of Religion-Union of American Hebrew Congregations f</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'naï B'rith National Youth Services Appeal e</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel b</td>
<td>1,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary f</td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Women Organization b</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of the Hebrew University l</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society l</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institutions e</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United HIAS Service l</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center at Denver l</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT-Women's Division a</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Vodaath Yeshiva l</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Committee for the Weizmann Institute l</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women l</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mainly from funds raised by members.

b No appeal to welfare funds.

c Substantial proportion raised in New York City.

d Substantial proportion raised on West Coast.

e Limited inclusion by welfare funds.

f Mainly from congregational membership.

g Mainly in cities where no welfare fund allocation is sought.

h Mainly from B'naï B'rith membership.

i Welfare fund allocations not sought for capital funds.

j Mainly in New York City.
### TABLE 3

**Distribution to Fields of Service of Funds Raised by Central Community Campaigns**

*(Estimates in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount Budgeted</strong></td>
<td>$89,755</td>
<td>$89,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas and Refugee Needs</td>
<td>56,163</td>
<td>55,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>2,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>4,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>2,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>28,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The difference between totals budgeted and totals raised represents "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, elimination of duplicating multiple-city gifts, exclusion of informal joint appeals in small cities, and contingency or other reserves. The figures for 1955 are preliminary, subject to revision when more complete reports are available.

*Figures for New York include the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) of Greater New York and 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 in other cities 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 and the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB).
### Table 4

**Distribution of Contributed Funds in 1955 to National and Overseas Fields**

*(Estimates in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Service, Per Cent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>By Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Through Independent Campaigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$101,238</td>
<td>$59,099</td>
<td>$42,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overseas**

- United Jewish Appeal...
  - Per Cent: 56.7
  - By Welfare Funds: 52,158
  - Through Independent Campaigns: 5,207

- Other Overseas
  - Per Cent: 13.7
  - By Welfare Funds: 2,413
  - Through Independent Campaigns: 16,474

**National**

- Community Relations...
  - Per Cent: 5.0
  - By Welfare Funds: 2,461
  - Through Independent Campaigns: 2,582

- Health and Welfare...
  - Per Cent: 5.2
  - By Welfare Funds: 119
  - Through Independent Campaigns: 5,200

- Cultural
  - Per Cent: 5.5
  - By Welfare Funds: 407
  - Through Independent Campaigns: 5,188

- Religious
  - Per Cent: 7.8
  - By Welfare Funds: 374
  - Through Independent Campaigns: 7,505

- National Service
  - Per Cent: 1.1
  - By Welfare Funds: 1,107
  - Through Independent Campaigns: 43

---

*a Represents amounts raised in smaller cities with no formal welfare fund structure.

### Table 5

**Distribution of Federation Allocations (Including Chest Funds)**

*For Local Services in 93 Communities, 1954, 1955*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Service</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,065,403</td>
<td>$6,705,493</td>
<td>- 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>+ 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Services</td>
<td>4,862,208</td>
<td>4,924,433</td>
<td>+ 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>+ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Culture</td>
<td>4,966,110</td>
<td>5,198,162</td>
<td>+ 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>+ 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>2,840,678</td>
<td>2,946,819</td>
<td>+ 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>+ 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1,742,755</td>
<td>1,415,483</td>
<td>- 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>- 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>1,555,688</td>
<td>1,521,955</td>
<td>- 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>- 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>769,500</td>
<td>791,177</td>
<td>+ 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>+ 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>626,260</td>
<td>634,405</td>
<td>+ 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>+ 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>451,420</td>
<td>433,995</td>
<td>- 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>- 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                       | $24,880,022 | $24,571,920 | - 1.2             |
| Per Cent                    | 100.0        | 100.0        |                   |

Provided by Federations: $16,307,339 | $15,596,651 | - 4.4
Provided by Chests: $8,572,683 | $8,975,269 | + 4.7
TABLE 6
DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 73 COMMUNITIES 1946, 1955
(Amounts in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Services</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th></th>
<th>1955</th>
<th></th>
<th>Amounts Allocated in 1955 (thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Index of Change 1946 = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>$3,044</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>$4,835</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>$4,835</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Vocational Guidance</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of the Aged</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$11,363</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$22,590</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$22,590</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes both federation and community chest funds. Local services for refugees are excluded.
N.B. During this period the United States Consumer Price Index rose by 37.3 per cent.
### TABLE 7: Receipts of National Jewish Agencies for Overseas Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal &amp; Beneficiary Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal (a)</td>
<td>$58,796,647</td>
<td>$48,613,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Joint Distribution Comm. (b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Israel Appeal (b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund (c)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Association for New Americans (b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT - Women's Division</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total UJA and Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>$58,796,647</td>
<td>$48,613,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Overseas Agencies</th>
<th>Amount 1955</th>
<th>Amount 1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Comm. for Weizmann Inst. of Science</td>
<td>$87,729*</td>
<td>$160,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of Hebrew University (c1)</td>
<td>349,677</td>
<td>390,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society</td>
<td>163,819</td>
<td>189,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institutions</td>
<td>283,104</td>
<td>297,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezras Torah Fund</td>
<td>9,979</td>
<td>10,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Council of Israel Institutions (d)</td>
<td>111,341</td>
<td>108,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah (e)</td>
<td>626,000</td>
<td>644,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Hadassah (e, f)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School Campaign-Hebrew University (g)</td>
<td>14,710</td>
<td>2,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel (h)</td>
<td>346,614</td>
<td>382,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women (i)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Women (e)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Hias Service (f, j)</td>
<td>331,415</td>
<td>236,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,384,388</td>
<td>$2,483,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERSEAS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$61,181,035</td>
<td>$51,097,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Excludes contributions and earnings of Investment Fund established in 1955.
(a) Income is for calendar year on cash basis; pledges for each campaign year are higher. Cash receipts in 1954 were delayed because of flotation of a special loan of $64,251,500 (excluded from totals) of which $12,998,140 was repaid in 1954.
(b) Excludes income from UJA; also income from campaigns abroad, from inter-governmental agencies and reparations income of $6,867,900 in 1954 and $7,923,100 in 1955 for JDC; and excludes the dollar equivalent of about $17,000,000 in 1954 and about $12.5 million in 1955 for the Jewish Agency, the major beneficiary of the United Jewish Appeal.
(c) Traditional collections in U.S.; exclusive of Jewish Agency grants to JNF in Israel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1952</strong></td>
<td><strong>1954</strong></td>
<td><strong>1955</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ - $</td>
<td>$ - $</td>
<td>$- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465,148</td>
<td>677,718</td>
<td>$ - $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991,740</td>
<td>812,456</td>
<td>270,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860,673</td>
<td>863,683</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789,664</td>
<td>765,369</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,659</td>
<td>156,920</td>
<td>3,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71,533</td>
<td>38,705</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,968,714</td>
<td>7,124,437</td>
<td>698,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,926</td>
<td>27,345</td>
<td>4,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,064</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>68,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,307,051</td>
<td>1,405,925</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,585</td>
<td>438,505</td>
<td>195,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,024,582</td>
<td>1,064,025</td>
<td>56,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602,387</td>
<td>572,101</td>
<td>516,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$13,729,726 | $13,951,335 | $1,814,998 | $1,777,558 | $17,929,112 | $18,212,223 |

$16,474,198 | $16,582,788 | $2,301,887 | $1,957,045 | $79,957,120 | $69,637,024 |

---

(c1) Excludes UTT income for 1951 received in 1955.
(d) FCII estimates that additional direct transmissions to yeshivot in
   Israel are about $1,200,000 annually.
(e) Welfare income estimated by CJTWF; amounts raised for JNF are
   excluded.
(f) Excludes grants from other organizations.
(g) Based on estimate by Medical School campaign that 40 per cent of
   amounts raised are secured from welfare funds.
(h) Excludes overseas income.
(i) Estimated by NCJW
(j) Cash basis; allocation basis for welfare fund grants, $520,000 for
   1955 and $220,000 for 1954.
### TABLE 8: RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal</td>
<td>$1,628,672</td>
<td>$1,632,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress-World Jewish Congress(b)</td>
<td>783,005</td>
<td>691,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee(b)</td>
<td>184,338</td>
<td>206,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans of U.S.</td>
<td>127,296</td>
<td>113,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Relations Advisory Council</td>
<td>106,425</td>
<td>121,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total(c)</strong></td>
<td>$2,829,736</td>
<td>$2,764,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center (formerly JCRS)</td>
<td>$24,491</td>
<td>$26,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;City of Hope&quot;(a)</td>
<td>35,194</td>
<td>38,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Patients Sanitarium for TB</td>
<td>8,612</td>
<td>7,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>66,233</td>
<td>74,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Home for Asthmatic Children</td>
<td>13,043</td>
<td>15,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
<td>54,745</td>
<td>65,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$202,318</td>
<td>$228,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$67,386</td>
<td>$68,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>7,835</td>
<td>8,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>6,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board</td>
<td>1,124,594</td>
<td>1,078,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>8,627</td>
<td>7,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,215,702</td>
<td>$1,169,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Research</td>
<td>$3,230</td>
<td>$3,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Tercentenary Committee*</td>
<td>134,465</td>
<td>52,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitzaron</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal(e)</td>
<td>412,934</td>
<td>433,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>7,000(f)</td>
<td>7,000(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis Youth Foundation</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>3,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social Studies (CJR)</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>1,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
<td>39,885</td>
<td>37,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadruth Ivrit(h)</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>18,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>4,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td>7,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Society</td>
<td>9,576</td>
<td>8,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers Seminary(g)</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>5,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menorah Association</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>6,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural College</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>10,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish Scientific Institute(h)</td>
<td>30,490</td>
<td>31,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Organization of America</td>
<td>20,000(f)</td>
<td>20,000(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$720,415</td>
<td>$655,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For footnotes, see page 194.
## JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES

### FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1955 AND 1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,940,000</td>
<td>275,496</td>
<td>225,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86,147</td>
<td>113,773</td>
<td>121,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,067</td>
<td>36,805</td>
<td>37,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,610</td>
<td>36,720</td>
<td>30,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,568,672</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,413,864</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,781,500</td>
<td>250,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225,477</td>
<td>121,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,265</td>
<td>30,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,720</td>
<td>30,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,390,788</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$518,922</td>
<td>660,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82,126</td>
<td>81,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,857</td>
<td>7,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,345</td>
<td>19,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>679,538</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Other Contributions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,669,363</td>
<td>2,911,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,641,330</td>
<td>8,820,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,966,099</td>
<td>8,820,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8: RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federations &amp; Welfare Funds</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary</td>
<td>$1,642</td>
<td>$3,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Campaign HUC-JIR-UAHC</td>
<td>137,095</td>
<td>143,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion(j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Amer. Hebrew Congregations(j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Theological College</td>
<td>30,566</td>
<td>32,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>119,173</td>
<td>128,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesifta Tifereth Jerusalem</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>3,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute</td>
<td>3,000(f)</td>
<td>3,000(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizrahi National Education Committee</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>7,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ner Israel Rabbinical College</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>7,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Beth Jacob Schools</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>2,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>5,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah</td>
<td>3,569</td>
<td>3,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Vodaath Yeshiva</td>
<td>19,535</td>
<td>21,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telshe Rabbinical College</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>8,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Lubavitcher Yeshivoth</td>
<td>8,182</td>
<td>10,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations(g)</td>
<td>3,273</td>
<td>3,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>97,272</td>
<td>115,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University-Einstein Medical School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>$449,926</th>
<th>$499,384</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DOMESTIC</td>
<td>$5,418,097</td>
<td>$5,317,384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1955 data are for fourteen months (terminal period).
(a) Excludes income from JDA.
(b) Excludes overseas income.
(c) Excludes "other income" of NCRAC obtained from national agencies to avoid double counting.
(d) Includes Building Fund income.
(e) Excludes ADL grants to prevent double counting.
(f) Estimated by CUFWP.
(g) Excludes grants by national agencies, to prevent double counting.
(h) Excludes foreign income.
(j) Income from Combined Campaign shown under Combined Campaign.
## Other Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$64,201</td>
<td>$58,182</td>
<td>$921</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$66,764</td>
<td>$61,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1,424,196</td>
<td>1,299,908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,561,291</td>
<td>1,443,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>81,453</td>
<td>83,341</td>
<td>275,801</td>
<td>238,679</td>
<td>357,254</td>
<td>322,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,734</td>
<td>46,600</td>
<td>70,617</td>
<td>76,607</td>
<td>118,351</td>
<td>123,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>281,332</td>
<td>265,266</td>
<td>33,133</td>
<td>51,942</td>
<td>345,031</td>
<td>349,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,216,570</td>
<td>1,154,441</td>
<td>333,415</td>
<td>349,111</td>
<td>1,669,158</td>
<td>1,632,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131,121</td>
<td>140,439</td>
<td>52,361</td>
<td>32,281</td>
<td>185,420</td>
<td>176,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158,130</td>
<td>146,081</td>
<td>22,910</td>
<td>20,285</td>
<td>184,040</td>
<td>169,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,829</td>
<td>24,428</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>29,904</td>
<td>34,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209,093</td>
<td>152,149</td>
<td>44,339</td>
<td>25,808</td>
<td>259,471</td>
<td>184,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,837</td>
<td>40,182</td>
<td>14,143</td>
<td>37,746</td>
<td>59,976</td>
<td>80,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120,658</td>
<td>125,623</td>
<td>44,587</td>
<td>45,737</td>
<td>171,080</td>
<td>176,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58,969</td>
<td>54,493</td>
<td>11,038</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>73,756</td>
<td>65,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167,677</td>
<td>155,596</td>
<td>166,162</td>
<td>143,928</td>
<td>353,574</td>
<td>621,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269,204</td>
<td>144,139</td>
<td>61,278</td>
<td>50,417</td>
<td>337,132</td>
<td>203,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>334,328</td>
<td>325,578</td>
<td>55,248</td>
<td>53,108</td>
<td>397,758</td>
<td>389,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,786</td>
<td>17,216</td>
<td>222,001</td>
<td>167,196</td>
<td>268,760</td>
<td>187,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>964,488</td>
<td>754,536</td>
<td>907,459</td>
<td>638,941</td>
<td>1,969,219</td>
<td>1,508,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,560,849</td>
<td>1,230,791</td>
<td>38,809</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>1,599,658</td>
<td>1,241,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,505,435</td>
<td>$6,519,389</td>
<td>$2,386,496</td>
<td>$1,951,976</td>
<td>$10,341,857</td>
<td>$8,970,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$20,519,570</td>
<td>$18,737,146</td>
<td>$7,545,912</td>
<td>$6,661,700</td>
<td>$33,483,579</td>
<td>$30,716,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Federations and Welfare Funds and From Other Domestic Sources, 1955 and 1954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income

1955: $7,505,435

1954: $6,519,389

### Contributions

1955: $20,519,570

1954: $18,737,146
JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE

During the period under review, July 1, 1955, through June 30, 1956, the individual and family services offered by Jewish agencies, institutions, and hospitals in the United States reflected developments observable in the general Jewish community. The programs at the annual meetings of national coordinating bodies such as the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), et al., were concerned with a variety of trends and developments within the Jewish community of the United States. One of the most frequently repeated themes at such conferences, however, was that the clientele of Jewish social agencies was changing in character, and that services offered by such agencies had to be adapted to a native-born, middle-class, suburban population. It was a population, on the whole, which had more formal American education than the preceding one.

A growing part of the disposition and outlook of this new clientele was the acceptance of professional help in problems of social and psychological adjustment. The stigma of the recipient of "charity" appeared to be rapidly disappearing, as the new clients of Jewish social agencies applied for help with much the same spirit as they had in accepting educational and cultural services offered by the general community. The term "community services" could be found in the names of many Jewish agencies, and the implication of the term was that the services given by such agencies were available to the entire Jewish community.

Added impetus toward such a development may have been given in 1955-56 by the increase in funds raised. Fund-raising campaigns in a few communities exceeded the peak year, 1948. In 1955, the downward trend in fund raising since 1948 was stemmed, and in 1956 most campaigns were more successful than in 1955. However, the case loads of Jewish agencies, on the whole, did not show a corresponding decline. One important reason for this was to be found in a shift in the type of service offered in order to meet the needs of an ever-widening section of the total Jewish community.

Family Services

Of the various types of agency providing social services for the Jewish community, the so-called family agencies (which, in actual fact, were multiple service agencies administering a variety of tangible and psychological services) showed the change from a relief to a service function most clearly. Twenty years before, all family agencies had performed a direct relief-giving function for both native and foreign-born clientele. Since that time, the relief function for the native-born population had been taken over to a considerable extent by the public nonsectarian agencies, and during the Forties,

1 See "Campaigns Head for Banner Year," The Jewish Community, May 1956, Vol. II, No. 2.
the relief services of Jewish family agencies were administered primarily for refugees. By 1956 however, the refugee case load of most family agencies had declined considerably, and the function of even most of the small family agencies was described in terms of personal and family counseling, psychiatric service, family life education, and assistance with problems of the aging.\(^3\)

Recognizing the rapidity of change within the family service field, the family services planning committee of the CJFWF planned a survey to be carried out in November 1956, in order to outline the types of service currently offered in Jewish family agencies. This survey would look into counseling services, as well as such concrete services as financial assistance and homemaker service offered by the family agencies to both refugees and nonrefugees.

This study would also secure data on the extent of psychiatric treatment services in Jewish family agencies. A preliminary study of direct psychiatric treatment carried out by the social planning committee of the CJFWF early in 1956 showed that such treatment to agency clients was then given by thirty-five different agencies, including family and other multiple service and specialized child care agencies. The number of clients receiving such service was still comparatively small. The Jewish Community Services of Long Island, which reported the largest number of clients receiving psychiatric treatment under agency auspices, reported 105 such cases for the first six

---

months of 1955, approximately one-sixth of the total active case load. Psychiatric treatment in the larger communities, such as New York City, Boston, and Los Angeles, was offered generally through psychiatric panels; in the smaller communities, such as Atlanta, Ga., Buffalo, N. Y., and Hartford, Conn., through the agency's psychiatric consultants. A few agencies (Passaic, N.J., Seattle, Wash.) referred cases to private psychiatrists in the community, while others, such as Baltimore, Md., used hospital-connected clinics. 4

Aside from direct treatment, increasing attention was given in 1955–56 to the counseling function of Jewish family agencies. While it was by no means universally agreed that "the goal of the Jewish family agency's service was its counseling or case work help to people with problems in interpersonal relationship," 5 the principle that counseling was one appropriate function for the family agency with a properly trained staff did seem to be generally accepted. The extent of such service and its relation to other more tangible services administered by Jewish family agencies was to be disclosed by the study of the CJFWF's planning committee scheduled for November 1956.

During the calendar year of 1955, seventy-two agencies served 32,725 cases, as compared with 34,610 during 1954, or a decrease of 5.4 per cent. Seventy-three agencies were staffed by 412 supervisors and caseworkers. In 1955, immigrant cases were 13.8 per cent of the total cases served by sixty family service agencies, excluding the New York Association for New Americans, as compared with 20.3 per cent in 1954. 6

Care of the Aged

Further evidence regarding the use of social services by the whole Jewish community was provided in the admissions requirements of Jewish homes for the aged. A study by the CJFWF 7 published in June 1956 disclosed the fact that such homes were no longer dealing exclusively with an indigent population. Thirty-eight representative homes provided information showing that more than half of their operating income was derived from payments for service by residents of the homes or their families. True, more than half of the residents were recipients of old age assistance, social security, and other types of pension. However, a large percentage could afford to pay, at least partially, for the care they received without such outside assistance.

One Jewish home, namely the Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews of New York City, had had considerable experience in serving residents who could afford the full cost of care. In its private pavilion, the admissions policy required a set fee of $13.00 per day, and verification of income through bank statements and other such material—to make sure that applicants could afford to meet the cost of service.

Another home, in Miami, Fla., was currently giving consideration to the

---

6 I am indebted to the statistical service of the CJFWF for the statistical information appearing in this report.
admission of applicants with substantial assets. This home planned to require a capital contribution from applicants who could afford it.

While such instances were representative of a trend in Jewish social service, it must be emphasized that considerable financing of homes for the aged was provided through community funds. Of fifty-three homes reporting in 1954, 13.7 per cent of the total income came from central Jewish organizations, and 4.8 per cent from community chests.

In 1955, 8,634 aged persons were resident in sixty-one homes for the aged, as compared with 8,418, in 1954. In 1955, 827 (or less than one per cent) of the residents were under seventy years of age, 7,805 seventy years of age and over, compared with 815 under seventy and 7,597 over seventy during 1954.

While the volume of intramural care for the aged was considerable, it should be remembered that extramural service for the aged was also given by family agencies and by other types of agency. Particularly noteworthy were the programs of private residence care now offered in several cities under the auspices of family or multiple service agencies. Through such programs, elderly persons, who formerly could have received care only in an institutional setting, now were placed in "foster homes" maintained under the supervision of an agency or, in some instances, of an institution for the aged. Statistics were not available on the extent of such service throughout the United States. One agency maintaining such a program, however, namely the Jewish Community Services of Long Island, had 116 elderly persons in placement during the year 1954–55, and 106 during the year 1955–56.

As in the case of institutional care for the aged, payments were made by the elderly person himself wherever possible or by his relatives. Public agencies contributed part of the total board cost wherever the client was eligible for public assistance. In most cases, the agency paid approximately $150.00 a month for room and board, and in addition provided supervision of the home, medical care where necessary, and concrete and counseling services for the elderly individual and members of his family. The cost of care over and above that covered by public assistance, insurances, or help by the family, was borne by the agency. (See Table 2.)

**TABLE 2**

**Public Aid or Insurance in 64 Homes for the Aged**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aid or Insurance</th>
<th>Number of Homes Recipients</th>
<th>Per Cent Recipients Among Residents of 64 Homes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Age Assistance................</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to the Blind................</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Age and Survivors Insurance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Aid................</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total Number of Residents in Homes: December 31, 1954—8,973
  December 31, 1955—9,202
Child Care Services

There was an outstanding decline in admissions and in the total number of cases of children under care. This decline, amounting to 8 per cent in the number of admissions and 3.1 per cent in the total number of cases under care, contrasted with an increase in the case loads of family agencies. It was not as inconsistent as it might seem to be, however, with the general trend in Jewish social service noted earlier in this report. Two or three decades before, institutions for children and child care agencies were populated to a considerable extent by children from broken homes where economic need was a paramount factor. Within the past few years, however, many Jewish child care institutions, such as the Pleasantville Cottage School in New York and Bellefaire in Cleveland, Ohio, had begun to offer "residential treatment" rather than "custodial" institutional care. The foster home agencies, which formerly provided little in the way of psychiatric treatment or other types of mental hygiene service, had also shifted in their outlook so as to meet the needs of a different group of children requiring care.

On the whole, children coming into the care of such agencies in 1955-56 were considered to be in need of psychological treatment, and professional staffs employed by the agencies were oriented to such treatment. Economic need or a broken home were not considered sufficient reasons for placement in institutions or foster homes, since public agencies or the family agency could provide help in such instances through financial assistance, homemaker, and other types of service. The philosophy that children should receive care in their own homes, wherever possible, was shared by both family and children's agencies. As a result, the children receiving care in institutions and placement agencies represented a group considered to be in need of such care because they could not be helped psychologically within their own homes.

Considerable shifting in the use of existing child care resources was evident in an extensive study carried out in 1955 by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York. This study of both Federated and non-Federated Jewish child care services in New York City pointed up a need for examination of present child care resources in terms of their adaptability to the need for psychiatric and other types of treatment on the part of children coming into their care. During 1955, fifty-five child care agencies supervised 4,251 children, as compared with 4,385 in 1954. The agencies themselves directly supervised 45.7 per cent of the children in 1955; of those under their direct supervision, 45.7 per cent were placed in foster homes, 32.4 per cent in the agencies' own institutions, and 20.4 per cent in the homes of parents.

Hospital Care

As in previous years, the Jewish community provided a tremendous volume of hospital care in 1954-55 for both Jewish and non-Jewish patients. While Jewish hospitals received considerable subsidy from public sources, payment for service continued to be the largest source of operating funds. Here, as in

---

the case of the Jewish social agencies, all economic groups and all segments of
the population were the beneficiaries of Jewish philanthropy. During 1955,
sixty-one hospitals under Jewish auspices had a total of 502,492 admissions and
live births.

Jewish Vocational Service

During the twelve-month period ending June 1956, Jewish communities in
the United States and Canada, which had a part-time or full-time vocational
service facility, served 83,283 individuals, according to reports submitted to
the Jewish Occupational Council. Of this number, 21,430 were served in the
vocational guidance departments of Jewish vocational service (JVS) agencies,
and 61,853 in the employment departments of these agencies.

Of those who were considered employable, 16,971 received direct assistance
in finding employment. This was more than one out of every four individ-
uals. It should be remembered that these agencies gave priorities to marginal
and handicapped individuals in their employment departments.

Of the total number served during this period, 5,134 were refugees. Of
those refugees considered ready for job referrals, 2,756 received direct help in
finding employment.

The average total number of professional workers who rendered these
services was 107.

Sheltered Workshops

Thirteen out of twenty-six communities in the United States and Canada
with JVS facilities now had sheltered workshop programs operated by these
facilities, or conducted in cooperation with these facilities. These communi-
ties included Chicago, Ill., Cincinnati, Ohio, Denver, Col., Detroit, Mich.,
Miami, Fla., Milwaukee, Wis., Montreal, Quebec, New York, N. Y., Newark,
Denver, New York, and Toronto added these workshops during 1955–56. It
was very likely that additional communities would add these facilities in the
coming year. Several had the subject under study.

Employment Discrimination

In March 1956 the JVS agencies repeated a cooperative study with the
community relations agencies first carried out in March 1955. Job-seeking ap-
plicants to Jewish vocational service agencies were asked to fill out uniform
questionnaires regarding their job-seeking experience, including experience
of job discrimination because of religion. This survey was part of the co-
operative program of the joint committee on employment discrimination of
the Jewish Occupational Council and the National Community Relations
Advisory Council.

The results of the 1956 survey confirmed the 1955 findings. Considerable
effort had been made in recent years to induce employers to eliminate ques-

---

9 I am indebted to Roland Baxt of the Jewish Occupational Council, who prepared this sec-
tion of the report.
tions about religion from application forms and all interviews. Such ques-
tions were prohibited in cities and states with fair employment practice
(FEP) laws. Nevertheless, approximately 7 per cent of those who made direct
application to employers reported that they had been questioned about their
religion. Since discrimination on the basis of religion was frequently prac-
ticed subtly, it may be estimated that the extent of such discrimination was
more widespread than revealed by this statistic.

In 1956 applicants in communities without FEP laws were questioned by
employers about religion almost four times as often as applicants in cities
covered by such legislation—the proportions being 15.2 and 4.0 per cent re-
spectively in 1956, compared with 17.1 and 8.6 per cent in 1955.

The use of questions about religious affiliations by commercial employment
agencies continued to be fairly widespread. Of those applicants who regis-
tered with commercial employment agencies in the two months preceding the
study, approximately 13 per cent reported in 1956 that they were questioned
about religion (20 per cent in 1955).

It was also clear from the survey that many applicants neither recognized
nor complained of discrimination, even when they encountered it; as in 1955,
only a small proportion of those asked about their religion felt that they
were discriminated against. This was despite the fact that such questions
were deemed discriminatory by all state commissions against discrimination,
and in areas of FEP jurisdiction would constitute ground for valid com-
plaints of violation of the law. (See also p. 123-24.)

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Under Public Law 565, three JVS communities, namely Chicago, Ill., Mil-
waukee, Wis., and New York City, received grants to total approximately
$150,000 over a three-year period. The projects covered by these grants in-
cluded special experiments in diagnosis of employability and restorative
training of severely disabled, and an understanding of employer policies and
practices in the utilization or lack of utilization of handicapped workers.

JVS agencies in Chicago, Ill., Detroit, Mich., Newark, N.J., Pittsburgh, Pa.,
and St. Louis, Mo., were used by the local offices of the state division of vo-
cational rehabilitation on a fee basis. During 1955-56 the New York JVS
undertook a special project aimed at personal adjustment training for work
of severely retarded school youth, with funds which were made available by
the New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Of the twenty-six Jewish communities which had full or part-time Jewish
vocational service facilities, twelve now had a policy of a fee for vocational
guidance service based on ability to pay. Several JVS agencies (New York
City, Chicago, Boston) received foundation support for special programs dur-
ing the 1955-56 year. It was believed that this source of support would in-
crease in the next few years.

OTHER TRENDS

The increasing number of Jewish students seeking entrance to colleges and
universities, and the growing shortage of adequate facilities, had increased
the demands for assistance from JVS agencies in planning for college. From all indications, the demand for this type of assistance would mount during the next few years.

In several communities, social planning bodies had called upon JVS agencies to undertake special programs to help prevent delinquency. Studies of this problem by national, state, and local bodies had pointed to an increased need for assisting youth in job planning, as well as in obtaining suitable employment.

Increasing acceptance of the feasibility of vocational rehabilitation, aided by funds from government and other sources, was bringing many of the JVS agencies and Jewish hospitals together in cooperative effort. This, again, was an area where increased activity could be expected within the next few years. Membership organizations, such as the National Council of Jewish Women and the Cerebral Palsy Association, had accepted such responsibility, as had state departments of labor and various public mental health funds.

The JVS agencies continued their pioneering efforts in serving the aged Jewish community support from other sources was expected to increase during the next few years.

JEWISH OCCUPATIONAL COUNCIL

The Jewish Occupational Council was the national coordinating agency for Jewish vocational services throughout the United States, Canada, and more recently, Israel. In 1954, the Hadassah Organization of America, which maintained vocational services in Israel, joined the JOC. In addition to its long list of basic services to these agencies and other organized Jewish communities, the Jewish Occupational Council completed a number of special studies during the 1955–56 year. These covered the areas of sheltered workshops, the implications of recent legislative developments, and the contributions of Jews to the American economy.\(^{10}\)

HERBERT H. APTEKAR

THE UNITED STATES, ISRAEL, AND THE MIDDLE EAST

DURING THE PERIOD between the summer of 1955 and the fall of 1956, the Middle East assumed primary importance in American foreign policy. From August 30, 1955, when Secretary of State John Foster Dulles reported that the United States had unofficial information about Soviet offers to supply arms to Arab states, American policy in the Middle East had centered on two main objectives: (1) preventing Russia from becoming a dominant influence in Middle Eastern affairs, and (2) maintaining peace in the Middle East.

Because of the increasingly critical nature of Middle Eastern problems, the United States had no opportunity to work toward the permanent settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict that had been outlined by Secretary Dulles on August 26, 1955 (see American Jewish Year Book, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 283-84). Events diverted American policy from long-term solutions to immediate considerations arising from the Communist-Arab rapprochement.

Arms

Since 1948 Egypt had been seeking arms from the United States. But Egypt's unwillingness to participate in a Western-sponsored military defense scheme and her conflict with Britain over the evacuation of the Suez Canal zone, had prevented Egypt from receiving major military supplies from the United States. After the Anglo-Egyptian agreement on the evacuation of the Suez Canal zone, signed on October 19, 1954, the United States sent increased economic aid to Egypt and promised military aid. But Egypt refused to sign the mutual security agreement on military aid, because she felt that it would commit her to the West. Egypt was then granted the possibility of receiving "cash-reimbursable" military aid, along with Israel, Iran, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia.

Because of the continuing tension between Israel and Egypt, and the United States commitment to avoid an arms race between the Arab states and Israel, as stated in the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950, requests for major military purchases by both Egypt and Israel had been rejected. Because of the recurring references to the Tripartite Declaration, the entire text follows:

The Governments of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, having had occasion during the recent Foreign Ministers meeting in London to review certain questions affecting the peace and stability of the Arab states and of Israel, and particularly that of the supply of arms and war material to these states, have resolved to make the following statements:

1. The three Governments recognize that the Arab states and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purposes of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole. All applications for arms or war material for these countries will be considered in the light of these principles. In this connection the three Governments wish to recall and reaffirm the terms of the statements made by their representatives on the Security Council on August 4, 1949, in which they declared their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab states and Israel.

2. The three Governments declare that assurances have been received from all the states in question, to which they permit arms to be supplied from their countries, that the purchasing state does not intend to undertake any act of aggression against any other state. Similar assurances will be requested from any other state in the area to which they permit arms to be supplied in the future.

3. The three Governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance
of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three Governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation.

Though the United States at first tried to forestall the Communist-Egyptian arms deal by offering Egypt arms on credit, the British opposed this plan. On September 27, 1955, when Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt announced officially that Egypt had concluded an agreement with Czechoslovakia exchanging cotton and rice for armaments, Secretary Dulles and British Foreign Secretary Harold Macmillan issued a joint statement avowing Anglo-American harmony of views and expressing their desire to avoid an "arms race which would inevitably increase the tensions in the area." The next day, the State Department sent Assistant Secretary of State George V. Allen to Cairo, but Allen's two conversations with Premier Nasser had no practical results.

In the next few days, France aligned herself with the Anglo-American position; the Soviet Government issued a statement on October 1 declaring that "every state has the legitimate right to provide for its own defense and to purchase arms for its defense needs from other states at the usual commercial terms." The Council of the Arab League expressed support of Nasser's "firm stand"; Syrian and Saudi Arabian spokesmen indicated their willingness to make similar arrangements.

At a press conference held in Washington on October 4, 1955, Secretary Dulles refrained from criticizing Egypt: "It is difficult to be critical of countries which, feeling themselves endangered, seek the arms which they sincerely believe they need for defense." From the standpoint of United States relations with the Soviet Union, Dulles stated that "such deliveries of arms would not contribute to relaxing tensions." He was also skeptical about the possibility of achieving security through an arms race.

On October 11, 1955, Abba Eban, Israel ambassador to the United States, proposed to Assistant Secretary Allen that the United States put into effect a guarantee of the borders between Israel and the Arab states; he also asked that the United States promise to help Israel maintain her arms balance. However, Israel made no specific request, pending further information as to the quantity and quality of Communist arms shipments to Egypt. The same day Syrian Ambassador Farid Zeineddine told Allen that any United States security guarantee to Israel "would very probably create outright struggle" in the Middle East.

Toward the end of October, the scope of the Communist-Egyptian arms deal became known; it was reported to total about $80,000,000, with individual weapons priced considerably below what Western countries would charge. The arms included 200 Soviet MIG jet fighters, 100 Russian tanks, 6 submarines, and a substantial amount of artillery. From the first, Israel con-

---

1 On July 26, 1956, Nasser, speaking at Alexandria on the nationalization of the Suez Canal, admitted that the arms agreement had been made with the Soviet Union and not with Czechoslovakia. This admission appeared the next day in the Soviet press, which had previously scrupulously identified the arms deal as Czech-Egyptian.
tended that the arms deal constituted a major danger to her, and attached particular importance to a security pact with the United States. The size of the Communist arms shipments to Egypt impelled Israel to seek arms aid from the West.

On October 26, Israel Prime Minister Moshe Sharett went to Paris to put his case before the foreign ministers of the United States, Great Britain, and France, just prior to the Big Four foreign ministers conference in Geneva. Though Secretary Dulles agreed to consider a specific request from Israel for arms, he emphasized that this was not to be construed as a promise to supply arms.

The first official policy statement clearly indicating the American position on arms to the Middle East was enunciated by President Eisenhower on November 9. Reaffirming the Tripartite Declaration and supporting Secretary Dulles’ August 26 peace proposals (security guarantees to Israel and its Arab neighbors based on a prior agreement between them on borders), the President said that the United States would “continue willing to consider requests for arms needed for legitimate self-defense,” but that the United States did not intend to “contribute to an arms competition.”

On the same day Prime Minister Eden, speaking at the Lord Mayor’s banquet in London, urged Israel and the Arab countries to compromise on territorial claims, offering British and American formal treaty guarantees once an acceptable agreement had been reached.

On November 15, in a message addressed to Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver and read at a rally called by the American Zionist Council in Madison Square Garden in New York City, President Eisenhower reiterated his views of November 9, stressing the imperative need of a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict.

On November 16, Ambassador Eban submitted to Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., a formal bid to be allowed to purchase a listed quantity of arms “under the most lenient conditions of credit and price.” The same day Premier Nasser broadcast a statement from Cairo in which he accused the United States of a “deliberate attempt to maintain the military superiority of Israel over the Arabs,” and warned that United States arms aid to Israel would force Egypt to seek additional arms.

During November and December 1955, when Israel Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett was in the United States on a speaking tour in behalf of Israel Defense Bonds, he twice conferred with Secretary Dulles about American arms for Israel. On December 12, diplomats representing eight Arab states called on Secretary Dulles to inform him that if the United States supplied arms to Israel, they would be forced to rely on the Soviet bloc for arms of their own.

On December 13, two days after Israel’s raid against Syrian military positions near the Sea of Galilee (see p. 212), Assistant Secretary of State Allen reportedly informed Ambassador Eban that the State Department must be able to assure Congress that any arms hereafter sold to Israel would be used only for defensive purposes, and that Israel’s raid against Syria had slowed consideration of Israel’s request for arms. On January 15, 1956, Allen said that Israel’s request for arms was still under consideration, but added that he did not think it realistic for Israel with a population of 1,700,000 to
"expect to have indefinitely, plane for plane and gun for gun, as large an armaments position as that of 40,000,000 Arabs."

On January 25, Ambassador Eban visited Secretary Dulles to press Israel's request to purchase arms in the United States, and was told by the secretary that though the United States had not shut the door on the matter, it was not prepared at the time to meet Israel's request.

In the meantime, British and American diplomats had jointly been examining their Middle Eastern policies with the view to establishing a forceful common policy. After a series of preparatory meetings between members of the British Foreign Office and the State Department, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden held a three-day conference in Washington. The conference concluded on February 1, 1956, with the issuance of both a joint declaration contrasting the record of the Soviet Union and the Western countries on colonialism and a statement summarizing the substance of the Anglo-American talks. Though the conference dealt with most of the troubled areas in the world, the statement put the greatest emphasis on the Middle East. It stressed Anglo-American efforts for a settlement of Israel-Arab conflict, reaffirmed the Tripartite Declaration, gave full support to the efforts of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to maintain peace on the borders, and cautioned that security "in this area cannot rest upon arms alone." The statement noted that Soviet arms supplies had added to the tension in the area and increased the risk of war.

These views were repeated, with some elaboration, by Secretary Dulles on February 6, in written reply to a letter from forty Republican congressmen urging arms aid for Israel. Reaffirming that American foreign policy "embraces the preservation of the State of Israel" and the principle of maintaining friendship with both Israel and the Arab states, Secretary Dulles wrote that the combined influence of the signatories of the Tripartite Declaration and of the United Nations "against any armed aggression is a far more effective deterrent to any potential aggressor than any amount of arms." Nevertheless, Dulles added that he did not exclude the possibility of arms sales to Israel.

PUBLIC REACTION

American public awareness of the problems in the Middle East was heightened by the Communist-Egyptian arms deal. Public opinion polls taken in the last half of 1955 showed that though more people tended to sympathize with the Israel than with the Arab position, this pro-Israel sentiment did not affect the concern felt for the maintenance of peace in the Middle East and the protection of American interests in the area, especially oil. The polls showed that a majority of Americans favored close American relations with Israel; however, an even larger number favored close cooperation with the Arabs. The polls also indicated that public sentiment did not support arms aid to Israel.

Similarly, national editorial opinion in the general press was favorable to Israel, critical of Egypt, and condemnatory of the Soviet bloc; but only a small number of influential newspapers advocated American arms aid to Israel. In the main, the national press reflected the hesitant policy of the State Department.
Most Jewish organizations urged the United States to sign a mutual defense pact with Israel, and to provide Israel with defensive arms. On September 29, 1955, the National Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) adopted a unanimous resolution urging the speedy conclusion of a defense pact in view of the threat created by the Egyptian-Czech arms deal. On October 5, the presidents of sixteen major American Jewish organizations \(^1\) issued a statement expressing concern over the Communist arms deal and the belief that the American government would not succumb to "pressures on matters of conscience and higher self-interest."

At its executive board meeting on October 22, 1955, the American Jewish Committee urged the United States to offer security guarantees, within the framework of the United Nations, to all the peoples of the Middle East, and to assure full protection against aggression to any government that became a party to a security agreement.

On November 15, the American Zionist Council convened a meeting in Madison Square Garden in New York City that urged both security guarantees and defensive arms for Israel. At the beginning of January 1956, a delegation of military figures representing the Jewish War Veterans of America met with Assistant Secretary of Defense Gordon Gray to discuss the military aspects of providing arms aid to Israel. On January 29, 1956, the American Jewish Committee adopted a statement at its annual meeting urging the United States to permit Israel to purchase defensive arms in this country.

The American Veterans Committee, at its annual convention on November 15, 1956, advocated arms to Israel pending an effective security guarantee.

Many leaders in politics urged arms aid and security guarantees to Israel. These included Senator Herbert H. Lehman (Dem., N. Y.), New York State Attorney General Jacob K. Javits (Rep.), Senator Estes Kefauver (Dem., Tenn), Adlai E. Stevenson (in an address at the University of Virginia on November 11, 1955), Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (Dem., Minn.), and Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York City.

Possibly the most widely reported statement on arms for Israel was issued jointly by former president Harry S. Truman, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Walter P. Reuther on January 28, 1956. This statement said the United States "must counteract every attempt by the Soviet Union to upset the present precarious balance of power" in the Middle East, and hence the "United States should now provide the defensive arms needed by Israel to protect itself against any aggression made possible or incited by the introduction of Communist arms."

Though there were not many ardent proponents of military aid and guarantees to Israel outside of Jewish organizations, there were even fewer

\(^1\) Joseph S. Barr, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; Rabbi Philip Bernstein, American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs; Joseph Breslaw, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel; Maurice N. Eisenstadt, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Moses I. Feuerstein, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; Israel Goldstein, American Jewish Congress; Adolph Held, Jewish Labor Committee; Mrs. Moise Kahn, National Council of Jewish Women; Rabbi Max Kirshblum, Mizrahi Organization of America; Philip Klutznick, B'nai B'rith; Mortimer May, Zionist Organization of America; Rabbi Irving Miller, American Zionist Council; Charles Rosengarten, United Synagogue of America; Herman Seidel, Central Committee, Labor Zionist Organization of America; Mrs. Rebecca Shulman, Hadassah-Women's Zionist Organization of America; Bernard H. Trager, National Community Relations Advisory Council. This statement was signed also by Nahum Goldmann on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.
opponents of this position. These opponents included the pro-Arab American Friends of the Middle East (AFME). AFME took the position that the Middle Eastern arms balance could be rectified only by providing "the governments of the Arab states with equipment equal to that which has been provided Israel," according to a statement by its executive vice president, Garland Evans Hopkins on October 10, 1955. A newly formed group, the Committee for Security and Justice in the Middle East, whose twenty-nine members were largely drawn from Americans long sympathetic to the Arab cause, issued a statement on January 24, 1956, asserting that "furnishing munitions to Israel will have the direct effect of driving the Arab world once and for all into the outstretched arms of the Kremlin."

Only a very small number of senators and congressmen expressed themselves as opposed to arms aid to Israel; these included Senator William F. Knowland (Rep., Calif.) and Congressman James P. Richards (Dem., S. C.), chairman of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee.

Saudi Arabian Arms Shipment

On February 16, 1956, the State Department confirmed press reports that it had approved the sale of eighteen M-41 light tanks to Saudi Arabia. This announcement created a furor in Washington, because for four months State Department policy had seemed directed toward a complete embargo on all military shipments to the Middle East. In the light of the State Department's failure to act on Israel's request to purchase arms, and the American government's continued avowal of its intention to avoid an arms race in the Middle East, the Saudi Arabian tank shipment aroused considerable consternation. In confirming reports of the imminent shipment of the eighteen tanks, Lincoln White, State Department press officer, explained that Saudi Arabia had requested permission to purchase the tanks in the spring of 1955, and that the United States had agreed to the transaction in the fall of 1955, under a mutual security agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabia signed June 18, 1951. The United States was satisfied that the shipment would not increase the danger of war in the Middle East, and that the tanks were intended for training purposes, and would be used in connection with the United States training mission in Saudi Arabia.

Israel's ambassador to the United States Abba Eban promptly denounced the tank shipment as a "regrettable departure" from American policy of maintaining an arms balance; several congressmen and senators expressed their disapproval. On February 17, Senator Walter F. George, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called for a Congressional investigation of the tank transaction.

When news of the tank sale was reported, Secretary of State Dulles was away on vacation; the matter was judged sufficiently important to be handled by the White House. Early on February 17, the White House announced a suspension of arms shipments to the Middle East, pending further examination. That day Saudi Arabian Ambassador Sheikh Abdullah al-Kahyyal registered with Assistant Secretary of State Allen his country's protest against the suspension of the tank shipment.

The next day, February 18, President Eisenhower lifted the embargo, and the State Department issued a statement prepared by Acting Secretary of
State Herbert Hoover, Jr., announcing that the shipment would go forward. The statement indicated that the American government believed this particular transaction would meet the conditions of the Tripartite Declaration, and indicated that the issuance of export licenses in this instance would not affect the "most careful scrutiny" being given to outstanding requests—presumably a reference to the Israel application of November 16, 1955. It was generally believed that the decisive factor in lifting the twenty-four-hour embargo was American fear lest Saudi Arabia refuse to renew the five-year agreement for use of the Dhahran Air Base by the United States Air Force which was to expire in June 1956.

The Saudi Arabian tank incident evoked considerable public controversy; Zionist organizations criticized the transaction, and pro-Arab groups urged that the Saudi Arabian shipment should not furnish "an excuse for granting the heretofore rejected Israeli applications."

On February 24, 1956, following Secretary Dulles' return to Washington, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing on the situation in the Middle East, with the particular purpose of clarifying United States policy with regard to arms shipments to the Middle East. Both Dulles and Hoover testified. The hearing clearly indicated that the tank shipment had been considered in connection with renewal of the air base agreement. Secretary Dulles reiterated the view that Israel, because of its small size, could not win an arms race with the Arabs. He also repeated that the United States did not exclude the possibility of arms sales to Israel or the Arab states. He assured the committee "that there is no problem" that the tanks to Saudi Arabia could be used against Israel, because of the impassable desert and the fact that Saudi Arabia did not have a common frontier with Israel. Dulles stressed the urgent need for a peace settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors, and restated his proposals of August 26, 1955.

**Modification in American Arms Embargo**

On February 28, 1956, Israel Ambassador Abba Eban and Israel Minister Reuven Shiloah presented to Assistant Secretary of State Allen, Israel's demand for a yes-or-no reply on Israel's request to purchase arms in the United States. The following day Premier David Ben Gurion made the same request in Israel of American Ambassador Edward B. Lawson. On March 2, Secretary Dulles received Ambassador Eban, but told him only that Dulles' testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should not be interpreted as foreclosing an affirmative decision on Israel's request.

In the meantime, events in the Middle East (see p. 393-96) had apparently stiffened British and French attitudes toward Egypt and Jordan, and the United Kingdom and France were viewing Israel's requests for arms more sympathetically. The United States, too, had been reassessing its attitude, particularly toward Egypt, and at the end of February it was reported that the United States would not object to a shipment of twelve Mystère IV jet interceptors ordered in 1955 for the Israel Air Force. By the end of March, when France began delivery of the planes, it was clear that the United States would raise no objections to British and French arms sales to Israel, while she herself failed to approve or reject Israel's pending request. Realizing that she could not await early action from the United States,
Israel turned also to Canada for arms purchases, and negotiations were reported under way in April. Israel continued, however, to press the United States; on April 23, Ambassador Eban called on the State Department, pointing out that it was self-defeating for the United States to say that arms sales to Israel by other countries might be useful, but that the United States would not sell her any at this time. Eban urged the United States to take the lead in such sales.

But on May 8, in an address before B’nai B’rith, Secretary Dulles reiterated American opposition to an arms race in the Middle East.

Despite the secretary’s verbal adherence to the arms policy in force in 1955, revision of State Department attitudes toward Egypt and related Middle Eastern problems became apparent in the summer of 1956 when there was a radical reshuffle of United States representatives in that area. Early in July the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had been notified by the White House to act on the nominations of new ambassadors. Raymond Arthur Hare, director general of the Foreign Service, was appointed to replace Henry A. Byroade as ambassador to Egypt; William M. Rountree, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, was appointed to replace George Venable Allen in the post of Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs. It was generally believed that one reason for the change had been the ineffectiveness of Byroade, reputed to be a warm friend of the Arabs, in guiding American relations with Egypt.

In the second half of September, Canada announced a sale of twenty-four jet planes to Israel. On September 21, 1956, the State Department declared that Canadian officials had consulted the United States on the transaction, and that the United States had raised no objections to the sale. At this point, American policy was summed up as follows: Though the United States opposed an arms race, it opposed the creation of a serious arms imbalance in the Middle East which might result from Communist arms shipments. In order to avoid the semblance of a Middle Eastern cold war between Russia and the United States, with each country shipping arms to conflicting nations, the United States preferred to have other Western countries help rectify the arms imbalance.

DOMESTIC POLITICAL ISSUE

At a news conference held on January 24, 1956, Secretary Dulles mentioned the possibility of keeping one or two matters of foreign policy out of debate in the Presidential election campaign. This statement was widely interpreted as referring to the question of American Mid-Eastern policy, particularly with reference to arms for Israel. The suggestion was hailed by the AFME, which had earlier demanded that the Arab-Israel conflict not become a matter of domestic politics, and by the American Council for Judaism. The American Zionist Council denounced the proposal as “a cowardly departure from American political custom and precedent.”

That Middle Eastern policy was indeed a matter of domestic politics was made very clear at the Democratic Party convention on August 16, 1956, when the party’s platform was adopted. The Democratic platform attacked Republican policy in the Middle East, and put the Democratic Party on record as supporting arms shipments to Israel “to redress the dangerous im-
balance of arms in the area," as well as the conclusion of security guarantees. A week later the Republican Party convention adopted a platform whose plank on the Middle East avoided commitment of arms to Israel. The Republican platform merely declared that "we shall support the independence of Israel against armed aggression," and pointed to the United Nations as the best hope for peace in the Middle East.

**Border Tension**

At the end of August 1955, renewed shooting between Israel and Egypt broke out on the Gaza border, the scene of major border incidents earlier in the year (see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 281-82). At this time the fear that border incidents might lead to war was heightened by the new factor of Soviet arms to Egypt. On September 1, the State Department reported it had instructed its diplomats to impress upon Egypt and Israel the gravity of the situation. When, on September 8, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing a series of proposals by Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns, chief of staff of the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), to bring about peace on the borders, United States Representative to the UN Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. urged Israel and Egypt to give General Burns their full cooperation and accept his proposals.

Although Egypt and Israel had conditionally agreed on September 27 to withdraw from the demilitarized zone, Israel attacked the demilitarized zone at El Auja on the Egyptian border on November 2. Fifty Egyptians were killed, forty were wounded, and four Israelis were killed. The next day United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold made new proposals to restore quiet on the border. On November 5, the State Department issued a statement after the ambassadors of Israel (Abba Eban) and Egypt (Ahmed Hussein) had called on Assistant Secretary Allen, at the request of the department. The United States deplored "resort to force for the settlement of disputes," and expressed strong support of UN efforts for a peaceful settlement.

Tension next erupted on the Syrian border on December 11, when Israel forces attacked Syrian positions on the northeast corner of Lake Tiberias (Sea of Galilee), killing fifty-six Syrians, taking twenty-nine prisoners, with at least six Israelis killed. At Syria's request, the UN Security Council took up the question on December 16. Ambassador Lodge extended American sympathy to the Syrian government for the loss of life and urged Israel not to resort to force. On January 12, 1956, the United States, France, and Britain introduced a draft resolution. Though falling short of Syrian demands for sanctions against Israel and Israel's expulsion from the UN, the resolution condemned Israel for the attack, and called upon her to comply with her obligations under the UN charter and the armistice agreements. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the Security Council on January 19, 1956.

**Hammarskjold Mission**

The continued tension on the borders between Israel and her neighbors remained the subject of American concern. On March 7, 1956, President
Eisenhower called for "urgent and early action" by the United Nations to keep the peace in the Middle East. The following week, the President reported that the United States was drawing up proposals for a new approach by the United Nations to the problems of the Middle East. On March 20, the United States asked for an urgent meeting of the Security Council, the item on the agenda as proposed by Ambassador Lodge to be: "The Palestine Question: Status of Compliance Given to the General Armistice Agreements and the Resolutions of the Security Council Adopted During the Past Year."

The following day the United States submitted its proposal to the Security Council in the form of a resolution requesting the secretary general of the United Nations to "undertake, as a matter of urgent concern, a survey of the various aspects of enforcement of, and compliance with, the four general armistice agreements and the council's resolutions under reference." The resolution also requested the secretary general to arrange for the adoption of specific measures designed to reduce border tension: withdrawal of forces from armistice demarcation lines, full freedom of movement for UN observers along the demarcation lines and in the demilitarized zones, and establishment of local arrangements for the prevention of incidents. The secretary general was to report back to the Security Council within a month.

On March 26, the Security Council acceded to the request of the Arab nations for a delay in the consideration of the United States proposal, despite Ambassador Lodge's plea for urgent action. On April 3, the Security Council began discussion of the proposal, and the next day unanimously adopted the United States resolution.

Just before Hammarskjold left for the Middle East, fighting broke out again between Israel and Egypt. On April 9, James C. Hagerty, press secretary to the President, released a statement that the President had conferred with Secretary Dulles, that they regarded the situation with the "utmost seriousness," and that the United States would support in fullest measure the mission of the UN Secretary General. The statement also stressed United States commitments "within constitutional means" to oppose aggression in the Middle East, and to assist any nation subject to such aggression. At that time, Egypt had been raiding the Israel border with its suicide squads, and the United States had been trying to persuade Nasser to end the raids and avoid counterattacks by Israel. (On April 10, United States Ambassador to Israel Edward B. Lawson, speaking in Ramat Gan in Israel, praised the Israelis for their "remarkable restraint and composure" in the face of Egyptian "terrorism.")

On May 6, Secretary General Hammarskjold returned from his mission, and on May 10 he presented his report to the Security Council (for details of his accomplishments, see p. 397).

On May 29, during the debate in the Security Council on Hammarskjold's report, Great Britain introduced a resolution requesting the secretary general to continue his good offices in connection with enforcement of the armistice agreements. This proposal was supported by the United States, and unanimously adopted on June 4. On July 19, Hammarskjold began his second round of talks in the Middle East.
Baghdad Pact

On October 26, 1955, when the Shah of Iran ratified Iran's adherence to the Baghdad Pact for mutual defense in the Middle East, the nations in the Baghdad Pact included Iraq, Turkey, Great Britain, and Pakistan, in addition to Iran. This "northern tier" defense scheme had from the start aroused bitter opposition from the Soviet Union. It had also aroused the hostility of Egypt, who viewed Iraq as her rival for leadership in the Arab world. As a countermove to the pact, Syria and Egypt signed a defense pact on October 20, 1955; Saudi Arabia and Egypt signed one on October 27. In November Egypt established a joint military command with Syria, and in December, one with Saudi Arabia. Israel, too, viewed the Baghdad Pact with suspicion.

On November 21 and 22, 1955, an inaugural organizational meeting of the Council of the Baghdad Pact was convened in Baghdad. The United States, which had engineered the defense plan and was supporting some of its member nations with military aid, had nonetheless been resisting British pressure to adhere to the group. But at the opening session, the United States expressed its approval of the pact and its intention to establish permanent political and military liaison with the council. The council welcomed this intention, and in its final communiqué expressed appreciation of the "generous and valuable help" which the United States had given "in the provision of arms and other military equipment to enable them to strengthen their defense against aggression," and for extensive American economic assistance.

On April 16-20, 1956, the Council of the Baghdad Pact held its second meeting in Teheran. Though the State Department declared that the United States was not prepared to adhere to the pact "at this time," a high-ranking delegation, headed by Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, attended the meeting as observers. At the opening session, Henderson stated that the United States delegation had come prepared to discuss its supplementing of bilateral programs of economic and military assistance which the United States had with each of the pact member nations "through a program of broader economic cooperation coordinated through the Pact Organization." He pointed out that the United States would nonetheless continue to retain friendly ties with other nations in the area. This statement supported the generally held view that the United States had refrained from joining the pact because of Egypt's opposition to it.

In the course of the meeting, however, the United States drew close to the council: it agreed to establish a military liaison office at the permanent headquarters of the council; and it became a member of the council's economic committee and of its counter subversion committee. The United States also agreed to pay a share of the cost of the council's permanent secretariat. In its final communiqué, the council stressed the active participation of the United States in its work.

Economic Aid

Under the Mutual Security Act of 1955, $73,000,000 had been provided for economic assistance in the Near East and North Africa for the fiscal year
ending June 30, 1956. Because of the uncertain atmosphere resulting from Soviet military, diplomatic, and economic intervention in the area, the United States found it difficult to plan firm projects during this fiscal year.

During fiscal year 1956, Israel received $22,500,000 for development assistance, of which $10,000,000 was on a loan basis. Part of these funds were used to complete a project to bring water into the Negev and make possible the irrigation of over 200,000 acres of once barren soil.

Israel also received $1,500,000 in technical cooperation assistance.

On July 17, 1956, Secretary Dulles gave his recommendation to a proposal that the United States expend $3,500,000 (over £6,000,000) on deposit in Israel for scientific and humanitarian projects there. These funds had accumulated to the credit of the American Embassy in Israel under the Informational Media Guaranty Program of June 9, 1952, under which Israel distributors were allowed to import American books and publications in return for payment of local currency to the United States Embassy. On January 25, 1956, Secretary Dulles had appointed Bernard Katzen as special consultant to recommend uses for the local funds. An important consideration in the selection of the projects was "the potentiality of each project for the consolidation of goodwill between the people of Israel and the United States." On July 25, 1956, the Senate authorized this appropriation in an amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1957.

On May 9, 1956, it became known that Israel had asked the Export-Import Bank for a loan of $75,000,000 to finance development of water resources, for projects other than the Jordan River.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, United States economic aid to Lebanon amounted to $5,470,000 for development assistance and $2,293,000 for technical cooperation. Most of these funds were used to help accelerate a major program of public roads construction undertaken by the Lebanese government as part of a five-year economic development plan.

Jordan received $5,000,000 in development aid and $2,625,000 in technical assistance during the 1956 fiscal year. These funds were used for road construction and projects in afforestation, agriculture, health, and education.

Technical assistance in the amount of $2,300,000 was provided to Iraq, whose tremendous oil revenues were being used in basic development projects.

ARAB REFUGEES

In August 1955, Eric Johnston, President Eisenhower's special envoy to the Middle East, began a new round of discussions with Arab and Israeli officials regarding the plan for joint development of the Jordan River valley. Negotiations had seemed to be proceeding favorably toward a successful conclusion of the mission which Johnston had first undertaken in October 1953. But with the announcement of the Communist-Egyptian arms deal, with growing anti-American sentiment among the Arab countries, and with increased border tension between Israel and her neighbors, the League of Arab States, at a conference in Cairo on October 8, postponed consideration of the question.

The United States had held that acceptance of the Jordan River development plan would represent a "substantial start" toward the solution of the
Arab refugee problem. James J. Wadsworth, United States representative in the General Assembly, in a statement to the Ad Hoc Political Committee on November 16, 1955, discussing the report of the director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), criticized the leaders of the Arab nations for their failure to "let us help them help themselves." He said that upon their shoulders "rests the choice between progress to greatness and prosperity or the narrow clinging to the status quo which benefits no one but those who profit from misery and chaos."

On December 3, 1955, the General Assembly approved a resolution on the Palestine refugees, drafted by the United States, Great Britain, and Turkey embodying criticism at the lack of progress, and requesting the governments of the area "to make a determined effort" to cooperate with UNRWA's program for the relief and rehabilitation of the refugees.

Only $16,700,000 of the $62,000,000 appropriated as the United States contribution to UNRWA was used during the fiscal year of 1956. The unexpended balance of $45,300,000 was reappropriated for fiscal year 1957.

**Aswan Dam**

Since 1953, the Egyptian plan to build the High Dam at Aswan had been seriously studied by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development under the assumption that the United States would also provide a loan or a grant. By the fall of 1955, studies by the International Bank showed the Egyptian project to be feasible if Egypt could arrive at an agreement with the Sudan on sharing the Nile waters, and if Egypt could work out an economic plan for the next ten years that would effectively concentrate her domestic resources on the construction of the dam.

Despite the Communist-Egyptian arms agreement, the United States had continued to provide Egypt with economic assistance under the Mutual Security Act of 1955 in the amount of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. The United States also showed her willingness to help finance the dam, even though there were reports about Soviet offers to finance construction of the High Dam. An allocation of $56,000,000 from development assistance funds for fiscal year 1956 seemed assured as an outright gift toward the financing of the dam. Great Britain, too, promised $14,000,000 in the form of blocked sterling. These assurances were made on December 16, 1955; on their basis Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank, undertook negotiations with Premier Nasser over a loan to Egypt of $200,000,000. On February 9, 1956, Black concluded two weeks of negotiations with Premier Nasser, and announced that "substantial agreement" had been reached.

But on April 1, Nasser declared that Egypt had not yet rejected the Soviet offer, and that she had had to postpone the start of the project because of "many complex difficulties," including failure to agree with the Sudan on sharing the Nile waters.

In the meantime, the State Department had for some months been reassessing its policy toward Egypt, largely because of her increasingly anti-Western attitude and her economic commitments to the Soviet bloc. Egypt's recognition of Communist China in May 1956 also affected the State Department unfavorably (Secretary Dulles described the recognition as "an action that we regret").
By June 30, 1956, the Egyptians had not yet decided to accept the American offer of aid, and the amount of $56,000,000 which had been set aside for a grant under the Mutual Security Act of 1955 was no longer available. Though experts believed that this amount could be provided for out of the new foreign aid bill, even at the expense of other projects, the Senate Appropriations Committee, on July 16, issued a directive to the administration which declared that none of the funds provided for in the new mutual security bill should be used for assisting in the construction of the Aswan Dam. The following day, Ahmed Hussein, Egyptian ambassador to the United States, arrived in Washington with instructions from Premier Nasser to reach final agreements as soon as possible on the basis of the offers of December 16, 1955.

On July 19, when Hussein called on Secretary Dulles, he was informed that the United States "has concluded that it is not feasible in present circumstances to participate" in the construction of the High Dam. The State Department noted that agreement had not been reached with the Sudan, and that "the ability of Egypt to devote adequate resources to assure the project's success has become more uncertain than at the time the offer was made." The next day, Britain followed suit and canceled her offer of aid. In the wake of these announcements, the Soviet Union announced that it had not been considering aid to Egypt in the construction of the Aswan Dam; it then became clearly evident that Egypt had been using exaggerated reports about Soviet economic aid to obtain Western financing.

On July 24, Premier Nasser violently denounced the United States for its withdrawal of aid, declaring:

If an uproar in Washington creates false and misleading announcements, without shame and with disregard for the principles of international relations, that the Egyptian economy is unsound and throwing shadows of doubt on Egypt's economy, I look at Americans and say: May you choke to death on your fury!

Two days later, in an address at Alexandria, Premier Nasser announced that his government had seized full control of the Suez Canal and that the profits of the waterway would be used to build the High Dam at Aswan.

At the time of writing (September 1956), joint American, British, and French efforts to obtain international control for the Suez Canal were still unsuccessful.

Technical cooperation assistance in the amount of $2,716,000 had nevertheless been made available to Egypt during the fiscal year of 1956. On August 23, 1956, the International Cooperation Administration said it would not send any additional staff to Egypt or begin any new projects until the Suez Canal crisis was over.

Arab Discrimination Against American Jews

In the course of the broad public discussion about American policy in the Middle East, certain discriminatory practices by some Arab governments—to which the United States was acceding—came under sharp attack.
Right of Travel and Transit

The Arab countries, with the exception of Egypt, which had recently discontinued its ban on Jewish travelers, had prohibited travel and even right of transit by American citizens of the Jewish faith. Visa applications issued by Arab countries required the applicant to specify his religion and, with a few exceptions, American Jews were denied visas. Concurrence by the United States with this practice had been evident in the notification issued by the United States Passport Office to Americans who indicated that they intended to travel in the Middle East; the Passport Office advised Americans to supply themselves with a “baptismal certificate or a letter from a pastor.” American ship and air lines advised travelers of “Jewish faith or Jewish name” that they would be refused landing privileges in Arab ports.

During the spring of 1956 protests to the State Department about American compliance with this discriminatory practice were submitted by several Jewish institutions, including the American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish Congress.

In June 1956 it was learned that the National Education Association (NEA), the largest teachers’ organization in the United States, was sponsoring study tours to Middle Eastern countries, despite the Arab denial of travel rights to American Jews. Individual members and regional bodies of the NEA urged the association to discontinue these tours, but at its annual convention on July 5 the resolutions committee of the NEA sidestepped the requests of local groups by referring the issue to the association’s board of directors for consideration in the fall. On October 11, Bernard Donovan, chairman of the New York City NEA committee, announced that a meeting of the NEA board of directors held earlier in Washington had decided to exclude the kingdom of Jordan from the round-the-world tours to be sponsored by the NEA in the summer of 1957.

Employment Discrimination

The Arab League boycott against Israel was widely applied to include a boycott by several of the Arab states against American Jews as well; this became a subject of major controversy during the first half of 1956. One aspect of this discriminatory policy was Saudi Arabia’s insistence on her right to exclude from the American air base at Dhahran all Americans of Jewish faith. Various Jewish and non-Jewish groups objected to American acquiescence in this policy. At the hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 24, 1956, Secretary Dulles was questioned on the subject; he justified the barring by the United States of Jewish personnel from the air base as follows:

Now we do not like or approve or acquiesce, except perforce in any such practices, such as that, but we do have to recognize the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally . . . and we have a very special relationship there with that Government.

That does not mean we approve of all its practices at all. It does mean we get along together in a way which is of mutual advantage.

On March 1, Senator Herbert H. Lehman (Dem., N. Y.) accused Secretary Dulles of “moral blindness” in standing by the agreement for the use
of the air base at Dhahran; Lehman called upon the State Department to renegotiate the arrangements with Saudi Arabia which were due to expire in June 1956.\(^2\) On June 27, Senators Lehman, Paul Douglas (Dem., Ill.), and William Langer (Rep., N. D.) introduced a resolution in the Senate aimed at outlawing the discrimination against American Jews practiced by Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries. By the beginning of July, the resolution had eighteen co-sponsors (six Republicans and twelve Democrats); it was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration. Under State Department pressure, the resolution was watered down in committee to read that "it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no discrimination among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations." In this form, the resolution was unanimously adopted by the Senate on July 26. Passage of the resolution was welcomed by all major Jewish organizations.

On August 18, the B'nai B'rith made public a letter from Secretary Dulles in which he said that the resolution introduced into the Senate "has afforded the Department of State the opportunity to continue its efforts to impress on the Arab states the sentiments of this country."

Almost all Jewish organizations had expressed their objections to American acquiescence in Saudi Arabian discrimination against American Jews; these were joined by the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Veterans Committee, and Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State; the last group charged that Christians, though admitted to the Dhahran base, were subject to restrictions in their religious practice, without objection by the United States.

Saudi Arabian and Iraqi actions in barring American Jews from private employment with American or other foreign firms in these countries (Arabian-American Oil Company—ARAMCO, for example) and ascertaining the religion of the personnel of American firms doing business with their countries were also strongly protested by many Jewish organizations. On December 29, 1955, a State Department spokesman said the matter was under study.

Lucy Dawidowicz

\(^2\) On August 23, 1956, the State Department announced that an "informal agreement" had been reached with Saudi Arabia to extend indefinitely the right of the United States to use the air base at Dhahran. It was understood that the State Department preferred this arrangement during an election year to formal renegotiations.