Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances

Many types of Jewish communal services are provided under organized Jewish sponsorship. Some needs of Jews (and non-Jews) are exclusively individual or governmental responsibilities, but a wide variety of services are considered to be the responsibility of the total Jewish community. While the aim is to serve Jewish community needs, some services may also be made available to the general community.

Most services are provided at the geographic point of need, but their financing may be secured from a wider area, nationally or internationally. This report deals with the financial contribution of American Jewry to domestic and global services and, to a lesser extent, with assistance given by Jews in other parts of the free world. Geographic classification of services (i.e. local, national, overseas) is based on areas of program operation.

A more fundamental classification would be in terms of types of services provided or needs met, regardless of geography. On this basis, Jewish communal services would encompass:

- Economic aid, mainly overseas—largely a function of government in the United States.
- Migration aid—a global function, involving movement between countries, mainly to Israel, but also to the United States and other areas in substantial numbers at particular periods.
- Absorption and resettlement of migrants—also a global function involving economic aid, housing, job placement, or retraining and social adjustment. The complexity of the task is related to the size of movement, the background of migrants, the economic and social viability or absorptive potential of the communities in which resettlement takes place, and the availability of resources and structures for absorption in the host communities.
- Health—mainly general hospitals, some specialized hospitals, and outpatient clinics in larger cities in the United States, including facilities for the chronically ill aged. This also includes health facilities in Israel and, to a lesser extent, Europe.
- Welfare services—primarily family counseling, child care, and care of the aged; some of these services are maintained on a regional, as well as a local basis. They are rarely organized on a national basis except for coordinating and clearance services. Child care and care for the aged are also major activities in Israel.
- Youth and recreational services—mainly Jewish centers, summer camps, Hillel units on campuses, and other youth services provided by B'nai B'rith.
• Community relations—provided by a network of local agencies and a series of national agencies, some of which also operate on regional and local bases. Some national agencies also seek to provide aid to overseas communities in relation to civil rights.

Religious agencies—local congregations, national groups of congregations, and associated rabbinical bodies.

Jewish education—provided through congregational, communal, and independent schools, coordinating bureaus of Jewish education, specialized national agencies, yeshivot, teacher-training schools and theological seminaries.

Cultural agencies—are under Jewish sponsorship and include higher education (other than theological seminaries); research in the social sciences, history, linguistics; publications; library, archive and museum facilities and lecture bookings.

Vocational services—provided in larger communities in the United States through specialized agencies (Jewish Vocational Services and Vocational Service of B'nai B'rith) for individual and group guidance, in the form of sheltered workshops and sometimes as part of family agencies; overseas, in the form of vocational education programs conducted by ORT, Histadrut, Hadassah, and other agencies.

• Service agencies—mainly specialized national agencies designed to make for more effective clearance of activities in each field of service among national and local agencies.

Many agencies provide services in more than one of these areas. For purposes of classification, agencies have been grouped in this report in terms of the major focus of their activities.

The cohesive elements in planning and financing these services are mainly federations and welfare funds, for local services; federations together with national and overseas agencies, for non-local services.

Federations identify needs, plan for their provision through budgeting, and conduct annual fund-raising campaigns to provide the resources requisite to planning. After review of programs and finances, each federation distributes its campaign proceeds to those local, national, and overseas beneficiary organizations which are generally accepted as broad Jewish responsibilities.

**INCOME AND COSTS OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES**

Estimates of income and costs of Jewish communal services can be made for most, but not all, activities. Exceptions where data are not available are noted below. Income and costs approximate each other roughly, particularly for operating programs, as distinct from capital projects.

The aggregate value, or cost, of Jewish communal services may be loosely described as the “gross national product” of such services.

On this basis, the minimal estimate for the “gross national product” for
Jewish communal services was over $725 million in 1965. Excluded from this total are: almost all endowment income of federations and local agencies, all local capital fund campaigns, and all internal congregational operating expense. Costs of Jewish education may also be understated in this total.

This sum is related to the major sources of income: annual campaigns for contributions, service payments, and public tax funds.

There have been major increases in service payments in tax funds, with moderate changes in contributed income in the last decade. If data for 1965 were compared with data for 1955, the following major changes are indicated:

Federations provided $22 million more in annual campaigns.¹

Nonlocal agencies raised $51 million more, including $4.3 million for the new Israel Education Fund campaign; $12 million more for Brandeis University; $6.3 million more for Yeshiva University (including the medical school); $5.3 million more for the Conservative and Reform theological drives; $4.6 million more for City of Hope and National Jewish Hospitals; $6.2 million more for three institutions of higher education in Israel; $1.7 million more each for B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal and America-Israel Cultural Foundation (AICF); and $1 million more each for American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, ORT, and Hadassah.

Other non-contributed income (earnings, investments, service payments, government grants, etc.) rose by $50 million, of which $34 million was accounted for by Brandeis and Yeshiva Universities.

Grants by community chests for local Jewish services rose by almost $9 million.

Hospital income rose by at least $170 million, care for the aged income by about $25 million, and center income by about $16 million.

While there are gaps in some of the data (mainly for congregational income and local capital fund campaigns), the data summarized above indicate that income and costs of Jewish communal services rose by over $340 million from 1955 to 1965.

Results of Jewish Federated Fund Raising

Over $3 billion was raised by the central Jewish community organizations of the United States in their annual campaigns in the 28-year period 1939 through 1966.² This period coincides with the organization of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), which received almost $1.7 billion, mainly from welfare funds.

¹ From 1953 to 1963 book values of endowment funds increased by $37 million for large cities, with market values $13 million higher. In 1965 alone, large city endowment funds increased by at least $6 million (CJFWF "Council Reports," November 1966).

² UJA partners raised funds jointly in 1934 and in 1935 but raised funds independently prior to 1934 and in 1936 through 1938; JDC raised funds since 1914, Keren Hayesod since 1920, and JNF since 1910.
The annual totals for campaign proceeds for this period show the following major changes:

- From 1939 through 1942 annual levels ranged from about $27 to $29 million.
- From 1943 through 1945 there were annual rises of about $10 million, so that a level of $57 million was reached by the end of World War II.
- From 1946 through 1948 peak fund raising was reached during the period of the massive post-war DP problem and the effort related to the creation of the State of Israel; 1946 results more than doubled and moved forward to the 1948 peak of over $200 million.

From 1949 through 1955 the impact of these historic events diminished. As a result, there were successive declines, until the level of about $110 million was reached in 1954 and 1955.

From 1956 through 1964 campaign results ranged from a high of $139 million in 1957 to a low of $124 million in 1958, with results in 1959–64 within a narrower range of $125 to $130 million. Most of these year-to-year changes reflected the introduction of special-fund efforts to supplement regular campaigns.

1965 results of $132 million and 1966 results of $137 million were the highest since 1957. If 1966 pledges to the UJA Israel Education Fund of $6.4 million were included, the total for 1966 would be the highest since 1949.

These campaigns include only maintenance and operating needs, with minor exceptions. They exclude totals for capital-fund or endowment drives conducted by federations alone, or together with local Jewish agencies for local hospitals, homes for the aged, centers, and other structures.

By contrast, the data for independent efforts of national and overseas agencies include major capital and endowment fund drives, mainly for educational and religious institutions and hospitals. Comparisons between totals for annual federation campaigns and for independent appeals would be grossly inaccurate.3

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York and its beneficiaries obtained from 1961 through 1966 about $138.5 million in pledges including about $19 million in government grants, endowments and investment and other income, toward a building fund goal, originally set at $104.4 million, but later successively revised to over $250 million.4 The plan encompasses numerous projects including a proposed affiliation of Montefiore Hospital with the Einstein College of Medicine and the organization of a medical school at Mt. Sinai Hospital. Earlier campaigns for capital purposes had raised $16.5 million in 1949, $13.5 million in 1945, and $3 million in 1943.

3 For example, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies’ experience of securing $16 million in capital fund pledges in 1966 alone was unique in size, but not in occurrence; many other cities raised substantial capital sums beyond their annual maintenance campaigns.

4 Pledges and collections at June 30, 1965 were about $98.5 million but rose to $115.7 million a year later. In addition, federation beneficiaries reported $19.2 million in “available and potential resources.”
Systematic data on local capital fund raising are not available on an annual basis because of the long-term nature of these efforts, but partial figures indicate their magnitude. They are largely conducted by federations outside their annual campaigns.

The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) reported that in 1966 alone eight community centers were newly completed at an estimated construction cost of $9.1 million. This would bring the total of new centers built in the last two decades to 107, at a cost of $102 million.\(^5\)

Progress on plans for hospitals and medical centers were reported in 1966 in seven cities, involving an aggregate estimated cost of over $20 million.\(^6\) New or expanded homes for the aged (some including apartment housing for the elderly, and some medical facilities) in five cities were planned at a cost of $11 million. Five new facilities for Jewish education had goals of about $4 million, but this excluded school facilities in temple buildings. Some 16 temples had goals of about $13 million. Three Hillel buildings were projected at an estimated cost of $1 million. Many of these efforts were begun prior to 1966 and will continue for at least several years after 1966, with non-contributed income representing substantial portions of the cost (matching federal funds, proceeds of sale of old structures, mortgage loans, etc.). This was exclusive of the combined drives of New York Federation for over $250 million, that of Philadelphia for $15 million, of Chicago for $9 million, and of Washington, D.C. for over $5 million.\(^7\)

Reports from cities with a total Jewish population of 2,625,000 listed 555,000 individual gifts but excluded tens of thousands of individuals covered by organization gifts, Yiddish newspaper gifts, and the like, especially in the largest cities. These cities represent about 45 per cent of the Jewish population in the United States.

The amounts raised by federations are augmented by funds provided by nonsectarian united funds and community chests for local Jewish services. These grants totalled $19.5 million in 1965, mainly to federated agencies, and were expected to exceed $20 million as a result of the planned inclusion of local Jewish services by the community chest in Boston. Outside New York City, chests provided well over $16 million to federations. Among the largest cities, only Baltimore did not receive chest funds. Most larger cities and intermediate-sized cities received such support.

Cities with the same Jewish population frequently raised varying amounts in their federated campaigns and received widely different levels of chest support. This was related to the relative fund-raising success of particular chest campaigns, to the stage of development of local services in specific communities, to the levels and sources of internal income of local Jewish

---

6 This is exclusive of the Toronto plan for hospital expansion, estimated at $18.5 million.
7 Mainly from 1966 issues of *JTA Community News Reporter*. Since coverage is not complete, figures cited are understatements. Some projects were announced in 1965 and earlier years. The degree of progress in 1966 had not been noted publicly at year’s end.
agencies, and to the prevailing relationships among Jewish federations, Jew-
ish local agencies, and chests.

**Independent Campaigns**

Each federation determines for itself the beneficiary agencies which it
supports through allocations. There are about 25 nonlocal appeals which
are included by most federated campaigns, with other agencies receiving less
extensive inclusion.

A beneficiary agency is expected to forego independent fund raising in
localities where it receives an allocation from the federation, except where
the federation specifically agrees to some form of limited, independent fund
raising.

Agencies raise funds directly in cities where they are not included by
federations, frequently with federation clearance on timing and other aspects
of the campaign. Welfare funds do not normally allocate funds for capital
needs of nonlocal agencies. In some cases, maintenance needs of agencies
are included by federations while independent solicitations are conducted by
the same agencies for capital needs not eligible for federation support.

A number of federations had developed policy statements regarding sup-
plementary appeals, which stressed the primacy of the federation campaign,
commitment of community leaders to such primacy, clearance procedures
on approved appeals, and public reporting by these appeals.

In 1965, some 70 agencies raised $88.6 million independently. In most
cases these were not additions to the allocations received from welfare funds,
but represented the sole funds these agencies raised in communities for par-
ticular purposes.

The New York UJA’s inclusion is limited to the national UJA, JWB, and
United Hias Service (UHS); other nonlocal agencies raise funds indepen-
dently in New York City. While no accurate estimates are available regard-
ing the totals raised in New York City, partial information suggests that half
of $88.6 million raised independently may have been secured in New York
City. These funds are not supplementary to allocations by welfare funds.

Of $31.1 million raised independently by overseas agencies in 1965,
Hadassah raised $7.9 million through membership efforts, while the other
three women’s organizations—ORT, National Council of Jewish Women
(NCJW), and Pioneer Women raised $1.6 million, $0.6 million, and $1.1
million, respectively. Most welfare fund allocations to Hadassah were ear-
marked for the Youth Aliyah program operated by the Jewish Agency (Jeru-
salem), with other programs financed mainly by membership. ORT does not
appeal to welfare funds because of the support it receives from the American
Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), while NCJW and Pioneer
Women receive welfare fund support in a small number of cities.

---

8 Partial data for $55 million raised by 11 agencies independently in 1965 indicate that 55
per cent of this sum was raised in New York City but many other agencies were securing sup-
port in New York City below this level (Council Reports: Fund Raising, October 1966).
The three institutions of higher learning in Israel received contributions of over $7.5 million, mainly in New York City, with a substantial portion earmarked for building and special funds. Welfare funds provided maintenance funds to Hebrew University and Technion. The Jewish National Fund (JNF) continued its traditional appeal and raised $2.8 million, with no support sought from welfare funds. The other major effort was that of Histadrut which raised $1.8 million, mainly from Labor Zionist sources in those cities where it received no welfare fund allocations.

The UJA Israel Education Fund in 1965 had cash receipts of $4.3 million which were secured independently, but in close cooperation with welfare funds.

Most of the total of $5.6 million raised independently in the community-relations field was accounted for by the efforts of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League in New York City and Chicago, and by supplementary efforts in cities where welfare fund grants were conditioned upon a waiver of separate fund raising or upon clearance of such efforts with the respective welfare funds affected.

A total of $16.7 million was raised by hospitals, mainly City of Hope (Duarte, California) and National Jewish Hospital (Denver), and by the Einstein College of Medicine. Most of the national hospitals no longer have wide acceptance as welfare fund beneficiaries, and they are not thereby precluded from independent efforts. Welfare fund grants which continue are small and token in character.

In the cultural field the major amounts raised independently are by Brandeis University ($14.4 million), which does not seek welfare fund support, and by B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, which raises about $3.2 million, mainly from members of B'nai B'rith.

While $15.9 million was raised independently by agencies under religious auspices, the major components were for Yeshiva University (almost $3.3 million, the greatest portion of which was raised in New York City); $3.3 million raised by the Reform Jewish Appeal, mainly within its membership, and $5.2 million raised by the Jewish Theological Seminary, mainly from supporters of Conservative Judaism.

The magnitude of funds raised independently by specific agencies is based on effectiveness of campaign techniques, attractiveness of the nature of the appeal, effective organization of supporting groups, and, particularly, the response evoked in New York City.

The major independent efforts are those which do not appeal to welfare funds or which do not receive significant welfare fund support (e.g. Brandeis University, national health appeals, membership drives of ORT and B'nai B'rith, JNF, and Weizmann Institute); agencies which receive allocations for operations but not for capital or special purposes (Hebrew University, Technion, Yeshiva University), and agencies which rely mainly on their own membership, with supplementation by welfare funds (Reform Appeal, Jewish Theological Seminary, Hadassah, NCJW, Pioneer Women).
Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies (generally arranged by agreement with federations) provides smaller sums for operating purposes. Local hospitals, centers, family agencies, child care agencies, and homes for the aged raised over $7 million independently for operating purposes in 1965. These were supplementary contributions, with the major share of income derived from Jewish federations and community chests. These amounts do not include capital fund campaigns and endowment income (bequests, etc.) received by local agencies.

**Distribution of Funds**

Jewish federation campaigns are conducted on a pledge basis with payments made in installments, except for the smallest gifts. Most campaigns are conducted in the Spring. Possibly one-third of cash collections on pledges for a given campaign year are paid in succeeding years. As a result, an allowance for “shrinkage” averaging 4.2 per cent was made in 1965 for the difference between cash and pledges.  

Cost of administering federations, including costs of fund raising, budgeting, planning, and other central functions averaged 14.5 per cent.

These major elements explain the difference in the figures shown for amounts raised (Table 1) and the figures shown for amounts distributed (Table 3). Amounts distributed also include over $1.7 million in 13 cities, outside New York City, from sources other than current campaigns: investment earnings, bequests, unexpended income of prior years, and the like.

About 57.2 per cent of amounts budgeted for 1965 by welfare funds were applied to overseas needs, 4.1 per cent to national agencies, and 38.7 per cent to local services. The shifts from 1964 were less than one-half of one per cent.

The UJA share (included in “Overseas”) rose from 58 per cent in 1955 to 65 per cent in 1957 and levelled off at 56 to 60 per cent in 1958 to 1961. From 1963 through 1965, the UJA share was 54 to 55 per cent.

Overseas agencies other than UJA continued to receive under three per cent of totals budgeted. Together with national agencies, all nonlocal non-UJA agencies continued to receive about seven per cent of totals budgeted.

A major factor affecting the distribution of funds is the existence of Jewish hospitals in almost all of the large centers of Jewish population. This is reflected in higher shares of funds for local Jewish services and lower nonlocal shares in the very largest cities. Thus, nonlocal agencies received about 58 per cent of funds budgeted in 1965 in cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over. The very smallest communities (under 5,000 Jewish popu-
lation) with the least developed networks of local Jewish services, continued to give nonlocal agencies 82 per cent of their budgeted funds. Intermediate-size cities provided nonlocal agencies with about 72 per cent of budgeted funds.

Local services received for operating purposes about $40 million in 1965. While the total dollar amount remained stable, increases were shared by most local fields of service where aid was secured from community chests. Income for Jewish local services from community chests rose by almost three per cent in 1965. This was equivalent to about half of the rise of total costs of services eligible for chest support (health, family and child care, recreation and care for the aged). Jewish federation allocations rose by over four per cent; but this was effected mainly by increased allocations for Jewish education and for local community relations, by the need to provide total financing in cities where local Jewish services received no chest support, and by the need to supplement chest grants (based on reports from 127 cities in 1965).

There was a decrease in allocations for local capital purposes in 1965. Such allocations did not exceed 1.4 per cent of the total nationally or 2.0 per cent outside New York City. Local capital funds are frequently excluded from the annual maintenance campaigns. The figure of allocations for capital-fund purposes from federations relates only to minor funds provided for these purposes in the annual campaigns.

Local services receiving most widespread federation support in all sizes of communities were community centers and Jewish education programs. They received a greater proportion of the funds in smaller cities, than in larger communities.

There are important variations in local services included by federations even among cities of the same relative size in terms of Jewish population or campaign results. Federations do not receive community-chest support for Jewish education, local community relations, and local refugee aid programs.

In order to determine the relative support provided by federations to various local fields of service, it is necessary to take into account the contribution made by community chests.

Thus, from the total of $31 million provided to fields eligible for chest support in 1965, in 127 cities outside New York City (hospitals, family and child care centers, care of the aged, and administration) total chest support of $16.1 million should be deducted. The difference ($14.9 million, or about 48 per cent) represents federation support for these fields on a combined basis.

In making intercity comparisons of allocations for specific fields of service, it is important to note whether the federations being compared have the same inclusion pattern, and if they do not, the approximate values of services excluded by one community but included by another. This is particularly significant for service areas which are not universally included by federations.
The pattern of fund distribution in communities results from systematic budget review by allocations committees of federations and welfare funds. This involves study of agency programs and finances, utilization of factual reports, and intercommunity statistical comparisons prepared by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), and consideration of recommendations by the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC) consisting of 25 of the largest communities. LCBC recommendations deal with 16 nonlocal agencies which receive three-quarters of all nonlocal federation allocations, exclusive of UJA.

OVERSEAS SERVICES

Aid to Israel and Other Overseas Areas

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States is channelled through the UJA and other overseas agencies, and through the Israel Bond drive. From 1948 through 1966 the UJA provided over $810 million for the Jewish Agency for Israel (via the United Israel Appeal, which included transmissions of $115 million to the JNF, mainly between 1948 and 1952). The JDC used UJA funds for its program in Israel (as part of its ramified overseas services) to the extent of almost $160 million.\(^\text{11}\) Hadassah raised over $160 million in this period. Sales of Israel Bonds were over $780 million in the United States.

United States governmental assistance and reparations and restitution payments from Germany are the other major external sources of aid to Israel. United States government aid to Israel through 1965 was about $1,065 million including $466 million in loans, of which $273 million was repaid; grants and technical aid of $278 million; surplus food, of which $93 million were grants and the remainder loans in local currency, which were partially repaid. (In addition, total aid for 1966 was about $39 million.\(^\text{12}\)) German reparations payments totalling about $830 million were completed in 1966; over $50 million was transferred to Jewish organizations outside Israel under the terms of the reparations agreement.

There was a rise in foreign currency balances of $106 million in 1965, which resulted in a record balance of $749 million (or $611 million after deduction of foreign deposits in Israeli banks). This was more than offset by foreign currency liabilities of $1,206 million,\(^\text{13}\) mainly loans (including Israel bonds, $532 million; and other loans, $674 million).

In 1966, however, there was a reduction of $20 million in these reserves, and the governor of the Bank of Israel warned that these reserves would be exhausted if the trade deficit rose to $750 million by 1970.\(^\text{14}\)

---

\(^{11}\text{This was included in total receipts of JDC of over$560 million}^{12}\text{Near East Report, May 1966 and September 1966.}^{13}\text{Review of Economic Conditions, July 1966 (Bank Leumi Le-Israel).}^{14}\text{Jerusalem Post, January 20, 1967.}
Israel's own earnings are largely in the form of exports of goods and services, supplemented by foreign investment and private transfers of funds. Exports reached $406 million in 1965, or about 50 per cent of imports of $816 million. Preliminary data for 1966 indicate exports of about $476 million in 1966, or about 58 per cent of imports of about $818 million. The annual trade deficits had ranged from $223 million to a peak of $465 million in 1964. The 1966 deficit reached $342 million.

These figures deal with trade in commodities only. If services are included (tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $465 million in 1966, $521 million in 1965, and about $569 million in 1964. These deficits were partially offset in 1965 by 341 million and in 1964 by $351 million in "unilateral transfers" consisting mainly of restitution and reparations, campaign proceeds in United States and other countries, personal transfers, and United States government aid. This offset was reduced to $310 million in 1966, mainly as a result of the end of reparations income.

Capital imports vital to Israel's economy were reduced from $453 million in 1964 to $390 million in 1966, mainly as a result of a drop in foreign investments.

Philanthropic Programs for Israel

Philanthropic funds continue to be an important source of income for Israel's economy. These funds are specifically earmarked for welfare, health, and educational programs. At the same time, the exchange of dollars for pounds is also helpful to the country.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF had available for overseas purposes about $102.6 million in 1965, compared with about $92.1 million in 1964. Over 80 per cent of these funds are earmarked for Israel. Campaigns in other overseas countries also provide funds for programs in Israel. The Bank of Israel reported global transmissions of about $107 million to Israel in 1965, compared with $96 million in 1964.

Total immigration since the creation of the State of Israel, 1948 through 1966, was about 1,260,000, while about 150,000 Jews migrated from Israel to other countries. Major migration took place from 1948 through 1951, when almost 700,000 Jews entered Israel. Fewer than 90,000 Jews migrated in the following four years (1952-55), but there was an upsurge in 1956-57, when over 125,000 Jews migrated to Israel.

The immigration pace slackened in the three years from 1958 through 1960, when fewer than 75,000 Jews went to Israel; the tempo was increased again in the ensuing four years (1961-64), when 230,000 Jews migrated to Israel. In 1965 and 1966, migration was again at a lesser level.

---

The waves of immigration were related to opportunities existing at particular times: the postwar migration of displaced persons; movements from Eastern Europe, when conditions in Poland, Hungary, and Rumania permitted emigration; movements from North Africa resulting mainly from political changes in Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Yemen, and Egypt, and the like.

**Bond Sales for Israel**

A series of State of Israel bond issues have been floated since 1951: Independence Issue, Development Issue, Second Development Issue, and Third Development Issue. Sales of the Third Development Issue began on March 1, 1964, and of the Development Investment Issue on March 31, 1966.

Floatation of the Independence Issue for a three-year period, from May 1, 1951 to May 1, 1954, resulted in sales of $145.5 million. The second issue, the Development Issue, which was floated for a five-year period from 1954 to 1959, resulted in sales of $234.1 million,¹⁹ and sales of the third issue, known as the Second Development Issue, were $293.7 million in 1964, the end of the five-year period of flotation. Sales of the fourth issue, known as the Third Development Issue, began on March 1, 1964. By November 1966, $200.2 million had been sold and were still outstanding.

Total bonds sold for all issues were $928 million at the end of 1966.

At the end of November 1966 there were outstanding in the hands of the public $501.9 million, consisting of $85.2 million Development Issue; $182.3 million Second Development Issue; $200.2 million Third Development Issue, and $34.1 Development Investment Issue.²⁰

From the inception of sale of Israel bonds in May 1951 through November 1966, $66.8 million worth of State of Israel bonds were surrendered in Israel for pounds by the Jewish Agency for Israel. In 1966, $5.7 million worth of bonds were reported to have been received by the UJA in payment of individual pledges to local welfare funds.²¹

The Third Development Issue provides that a bond must be held for a period of at least two years before a charitable institution may surrender it in Israel for Israeli pounds. As a result, these bonds may not be used in payment of pledges during this two-year period.

Redemption of the Twelve Year Dollar Savings Bonds of the Independence Issue was completed. Redemption of the Development Issue began on April 1, 1964, and $26.6 million is to mature during 1967.

From 1963 through 1966 over $170 million in bonds matured. Almost $38 million was converted for investment purposes in 1963–66, out of a total of $94.7 million converted for such purposes since inception.

A substantial portion of the monies received by bondholders on redemption of their matured bonds was reinvested in the State of Israel bonds being sold in 1963 and later years.

¹⁹ This includes $5.6 million in conversion from earlier issues.
²⁰ This includes $22.4 million in conversions from earlier issues.
²¹ The bond sales organization reports total "turn-ins" from 1961–66 of over $30 million.
Bond sales in the United States totalled $76.2 million in 1966, at about the same level as in 1965. In Canada, 1966 sales amounted to $5.7 million, compared with $5.5 million the preceding year. Elsewhere, $9 million in bonds were sold, so that worldwide sales amounted to $90.9 million, close to the level of 1965 Israel Bond sales, the largest for any one year.

The proceeds of bond sales are used for agriculture, industry, power and fuel, housing and educational construction, and transportation and communication.

Reparations and Restitution Funds

Foreign currency income for individual restitution payments from Germany constituted the largest single source of foreign currency for Israel during 1965 and 1966. This totalled $112.7 million in 1965 and $115 million in 1966, compared with $134.2 million in 1964.

Payments from Germany under the reparations agreement were $17 million during 1965, with no further payments due.

In March 1964 the Conference of Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (CJMCAG) made the eleventh and last yearly allocation of funds put at its disposal by Israel from reparations payments. This was in addition to reparations funds used directly by the Israel government.

There was a loss in income of about $6.5 million for the JDC for programs in Europe and Australia. The JDC continued to receive $1 million annually from residual reparations funds.

There had also been grants for cultural and educational reconstruction in Europe and the United States. About $10 to $11 million annually had gone for relief programs in Israel in recent years, with the Jewish Agency as the major beneficiary. These ended early in 1966.

No further annual allocations were available after 1964, but a Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1964, with $10 million from Claims Conference funds for the support of "Jewish history, religion, education, traditions." Operations began in 1965.

Overseas Agencies

American Jewish financial support for needs in Israel and in other overseas areas is provided mainly through federation allocations to UJA and to about a dozen other overseas agencies. UJA continued to receive the major share of overseas allocations by welfare funds. Other overseas agencies raised the major portion of their funds independently.

Total income in 1965 of all overseas agencies was $92.1 million, with $31.1 million raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities were the Israel Education Fund of UJA, which was now conducted independently under agreement with welfare funds; Hadas-

22 The UJA share of all funds budgeted was 54.5 per cent in 1965. Its share of gross pledges was 46 per cent.
sah, which raised $7.9 million through membership activities; the building and special fund drives of Hebrew University and Technion, which raised $6 million; the drives of National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women, for welfare activities conducted by Histadrut in Israel, which raised $2.9 million; the JNF campaign for "traditional income," which raised $2.8 million, and Weizmann Institute, which raised $1.5 million.

United Jewish Appeal

UJA is a partnership of the United Israel Appeal (UIA) and JDC for joint fund raising. Over 90 per cent of UJA income is received from federations. The remainder is secured in hundreds of small nonfederated communities where UJA enlists the cooperation of community leaders to take responsibility for conducting local campaigns for UJA or joint appeals, with UJA as the major beneficiary.

From its inception in 1939 through 1966, UJA received about $1,686 million and distributed about $925 million to UIA (formerly United Palestine Appeal), $580 million to JDC and $87 million to United Service for New Americans (USNA), New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), and UHS.

UJA provides general campaign services to communities (publicity, speakers, and the like), and seeks to secure from welfare funds a maximum share of funds collected. It does not operate any service programs directly. These are conducted through the agencies which share in the UJA proceeds: UIA (actually by the Jewish Agency in Israel), JDC, and NYANA and UHS which received most of its income from sources other than UJA.

The distribution of UJA funds in 1965 was in accordance with a formula which has remained unchanged since 1951 and is effective through 1968. It provides that, after deduction of campaign expenses and allocations to NYANA, UIA is to receive 67 per cent and JDC 33 per cent of the first $55 million raised each year. Beyond $55 million, UIA is to receive 87.5 per cent and JDC 12.5 per cent. This formula was not applied to the proceeds of "special" campaigns.

UJA initiated its Israel Education Fund in September 1964. The objective is to conduct a five-year capital-fund campaign to provide high school buildings, teacher-training programs, student scholarships and related centers, equipment and facilities. This effort is separate from the annual UJA campaign.

A total of $9.6 million in pledges were received in 1965, which increased to $16 million by the end of 1966.

Large gifts are sought: $100,000 and over, payable in up to five years, with no diminution of the gift from the same source to the welfare fund which provides support for the UJA annual campaign, and with consultation with local welfare funds in order to avoid conflict with other solicitation efforts.

JDC does not share in this fund. The funds are turned over to the UIA
which is to "own, manage and operate the schools and related institutions" to be built with the donated funds, with the Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem) as operating agent in Israel.

The government of Israel cooperates by providing land for construction, exempting the institution from governmental tax, providing funds toward the cost of maintenance, and agreeing not to make similar arrangements with other efforts of the same kind without prior consultation with UJA and UIA.

**UJA Special Funds**

Beginning in 1956, UJA received "special" funds designed to augment the proceeds of its "regular" funds each year (except for 1961).

On a pledge basis, UJA income was $64.4 million in 1966, exclusive of the Israel Education Fund. This was about three per cent higher than the 1965 pledge total of $62.4 million.

On a cash basis, the UJA had receipts of $61.6 million in 1966, compared with $61.4 million in 1965. These were the cash amounts received each year regardless of years in which the pledges were made. In addition $4.3 million was received in 1965 and $2.7 million for the Israel Education Fund on total pledges of $16 million.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its percentage share of campaign proceeds. UJA proceeds for 1966 of about $64.4 million compared with gross campaign proceeds of about $137 million.

**UJA Special Loans**

**CURRENT LOAN**

Borrowing from banks has been a major factor affecting the financing of UJA, UIA and JAFI, Inc. in the last decade.

The current loan was negotiated in April 1965 for $50 million for a 15-year period with a group of 11 insurance companies.

These funds were borrowed by UIA and guaranteed by UJA.

This represented a refinancing of prior bank loans of about $45.2 million which had been borrowed earlier for a 10 (and then a 12) year term by federations from local banks and underwritten nationally by UJA.

The consolidation of the loan in 1965 resulted in repayment of the outstanding balances of the earlier loan. The difference in the terms of loans was expected to make about $4 million per year additional in cash available for the work of UIA. The amount owed on the loan at the end of 1966 was $46.6 million.

The terms of the loan also limit short-term debt (for 12 months) at any time to $10 million. The loan for $50 million is exclusive of financing provided by some of the insurance companies for capital requirements for housing in Israel.
PRIOR LOANS

UJA borrowed $64,751,500 through welfare funds in 1954. These funds were transmitted to UIA for use in carrying out the welfare activities of the Jewish Agency in Israel (immigration, absorption, and land settlement).

Major new borrowing took place in subsequent years. As welfare funds repaid loan installments and interest, UJA credited such amounts against community allocations to UJA. Such repayments were considered as UIA income on account of its share of UJA proceeds in lieu of cash.

UJA undertook in 1961 a ten-year debt liquidation program which consolidated prior debts of UJA and UIA, totalling $65 million. The debts were to be repaid at the rate of ten per cent each year. The loans were arranged by federations and local banks, and underwritten nationally by UJA. There were 39 cities involved in the loans, with $40 million borrowed outside New York City and $25 million in New York City. The balance of about $45 million in these loans was repaid out of the proceeds of the current loan in April 1965.

Liabilities of the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) exceeded assets by about $206 million on March 31, 1965. Assets were about $50 million, but liabilities were about $256 million (borrowing in the succeeding two years was expected to result in raising this total above the $300 million mark). Long-term debt was reported at $119 million with short-term debt and debt currently maturing totalling $127 million. UIA has no legal responsibility for loans made outside the U.S.

UJA funds destined for the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, are disbursed through UIA which is one of the two official partners in UJA.

Receipts of UIA, in 1966, from UJA were about $38 million and, in 1965, about $37 million. In addition, cash receipts for the Israel Education Fund were $2.7 million in 1966 and $4.3 million in 1965. This compared with peak receipts of about $55 million in 1957 and the lowest annual receipts of about $35 million in 1954 and 1955. While the peak year of UJA fund raising was 1948, UIA received a lower share from UJA in that year ($37 million) than in more recent years when the JDC share of UJA funds had declined.

Jewish National Fund

JNF, under the UJA agreement, is permitted to raise $1,800,000 annually from "traditional collections" in the United States, after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Its total United States income, including traditional income, bequests, and other income was about $2.8 million in 1964-65. JNF received in Israel annual allocations of about $1.2 million directly from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), which were terminated at April 1, 1965.

In the four fiscal years ending March 31, 1964, JNF had a global income of almost IL 102 million, or an annual average of $8.5 million at cur-
rent rates of exchange. The global JNF budget for 1966–67 is set at almost $19 million, with about 40 per cent to be derived from contributions. Most of the funds are used for land reclamation, afforestation, road-laying, and drainage. It reports the planting of 80 million trees. In late 1966 it was providing 3,500 jobs in afforestation.

United Israel Appeal, Inc.

The Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. and the United Israel Appeal were merged in June 1966. The merged organization is known as the United Israel Appeal, Inc. One hundred of 210 members of the board of trustees of the combined agency were drawn from names suggested for consideration by various communities, and 100 were designated by the American Zionist organizations, which had previously been represented in the former UIA. Ten were elected at large.

The new board of trustees elected two-thirds of the board of directors of 27, with the remaining one-third designated by the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.23

The operating agency for services to immigrants and for other programs in Israel continues to be the Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem). These services are to be provided in line with the specific allocations and instructions of the new UIA, Inc., in the same way as they were previously provided in accordance with allocations by JAFI, Inc.

This change eliminated one channel for transmission of funds, reduced confusion with multiple agencies bearing the name “Jewish Agency,” and broadened representation on the new governing board.

Funds from UJA flow directly to the new UIA, Inc., and are appropriated for specific programs.

Complete responsibility for the use of American Jewish philanthropic funds provided by Federations to UJA for needs in Israel is centered in America. The tax-exempt and tax-deductible status of these contributions remains unimpaired, since the American control of funds is in line with policies developed by the Internal Revenue Service for all agencies providing funds for use overseas.

UIA utilizes American staff appointed by and responsible to itself (stationed in Israel) in order to assure American control of the specific programs and costs in resettlement, absorption of immigrants, and related services for which it assumes responsibility for financing. The operating agency continues to be the Jerusalem Jewish Agency, with which UIA contracts for the financing and operating of specific agreed-upon projects in Israel.

Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem)

Sources of Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) income have been primarily UIA,

23 The Jerusalem Jewish Agency maintains a separate branch in the United States (Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.) for activities which are not financed through UJA.
Inc. earmarked grants from the United States; a share of Keren Hayesod campaigns in Jewish communities outside the U.S.; counterpart income flowing from the German reparations agreements up to 1966; grants and loans by the Israel government for costs of agricultural settlement; and earmarked contributions for Youth Aliyah.

In 1948 through 1966, the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) received UJA funds of about $700 million. (In earlier years during this period JNF had received an additional $115 million. In addition, since 1952, JNF received funds indirectly from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), with such support ending in March 1965.

About 80 per cent of contribution income generally comes from the United States. Contributions in 1964-65 accounted for about $44 million transmitted to Israel from the United States and other countries. This was over two-thirds of total income (exclusive of loans), but less than half of total income if loans are included. Over $28 million was derived from new long- and medium-term loans, and about $27 million was repaid. Israel government grants for agriculture and remaining receipts, mainly from reparations (up to 1966) and sales of housing to earlier immigrants, and earmarked funds, covered the balance of income.

The Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) spent about $108 million in the year ended March 31, 1965, including loan repayment principal and interest of about $27 million.

While similar detailed data were not yet available for 1965-66, indications were that total income and borrowing was at about the preceding year's level, except for the start of receipts from the Israel Education Fund of UJA.

The largest single area of functional expenditures in 1965-66 was for agricultural settlement, amounting to over $23 million. The objective is eventual self-support for the newcomer. Aid is provided in the form of founding of new settlements, irrigation projects, citiculture, equipment, seed, instruction, supplementary employment, and long-term loans. Part of these costs has been covered by advances and grants from the Israel government. The Jewish Agency has been transferring settlers' agreements to repay Jewish Agency loans to the government in consideration of government grants for agricultural settlement.

After financial independence was attained late in 1966 by 116 settlements, aid continued to be received by 364 settlements inhabited by 110,000 persons. It was planned to transfer 63 additional settlements to government care by April 1967, and to bring 150 settlements to independence by 1968-69. This resulted from decisions following findings released by the Ben Aharon Commission which had recommended advances in this direction.

24 Includes some advance payments for 1965-66 for "other countries."
25 In 1964-65 the combined budgets of the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) and of the World Zionist Organization were about $113 million, of which $96 million was for the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). The combined budgets for 1965-66 were again at the same level (see report submitted to Zionist General Council, Jerusalem, January 1967).
Costs of permanent immigrant housing were almost $15 million in 1965–66.

Initial absorption of immigrants cost over $11 million in 1965–66, exceeding, for the first time, the $10 million mark for immigration and transportation costs. This change was further accentuated in 1966–67.

Youth Aliyah programs for maintenance and education of immigrant and other youth cost about $6.8 million in 1965–66. Hadassah in the United States and other women's organizations in the United States and abroad provided a major share of these costs, with the remaining share of costs borne by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) and UIA.

Other Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) expenditures included grants totalling about $2.5 million for institutions of higher learning in Israel (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, Technion, Bar-Ilan University and Tel Aviv University), a terminal allocation of $1.2 million to JNF (in 1964 and 1965), organization and information activities, and general administrative expenses within and outside Israel.

UIA provided financing toward specific agreed-upon projects conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) but not those of its American Section, or the American Zionist Council, or the World Zionist Organization.

**Programs Financed by United Israel Appeal, Inc.**

In 1965–66, UIA, Inc. provided $34.0 million toward costs of programs operated by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). These expenditures were based upon an agreement that the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) would make specific expenditures on behalf of, and in accordance with, the instructions of UIA. In addition, UIA had repaid $3.1 million in loans and in interest in the United States.

The programs which received the largest shares of UIA financing were those for initial immigrant care, including immigration, transportation, and absorption. In 1965–66 the amount provided for absorption exceeded amounts for other programs.

Other non-UJA sources of income were available to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) for particular programs. These were funds provided by the government toward the agricultural settlement program, and by Hadassah and other groups for Youth Aliyah. In each case, UIA earmarked its funds for specific programs.

**American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee**

JDC is an American agency conducting a global program of direct aid to Jews through its own staff overseas and through cooperation with indigenous Jewish organizations. In 1966 it undertook to align its administrative structure so as to make for maximum effectiveness.

It assisted about 212,000 persons in 1966. Of these, 86,000 were in Israel (including about 37,000 receiving aid from Malben, over 26,000 in ORT
schools, and about 16,000 in yeshivoth), 70,000 in Europe, 51,000 in Moslem areas, and about 5,000 in other areas. This is exclusive of others aided by “relief-in-transit” programs which are less formally organized.

When the German reparations income ended in 1965 (except for $1 million annually in terminal grants), cash receipts fell to $20.4 million and disbursements to $24.0 million, with about $3.3 million additional secured from borrowing. UJA provided $17.9 million, reparations income less than $1.2 million, and campaigns abroad (mainly Canada, Great Britain, and Latin America) less than $0.6 million.

Preliminary estimates for 1966 indicate that income in 1966 was expected to remain at the 1965 level of about $20.5 million, while appropriations were to be at a level of about $22.6 million.

The JDC Malben program of service to sick, aged, and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to account for the largest single share of its appropriations: $6.1 million, or 27 per cent of the 1966 total. An additional $0.8 million was provided for aid to yeshivoth and other traditional institutions in Israel. Malben aided about 37,000 persons during 1966, including care of the aged in institutions (3,800), in their own homes (21,700), and medical and psychiatric services. Malben accounts for the greatest portion of the total of over $160 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1966.

The largest number of North African Jews receiving JDC aid was in Morocco, where over 23,000 Jews (about one in three Jews remaining in Morocco) were being assisted in 1966. About 26,000 Jews in Tunisia and Iran were also receiving JDC aid. JDC appropriated almost $4.8 million in 1966 for work in Moslem areas. JDC assistance is channeled through such agencies as OSE in the health field; the Alliance Israélite Universelle, Ozar Hatorah and Lubavitcher schools in the educational fields, and ORT for vocational training.

JDC programs operated in about a dozen European countries, but two-thirds of the total aided were assisted in France: 45,500 aided included a large proportion of Tunisian, Algerian, and Moroccan refugees. Two-thirds of the Jews aided in France were assisted by federated agencies of the Fonds Social Juif Unifié which secure JDC aid. The JDC assistance program was aiding 11,000 Jews in Poland and 5,000 in Italy, Belgium, Austria, and other countries.

ORT and Vocational Education

Vocational training overseas is provided through facilities of ORT which operates in Western Europe, Moslem countries, and Israel. Vocational education in Israel is also conducted as part of the programs of Histadrut.

26 Progress of the FSJU is indicated in its fund-raising totals, which have risen from $450,000 in 1957 to $1.6 million in 1966. JDC aid to programs in France was about $2 million in 1966.
Hadassah, Youth Aliyah, and Technion, and by the Israel government and municipalities.

The global expenditures of the World ORT Union were at an annual level of about $12.9 million in 1966. Total ORT trainees in 1966 were 47,623, of whom 26,723 were in Israel, 5,389 in France, 6,185 in Moslem countries, and the balance mainly in Europe.

American Jewish support of the ORT program is channeled in two ways: through the JDC grant to ORT ($1,950,000 in 1966 and $2,100,000 for 1967) derived from the JDC participation in UJA and through membership contributions of ORT in the United States. Women's American ORT raised $1.6 million in 1965 and $1.8 million in 1966. In addition, the American ORT Federation provided in 1966 almost $0.4 million from dues and bequests and about $0.2 million from similar sources.\(^27\) The agreement between ORT and JDC permits ORT to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25, unless otherwise provided by mutual local agreement.

World ORT raised about $0.9 in other countries in 1966, and secured over $8 million from local sources in the countries of operation, mainly from government sources.

Global income of ORT was estimated at close to $12.8 million in 1966, and was expected to exceed $13 million in 1967. Over half of the outlay in 1966 was in Israel ($6.8 million) and about one-fifth in France ($2.7 million), but local sources (mainly governmental tax revenues and school fees) provided the major share of financing.

Migration Services

United Hias Service provides a worldwide service designed to enable Jews to migrate to countries where they can make an economic and social adjustment. UHS assisted 8,806 Jewish immigrants to migrate in 1966 (including 5,901 to France and 2,089 to the United States), compared with 12,142 in 1965. A migration level of at least 8,200 is expected in 1967.

A large proportion of the Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remain in New York City. Hence, the financing of the program of NYANA is considered to be a national responsibility, reflected in the inclusion of NYANA as a direct beneficiary of national UJA.

Jewish immigration to the United States in 1966 was estimated by UHS and NYANA at about 7,000 including those aided by agencies and those arriving independently. Of those who settled in New York City about 3,100 received aid from NYANA in 1966. UJA grants to NYANA in 1965 and 1966 were over $600,000 annually.

Hadassah

The largest income of an overseas service agency other than UJA was that

\(^27\) This excludes transactions involving ORT contracts with the U.S. Agency for International Development for nonsectarian services in underdeveloped nations in Africa and elsewhere.
of Hadassah which received $10.9 million in 1965 and $11.8 million in 1966. Hadassah's major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah. The new 545-bed Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem was opened in 1961 at a cost of over $25 million. Medical services in Israel are also provided by the Kupat Holim of the Histadrut, by governmental departments, and by the Malben program of JDC.\textsuperscript{28} Hadassah has transferred some of its health stations to governmental agencies.

The Youth Aliyah program for maintenance and training of immigrant youth (in the earliest years orphaned, now mainly with families in Israel) is conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), at a cost of about $6.8 million in 1965–66. Hadassah’s transmission to Youth Aliyah was about $1.8 million in 1965–66. Other women’s groups in the United States and overseas provide smaller supplementary funds for Youth Aliyah. The number of children cared for at the end of June 1966 was 12,333, including 2,474 in day centers.

**Higher Education in Israel**

A report, issued in Israel late in 1965 by a Special Committee on Higher Education (Sharef Committee), recommended the establishment by law of a Higher Education Authority to develop a master plan of educational needs; recommend the level of government financial aid; decide on the division of the governmental appropriation for higher education, and possibly have veto powers over proposals to create new institutions or add new facilities. It estimated that the 1964 enrolment of 18,000 might rise to about 50,000 by 1974. (In 1965–66 total enrolment was 21,756.)\textsuperscript{29} The composition of the 25-man Authority, to be appointed by the president of Israel, would include seven scholars, five representatives of the given institutions, nine public figures, and key ministry officials.

The institutions of higher education in Israel (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, and Technion) had receipts in America of over $11 million in 1965, mainly in contributions. In addition, all three institutions received grants from UIA, a beneficiary of UJA funds, from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), and from the government of Israel.\textsuperscript{30} Weizmann Institute income in the United States is derived from an annual fund-raising dinner and from an investment program.\textsuperscript{31} Hebrew University and Technion received over $624,000 from federations

---

\textsuperscript{28} All hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary, and private) totaled about 18,400 and provided about 6.7 million days' care in 1965.

\textsuperscript{29} Newspaper reports cite increased enrolment in 1966: 12,000 for Hebrew University, 5,700 for Technion, 6,700 for Tel Aviv University, 1,500 for Haifa University, 2,600 for Bar-Ilan University.

\textsuperscript{30} Government support to higher education in Israel has been over one-half total costs. It was almost $27 million in the draft budget for 1967–68.

\textsuperscript{31} Of $1,315,000 earmarked for higher education by UIA in 1965–66, Weizmann Institute received $859,000, Hebrew University $293,000, Technion $67,000, Bar-Ilan University $43,000, and Tel Aviv University $53,000. These funds were augmented by grants by the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem.
in 1965. Their building-fund and special-fund cash campaign proceeds were at the $6 million level in 1965. Pledges for Hebrew University had risen sharply in 1965 because of the inclusion of about $3.6 million for the Truman Peace Center, and exceeded $10 million. The Truman Peace Center appeal was largely non-recurring in 1966. The maintenance appeals of the two institutions were combined; their capital-fund drives were conducted separately.

Both institutions had marked enrolment increases in recent years, with 10,813 students registered at Hebrew University (including a Tel Aviv branch) and 4,422 at Technion in 1965–66. Hebrew University includes schools of humanities, social sciences, education, social work, physical sciences, agriculture, law, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy. Technion includes schools in various branches of engineering, architecture, industrial sciences, as well as a technical high school. The Tel Aviv School of Law and Economics was merged with Hebrew University in 1959.

Bar-Ilan University, founded in 1955 by the Mizrahi Organization of America, had a student enrolment of 1,838 in four faculties in 1965–66: Jewish studies, natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and languages and literature. Fund raising in the United States has been largely directed to Mizrahi membership groups.

Tel Aviv University, affiliated to the municipality, was reorganized as an independent agency and sought public financial support for capital needs on a limited basis, beginning in 1964. There were 3,547 students enrolled in 1965–66 in humanities, in natural sciences, and in postgraduate medical courses. About $1.3 million was secured in pledges in the United States in 1965–66, of which about $0.8 million was received in cash.

Haifa University began its program in 1964–65 and had an enrolment of 878 students in 1965–66. Beersheba University opened in 1965 and had an enrolment of 440 students in 1966.

Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel

There were 15,871 students in attendance in 1965–66 in 127 yeshivoth receiving JDC support and about 1,400 students in 48 other yeshivoth. Many of these yeshivoth have no age limits, although most students are aged 14 to 17. They are termed “traditional institutions” because of their roots in the traditional religious life in Eastern Europe.

Many of the yeshivoth receive support from JDC (about $800,000 annually). Some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel Institutions ($176,000 raised in 1965), but a great number also seek funds separately in the United States through collectors (meshulochim)

33 Aaron Greenbaum, Cultural and Religious Activities in Israel (Jerusalem: AJDC). Israel Government Yearbook for 1965–66 reports that about 9,600 students received secondary education or vocational training.
and through mail appeals. There are no comprehensive records of the extent of these appeals or their support in Israel, but 1961 receipts of yeshivot in Israel were reported at $7 million, with about one-third from contributions in Israel and about one-third from other contributions.

Cultural programs in Israel were supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation ($2 million in 1965), which included in its appeal some 50 agencies in Israel. These were mainly agencies in the fields of music, theater, dance, art, and literature. AICF seeks building funds, in addition to funds for maintenance. The major recent capital project was for a new structure to house the National Museum of Israel.

Other Overseas Agencies

While UJA received almost all its income through welfare funds and joint community appeals, other overseas agencies received a similar share of their total contributions through welfare funds.

Hadassah, Pioneer Women, and NCJW have traditionally raised most of their funds through membership activities; National Committee for Labor Israel has raised funds independently in the largest communities where its membership strength is centered, while seeking federation allocations in smaller and medium-sized communities; American Friends of the Hebrew University and American Technion Society have concentrated their independent appeals on their building and special funds, while seeking federation support for maintenance needs.

Almost all of these agencies were authorized to conduct campaigns for Israel by the Jewish Agency Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns under conditions regarding timing, goals, scope of campaigns, and clearance with welfare funds, set by that Committee. The objective of the Committee is to help assure the primacy of UJA among appeals for Israel through the cooperation of other authorized campaigns and by avoiding a multiplicity of campaigns.

Fifteen overseas agencies, other than UJA agencies, had income of $26.3 million in 1964, compared with $31.3 million in 1965. The rise was centered in receipts for higher education and for AICF.

UHS and AICF participated in the cooperative budget review process of the LCBC, a grouping of welfare funds in 25 of the largest cities (Providence and Columbus joined in 1966).

The Labor Zionist effort in the United States is channeled through the National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women, which raise funds

34 Authorized agencies in recent years were: American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund raising dinner only); American Friends of Hebrew University; America-Israel Cultural Foundation; 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); Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women's League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).
for activities of the Histadrut in Israel in education, vocational training, health, and immigrant welfare.

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency is a worldwide news service reporting news affecting the Jewish people. It was reorganized in 1962 and sought, with LCBC approval, to secure direct federation allocations. (Such allocations rose from about $36,000 in 1961 to about $152,000 in 1965, including New York UJA.)

There are agencies which center their activities in other areas but include limited overseas programs: NCJW for social work and education scholarships, and for activities related to the Department of Secondary and Higher Education at the Hebrew University, and the Jewish Labor Committee for aid to political and labor refugees in Europe and in Israel.

Overseas concerns are also shared by some domestic agencies in the form of intervention with governmental bodies on behalf of the rights of Jews overseas: the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Section of World Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Jewish Labor Committee.

NATIONAL AGENCIES AND SERVICES

Jewish national agencies deal with the continuing needs of American Jews in the areas of protection of civil rights, health, education (both religious and secular), youth services, culture, and the like. In some of these program areas, local service agencies exist in specific communities, and the task of serving total needs may be said to be divided between national and local agencies. This is true particularly in community relations, Jewish education, health, and vocational services.

Some agencies operate in more than one field of service. As a result there are selective multiple references to specific agencies in the sections which follow.

The local federation and welfare fund provides a link between local, national, and overseas services by means of centralized fund raising, through federation review of agency programs in the process of budgeting funds, and in planning and sometimes operating local services.

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds serves local central community organizations by helping to strengthen fund raising, budgeting, planning and coordination of services, public relations, inter-city and national-local relations, overseas services, specialized consultation in such services as family service, child care, care for the aged, and health services, and in basic community organization.

Community Relations

Response to threats to the status of Jews in other countries was an important factor in the creation of modern Jewish community relations agencies. The major current emphasis is on improvement of domestic group relations.
Each of the five major national Jewish community relations agencies serves a membership: directly in the case of the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and Jewish War Veterans, indirectly in the case of the Anti-Defamation League (for B'nai B'rith membership) and the Jewish Labor Committee (for trade union membership). Some of them also conduct foreign affairs activities and cultural programs, and issue publications of interest to circles wider than their own membership.

The American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League conduct activities which utilize mass media (radio, TV, movies, press, magazines, etc.), as well as specialized programs (interfaith and intercultural education, business and industry, labor, veterans, youth, minority groups, etc.). Both maintain networks of regional offices as two-way channels for the integration of their national and local programs.

The other three agencies concentrate on more specialized approaches: American Jewish Congress on legal and legislative activities; Jewish Labor Committee on work with labor unions, and Jewish War Veterans on work with veterans' groups. Interfaith and other community-relations activities are conducted also by congregational associations, although the major portions of their programs are centered on aid to the religious programs of affiliated congregations.

After the Joint Defense Appeal (JDA) arrangement was terminated at the end of 1962, both the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League conducted separate campaigns for funds. Both increased their gross receipts from their independent New York City and Chicago campaigns, and welfare fund support, while rising, was closer in the aggregate to the previous JDA level.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) serves as the coordinating and clearance agency for the American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, National Council of Jewish Women, and the three congregational associations, and for 79 local and regional community relations councils. The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League re-joined the NCRAC in 1965; the American Jewish Committee rejoined in 1966.

NCRAC, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee and Jewish War Veterans have participated in the cooperative budget review process of LCBC. The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League began to participate in 1963, and the American Jewish Committee in 1965.

The five national operating agencies and NCRAC received $10.8 million in 1965, compared with $10 million in 1964. Most of the increase was secured from independent fund raising in New York City by the former JDA agencies.

Health

Living conditions of Jews arriving in the United States at the close of the last century made for a high incidence of tuberculosis, and impelled the
creation between 1899 and 1914 of three national tuberculosis hospitals, a sanitarium, and a home for children of TB patients (as well as a specialized arthritis hospital). An additional motivation was the theory that the climate of areas like Denver and Southern California was helpful in TB cases.

These institutions came into existence before many of the present local Jewish hospitals were organized. Improvement in the health status of Jews and medical advances in recent years in TB therapy led to a shift of emphasis by the TB hospitals to include heart, cancer, and research and treatment of asthma in adults. However, TB still continued to represent a major share of days' care provided for all ailments.

Almost all fund raising by these agencies is conducted independently. Income from federations amounts to about one-fifth of one per cent of the institutions' total income.

The Albert Einstein Medical School, under the sponsorship of Yeshiva University in New York City, began functioning in 1955. Its receipts in 1965 were $26.5 million, compared with $21.8 million in 1964. Its student enrollment in 1965–66 was 408. It awarded 92 M.D. degrees in 1965–66. A new hospital was opened in 1965 by the medical school. Construction cost was $20 million.

Income of the other five agencies in 1965 was $15.2 million, compared with $14.8 million in 1964. Two of the agencies (City of Hope near Los Angeles, and National Jewish Hospital in Denver) accounted for almost $12.4 million of the total for 1965.

Service Agencies

Basic services in many program areas are provided by local service agencies, financed in large measure by federations and (in some fields) by community chests and united funds. These local agencies utilize national services which bring to them the experience of other communities and the results of national program planning. There are five national organizations that furnish service to local Jewish community centers, programs for the Armed Forces, Jewish education, religion, and vocational guidance. These agencies serve as coordinating and consultative bodies for their respective fields.

JWB is the largest of these agencies. It received $1,518,000 in 1965, out of a total of $2,058,000 for the five agencies. In addition to the assistance it provides to Jewish community centers, JWB conducts a program of service to Jews in the Armed Forces and sponsors a number of Jewish cultural projects. The JWB undertook a financial plan in 1961 which was related to the magnitude of federation income for its Armed Services program, and community center budgets for its center services program. Since federations frequently provide funds to centers (as do community chests), JWB continues to look to federations for support of both of its basic programs. JWB support from United Service Organizations (USO) for programs for the Armed Forces was sharply reduced after April 1964 as a result of a general
reorganization of USO. The annual level of JWB-USO operations was reduced from $355,000 in 1963 to about $145,000 for 1966.

The American Association for Jewish Education serves local communities with studies and consultation in educational trends, stimulation of student enrolment, recruitment and placement of teachers, and pedagogic materials. It also aids the professional organization of Jewish school administrators (National Council of Jewish Education).

Other national service agencies are the Jewish Occupational Council, which serves local Jewish Vocational Services agencies and national agencies concerned with Jewish occupational adjustment; the National Conference of 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 of America, which represents its affiliated Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbinical and congregational associations seeking to foster intergroup cooperation and relations with corresponding Christian bodies and in relation to governmental agencies.

NCRAC also provides service to 79 affiliated local community-relations agencies.

Jewish Culture

Following a CJFWF survey, the National Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1960 as an autonomous operation, with an associated Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies consisting of sixteen participating agencies.

Specific activities undertaken initially included a program of awards to scholars for research, earmarked grants to existing cultural agencies for high priority projects, provision of information on the Jewish cultural field, aid to the Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies process for joint cultural agency consultation, and information on Jewish cultural agencies.

In addition to a number of small agencies dealing with specific aspects of Jewish cultural endeavors exclusively,35 major programs in the Jewish cultural area are conducted by agencies which concentrate their efforts in other fields (e.g., American Jewish Committee, JWB).

Although sixteen agencies had income of $33.2 million in 1965, Brandeis University accounted for $24.9 million; B’nai B’rith National Youth Service Appeal for $4.2 million; Delaware Valley College for $1.3 million, and the Zionist Organization of America for $0.8 million. The remaining 12 agencies received $1.9 million in 1965.

Four of the agencies are institutions of higher learning: Brandeis University, Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture, Dropsie College, and Jewish Teachers’ Seminary and People’s University. In addition, Yeshiva University includes university courses in the arts and sciences, as well as a medical school and a theological seminary.

35 The field also includes agencies operated under Jewish auspices with general cultural programs as well as programs with more specific Jewish content.
Research and scholarly publication programs are conducted by YIVO, and by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies in the fields of sociology, economics, and linguistics; American Academy for Jewish Research; American Jewish Historical Society, American Jewish Archives, American Jewish History Center, and the Jewish Museum of the Jewish Theological Seminary in the fields of history and archives, and by Histadruth Ivrit and Bitzaron for Hebraism. Population studies are conducted mainly by CJFWF and JWB. Both of these agencies expanded their research programs in 1965.

The Jewish Publication Society specializes in publishing books of Jewish interest. The National Conference of Jewish Communal Service publishes a journal dealing with social-work developments. Dropsie College publishes a Jewish quarterly review. CJFWF issues research reports on community organization, health and welfare planning, campaigning and budgeting, as well as studies of specific local service agencies.

Reference yearbooks are published in a number of fields: the American Jewish Year Book (published jointly by the American Jewish Committee and Jewish Publication Society) contains specialized articles on major developments in the United States and other countries, statistics, and directories; the Yearbook of Jewish Social Service (published by CJFWF); and the JWB Center Yearbook. CJFWF also publishes an annual summary of major program and financial developments in all fields of Jewish communal service for which data are available (Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances). JWB conducts activities designed to stimulate interest in Jewish books and music, and operates a Jewish lecture bureau.

B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal (Hillel Foundations, B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, and B'nai B'rith Vocational Service) and Jewish Chautauqua Society emphasize youth activities. BBNYSA agencies conduct local operations, coordinated on a regional and national level.

**Religion**

National religious agencies provide training of rabbis, cantors, Jewish educators, shohatim, and other religious functionaries, assist programs of religious congregations, including elementary Jewish education, and encourage the enlistment of the religiously unaffiliated members of the Jewish population.

Each of the three religious wings has its own rabbinical association and congregational associations, with affiliated national associations of sisterhoods, men's clubs, and youth groups. Nationally, they attempt to help organize new congregations and publish ritual and educational materials. The three wings are represented in the Synagogue Council of America. The Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox congregations had enrolled well over 200,000 families each, exclusive of ancillary sisterhoods, brotherhoods, men's clubs, youth groups, and non-member users of synagogues.

---

The major seminaries rely extensively on associated congregations for their financial support, sometimes through *per capita* arrangements, but they also receive federation support. They generally campaign independently in larger cities and in communities where federations believe that such programs should be completely a congregational responsibility.

The Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion prepares religious functionaries for Reform Judaism; the Jewish Theological Seminary for Conservative Judaism, and Yeshiva University and several smaller institutions for Orthodox Judaism.

Most Orthodox *yeshivoth* are located in New York City. Major *yeshivoth* in other cities are: the Jewish University of America-Hebrew Theological College in Chicago; the Rabbinical College of Telshe in Cleveland; the Ner Israel Rabbinical College in Baltimore; and the Chachmey Lublin Theological Seminary in Detroit.

Aid to religious day schools is a major function of the Mizrachi National Council for Torah Education, the United Lubavitcher Yeshivoth, the National Council of Beth Jacob Schools and Torah Umesorah.

Some of the programs conducted by the major seminaries involve interfaith activities designed to promote better understanding between Jews and Christians.

Yeshiva University combines a theological seminary and a school for Jewish educators with a liberal arts college, a medical school, and other graduate schools, including a social work school.

Nineteen national religious agencies received $29.3 million in 1965 compared with $26.6 million in 1964. This excludes the Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University which received a total of $26.5 million in 1965, compared with a 1964 total of $21.8 million.

**LOCAL SERVICES**

Central communal sources (Jewish federations and chest-united funds) provided about $61 million for local Jewish services in 1965.

Jewish federations supplied about $41.5 million in 1965, compared with $39.8 million in 1964, to local Jewish services in the fields of health, family and child care, refugee aid, Jewish centers, Jewish education, care of the aged, vocational services, and community relations. Federations constituted the major source of contributed income for local Jewish agencies.

Nonsectarian community chests and united funds provided an additional estimated $19.5 million in 1965, in most cases through Jewish federations, but in some cases directly to Jewish service agencies. Of this sum, $12.4 million was received in the 14 largest cities in which over 75 per cent of the Jewish population resides.

Community chests generally restrict their support to agencies operating in the fields of health, family and child care, care of the aged, and Jewish cen-

---

37 Includes Greater New York Fund and New York City United Hospital Fund.
ters. A substantial share of contributed communal income even in these fields comes from Jewish federations, particularly for health services and care of the aged. Federations have, in addition, the exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

Available data for 127 communities for 1964 and 1965 show how central communal funds (federation and chest income) were distributed among various fields of local service (see Table 5). Federations continued to provide roughly three-fifths and community chests two-fifths of central communal funds received by local agencies in these communities, but these totals include many fields of service and agencies which receive no chest support. The rise in funds in 1965 was 3.7 per cent. Total allocations by Jewish federations for local services have continued to rise dollar-wise since 1955.

The largest rises in 1965 occurred for Jewish education (6.9 per cent) and for vocational services (6.7 per cent), almost exclusively from Jewish federation sources, since community chests infrequently provide aid to such services. Rises from 4 to 5 per cent in 1965 in central community grants were experienced in the fields of recreation, family and child care, and local community relations. Hospital grants and grants for refugee care rose by less than two per cent. There was a drop in grants for care for the aged, but this was accounted for mainly by an increase in service payments in one of the largest cities.

The major sources of funds for local service agencies other than central funds are payments for service by users and public tax funds. These sources of funds have risen to a greater extent than community funds. Such communal grants accounted for 4.4 per cent of receipts of hospitals in 1965. Homes for the aged, family service and child care agencies also increased their income from service payments.

An analysis of allocations for local services by 94 communities over a five-year span (1961–1965) indicates significant changes:

Both chest grants and federation grants rose at about the same rate: 14 to 15 per cent. The federation share of allocations was stabilized at about 60 per cent during this period.

There were sharp rises in allocations for Jewish education, family and child care, and community relations services, which rose by 20 to 21 per cent since 1961. Allocations for centers, camps, and youth services rose by 18 per cent, while refugee care rose by 15 per cent, and vocational services and care for the aged by about 10 to 11 per cent. Hospital allocations rose least of all (two per cent).

A similar analysis for a full decade indicates that chest grants rose by 40 per cent since 1956, while federation grants rose by 42 per cent. The sharpest rises in the decade 1956–65 were for care of the aged, 65 per cent; employment services, 62 per cent; centers, 62 per cent; Jewish education, 58 per cent; family and child care services, 51 per cent, and local community relations, 39 per cent. Allocations for refugee care fell by 45 per cent.
Health

Most local Jewish hospitals are in the largest centers of Jewish population. Fifteen of the 16 cities with more than 40,000 Jewish population in the United States and Canada have local Jewish hospitals;\(^{38}\) in the 15,000 to 40,000 population group, eight out of 16 cities have local Jewish hospitals, with only three hospitals in smaller cities. As a result of this concentration of health services in the largest centers of Jewish population, local health allocations continued to average over 25 per cent of total local allocations in this group of cities.

There were reports in 1965 on 18,770 beds and 1,692 bassinets in 54 general and special hospitals under local Jewish sponsorship. Further reports for 1964 on ten other hospitals indicated an additional total of 950 beds and 100 bassinets. Federations and chests provided $12.8 million for 49 of these hospitals in 1965, and an additional $1.3 million in 1964.

A total of 6.3 million days' care was provided in 1965 by 54 local (general and special) Jewish hospitals.

“Third Party” payments for service (Blue Cross, tax-support) have borne the major share of increases in recent years, while central grants from federations have been rising moderately in some communities and declining in others. Together with chest grants, they accounted for less than five per cent of operating receipts. Payments for hospital services (individual patient fees and Blue Cross insurance) and tax support had risen to $249 million in 1965 in 49 hospitals, or about 86 per cent of operating receipts. This total excluded payments of about $26 million for 14 additional hospitals in 1964.

Family and Child Care

Family service agencies provide personal and family counseling, family life education, psychiatric services, and a limited amount of economic aid. An increasing number of agencies provide homemaker services for the care of sick parents or of the aged in their own homes (26 in 1965, 19 in 1964), and group treatment where this is indicated as potentially helpful (21 in 1965; 16 in 1964). Activities of family service agencies are frequently conducted jointly with child care programs and with refugee services. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most of the cities with a Jewish population of more than 5,000. As in the case of health programs, most services are provided on a local level, although there are several regional programs and one national home for asthmatic children.

During 1965, 75 family agencies reported direct service to a total of 70,544 open cases on their rolls with about 52,000 cases opened and closed during the year, and a monthly average active caseload of over 18,000 families.

A total of 8,155 children were under care during 1965 in 47 child care

\(^{38}\) The exception is Washington, D.C.
agencies for which data were available. About 32 per cent of children under care at the end of the year were in foster homes, and 27 per cent in institutions, with most of the remainder living at home or with relatives.

Central communal allocations by federations and community chests for family and child care services rose by 5.4 per cent in 1965. Such central allocations continued to account for about 76 per cent of total receipts for family agencies (including refugee service). Central allocations were 25 per cent of the receipts of child care agencies. An additional 48 per cent was provided by public tax funds.

Refugees

These services in communities are financed locally, though they may be considered as extensions of an overseas problem. Post-war immigration to the United States began in volume late in 1946, reached its peak in 1949, and has declined since then, except for brief upturns. There was a parallel decline in local refugee costs for most of these years. While refugee costs accounted for 4.1 per cent in local allocations in 1956, they accounted for only 1.6 per cent in 1965.

Because over half of the immigrants tend to settle in New York City, the largest share of refugee costs is that of NYANA, financed by the national UJA. UHS seeks to encourage resettlement in other communities where the prospects for adjustment and self-support may be better than in New York City.

When immigrants arrive in these cities, economic aid and counseling are provided through local refugee programs, generally administered by the Jewish family agencies. In such arrangements, there is a sharing of overhead costs by these local agencies.

Average monthly aid was provided in 1965 to over 800 refugee families by 72 family agencies (including NYANA). While these were about five per cent of the active cases of these agencies, financial aid to refugees was 34 per cent of aid given by these agencies to all families outside New York (44 per cent, if NYANA were included).

Centers, Camps, Youth Services

According to JWB, there were over 300 Jewish community centers with a membership of about 710,000 in 1964. About 32 per cent of members are under 14 years of age, 18 per cent are aged 14 through 24, and half are 25 years or older.

Estimated total community center expenditures in 1964 were about $32.7 million, exclusive of separate camping agencies, compared with $30.6 million in 1963. A decade earlier, in 1954, these expenditures had been $15.5 million, while the 1945 level had been $7.2 million for a smaller network of centers. Federation and chest allocations to centers and other recreational facilities rose by 4 per cent in 1965, and by 18 per cent in the five-year period 1961–1965 (a rise of 62 per cent since 1956).
Although center fees tend to be kept at a level judged low enough to admit all who seek to use the facilities, the share of center income derived from fees, memberships, and other internal sources has increased in recent years. It rose from 50 per cent of center receipts in 1954 to 62 per cent in 1964, reflecting higher dues in new centers. Central community support from federations and community chests provided the balance of finances. Except for New York City (where minor chest support is secured); Baltimore, Boston, and six other important cities (where none was secured), and five other major cities (where lump-sum grants from chests do not involve earmarked center funds), chests generally provide greater support than federations.

Both sources of financing accounted for $10.4 million in 127 communities for centers, camps, and youth services outside New York City in 1965, a four per cent rise. From 1961 the rise was 18 per cent, while from 1956 it was 62 per cent.

Homes for the Aged

There were 68 homes for the aged which reported 13,181 beds in 1965. They cared for 15,892 residents who received 4.5 million days' care. This was a gain of about 700 residents over 1964. Federations and chests provided 10 per cent of receipts, with 82 per cent secured from payments for service, including public funds. Over 42 per cent came from governmental sources, exclusive of OASDI funds paid by clients.

Federation allocations to homes for the aged had risen by about 11 per cent between 1961 and 1965 (a rise of 65 per cent since 1956), increasing as the proportion of aged in the population continued to grow.

Over half of the residents in homes for the aged were over 80 years of age; four-fifths were over 75. Family agencies served at least 17,000 persons aged 60 and over in their own homes, including some requiring institutional placement. About 1,000 older Jewish persons were living in housing designed for the elderly in six cities operated under Jewish communal auspices, with the aid of long-term federal mortgage loans. The impact of Medicare and Medicaid programs on services to the aged will be evident after the effective dates of these programs in mid-1966 and 1967.

Receipts of $37 million were reported for 1965 by 60 of the homes. Payments for service accounted for $30.3 million, including public funds. Federations and chests reported $3.7 million to 49 homes (including over $2.9 million outside New York City). There were 11 homes which received support from neither source.

Jewish Education

There was an estimated enrollment of less than 590,000 students in 1963.39

39 In Boston, agreement for securing chest support for local Jewish services was attained in 1966.

Of these, half were attending Sunday schools, two-fifths were attending afternoon schools, and less than 9 per cent were in all-day schools. About 90 per cent of them were in schools with congregational orientation. In 1966 AAJE undertook to conduct a school enrolment census designed to secure more precise data than currently available.

The AAJE *National Study of Jewish Education*, issued in 1959, arrived at an estimate of a cost of “over $60 million” for 553,600 pupils in 1958. This estimate, in turn, was based on average costs in a number of cities totaling $46.5 million in 1956, which was increased to an estimated $60 million in 1958 on the basis of “general cost increases” and allowances for building-maintenance costs for congregational schools, which had not been included for estimates in cities outside New York City.

The consumer price index rose by over 12 per cent from 1958 to the end of 1966. Therefore, the cost of Jewish education since 1958, when it was estimated at $60 million, may have risen in excess of $10 million. An estimate of “over $70 million” is of the grossest type and is advanced only in the absence of more reliable data at this time.

The major sources of support of pre-bar mitzvah education are congregational and parental. Variations in scales of tuition fees are frequently dependent on variations in the provision for Jewish education in congregational membership dues. “Scholarship” arrangements are made by both congregational and communal schools to avoid barring students from low income homes. Financing of Jewish education is inseparable from congregational financing because of joint housing, joint staffing, and the pivotal role played by *bar mitzvah* preparation in Jewish education.

Jewish federations provide $6.1 million annually for Jewish education. The total budgets of the agencies supported are not reported.41 1965 allocations to local Jewish schools and to bureaus of Jewish education, reported by Jewish federations, were about $5.3 million outside New York City. They rose by almost seven per cent in 1965. A gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education has occurred each year; they were 21 per cent higher in 1965 than they had been in 1961, and 58 per cent higher than they had been in 1956. Payments by parents, either directly or through membership fees to congregations, provided the major source of income for primary education.

However, federations provided substantial shares of income for post-bar mitzvah education, for teacher training, and for the coordination and common service functions performed by bureaus of Jewish education.

Partial data for 19 cities indicate that federation grants for Jewish education in these cities were $3.2 million, or 23 per cent of total local allocations from federation sources (community chests do not provide funds for

41 Note that it would be inaccurate to compare the federation total of $6.1 million in allocations to the total of “over $70 million” for all costs of Jewish education, since most congregational schools do not seek federation support.
Jewish education. Included in these totals was $2.4 million given to elementary schools, or 39 per cent of their income of $6.2 million. Ten of the federations provided 59 per cent of the income of the secondary and teacher training schools which they supported.

In 1965 CJFWF established a Committee on Federation Planning for Jewish Education which developed in 1966 a "guidelines statement" with particular emphasis on the need to upgrade teaching manpower and post-elementary school education.

Community Relations

Organized programs designed to improve intergroup relations and to deal with specific instances of antisemitism exist primarily in the large and intermediate communities. The local activities financed by federations received about $1,025,000 in 1965 (outside New York City, which is served mainly by national agencies) — a rise of 20 per cent since the beginning of 1961 (39 per cent since 1956). Allocations in 1965 rose by 2.6 per cent.

In some areas, local and regional community-relations programs are financed by national agencies (mainly the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League) as part of a national network of regional offices.

Employment and Vocational Services

These programs are designed to assist Jews in finding employment and in guiding Jewish youth and others in the selection of trades and professions. Jewish vocational agencies or departments of Jewish family services operate mainly in the larger cities. Federations provided about $2.1 million in 1965 (including New York City). Substantial and growing supplementary income was received in recent years from government sources and service payments. Over $3.1 million in annual noncontributed income was identified by the Jewish Occupational Council. A complementary program is provided by a network of vocational service bureaus, financed by the B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal at a cost of over $0.4 million in 1965.

Local allocations for vocational programs increased by 3.5 per cent in 1965 outside New York City. The gain since the beginning of 1961 was 10 per cent.

Changes in Financing Since 1956

The major changes in federation and chest support of local Jewish services in the ten-year period 1956–1965 are briefly noted; only refugee costs fell by $0.5 million. The major rises were for:

- Recreational services, almost $3.9 million.
- Family and child care services, over $3.0 million.
- Jewish education, almost $1.9 million.
- Care for the aged, almost $1.2 million.
• Hospitals, about $0.4 million.
  Employment and vocational service, over $0.5 million.
  Local community relations, almost $0.3 million.

Of total rises of about $11 million since 1956, chests provided about $4 million, while the balance of $7 million was provided by federations.

S. P. Goldberg
### TABLE 1.
AMOUNTS RAISED IN CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS
1939–1966

*(Estimates in Millions of Dollars)*

| Year | Total*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYUJA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>157.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>204.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>117.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>109.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>131.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>139.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>124.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>130.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>126.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>129.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>124.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>126.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>132.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>137.0b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 1939–1966**

- **$3,072.7**
- **$1,094.4**
- **$1,978.3**

*Total pledges excludes amounts raised annually in smaller cities having no welfare funds, but includes substantial multiple-city gifts which are duplications as between New York City and the remainder of the country. Estimates for some prior years were adjusted by NYUJA in 1967 to secure greater year-to-year comparability. Excludes capital fund campaigns of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York: $3 million in 1943, $13.5 million in 1945, and $16.5 million in 1949, and about $138.5 million in 1961–66 including government grants, other noncampaign income and endowment funds of beneficiary agencies. Also excludes most endowment funds and major capital fund raising by federations for local agencies outside New York City.

* Provisional estimate based on incomplete results and on assumption that results for New York City will approximately follow national trend in 1966. Excludes Israel Education Fund of UJA, with pledges of about $17 million in 1965 and 1966, of which $11 million was raised by NYUJA.
| Table 1A. Estimated Annual Level of Income in 1965 of Jewish Communal Services in U.S. |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|
| (In millions of dollars)                      |                  |
| 1. Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds) | $132.2           |
| 2. Grants by United Funds and Community Chests | 19.5             |
| 3. Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies (including capital funds) | 88.7\textsuperscript{d} |
| 4. Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies | 60.4             |
| 5. Hospital Income (excluding 1 and 2)         | 289.9\textsuperscript{e} |
| 6. Family Service Income (excluding 1 and 2)   | 2.9              |
| 7. Child Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)       | 11.0             |
| 8. Jewish Vocational Service (excluding 1 and 2) | 3.1\textsuperscript{e} |
| 9. Aged Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)        | 32.3             |
| 10. Center Income (excluding 1 and 2)\textsuperscript{a} | 20.1            |
| 11. Jewish Education Income (excluding 1)\textsuperscript{b} | 65.0            |
| **Total**                                     | **$725.1**       |

[This excludes mainly endowment income in most communities; local capital fund campaigns, and internal congregational operating expense.]

\textsuperscript{a} JWB Yearbook, Table 13, November 1966.
\textsuperscript{b} Approximate; based on revision of estimate in National Study of Jewish Education, less Welfare Fund allocations. See text.
\textsuperscript{c} Understated: excludes some nonreporting hospitals and local vocational services.
\textsuperscript{d} Major inclusions were Brandeis University $14.4 million; Hadassah $7.9 million; Einstein Medical Center $6.5 million; City of Hope $5.4 million; JTS $5.2 million; AFHU $3.5 million; BBNYSA $3.2 million; NJH $3.2 million; JNF $2.8 million; ADL $2.5 million and AJCommittee $2.2 million.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cash Sales Incl. Conversions</th>
<th>Sales in United States</th>
<th>Sales Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (May 1–Dec. 31)</td>
<td>$52,647</td>
<td>$52,506</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>47,521</td>
<td>46,516</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>36,861</td>
<td>31,551</td>
<td>5,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>40,406</td>
<td>34,361</td>
<td>6,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>43,507</td>
<td>36,681</td>
<td>6,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>54,525</td>
<td>45,699</td>
<td>8,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>49,854</td>
<td>40,696</td>
<td>9,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>46,541</td>
<td>37,763</td>
<td>8,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>52,265</td>
<td>42,628</td>
<td>9,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>51,965</td>
<td>41,390</td>
<td>10,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>57,405</td>
<td>45,287</td>
<td>12,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>58,125</td>
<td>46,396</td>
<td>11,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>69,221</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>13,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>85,460</td>
<td>70,356</td>
<td>15,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>91,564</td>
<td>76,656</td>
<td>14,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>90,894</td>
<td>76,176</td>
<td>14,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$927,761</strong></td>
<td><strong>$780,162</strong></td>
<td><strong>$148,599</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Redemption of 12-year bonds issued in 1951 to 1955 began on May 1, 1963.*
TABLE 3-A. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF

(Excludes Total Under 5,000<sup>c</sup>)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgeted&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td>$73,636,422</td>
<td>$70,741,401</td>
<td>$8,160,874</td>
<td>$7,807,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overseas Agencies</strong></td>
<td>43,451,912</td>
<td>41,525,496</td>
<td>6,149,125</td>
<td>5,819,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Jewish Appeal</strong></td>
<td>40,992,227</td>
<td>39,141,877</td>
<td>5,845,534</td>
<td>5,543,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Overseas</strong></td>
<td>2,459,685</td>
<td>2,383,619</td>
<td>303,591</td>
<td>276,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Agencies</strong></td>
<td>4,142,552</td>
<td>4,025,914</td>
<td>563,008</td>
<td>516,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relations</strong></td>
<td>2,453,396</td>
<td>2,371,802</td>
<td>238,770</td>
<td>208,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Welfare</strong></td>
<td>44,071</td>
<td>44,763</td>
<td>27,375</td>
<td>26,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td>478,236</td>
<td>457,892</td>
<td>65,198</td>
<td>60,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious</strong></td>
<td>291,858</td>
<td>295,672</td>
<td>146,230</td>
<td>135,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Agencies</strong></td>
<td>874,991</td>
<td>858,785</td>
<td>85,435</td>
<td>84,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Operating Needs</strong></td>
<td>23,982,596</td>
<td>22,902,609</td>
<td>1,314,090</td>
<td>1,356,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Refugee Care</strong></td>
<td>589,454</td>
<td>668,331</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Capital Needs</strong></td>
<td>1,463,586</td>
<td>1,614,714</td>
<td>130,382</td>
<td>110,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between totals budgeted for beneficiaries and gross budgeted for all purposes represents "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, and contingency or other reserves. The difference between what a community may budget for all purposes (its gross budget) and totals raised may also reflect the extent that the budgeted amounts may include funds on hand from previous campaigns (reserves, etc.). Minor differences in amounts and percentages due to rounding.
### FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONSb

**New York City**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,000–15,000c</td>
<td>$11,411,357</td>
<td>$10,867,315</td>
<td>$10,501,145</td>
<td>$10,029,431</td>
<td>$43,563,046</td>
<td>$42,037,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000–40,000c</td>
<td>$7,488,312</td>
<td>$7,153,470</td>
<td>$6,791,783</td>
<td>$6,482,362</td>
<td>$23,022,692</td>
<td>$22,069,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 and Overc</td>
<td>$382,380</td>
<td>$383,571</td>
<td>$514,914</td>
<td>$514,167</td>
<td>$1,258,800</td>
<td>$1,209,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000–15,000</td>
<td>$722,480</td>
<td>$720,574</td>
<td>$645,674</td>
<td>$625,580</td>
<td>$2,211,390</td>
<td>$2,163,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000–40,000</td>
<td>$387,526</td>
<td>$378,780</td>
<td>$403,280</td>
<td>$390,352</td>
<td>$1,423,820</td>
<td>$1,394,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 and Over</td>
<td>$8,516</td>
<td>$9,197</td>
<td>$5,180</td>
<td>$5,788</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000–30,000</td>
<td>$63,788</td>
<td>$59,425</td>
<td>$75,325</td>
<td>$71,072</td>
<td>$273,925</td>
<td>$266,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000–15,000</td>
<td>$115,253</td>
<td>$129,639</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,857</td>
<td>$6,375</td>
<td>$5,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000–40,000</td>
<td>$1,0</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$d</td>
<td>$d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 and Over</td>
<td>$147,397</td>
<td>$143,533</td>
<td>$137,889</td>
<td>$133,511</td>
<td>$504,270</td>
<td>$493,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000–30,000</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000–15,000</td>
<td>$2,714,311</td>
<td>$2,449,071</td>
<td>$2,506,673</td>
<td>$2,436,109</td>
<td>$17,447,522</td>
<td>$16,661,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000–40,000</td>
<td>$58,962</td>
<td>$54,713</td>
<td>$113,015</td>
<td>$119,400</td>
<td>$417,202</td>
<td>$494,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 and Over</td>
<td>$424,964</td>
<td>$489,219</td>
<td>$444,000</td>
<td>$365,980</td>
<td>$464,240</td>
<td>$648,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000–30,000</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Includes small undistributed amounts.

c Jewish population.

d Less than .05 of one per cent.
### TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION TO BENEFICIARIES OF FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS

(Estimates in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount Budgeted to</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>New York City</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other Cities</strong></td>
<td><strong>New York City</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other Cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>$61,452</td>
<td>$58,465</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$16,940</td>
<td>$43,452</td>
<td>$41,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>$58,592</td>
<td>$55,742</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
<td>$16,600</td>
<td>$40,992</td>
<td>$39,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>$2,860</td>
<td>$2,724</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>$2,460</td>
<td>$2,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>$4,443</td>
<td>$4,386</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$4,143</td>
<td>$4,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>$2,453</td>
<td>$2,372</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$2,453</td>
<td>$2,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>39,408</td>
<td>37,557</td>
<td>15,425</td>
<td>14,654</td>
<td>23,983</td>
<td>22,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based upon communities which are currently CJFWF members and some smaller cities which are not CJFWF members but had been included in the base group of communities used in 1948 when this statistical series was started. Minor differences in amounts and percentages due to rounding. Community chest support excluded from this table, but included in Tables 5, 6.

- Figures for New York include UJA of Greater New York and Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugee costs in New York City are borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of UJA nationally. Most overseas and domestic agencies which are normally included in welfare funds in other cities conduct their own campaigns in New York. The New York UJA included the following beneficiaries (in addition to the national UJA): UHS and JWB. Data for New York UJA based on estimates of distribution of 1964 and 1965 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash is received.

- The difference between this amount and "total raised" in Table 1 represents mainly "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, elimination of duplicating multiple-city gifts, and contingency or other reserves.

- Includes small undistributed amounts in "total" and "other cities" columns.

- NYANA is included in UJA totals.

- Less than .05 of one per cent.
### TABLE 4. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND CHEST ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1965

*(In millions of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields Receiving Chest Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>$ 5.8</td>
<td>$ 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Provided by Chests (Exclusive of Administrative)</td>
<td><strong>$17.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td><strong>$28.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>$ 0.8</td>
<td>$ 0.3</td>
<td>$ 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fields Receiving Only Federation Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services (incl. Free Loan)</td>
<td>$ 2.1</td>
<td>$ 0.7</td>
<td>$ 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Aid</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided by Federations: $41.0  $15.7  $25.3
Provided by Chests: $18.4  $2.3  $16.1

**TOTAL**: $59.4  $18.0  $41.4

---

* Preliminary data for 1966 indicate a decrease of about $0.5 million for hospitals; a rise of $0.2 million for centers and camps; a rise of $0.3 million for family and child care, and a rise of $0.3 million for aged care.

b Provided by NYANA, financed by UJA.

c Provided mainly by national agencies.

d Most capital campaigns excluded because conducted apart from annual campaign; also excludes chest funds in nonfederated cities.

* Includes in N.Y.C. Greater New York Fund and United Hospital Fund.
### TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES, 1964, 1965

(Excludes New York City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,563,128</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>$7,672,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>8,711,834</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9,182,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>10,042,120</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10,443,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,219,635</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3,168,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1,308,597</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,395,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,913,845</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5,251,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>657,355</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>668,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>984,455</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,025,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>506,028</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>527,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>475,276</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>465,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,382,273</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,802,854</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$22,750,651</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>$23,720,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>15,631,622</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>16,082,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of total administrative and fund-raising costs ($10,720,958 in 1964 and $11,184,818 in 1965) reported for these 127 cities. Federation allocations for administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund-raising costs cannot be segregated between local and nonlocal programs.
TABLE 5-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\), INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS, FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES  
1964, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (127)</th>
<th>(58)</th>
<th>(41)</th>
<th>(15)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7,563,128</td>
<td>7,672,905</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>82,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>8,711,834</td>
<td>9,182,941</td>
<td>158,945</td>
<td>148,396</td>
<td>1,173,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>10,042,120</td>
<td>10,443,233</td>
<td>825,245</td>
<td>825,288</td>
<td>2,191,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,219,635</td>
<td>3,168,861</td>
<td>100,670</td>
<td>103,184</td>
<td>424,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,308,597</td>
<td>1,395,889</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>44,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,913,845</td>
<td>5,251,918</td>
<td>121,033</td>
<td>128,450</td>
<td>579,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>657,355</td>
<td>668,732</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>984,455</td>
<td>1,025,224</td>
<td>14,567</td>
<td>16,992</td>
<td>83,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>506,028</td>
<td>527,651</td>
<td>29,625</td>
<td>31,972</td>
<td>73,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local Administration(^a)</td>
<td>475,276</td>
<td>465,500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>77,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>22,750,651</td>
<td>23,720,433</td>
<td>774,634</td>
<td>823,962</td>
<td>2,265,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) This table includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of administrative and fund-raising costs ($10,720,058 in 1964 and $11,184,818 in 1965) reported for these 127 cities. Federation allocations towards administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund-raising costs cannot be segregated between local and nonlocal programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Admin. &amp; Fund Raising Costs</td>
<td>$10,720,058</td>
<td>$11,184,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>638,382</td>
<td>683,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–15,000</td>
<td>1,750,125</td>
<td>1,754,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000–40,000</td>
<td>1,694,806</td>
<td>1,879,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 &amp; Over</td>
<td>6,698,948</td>
<td>7,067,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^b\) Jewish population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Total (127) 1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>50,000 (58) Under 5000 1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>5,000–15,000 (41) 1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>15,000–40,000 (15) 1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>40,000 and Over (13) 1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service, Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local Administration</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

| Federations                      | 59.3             | 59.6 | 61.9                        | 65.6 | 47.5                    | 48.4 | 46.9                    | 47.0 | 63.7                   | 63.9 |
| Chests                           | 40.7             | 40.4 | 38.1                        | 34.4 | 52.5                    | 51.6 | 53.1                    | 53.0 | 36.3                   | 36.1 |

* See Table 5-A, note *.
* Jewish population.
* Less than 0.5 of one per cent.
* Slight difference due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>Index of Change&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 1961 = 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,492</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>$7,812</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>$7,430</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>8,511</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8,734</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$33,981</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$35,247</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$35,895</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

- **Federations** $20,341 59.9  $21,254 60.3  $21,565 60.1  $22,270 59.4  $23,191 59.7  114.0
- **Chests** 13,640 40.1  13,993 39.7  14,329 39.9  15,244 40.6  15,678 40.3  114.9

<sup>a</sup> Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.

<sup>b</sup> Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs. The total chest participation in these costs represents about four per cent of total administrative costs for these cities.

<sup>c</sup> Slight differences due to rounding.

<sup>d</sup> During this period the United States consumer price index rose by 5.5 per cent.
TABLE 6-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 94 COMMUNITIES, 1961, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (94)</th>
<th>(36)</th>
<th>(31)</th>
<th>(15)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,491,842</td>
<td>$7,655,839</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$68,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Service Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>7,399,759</td>
<td>8,885,207</td>
<td>127,688</td>
<td>115,085</td>
<td>878,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8,511,302</td>
<td>10,076,501</td>
<td>672,315</td>
<td>727,299</td>
<td>1,739,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>2,769,679</td>
<td>3,083,725</td>
<td>71,577</td>
<td>83,947</td>
<td>305,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>1,270,017</td>
<td>1,395,889</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>44,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>430,783</td>
<td>480,049</td>
<td>20,423</td>
<td>21,625</td>
<td>59,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>396,432</td>
<td>457,673</td>
<td>12,286</td>
<td>12,211</td>
<td>45,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>387,408</td>
<td>465,500</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>81,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration</td>
<td>439,804</td>
<td>465,500</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>81,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,980,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,868,674</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,050,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,101,968</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,809,168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$20,340,954</td>
<td>$23,190,739</td>
<td>$665,208</td>
<td>$723,055</td>
<td>$1,853,987</td>
<td>$2,309,817</td>
<td>$2,327,593</td>
<td>$2,619,688</td>
<td>$15,494,166</td>
<td>$17,538,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>13,639,853</td>
<td>15,677,935</td>
<td>385,544</td>
<td>378,913</td>
<td>1,955,181</td>
<td>2,532,592</td>
<td>2,601,688</td>
<td>2,949,247</td>
<td>8,697,440</td>
<td>9,817,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.

\(^{b}\) Jewish population.

\(^{c}\) See Table 6, note \(^{b}\).
### TABLE 6-B. Percentage Distribution of Federation Allocations<sup>a</sup> for Local Services in 94 Communities, 1961, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total (94)</th>
<th>(36) Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(31) 5,000–15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(15) 15,000–40,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(12) 40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Service</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Admin.&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

- **Federations**
  - 1961: 59.9
  - 1965: 59.7
  - 1961: 63.3
  - 1965: 65.6
  - 1961: 48.7
  - 1965: 47.7
  - 1961: 47.2
  - 1965: 47.0
  - 1961: 64.0
  - 1965: 64.1

- **Chests**
  - 1961: 40.1
  - 1965: 40.3
  - 1961: 36.7
  - 1965: 34.4
  - 1961: 51.3
  - 1965: 52.3
  - 1961: 52.8
  - 1965: 53.0
  - 1961: 36.0
  - 1965: 35.9

---

<sup>a</sup> See Table 6-A, note a.
<sup>b</sup> Jewish population.
<sup>c</sup> Less than .05 of one per cent.
<sup>d</sup> See Table 6, note b.
<sup>e</sup> Slight difference due to rounding.
TABLE 6-C. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\textsuperscript{a} FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 82 COMMUNITIES, 1956, 1965

(\textit{Amounts in thousands of dollars})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>\textbf{Index of Change 1956, 1965}</th>
<th>\textbf{1956=100%}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{Amount}</td>
<td>\textbf{Per Cent}</td>
<td>\textbf{Amount}</td>
<td>\textbf{Per Cent}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7,275</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>9,081</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>10,082</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5,148</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{TOTAL\textsuperscript{c}} \hspace{1em} $28,157 \hspace{1em} 100.0 \hspace{1em} $39,058 \hspace{1em} 100.0 \hspace{1em} 138.7

Sources of Income

\textbf{Federations} \hspace{1em} $16,458 \hspace{1em} 58.5 \hspace{1em} $23,350 \hspace{1em} 59.8 \hspace{1em} 141.9

\textbf{Chests} \hspace{1em} 11,699 \hspace{1em} 41.5 \hspace{1em} 15,708 \hspace{1em} 40.2 \hspace{1em} 134.3

\textsuperscript{a} Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.

\textsuperscript{b} Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs.

\textsuperscript{c} Slight difference due to rounding.
### TABLE 7. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS
FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1965 AND 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds*</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal &amp; Beneficiary Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal ⁶</td>
<td>$61,457,359</td>
<td>$60,635,483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Education Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,277,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Israel Appeal ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Association for New Americans ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT—Women’s Division ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American ORT Federation ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total UJA and Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>$61,457,359</td>
<td>$60,635,483</td>
<td>$8,723,635</td>
<td>$4,089,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Mogen Dovid ⁴</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td></td>
<td>$338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal ⁴</td>
<td>624,373</td>
<td>615,948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of the Hebrew University ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America-Israel Cultural Foundation ⁴</td>
<td>197,853</td>
<td>189,336</td>
<td>2,627,731</td>
<td>1,629,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezras Torah Fund ⁴</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>8,556</td>
<td>241,352</td>
<td>219,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Council of Israel Institutions ⁴</td>
<td>98,799</td>
<td>94,963</td>
<td>76,931</td>
<td>50,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah ⁴</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>544,855</td>
<td>7,856,248</td>
<td>7,611,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Telegraphic Agency ⁴</td>
<td>152,217</td>
<td>145,315</td>
<td>23,514</td>
<td>12,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel ⁴</td>
<td>241,701</td>
<td>258,954</td>
<td>1,802,272</td>
<td>1,547,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women ⁴</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>616,122</td>
<td>599,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Women Organization ⁴</td>
<td>1,090,269</td>
<td>993,640</td>
<td>156,939</td>
<td>153,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Jewish Congress ⁴</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>159,261</td>
<td>102,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,998,798</td>
<td>$2,898,530</td>
<td>$22,358,742</td>
<td>$17,829,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overseas</strong></td>
<td>$64,456,157</td>
<td>$63,534,013</td>
<td>$31,082,377</td>
<td>$21,919,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including joint community appeals.
* Cash received in each calendar year.
* Excludes income from UJA; also income from campaigns abroad, inter-governmental agencies, and reparations income.
* Traditional collections in the U.S., exclusive of Jewish Agency grants to JNF in Israel.
* Excludes contributions and earnings of investment fund.
* Income from welfare funds estimated.

---

* Includes Swope endowment fund.
* Excludes grants from other organizations.
* Amounts raised for JNF are excluded. Hadassah “other income” includes membership dues, shekel and Zionist youth funds.
* Includes overseas income and income from CJMCA, but includes UHS income from NYUJA.
* Includes overseas and Canadian income.
* CJFWF estimate.
<p>| TABLE 8. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS  |
| FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1965 AND 1964 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| <strong>Community Relations Agencies</strong> | <strong>Jewish Foundation</strong> | <strong>Joint Committee</strong> | <strong>Joint Labor Committee</strong> | <strong>Joint Council</strong> |
| <strong>Federations and Welfare Funds</strong> | <strong>Other Contributions</strong> | <strong>Other Income</strong> | <strong>Total</strong> | <strong>1965</strong> | <strong>1964</strong> | <strong>1965</strong> | <strong>1964</strong> | <strong>1965</strong> | <strong>1964</strong> |
| <strong>Joint Defense Appeal</strong> | 20,583 | 31,000 | 39,140 | 47,468 | — | — | 59,723 | 78,468 |
| <strong>American Jewish Committee</strong> | 1,350,226 | 1,128,263 | 2,205,282 | 2,194,177 | 708,302 | 888,554 | 4,269,202 | 3,946,487 |
| <strong>Anti-Defamation League</strong> | 393,292 | 401,553 | 620,738 | 471,080 | 241,394 | 246,133 | 1,256,061 | 1,118,766 |
| <strong>American Jewish Congress</strong> | 201,895 | 198,222 | 173,302 | 168,667 | 43,588 | 56,132 | 418,750 | 423,021 |
| <strong>Jewish War Veterans</strong> | 127,903 | 124,310 | 11,893 | 5,080 | 316,086 | 248,605 | 455,382 | 378,423 |
| <strong>National Community Relations Advisory Council</strong> | 185,516 | 177,449 | 8,875 | 9,600 | 56,372 | 31,878 | 250,763 | 218,927 |
| <strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong> | 3,468,315 | 3,215,890 | 5,595,389 | 5,239,020 | 1,781,663 | 1,588,840 | 10,845,367 | 10,043,750 |
| <strong>Health and Welfare Agencies</strong> | 5,997 | 6,883 | 690,483 | 1,037,319 | 374,437 | 526,426 | 1,070,917 | 1,260,317 |
| <strong>City of Hope</strong> | 5,500 | 6,534 | 5,364,234 | 4,934,650 | 2,031,356 | 2,320,019 | 506,213 | 584,722 |
| <strong>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</strong> | 43,252 | 42,502 | 202,445 | 249,600 | 260,543 | 292,620 | 1,258,176 | 1,140,020 |
| <strong>National Jewish Home for Asmthic Children (Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital)</strong> | 6,616 | 6,695 | 742,690 | 739,117 | 508,870 | 394,208 | 1,149,576 | 1,148,946 |
| <strong>National Jewish Hospital</strong> | 25,040 | 24,544 | 3,200,538 | 2,866,638 | 1,733,733 | 1,376,913 | 4,959,311 | 4,268,095 |
| <strong>Yeshiva University—Albert Einstein College of Medicine</strong> | — | — | 6,501,098 | 4,424,720 | 19,889,775 | 17,422,700 | 26,490,873 | 21,847,420 |
| <strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong> | 86,378 | 87,158 | 16,701,488 | 14,252,044 | 24,898,714 | 22,332,886 | 41,686,580 | 36,672,088 |
| <strong>National Service Agencies</strong> | 107,804 | 98,241 | 99,660 | 72,031 | 63,930 | 58,726 | 228,998 | 34,540 |
| <strong>Jewish Occupational Council</strong> | 21,499 | 20,610 | 1,500 | 1,773 | 120,980 | 121,157 | 143,663 | 228,598 |
| <strong>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</strong> | 9,860 | 8,458 | 9,244 | 9,308 | 26,609 | 25,279 | 45,713 | 43,041 |
| <strong>National Jewish Welfare Board</strong> | 1,284,568 | 1,275,934 | 70,058 | 61,336 | 163,669 | 154,682 | 1,518,295 | 1,491,724 |
| <strong>Synagogue Council of America</strong> | 19,170 | 17,827 | 49,227 | 49,393 | 10,331 | 8,334 | 78,726 | 74,054 |
| <strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong> | 1,442,901 | 1,420,967 | 229,689 | 193,841 | 385,203 | 257,597 | 2,057,793 | 1,872,405 |
| <strong>Cultural Agencies</strong> | 3,625 | 4,620 | 25,033 | 20,500 | 5,253 | 4,450 | 33,911 | 29,570 |
| <strong>American Academy for Jewish Research</strong> | 7,283 | 7,290 | 1,048 | 1,021 | 105,718 | 91,290 | 114,049 | 99,601 |
| <strong>B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal</strong> | 2,032 | 2,057 | 11,268 | 10,772 | 15,667 | 15,303 | 29,066 | 28,132 |
| <strong>Brandeis University</strong> | 564,255 | 502,278 | 2,347,217 | 2,292,891 | 433,124 | 294,366 | 4,244,559 | 3,721,605 |
| <strong>Jewish? Institute of Religion</strong> | 1,800 | 2,335 | 11,774 | 15,700 | 6,651 | 5,362 | 20,305 | 21,398 |
| <strong>Jewish College of Science and Agriculture</strong> | 620 | 1,023 | 14,088 | 9,440 | 1,266,858 | 1,122,271 | 1,281,566 | 1,153,234 |
| <strong>Jewish Chautauqua Society</strong> | 43,397 | 43,103 | 26,904 | 30,836 | 107,702 | 92,948 | 179,003 | 166,887 |
| <strong>Hastadnun</strong> | 39,341 | 40,531 | 101,682 | 108,662 | 101,918 | 91,810 | 222,329 | 221,738 |
| <strong>Jewish Institute of Religion</strong> | 14,546 | 14,522 | 68,240 | 71,885 | 32,823 | 30,570 | 115,609 | 136,453 |
| <strong>Jewish National Fund</strong> | 8,230 | 8,715 | 287,861 | 252,615 | 19,374 | 46,185 | 315,465 | 307,515 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Publication Society*</th>
<th>12,132</th>
<th>12,699</th>
<th>30,662</th>
<th>29,852</th>
<th>477,913</th>
<th>466,808</th>
<th>520,707</th>
<th>509,359</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>79,961</td>
<td>45,263</td>
<td>38,721</td>
<td>30,932</td>
<td>122,147</td>
<td>79,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture</td>
<td>80,726</td>
<td>81,049</td>
<td>17,130</td>
<td>22,599</td>
<td>10,389</td>
<td>98,967</td>
<td>103,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO, k</td>
<td>36,138</td>
<td>42,957</td>
<td>75,655</td>
<td>92,995</td>
<td>39,344</td>
<td>50,318</td>
<td>151,137</td>
<td>185,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
<td>27,863</td>
<td>29,061</td>
<td>651,072</td>
<td>664,864</td>
<td>168,717</td>
<td>120,200</td>
<td>847,652</td>
<td>814,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$826,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>$777,445</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,074,980</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,384,892</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,309,961</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,282,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,211,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,445,012</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Agencies**

| Beth Jacob Schools and Hebrew Teachers College | $32,538 | $23,608 | $283,485 | $284,767 | $165,058 | $137,355 | $499,078 | $445,370 |
| Reform Medrash Govohat | 6,522 | 5,785 | 474,163 | 533,323 | 3,345 | 3,345 | 484,035 | 540,289 |
| Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion | 104,681 | 87,442 | 781,081 | 689,613 | 2,208,795 | 1,912,533 | 3,094,494 | 2,689,588 |
| Union of American Hebrew Congregations | 80,379 | 85,501 | 5,230,046 | 4,556,754 | 1,343,596 | 1,699,866 | 6,654,021 | 6,342,021 |
| Jewish Theological Seminary | 7,300 | 4,600 | 528,444 | 248,388 | 107,878 | 135,177 | 365,390 | 388,115 |
| Hebrew Theological College | 4,018 | 4,060 | 253,588 | 248,388 | 107,878 | 135,177 | 365,390 | 388,115 |
| Hebrew Union College—Other than Medical School | 1,347 | 1,341 | 26,316 | 28,292 | 1,957 | 2,039 | 29,751 | 32,309 |
| **Sub-Total** | **$418,547** | **$393,835** | **$15,933,474** | **$13,736,330** | **$12,970,663** | **$12,484,729** | **$29,322,648** | **$26,614,894** |

**Total Domestic**

| $6,242,270 | $5,895,295 | $57,535,020 | $52,806,127 | $53,346,204 | $47,946,727 | $117,123,494 | $106,648,149 |

**Total Overseas and Domestic**

| $70,698,427 | $69,429,308 | $88,615,379 | $74,725,513 | $60,390,596 | $54,614,046 | $219,706,420 | $198,768,867 |

---

* Payments on pre-1963 pledges.
* Includes independent appeals in welfare fund cities: about $40,000 for AJCommittee, $257,000 for ADL in 1964; $595,000 for AJCommittee, $297,000 for ADL in 1965. On allocations basis, AJCommittee received $787,000 in 1964 and $810,000 in 1965; ADL received $914,600 in 1964 and $935,000 in 1965.
* New York City and Chicago campaigns.
* Excludes overseas income.
* Represents dues from national agencies.
* On an allocations basis, former JDA agencies together received about $43,400 more in 1964 than in 1963.
* The former Ex-Patients Sanitarium was consolidated with the American Medical Center at Denver in 1964-65. Financial reports reflecting this consolidation were not available at press time.
* CAFWF estimate.
* Includes building fund.
* Yeshiva University is reported in part under health and welfare agencies and in part under religious agencies. In the medical school, "other income" includes $16.3 million in government funds and hospital service grants in 1964 and $18.2 million in 1965, in other than medical schools, "other income" includes approximately $1 million additional in government grants for each year.
* Excludes grants from CJM/CAG, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, and Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.
* Income from centers included in federation agencies.
* Excludes grants by other national agencies to avoid double counting.
* Exclusive of gross sales of religious education publications.
* One-half to two-thirds of federation allocations consist of local "lunch fund" allocations reflecting public funds received through PJUPY.
* Including University of Judaism, California; duplicating Seminary income excluded. Transfer of approximately $1.5 million of other subsidiary assets to ITS excluded.
* HTC changed fiscal reports in 1964-65; there is therefore some small duplication of 1965 income in the 1965 totals.
* Includes fire insurance proceeds.
The modern Jewish quest for community, produced by the breakdown of the pre-modern Jewish order, demands a renewed concern with Jewish public affairs, a field of theoretical and practical interest that can best be defined in political terms. Long hidden within the confines of history and sociology, this field is now ready to force itself upon the consciousness of all those concerned with the quest for Jewish community at the highest level and, more immediately, with the life of specific Jewish communities. If, in most cases, today's quest for community is masked by the quest for identity—a concern that superficially appears to be more individualistic and private—the astute observer soon discovers that the two are not only intertwined but also interdependent. This is borne out by an already extant literature which, though presented in other guises, does speak to the central and specific problems of Jewish public affairs.

What do we mean when we define “Jewish public affairs” as a field, and what are its concerns? Public concerns are those involving the community as a whole, the collective interests of people living in the community, activities in society that have a communal bent or character, and the concerns of individuals insofar as they relate to community life and interests. While acknowledgment of some distinction between public and private concerns is crucial, it is equally clear that no sharp division between the two spheres can ever be drawn, even for reasons of convention. Rather, Jewish life can be conceived as revolving around a core of clearly public concerns, e.g., the life of the congregation or the provision of certain public services, surrounded by concentric circles of concern that move out toward the private realm and into a grey area of matters that can be considered “public” for some purposes, and “private” for others.

The delineation of Jewish public affairs raises certain additional problems by virtue of its Jewish aspect. In the western world, where the separation between public and private starts from firmly established premises and the political and the religious aspects of life are separated with equal clarity, public affairs soon resolves itself into questions of the immediately or essentially political. Within the framework of Jewish civilization, however, the distinctions between public and private, political and religious, are substantially blurred. Moreover, the lack of clearly political institutions to help set the formal boundaries of public affairs requires examination of Jewish social and communal life with a more careful and penetrating eye. Here, the present state of our knowledge of things political gives us an advantage over preced-
ing generations. Social scientists have discovered in Afro-Asian cultures blurrings of public and private, political and religious, similar to those found in Jewish life, that give us some new points of comparison.

The Biblical Paradigm

Identification of the specific concerns of Jewish public affairs must begin with the delineation of the appropriate theoretical principles. The principles that establish the continuing foundations of Jewish political thought properly originate in the Bible. A substantial, if hidden, literature discussing biblical political thought has been in existence for many years. Biblical political ideas have been elucidated by political philosophers (e.g. Locke and Spinoza) in the past and, more recently, by students of the Bible using modern critical methods (e.g. Noth and Kaufman). Even theologians have found it necessary to explore the political dimension of Scripture, a certain indicator of its importance in the scheme of biblical thought. One such work published in the period under review here, Leo Baeck's posthumous *This People Israel,* fortuitously offers us a way to view some first principles. By discussing the meaning of Jewish peoplehood and existence through a special kind of biblical exegesis, Rabbi Baeck implicitly outlines the fundamental concerns of Jewish public affairs and analyzes their differential development over the four millennia of Jewish history. In doing so, he unfolds what is, in effect, a political theory of Jewish existence, but a political theory in the uniquely Jewish religious context.

Baeck begins with the covenant idea, the central idea in Jewish social thought, and the great contribution of Jewish thought to political theory. The *brit,* or covenant, embodies both the source of all law and the commandments which comprise Jewish law. Following Jewish tradition, Baeck sees God covenanting with the universe, humanity, history, and the fathers. It is the covenant that links all things within the universe and within history. More than a theological concept, the covenant defines a political relationship at the highest level. In part, this is because God is the central source of right and justice, two of the highest concerns of politics, while the covenant is the means by which human beings are granted freedom, a third.

As a polity, Israel functions as the embodiment of the covenant idea, celebrating the freedom which it effectively brought into the world through the covenant and the idea of the covenant. Israel is not a power structure like Rome, whose institutions and ideas celebrate power and its uses, nor a talent contest like Greece, whose institutions, symbolized by the Olympic games, were designed to test the talents of the various Hellenic communities and their citizens.

From the covenant idea, Baeck sees the derivation of the Jewish conception of community. Man is not simply born into community, but is called to

* Complete citations of all books and articles mentioned in this essay will be found on pp. 222–229.
the task of molding it. When he forms his life in recognition of morality, he begins to create community. The covenant enables man to rise above the limitations inherent in his creation, to establish the free, just community.

Baeck sees the congregation as the uniquely Jewish embodiment of the community. In his thought, the congregational polity constitutes a small republic combining the religious and the political in the ideal form of "religious democracy." It provides the practical framework for the expression of the highest Israelite political ideal, the idea of theocracy. Baeck's conception of theocracy, the direct sovereignty of God over men, differs from the conventional modern conception because it correctly reflects the idea of *malchut shamayim* enunciated in the Bible. In the biblical spirit, he sees the acceptance of the sovereignty of God as the means of freeing individuals from pseudo sovereigns on earth. Herein Baeck sees a major difference between a congregation and the church. The congregation must be a republic. It can only exist through individuals who come together within it, partly because of their prior commitment to the great covenant and partly by means of an immediate contract. The Church, on the other hand, exists *per se* regardless of the individuals who may or may not be in it, arrogating, as it were, sovereign power to itself.

Historically, the spread of congregations throughout the world is the Jewish equivalent of the colonization process which led the Greeks to plant cities in the Mediterranean basin and the Americans to extend towns across a continent. Through the congregation, the Jews have been able to create communities wherever they have settled.

Baeck traces the history of Israel as one of the rise, decline, and renewal of congregational republics in their various forms, beginning with the biblical congregation of Israel. It is seen as a series of encounters, within which the fundamental principles of Jewish religio-political life have been expressed in different ways. The resultant differing syntheses of religious expression, communal organization, and economic activity have encouraged a variety of forms of public organization within the Jewish community as a whole.

Within the foregoing framework, Baeck considers the relationship of Israel as a community to the land of Israel, examining the ways in which the forces of geography work to mold the people. So, for example, he sees in the Jubilee legislation biblical affirmation of the relationship between labor, that binds man to the forces of creation, and freedom in the land, that is absolutely essential as a precondition of political freedom. In this light, Baeck views Zionism as a natural outgrowth of Jewish political ideas, an important factor in the renewal of the vital colonization process in the land of Israel. He then poses the great political question of Israel restored: whether it will develop a society in the spirit of traditional covenant of the Jews, or encourage an ersatz life of hedonism so widespread in the modern world.

Baeck also considers the crucial political problem of leadership. He sees the ideal leader of Israel as a combination of teacher and prophet, and, like many before him, finds this ideal expressed in the view of *Moshe rabbenu*
(Moses our teacher) presented in the Bible and the *midrash*. The leader, as teacher and prophet, has limited power and is chosen for higher reasons than mere personal talent. He is eminently suited to head the congregational republic because his role effectively supports man's freedom of choice to receive instruction and listen to prophecy, or to persist in his willfulness.

More generally, Baeck advocates the prophetic concept of the state from which can develop the promised kingdom of God on earth, a kingdom which embodies, in traditional Jewish terminology, the linkage of truth, justice, and peace. In this, it differs significantly from the two other Western concepts: the Greco-Roman that views the state as "the organic form and limits of the communal life of men" or the modern totalitarian that advocates the existence of the state for its own sake. Baeck regards the striving for the kingdom of God as man's great political task.

The unique role of the Jewish people as an entity on the world scene, Baeck says, evolved from its belief in the one God, at a time when other peoples worshipped idols. God's covenant which granted freedom to Israel marked the beginning of history. The Jewish people continues to exist and to play a special role in civilization because it understood the oneness of history and universe within which man lives, a oneness revealing totality and order. Illustrating his thesis, Baeck gives examples of the impact of Jews and Hebraic thought on public affairs, ranging from the role of the Jews as the maintainers of the channels of communication in the medieval era to the influence of the congregational idea on the revolution in church polity during the reformation. He could have added—as others have—the contribution of Hebraic ideas to the development of modern popular government.

Finally, implicit in Baeck's book is a methodology for studying Jewish public affairs. Using the midrashic method, Baeck sets forth a generational theory of history. Within the framework of space and time, which together comprise the universe (Baeck uses the appropriate Hebrew world *olam* to define the universe as space-plus-time), the basic unit of analysis is the generation, just as within the social order the basic unit is the congregation. History is given structure through generations and the meeting of generations. From the movement and meeting of generations emerges progress—defined not in the usual terms, but as a new understanding on the part of each generation of "that which is demanded" of humanity in general, and of it in particular. The generations themselves are tied together by a common share in their task and its fulfillment. An examination of the movement, meaning, and linkage of generations pursuing the great common task, makes possible the understanding and interpretation of the course of Jewish public affairs.

**The Recent Literature**

What Baeck expresses in occasionally esoteric theological terms, others have discussed in the more familiar language of history and the social sciences. Perry Miller, Hans Kohn, William Albright, and Louis Finkelstein,
to name but a very few, have explored various aspects of Jewish political life and thought, from the covenant idea to the use of contractual arrangements to organize societies and preserve individual rights. Examples of other historical and social science studies that willy-nilly elucidate the points made by Baeck will be found in the following pages. In fact, most of what Baeck and the others have said explicitly is implicit in all serious discussions of Jewish public affairs. That is why simple inventories of materials dealing with Jewish social and communal life miss the essential point. The implicit unity in such works, which remains immanent but unrevealed in unstructured catalogs, can only be brought to the surface through an understanding of the principles that underlie that unity and the proper application of these principles in organizing the literature in question.

With Baeck's theoretical formulation as a starting point, we can look at the other materials published in the last two years and see the practical manifestations of the Jewish concern for "the moral, the social, the community, and the congregation"; examine the practical considerations affecting these four elements, and get some sense of the theoretical concerns which animate those who study or comment upon Jewish public affairs. In one sense, this literature is vast; in another, the paucity of works is astounding. The periodical literature of the contemporary Jewish world is filled with materials that fall in the category of Jewish public affairs. Articles ranging from discussions of Jewish life in Afghanistan to the problem of Israel's relationship with the diaspora can be found aplenty. More serious works are less readily available, and when they are, they are more frequently commentaries on contemporary or perennial Jewish problems than probes into the nature of those problems. Indeed, scholarly works in the field remain at a minimum, rarely encompassing more than conventional historical and demographic research. Even though many of the questions should be obvious, the lack of theory in the field keeps them hidden in a maze of ephemeral materials.

Given the fundamental perspective set forth here—to consider it a theory would be much too premature—a review of the publications of the last two years reveals a number of subcategories of concern which more or less call attention to themselves. Only the most significant publications in each, with emphasis on books rather than periodicals, are cited here.

**Jewish Political Thought**

A number of books deal with the basic principles of Jewish political thought, albeit without quite acknowledging that they do so. In *The Higher Freedom*, David Polish attempts to reinterpret the characteristic "messianic obsession" of the Jewish people for our generation. Rabbi Polish's analysis starts from two traditional premises that also animate Baeck's ideas: that God, Israel, and Torah are tied together in an enduring covenant relationship, and that the rebirth of the State of Israel is "a new turning point in Jewish history" (his subtitle) because it restores the fullness of the union of
the three. The triad is bound together in a kind of "metabolic balance" which must be maintained without unduly emphasizing or minimizing any one of the elements, and which is to be brought about by the Jewish people today through proper deeds. Such deeds range from the revitalization of halakhah to continuing the struggle for universal social justice.

Robert Gordis, in his book *Judaism in a Christian World* and in a lecture at Syracuse University on "Jewish Tradition in the Modern World: Conservation and Renewal," deals with the changing nature of the Jewish community over the past several millennia and, particularly, with the problems of reconstructing that community in our own time. He identifies three major types of Jewish community: the natural community of ancient Israel and the compulsory community of the middle ages, both organic in character, and the voluntary community of today, seeking an organic structure. The first of these communities was self-determining; exclusive in that its membership was easily defined to include those born into it or resident within its territory, and inclusive in the sense that it embraced all aspects of life. The second, while not self-determining, remained exclusive and inclusive in these two ways. Both focused on the linkage between God, Israel, and Torah, and both were Torah-centered. Gordis makes the oft-repeated point that post-emancipation Jewish community life must be voluntary, can barely be exclusive, and cannot be inclusive at all, except in the land of Israel. An analysis of the various attempts at communal reconstruction leads him to a vision of the Jewish community of the future as one resting on voluntary principles that restore some degree of inclusiveness, but, in a way also tending to encourage a partnership with the larger world community.

In *The Case for the Chosen People: The Role of the Jewish People Yesterday and Today*, W. Gunther Plaut clearly reaffirms the thesis that the Jewish people exists for the special task of raising the world's moral level and that they are, indeed, chosen because of God's covenant with Israel at Sinai.

In a sense, *The Legacy of Maurice Pekarsky*, the collected writings of the late Hillel Foundation leader edited by Alfred Jospe, is a continuation of foregoing expositions in a different vein. For Pekarsky was also led to an overweening concern for Jewish community out of his sense of Jewish vocation. His fragmentary writings tie these two themes together within a framework of ostensibly historical and sociological analysis, but which, the careful reader will discover, is really much more than that.

Arthur A. Cohen's "Between Two Traditions" continues this theme in yet other ways. Discussing the Jewish people as a promethean force, he examines the Jewish sages as exemplary heroes for the Jewish world and the larger world of humanity. Jacob Neusner developing similar themes in "City, Society, Self," an essay in his *History and Torah*, describes the ideal Jew as one who participates in society and knows community, and discusses the kind of Jewish education necessary to fit him for both.

The publication of the second edition of Max Kadushin's *The Rabbinic Mind* once again makes available that milestone in the elucidation of the
mode of thought dominating the shapers of normative Judaism. Since so much of the organic thinking of the sages is devoted to problems of public affairs, Kadushin's exposition of the relation between the great Jewish value concepts and the social order provides an important starting point in the study of Jewish political thought. He concerns himself with the balance between society and the individual as part of the essential value structure of Judaism, and, particularly, with the manner in which value concepts endow historic groups with special character and direction.

The Worlds of Norman Salit, a posthumous collection of the sermons and addresses of one of the nation's leading rabbis, edited by Abraham Burstein, reflects a Jewish perception of public affairs at a different level. Salit, the late president of the Synagogue Council of America, described his work in the light of three precepts: Jewish law as the central concern of Jewish public affairs; an abiding concern with political morality, and the combined impact of law and political morality on the life of the community.

There were also several studies on specific aspects of Jewish political thought. David Daube discusses Collaboration with Tyranny in Rabbinic Law and rejects the notion of the legitimacy of tyranny in any form. Gerald J. Blidstein, in "Capital Punishment—The Classic Jewish Discussion" analyzes the meaning of the three Hebrew words for killing and murder according to halakhah and tradition. He concludes that the issue is too complex for simple formulary resolution because, despite the reluctance of later Jewish authorities to inflict the death penalty, there was an equal reluctance to abandon it entirely as a principle. "Crisis Halachah and Heterodoxy Today" publishes with a minimum of comment, responsa of the Hazon Ish and Chief Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook on heresy and the limits of dissent. While generally flexible in response to the needs of the times, both men recognize the legitimacy of setting limits within the framework of Jewish tradition. André Neher's "The Humanism of the Maharal of Prague" opens up the political aspects of that great medieval Jewish leader's universalistic humanism for consideration and further exploration.

A more contemporary note on the state of Jewish political thought was struck in the Commentary symposium "The State of Jewish Belief." Among the questions asked of the representative group of Jewish theologians selected to participate in the symposium was whether, in their view, Judaism advocated or was in tune with any particular political or economic philosophy or system. The answers were instructive. Most of the participants were quick to disclaim direct Jewish endorsement of any particular form of political or economic organization, even those who indicated that they believed that there was some anti-totalitarianism inherent in the Jewish system of thought. A generation ago, such a question would no doubt have elicited support for the idea that Judaism is the equivalent of liberal democracy or socialism. The trend away from the uncritical identification of Judaism with some modern ideology represents a step in the right direction. However, the politically attuned student having some knowledge of Jewish tradition must
necessarily be saddened by the complete failure of American Jewish theologians to recognize significant Jewish political ideas because of a lack of serious exploration of the dimensions of Jewish political thought.

The recent literature of Jewish nationalism seems to reflect the dominant trend of the new generation to seek out the ways in which the Jewish people and Judaism differ from other peoples and religions. This is in sharp contrast to the previous generation which, following the lead of the Zionists and their Reconstructionist associates, sought to minimize such differences. The change in terminology alone is significant. Whereas discussions of Jewish peoplehood and the survival of the Jewish national spirit were couched in sociological terms in the earlier period, a tendency to use theological terms has reemerged in the 1950's and, most particularly, in the 1960's among the new generation of Jews writing here and in Israel. The distinguished Israeli historian J. L. Talmon sums up the new attitude at the very close of his essay "Uniqueness and Universality" in his recent work The Unique and the Universal:

The Jewish historian becomes a kind of martyr in his permanent and anguished intimacy with the mystery of Jewish martyrdom and survival. Whether he be orthodox in belief or has discarded all religious practice, he cannot help but be sustained by a faith which can neither be proved nor disproved. I believe that notwithstanding all the vexations and entanglements caused by emergency and inescapable necessity—also reminiscent, by the way, of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah—Israel will one day be spiritually significant and in conjunction with the Jewish diaspora, spiritually effective in the world. History would somehow make no sense otherwise.

Perhaps the most significant scholarly discussion of the positive aspects of Jewish nationalism and its corollaries of chosenness and uniqueness to appear recently is Frederick M. Barnard's "Herder and Israel." Barnard points out that Johann Gottfried Herder, the 18th century German philosopher, viewed Israel as a model of the proper synthesis of nationalism and peoplehood. Herder emerges as a major delineator of the political in Jewish civilization who understood the intimate linkages between the political and the religious in Judaism. His political interest in the organic or community form of political organization found expression in a study of Hebrew poetry, Vom Geist der ebraischen Poesie ("The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry"). Herder views Moses as the creator of a nation who, by federating 12 republics into a polity based on the rule of law (Herder calls it a nomocracy), created the model social order. He compares Israel to the Swiss confederation of his age and discovers five essential determinates for proper development of national spirit: 1) a land that is the people's common heritage; 2) a constitutional covenant, freely entered into by the population, that leads to a commonly accepted law; 3) a common language and folk tradition; 4) an emphasis on family cohesion fostered and perpetuated by 5) deep reverence for the common forefathers of the nation. All these factors he finds to be preeminently present in the political history of Israel. Of these, he says, language is of first importance as the underlying tie that binds the polity. Herder found particu-
larly attractive the combination in Israel of an organic social order which enhanced the opportunities for community, with a political order that provided for the distribution of power among many centers.

If Jewish political thought has been on the ascendency in the last few years, the number of Jewish thinkers specifically oriented towards politics has declined. Most of the men cited in these pages do not consider themselves political philosophers, but deal with the political either explicitly or implicitly because it is so much a part of life. Only during the heyday of the Zionist revolution did there arise from the ranks of the Jewish people political thinkers who concentrated on Jewish political problems as such. As the Zionist revolution fades into history, such men become more difficult to find.

Charles H. Freundlich's Peretz Smolenskin, His Life and Thought treats one of the famous figures of turn-of-the-century Zionism. Jonathan Frankel writes penetratingly of "The Communist Rabbi: Moses Hess," the first real political theorist of modern Zionism, who viewed the Jews' return to their land as a "messianic act," a major step toward creation of a new world order founded on proper national, social, and moral principles.

There is a certain kind of intellectualizing that frequently passes as Jewish political thought by which Jews seek to confirm as "Jewish," beliefs derived first from outside Jewish tradition. In the last few years most of this kind of political thinking has been directed towards the great issues of world peace, particularly as they center on the struggle in Vietnam. The very range of such statements reflects the variety of views seeking support within Jewish tradition. On one extreme, there has emerged a group of Jewish pacifists who justify their pacifism as being in the mainstream of Judaism. While Erich Fromm is perhaps the best known of these, Rabbi Everett E. Gendler has recently come to the fore as a more authentic Jewish voice. Perhaps his best recent statement is the one published in "therefore chose life," which was prepared for the convocation on ways to peace held by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of Santa Barbara in New York in 1965. Nearly as polemical is Steven S. Schwarzchild's "The Religious Demand for Peace." In a frankly pacifist argument he concludes that, since God is radically for peace, religion must also be. A more balanced statement on the Vietnam situation is Judaism and World Peace, the record of the study conference sponsored by the Synagogue Council of America in February 1966.

Abraham Joshua Heschel summarizes his recent thoughts in the realm of social action in a new book, The Insecurity of Freedom: Essays on Human Existence which presents his general approach to understanding mankind and man's relations with God in a social context. In a very different way, Ellis Rifkin turns his attention to contemporary problems in an article "The Internal City: Judaism and Urbanization."

At least one recent work raises the very serious question of how Jewish tradition can be related to the political problems of the day. Richard J. Israel in "Jewish Tradition and Political Action" rightly points out that "Biblical
and Halachic traditions are no longer generating the kind of continuing guidance that we need for the world in which we live.” But because tradition “gives us a chance to stand back from our totally contemporary perspective and view our problems with other eyes,” it may still have the potentiality for developing in this direction. In effect, Rabbi Israel joins a small but growing chorus calling for the revival of serious Jewish political thought.

**Religious Movements and Public Persuasions**

Regardless of the significance of political thought in the larger framework of Jewish public affairs, the public life of the American Jewish community is increasingly oriented toward the religious movements as the institutional embodiments of the public persuasions of American Jews. The term “public persuasions” is used advisedly. While religion in America is commonly conceived to be primarily concerned with the private sphere, institutionalized Jewish religion is, in fact, overwhelmingly a reflection of public persuasions rather than private behavior or belief. Only a small percentage of Jews who are formally affiliated with any of the Jewish religious movements conduct their private lives according to the patterns prescribed by those movements. Hence, institutional affiliation reflects the kinds of public commitments which Jews wish to make and tells us little about the state of their personal lives as Jews.

These institutionalized public persuasions regularly receive a great deal of attention which is reflected in a wide range of publications. In the period under consideration here, three books appeared which examine in the conventional manner the panorama of public persuasions on the American scene: Joseph L. Blau’s *Modern Varieties of Judaism*, Benjamin Efron, ed., *Currents and Trends in Contemporary Jewish Thought*, and Ira Eisenstein, ed., *Varieties of Jewish Beliefs*. The periodical literature is no more rewarding. A number of articles sought ways and means to transcend the spreading denominationalism in Jewish life and to find a higher ground of common Jewish endeavor. Even they do not represent any new thinking but, rather, continue a line of thought and concern that has persisted in the United States for several generations.

**Orthodoxy**

The record of the emergence of a vital Orthodox movement since the end of World War II, with many and variegated strands representing a wide spectrum of views, finally broke into print in 1965. Charles S. Liebman’s article “Orthodoxy in American Jewish Life” is not only symptomatic of the new wave of Orthodox writing, but provides by far the best picture of the movement in its diversity. A second article by Liebman, “Left and Right in American Orthodoxy,” distinguishes between what are, in effect, three Orthodox approaches: the Modern Orthodox emphasizing the maintenance of Orthodox ritual practices side by side with a full commitment to modern society and its general values; the right-wing seeking the perpetuation of
traditional Judaism by developing isolated and tightly knit communities that hold themselves aloof from all non-Orthodox Jews; and the new Orthodox left wing, modern in its involvements but particularistic in its values, that wants Jewish law extended into contemporary social, political, and economic realms, not necessarily by modifying it or making it lenient, but by making it relevant to the concerns of our day.

In “Orthodox Judaism in a World of Revolutionary Transformations” Eliezer Berkovits speaks for the Orthodox left when he criticizes Orthodox obscurantism and provincialism and calls for the increased involvement of Orthodox Jews and Orthodox Judaism in the problems of the day through Jewish law and tradition.

Most of the material on the new Orthodoxy can be found in Jewish Life and Tradition, the two major periodicals of the modern Orthodox; but increasingly the non-Orthodox Jewish press has come to recognize the phenomenon as significant to their readership as well. Jacob Neusner discusses “The New Orthodox Left” in Conservative Judaism, essentially an analysis of, and reply to, Liebman’s study and his earlier review of Moshe Davis’ book, The Emergence of Conservative Judaism. The discussion was continued by Liebman.

CONSERVATISM

If the thrust of Orthodox thought in the past two years has been to raise questions of greater involvement in the world and the larger Jewish community, the Conservative movement has turned further inward. Continuing a trend begun some years ago, Conservative Jewish writers have been trying to emphasize the special historical roots of their movement that have helped make it a unique entity. Led primarily by rabbis and scholars, the major voices articulating this position have found their organ in Conservative Judaism which has been growing in importance. Neusner’s article has already been cited. In a similar piece by Abraham J. Karp, “The Origins of Conservative Judaism,” the accepted view is clearly enunciated:

The roots of Conservative Judaism are in the tradition. Its beginnings are in the rediscovery of authentic Judaism by 19th century Jewish scholarship, which disclosed the evolving, dynamic nature of Judaism. Those who exposed themselves to this scholarship soon found that the new knowledge influenced their understanding of the nature and demands of Judaism.

The new knowledge of the history of Judaism, Karp continues, revealed that “Judaism was influenced by the environment in which the Jewish people lived, and by their historical experience.” At times “the environment influenced the mode of living and the religious ritual expression,” and at other times, “the challenge was to ideology.” From this, the founders of the Conservative movement drew a dynamic picture of Jewish tradition and embarked on their course of adjusting the inheritance of tradition to the needs of new times.

On another plane, the conception of Conservative uniqueness has encour-
aged a drive for a greater separatism within the community. Whereas in the past, the Conservative synagogues frequently were the most identified with communal institutions of an educational and Zionist nature, today a strong drive exists for the reconcentration of all Jewish activities within the synagogues themselves. Perhaps the most extreme published expression of that view is Rabbi Jack Schechter's "Primer for a Revolution" outlining ways and means for Conservative institutions to take over functions previously shared as communal ones, even in the welfare field.

REFORM

The 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) led to a spate of evaluative and historical discussions of the development of Reform Judaism in the United States and the world. CCAR, itself, sponsored a volume *Retrospect and Prospect*, edited by Bertram W. Korn, which includes ten articles discussing various phases of the Reform movement and CCAR since 1889. Sidney L. Regner, in an historical article, notes the failure to unite Orthodox and Reform rabbis at the very inception of CCAR, the sectional basis of the organization in its early days, and its increasing self-definition as an advisory rather than a decision-making body within the context of the Reform movement. Bernard J. Bamberger, in an outline of the theological developments of the past 75 years, traces the problem of authority from the early attempts to call a synod for theological definition, to the present situation where CCAR serves primarily as a forum for theological debate. His discussion of trends and problems with which the Reform rabbis have dealt is almost a catalog of the modern concerns of organized religion.

Two articles in the volume, discussing social action, are Roland B. Gittelsohn, "The Conference Stand on Social Justice and Civil Rights" and Eugene Lipman, "The Conference Considers Relations between Religion and the State." In light of the recent discussions of the need to reevaluate the Jewish position on church and state (p. 91ff.), Lipman provides some valuable information on the development of radical separatism as a virtual dogma within the Reform movement. Arthur J. Lelyveld's "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World" and David Max Eichhorn's "The Conference and the Organized American Jewish Community" delineate Reform Judaism's growing concern with Jewish community in a more traditional sense. The thrust of the volume in its entirety, which is at least a quasi-official statement of the dominant views among the articulate leadership of the Reform movement, is that the traditional concerns of Jewish community in the sense of peoplehood, problems of authority, and the role of Jewish law, have increasingly come to the fore, in particular since the end of World War II.

This view is substantially confirmed in W. Gunther Plaut's *The Growth of Reform Judaism*, a companion volume to his book *The Rise of Reform Judaism*. It chronicles the development of the Reform movement until 1948.
through a judiciously edited selection of sources, interwoven with sensitive and useful commentary by the compiler. Plaut, who stands in the right wing of Reform Judaism and is known to be an advocate of the restoration of Jewish law and observance within Reform ranks, has also become the best historian of Reform of our time.

Other histories of the Reform movement and its impact appeared recently. Stephen Steinberg's "Reform Judaism: The Origin and Evolution of a Church Movement" traces the history of the Reform movement with the tools of modern sociology. Lucy S. Dawidowicz in "When Reform Was Young" sees the rise of Reform as a revolt against European Orthodoxy, parallel to a similar revolt among American Protestants at the time. Within a small Jewish community, numbering somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 Jews in 1846, with only 40 congregations staffed by four rabbis having very little Jewish learning, the Reform movement demonstrated its revolutionary character in its efforts to decommunalize Judaism and make Jewish religion a private matter. The low level of education of its leaders, even those coming from Europe, corresponded to the increasing prevalence of uneducated ministers in the Protestant churches. Reform’s emphasis on the Decalogue as embodying all that was necessary in Jewish law, its emphasis on subordinating Judaism to Americanism, its social optimism and emphasis on America as the chosen land, all ran parallel to similar views in mid-19th century frontier Protestantism. The author observes that pioneer Reform rabbis zealously goaded partly-observant Jews into nonobservance and elevated nonobservance into doctrinal antinomianism. Highly critical of Isaac Mayer Wise, the author develops the thesis that Wise looked to a nondoctrinal universal religion based on Jewish principles, and that his efforts to mold Reform Judaism ultimately pointed to that end. This, in the author’s view, also accounts for Wise’s militantly separationist stand on church-state relations. Wise was, perhaps, the first Jewish leader to attack the notion of the United State as a Christian nation. In doing so, he started the development of the present radical position on church-state separation, which is dominant in the contemporary Jewish community and still finds many of its most articulate spokesmen in Reform circles.

The author’s thesis draws support from two other articles that appeared at approximately the same time. John J. Appel writing about “The Trefa Banquet” held in 1883 that completed the split between Reform and non-Reform elements in American Judaism, concludes that Wise was not the moderate reformer he is conventionally made out to be, but “a doctrinaire Reformer zealous to bring Judaism into one with American customs and apparently blind to the fact that attacks on others’ habits and preferences are bound to create controversies which appeals to reason cannot resolve.” This analysis is further confirmed in a review of Wise’s editorial writings. Walter Jacob concludes in “Isaac Mayer Wise’s Views on Christianity” that “Wise was not satisfied with reforming Judaism, but sought also to reshape Christianity and
to demonstrate that the new Christianity led directly to the Judaism of the future.'

A more sympathetic view of Wise and the Reform movement is presented in James G. Heller's biography, *Isaac M. Wise*. Arthur Gilbert's "Reform Judaism in America" emphasizes the role of the Reform movement and CCAR in the social sphere, and the fight against antisemitism. He traces the history of the movement from its 19th century central European origins. In doing so, he also tends to confirm the Dawidowicz hypothesis that the Reform concern with "individualism in theology, experimentalism in liturgy, anticlericalism, and denominationalism" fits in well with the American scene and reinforces the links between Reform Judaism and "the voluntaristic, nonecclesiastical character of American religiosity."

Two important spokesmen for Reform Judaism, one of the preceding and the other of the present generation, also published significant statements. Julian Morgenstern, president emeritus of the Hebrew Union College and a leading advocate of Reform in the 1920's and 1930's, presents a major review of his philosophy of Jewish life, with special emphasis on the relationship of Reform Judaism to the Zionist idea, in "What Are We Jews?" Though more moderate than the views he espoused when he was at the height of his influence, Morgenstern is still close to classical Reform's position on the Jewish community. Jakob J. Petuchowski, on the other hand, in "The Limits of Liberal Judaism" reflects the more popular contemporary view of the importance of Jewish community by asking, "How much Liberal deviation is still compatible with the basic Jewish commitment to revelation and law?" He concludes that the basic Jewish commitments still stand as the measure of things Jewish, and that liberalism must be considered, to a certain extent at least, a deviation and must be limited accordingly.

In the area of more purely sociological considerations, Norman L. Friedman's study of social prestige and Reform Judaism, "German Lineage and Reform Affiliation: American Jewish Prestige Criteria in Transition" is an attempt to document the changes in patterns of Reform membership since the end of World War II.

**RECONSTRUCTIONISM**

Since the early 1960's, Reconstructionism has been making strides toward becoming a full-fledged fourth movement on the American Jewish scene. It has been limited in doing so only by the lack of congregations interested in formally affiliating with it. This transformation from intellectual movement to institutionalized organization has been reflected in the pages of *The Reconstructionist*. For thirty years a major intellectual voice in the Jewish community because of its concern for all things Jewish from the broadest perspective, *The Reconstructionist* has, in recent years, become increasingly a "highbrow" house organ, devoted more and more to expounding Reconstructionist doctrine rather than inviting the expression of a wide range of views. Thus, while the volume of material on Reconstructionism as an ideology and
a movement remains great, perhaps even greater than that produced by the other movements, little, if any, new thought has emerged in the last two years. Rather, there has been a succession of reworkings of Mordecai M. Kaplan's ideas, both by Kaplan and by his disciples and heirs.

ZIONIST AND SECULAR VIEWS

While the public persuasions dominant in American Jewish life today are increasingly those espoused by and reflected through the religious movements, there remain some bastions of secularism and autonomous Zionism in the United States, offering optional persuasions with organizational components for those who do not find themselves even nominally at home within the religious structure. A review of the literature tends to reaffirm the essential dormancy of independent secularist and Zionist persuasions. A few secularist and even more Zionist magazines and journals continue to publish, but generally confine themselves to reprinting speeches restating established points of view, or articles applying unmodified canons of analysis to the crises of the moment.

Standing outside of the mainstream of the movements are men whose task it is constantly to redefine the perennial questions of Jewish life. While frequently philosophers in a technical sense, they are equally concerned with shaping public attitudes at the persuasional level. In the past few years, the significant writers in this field have tended to take their direction from the works of Franz Rosenzweig (or other colleagues from the famous Lehrhaus, particularly Martin Buber). Rosenzweig's influence was clearly manifest in the Commentary symposium (pp. 184–85), as Milton Himmelfarb pointed out in his introduction to it. Maurice Friedman describes this group in his article, "The New Jew," who is defined "not by what he is but by what he must respond to." Therefore, what holds modern Jews together is their confrontation with a common situation, no matter how varied their responses to it. The direction of the new Jews is away from destroying old meanings and towards discovering new ones on every ground from social justice to the inner-light, meanings which flow from "an existential confrontation with the Hebrew Bible—not as an object of antiquarian interest but as the real ground and source of Judaism."

The emergence of this group, whose adherents cut across the established "denominational" lines, as an embryonic community as well as an intellectual force has given rise to widespread feeling in certain quarters that Jewish life in the United States is becoming polarized into two groups—the highly observant and the essentially nonobservant. The inference here is that the older public persuasions, which held Jews of different levels of observance within some kind of common framework, are being eroded by the public consequences of private indifference. Among Jews who observe, a common public persuasion is emerging, regardless of their formal ties with Orthodoxy, Conservatism, Reform, or anything else, while among Jews who do not observe, a similarly shared pattern is developing, regardless of their affiliation.
The two-sided notion of covenant and tradition, and its implications that Jews cannot simply accept the course of events in the modern world without raising critical voices as to the ultimate value of certain of the thrusts of modernism, is increasingly the common property of the first group. However, for the great majority of American Jews, including the great majority of synagogue members, the subordination of everything Jewish to the demands of modernism is becoming the characteristic pattern. The potential meaning of this polarization has been best evinced in the pages of Judaism. That journal has become the most outspoken voice of the younger generation of committed Jews, regardless of the nuances of their own belief patterns, and also the outlet for much of the most promising writing in the field of Jewish public affairs.

Defining the Boundaries of Jewish Society

The problem of defining the boundaries of Jewish society is a particularly modern one in Jewish history. While the question of who is a Jew is raised in every corner of the Jewish world, it is especially alive in the United States where freedom of choice is not only a theoretical phenomenon, but an immediately practical reality faced almost on a day-to-day basis by millions of Jews. The collection of "responsa" published in Jewish Identity, edited by Sidney Hoenig, treats the problem at its most universal level. Developed in answer to David Ben-Gurion’s query of the leaders of world Jewry about "Who is a Jew" in light of the problem of registering as Jews children of mixed marriages in Israel, the responsa cover the entire range of contemporary Jewish thought, with all its problems and contradictions. As was to be expected, the opinions were only advisory in character, with no definitive statement emerging even from the halakhists. The underlying positions taken in those responsa are effectively summarized by Stephen Steinberg in his article, “The Anatomy of Jewish Identification: A Historical and Theoretical View.” After discussing the problem of obtaining agreement on what precisely it means to be a Jew, Steinberg outlines five dimensions that can be tested empirically: the racial, religious, communalistic, secularistic, and intellectual.

The problem of defining the boundaries of the Jewish people has been complicated by the addition of a new wrinkle in the post World War II era: the problem of conversion to Judaism. If the new freedom of the 20th century in matters religious and ethnic serves to weaken the attachments of many Jews to their faith and people, by the same token it also opens up, for the first time in a millenium or more, possibilities for non-Jews to be added to the fold in significant numbers. Indeed, whereas in the past marriages between Jew and non-Jew almost invariably meant the loss of the Jew to Jewish life, today it is equally possible to bring the non-Jewish partner into the Jewish fold, if the Jewish partner so desires. The most reliable figures in recent studies of intermarriage show that at least one-third of all intermar-
riages result in the conversion of the non-Jewish partner to Judaism. Moreover, an increasing number of non-Jews seek to become Jews for reasons of belief. In recent years some Jewish groups have taken cognizance of this, and have even initiated efforts to bring information to potential converts in the non-Jewish world. The recent major work on this subject is *Conversion to Judaism*, edited by David Max Eichhorn, a comprehensive review of the theoretical and practical implications of conversion as discussed in classical Jewish sources. Included are not only biblical and talmudic references, but historical accounts of both individual and group conversions to Judaism in the past, as well as analyses of the phenomenon of conversion in the contemporary period by a psychologist, a sociologist, and a theologian.

In a more philosophical vein, Monford Harris discusses “On Marrying Outside One’s Existence.” He seeks to explain why otherwise nonobservant and apparently uninterested Jews react so violently to their children’s marriage outside of the covenant. Harris concludes that most Jews remain committed to covenantal Jewish existence, even if subconsciously, despite their lapses from actively living up to the terms of the covenant. But the child who intermarries “cuts the link that binds the generations” in their covenant relationship.

Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldschneider report on a study of intermarriage in the Greater Providence area in “Social and Demographic Aspects of Jewish Intermarriages.” It indicates a much lower incidence of intermarriage than either the Iowa or the Washington, D.C. studies, which received much attention.

Turning to the more technical literature of Jewish group identification, two items in particular deserve mention. Jack Rothman’s monograph *Minority Group Identification and Intergroup Relations: An Examination of Kurt Lewin’s Theory of Jewish Group Identity*, published by Research Institute for Group Work in Jewish Agencies in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee, is one of the volumes of the Jewish Group Life Research Publications program. It attempts to concretize and analyze some of the propositions on the subject which have been dominant in sociological thinking since the publication of Lewin’s works.

In an historical note, “Heroes, Heretics and Hidalgoes,” Allen D. Corré discusses the reasons for Baruch Spinoza’s excommunication by the Amsterdam Jewish community, making a serious point about the character of Jewish group consciousness. He rejects the conventional explanation—that the community wished to disassociate itself from Spinoza because his “seemingly atheistic tendencies” might have offended the Christian community, with which the Jews were anxious to preserve good relations—and offers a more profound one. Had the Amsterdam Jews, almost all of whom were Marranos or the children of the Marranos, ignored Spinoza’s attack on Judaism, Corré contends, they would have undermined the whole meaning of the Marranos’ martyrdom in Spain and Portugal and demeaned the reasons for their flight to strange lands where they could live freely as Jews. This positive interpre-
tation is perhaps more in keeping with the concern of the Jews for a meaning-
ful definition of their existence as Jews than is the "anti-defamational or intergroup relational" approach found in conventional histories.

**Political Culture**

One of the most significant factors shaping the responses of Jews to the needs, demands, and problems of Jewish public life is their dominant political culture—the underlying pattern of their orientations towards politics, the community, and public issues. Elsewhere, this writer has posited that the Jews have a moralistic political culture. That is to say, they look to public affairs as a means for achieving a better way of life and have correspondingly high expectations, both of their leaders who must be responsible to the community and its largest goals, and of the members of the community who are expected to maintain a high level of involvement in public life.

In this vein, Milton Himmelfarb's discussion of "The Jew: Subject or Object" is an attempt to understand the essentially moralistic response of the Jews (he uses the term "public regardingness") in light of their overall relationship to the larger political process as a result of their exclusion from certain kinds of political participation during the years of exile. The Zionist view, presented with great force in the last two generations, is that the Jews existed for seventeen centuries as political objects because they were stateless, political slaves of majorities in the various countries in the diaspora. Among the elements of the dominant political culture among Jews, as identified by Himmelfarb, are "an actively positive attitude toward society and community, growing out of their life in their own society and community; and a potentially positive attitude toward government, growing out of a Jewish tradition that affirms the worth of government and out of their strong feelings for the social and communal. . . ." Himmelfarb concludes that even during their exclusion from the political life of their host countries, the Jews were "already civic," and simply "wanted to be citizens." Pursuing the idea of political culture in a different direction, Herman Israel argues in "Some Influences of Hebraic Culture on Modern Social Organization" that Jewish tradition, by its very nature, promotes the limitation and diffusion of authority and that the social organization of modern western society is a direct result of the influence of biblical concepts on the Puritans, first in England and then in the United States and elsewhere. The study of the political culture of the Jews is barely recognized as a field for inquiry. The points raised by Himmelfarb and Israel are suggestive but hardly exhaustive, and the problems they implicitly pose will require much careful consideration.

**Political Behavior**

The political culture of the Jews leads directly to certain kinds of political behavior, both within the Jewish community and in relationship to the larger
society. The few articles exploring Jewish political behavior which were published in the past two years, all tend to confine themselves to particular causes and deal with the larger question only indirectly. Thus, Nathan Glazer writing on “Jews and Poverty” is primarily concerned that Jewish organizations have not taken a more active role in the war on poverty. In discussing their proper role, he elucidates the great Jewish achievements in the field of voluntary organization, which he pinpoints as reflections of the very fabric of Jewish life. He advocates a specifically Jewish contribution to the war on poverty in the form of an “aid program which teaches how to build institutions—nurseries, schools, counseling agencies, child care agencies, businesses, trade organizations.” Perhaps more typical is Charles F. Wittenstein’s “Jews, Justice and Liberalism” discussing the record of Jews as liberals and of their overall participation in the civil-rights movement. J. L. Talmon considers “The Jewish Intellectual in Politics” from a somewhat more detached and scholarly point of view, analyzing the intellectuals’ political behavior in the past century in light of tendencies in Jewish political culture.

**Political Organization**

In recent years there has been an increase in scholarly efforts to understand the nature of Jewish political organization, both past and contemporary. In a sense, this concern, much of which emanates from Israel, reflects a transcending of the Zionist view that the Jews had no political life except when they lived in an independent state of their own. Contemporary studies seek to explore the varieties of Jewish political organization during periods of independence, autonomy, and even nominal dependence. A number of good political histories emphasizing this point were published in 1965–1966, including the second volume of Yitzhak Baer’s monumental *The History of the Jews in Christian Spain*. While not exclusively political in orientation, Baer’s study deals extensively with the political concerns of the Jews of the Spanish kingdoms, focusing sharply on the role of Jewish political institutions in shaping Jewish life. In *Urban Civilization in Pre-Crusade Europe: A Study of Organized Town Life in Northeastern Europe During the 10th and 11th Centuries Based on the Responsa Literature*, Irving A. Agus does much the same thing for the French and German Jewish communities. While more broadly oriented than the Baer study, Agus’s work demonstrates how the use of responsa has opened up new vistas in research into the character of Jewish public affairs and the functioning of the Jewish community.

Mark Wischnitzer’s posthumous work, *A History of Jewish Crafts and Guilds*, is another book which, though not political in approach, adds to knowledge of Jewish public affairs, primarily in the Middle Ages. In documenting the socio-corporative nature of Jewish guilds and their relationship to Jewish congregational organization, Wischnitzer highlights the penchant for a particular kind of corporate polity, akin to Baeck’s “congregational republic,” which has characterized the Jewish approach to public affairs for
millennia. The continued existence throughout history of a Jewish artisan
class with its own internal corporate and congregational structure, side by
side with other elements in the Jewish community, not only dispels the myth
that Jews did not work with their hands until the restoration of Israel, but
also throws much light on how Jews combined work and community in order
to preserve both the free status of individuals and the organic character of
the social order.

All three works reflect the uniquely Jewish synthetic approach to polity
formation and maintenance, one which combines the various elements of
living into an organic political whole. As Baeck points out, this pattern stem-
mimg from the inseparability of religious and political concerns that was
established in ancient Israel, fully prevails today in Israel's rural settlements.
As Martin Buber noted in his study of the kibbutz, Paths to Utopia, both the
kibbutz and the moshav embody this combination of political and socio-
economic organization for essentially utopian ends. It is discussed also in
Melford E. Spiro's Children of the Kibbutz, reissued in 1965 by Schocken
as a paperback, and in Boris Stern's The Kibbutz That Was which evaluates
kibbutz achievements and the social and political impact of the kibbutz on
Israeli society. Indeed, the kibbutz remains the most popular Jewish political
creation from a publishing standpoint. Among other important discussions in
the last two years are Growing up in the Kibbutz by A. Rabin; The Economy
of the Israeli Kibbutz by Eliyahu Kanovsky; "Utopia and Politics: The Case
of the Israel Kibbutz" by the political scientist Allen Arian; "The Changing
World of the Kibbutz" by Allen D. Crown, and "The Changing Kibbutz" by
Ronald Sanders.

Reading through the material on political organization, the astute observer
immediately senses connections between covenant theory and communal gov-
ernment in Jewish life, even after the biblical period. This connection is made
more explicit by Martin P. Golding in "The Juridical Basis of Communal
Associations in Medieval Rabbinic Legal Thought." He discusses institution-
alization, by membership consent, of the medieval communities which thereby
acquired the powers of the ancient courts under Jewish law.

The writings on the political organization of the American Jewish commu-
nity pose difficulties unprecedented in the literature of earlier Jewish com-
munal experience. There is an almost total absence of significant research
into the operation of the organized Jewish community in the United States.
Most published materials are collections of simple demographic data, cata-
logues of the numerous organizations and their interconnections, or polemical
works discussing immediate problems of organized Jewish life. The occa-
sional pieces going beyond these categories are almost invariably historical
accounts. An important piece of historical research is Zosa Szajkowski's
"Jewish Relief in Eastern Europe, 1914–1917" which discusses the ideologi-
cal conflicts that developed out of the attempt to organize American Jewish
relief to European Jews in World War I.
Public Law

A subfield of direct concern in the study of Jewish public affairs is Jewish public law. This branch of Jewish law, long the major consideration of Talmudic students, has fallen into a state of some disrepair in the last two generations, with the completion of Jewish emancipation and the destruction of the last remaining corporate Jewish communities in the diaspora. Today, outside of Israel, students and scholars at best devote themselves to the laws regarding the status of Jews within the Jewish community but even this is confined to a relatively small group. In Israel, on the other hand, there is something of a revival of concern with Jewish public law as many Israelis, both in the religious camp and outside, seek to find ways to build the law of the new state upon Jewish jurisprudential precedents. Consequently, most of the published material dealing with Jewish public law appears in Hebrew and is outside the scope of this article. In general, it reflects the search for ways and means to adapt Talmudic precedents to contemporary situations and the ambivalence of those engaged in the enterprise.

The scholarly study of Jewish law as a system of jurisprudence has also been growing. Perhaps the most notable work in this field is Boaz Cohen's *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*, a major step forward in the comparative study of the very fundamentals of Jewish law. In a more popular vein, Samuel K. Mirsky's article, "Jewish Codes" presents a history of Jewish codes, together with an analysis of their purposes and a veiled appeal for the development of a new code within the framework of *halakhah*.

Communal Institutions

If little is available in the way of a general discussion of American Jewish communal organization, there is considerably more material on its various basic institutions. Here too, the material tends to be polemical rather than analytical, journalistic rather than scholarly. The exceptions are worth noting.

The closest thing to an umbrella institution on the American Jewish scene is the Jewish welfare federation, or its equivalent. The role of the federation as more than a fund-raising agency is just now being recognized. In this context, Ben Halpern, an excellent scholar in the field, discusses "Federations and the Community" in an article based on a working paper he prepared for the 1964 general assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the national "federation of federations." His approach is, in many respects, typical of the new-found concern for expanding the role of the federation as the heart of the local Jewish community, with responsibility for the range of vital communal services.

Mannheim S. Shapiro has written extensively on this and related questions in the last few years. In "Dilemmas of Jewish Agencies—Real and Unreal," he speaks with the authoritative voice of an insider about the problems facing Jewish agencies in light of the changing general society. He makes the useful
distinction between agencies which are concerned with the Jews as a group and those dealing primarily with individual Jews. He leads us to the question every agency must face, namely, what is distinctively Jewish and how agencies are responsible for dealing with it. In an earlier article, "The Role of Jewish Communal Agencies in Maintaining Jewish Identity," Shapiro speaks of the communal agency's new role which is no longer simply to bring relief to people made conscious of their Jewishness by external forces, but to stimulate Jewish consciousness in order to create the clientele they are to serve. Jacob Neusner takes a somewhat similar approach from the perspective of a "religionist" in his pamphlet, *Jewish Education and Culture and the Jewish Welfare Fund.*

Looking at another institution, Arthur Hertzberg sparked a great controversy with his article, "The Changing American Rabbinate." Himself a rabbi, Hertzberg argues that the rabbinate today is at an historic turning point because the American rabbi has ceased to be judge and leader, and has become a religious functionary in the more narrow Protestant sense. Viewing the traditional concerns of the rabbinate as increasingly peripheral to American Jewish life, Hertzberg concludes: "There are no great individual rabbinic careers, because there are no shared Jewish purposes on the American scene grand enough to evoke them."

The role of the Jewish community center has also come in for reevaluation in recent years. Herbert Millman's thesis in "The Jewish Community Center as an Arm of the Organized Jewish Community" is that in the highly diverse American society, "the sense of Jewish community is given significant expression, principally through the federation and the functional agencies established to serve the total Jewish community," and that the Jewish community center has been "particularly identified" as working closely with the federation "in nurturing the concept of community." Millman notes, however, that the Jewish communal purpose of the center needs greater clarity of emphasis and definition. Morris Levin also examines "Social Change and the Jewish Center," and in a similar, but longer, work Graemum Berger takes the center position a step further to argue that it is, or should be, a fourth force in American Jewish life, as indicated by the title of his book, *The Jewish Community Center: A Fourth Force in American Jewish Life.* Berger suggests, in effect, that the community center become the congregation of the new secularists.

The problem of Jewish communal organization and services in the open American society with its increasingly activist government has come in for considerable attention at this time of the "Great Society." The publication of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, *The Jewish Community Faces the Great Society: Implications for Jewish Communal Service; A Symposium* brings together some views of this problem. Ben Halpern discusses one aspect in "Sectarianism and the Jewish Community" and Arnold Aronson writes about another in "Sectarianism in the American Society Today: Impact on Jewish Communal Services."
In a very different vein are the historical studies of Jewish communal and political institutions. Perhaps the major one to appear in the past two years is Hugo Mantel's *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin*. Though primarily concerned with the development and workings of Jewish legal institutions, this volume sheds considerable light on the political role of the Sanhedrin at various stages of its existence.

**Jewish Public Welfare Institutions**

A major share of the attention given to Jewish public affairs throughout Jewish history has focused on institutions serving the public welfare in various assistance, relief, and rehabilitation capacities. In our own time, the work of these institutions has often constituted the virtual totality of Jewish public affairs in the diaspora, and their problems are therefore of special import in the study of Jewish public affairs. *Trends and Issues in Jewish Social Welfare in the United States, 1899–1958*, edited by Robert Morris and Michael Freund, can be considered the first comprehensive review of Jewish public welfare in this country as an independent communal activity. In commemoration of its 50th anniversary in 1966, JWB sponsored the publication of a volume by Oscar Janowsky and others, *Change and Challenge; the History of Fifty Years of JWB*. Similarly, Oscar Handlin authored *A Continuing Task: The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1914–1964*, a short history to commemorate the agency's 50 years of overseas relief, rehabilitation, and education work.

One of the more scholarly studies of local welfare institutions is Arnold Gurin's *The Functions of a Sectarian Welfare Program in a Multi-Group Society: A Case Study of the Jewish Welfare Federation of Detroit*. "Organized Jewish Welfare Activity in New York City (1848–1860)" by Nathan M. Kaganoff examines the incorporation papers filed by social welfare organizations with the City of New York during that period, a potential source of important material on Jewish institutional development in the United States.

**Organizations and Interest Groups**

The structure of Jewish community life in America would not be complete without considering the role of Jewish organizations, both national and local. A few exceptionally significant items published in 1965–1966 place Jewish organizational life in a larger perspective. Edward Grusd, editor of B’nai B’rith’s *National Jewish Monthly*, wrote a comprehensive history of *B’nai B’rith; Story of a Covenant*, the chronicle of the first great nonpolitical international organization for Jews from its beginnings in 1844. Gus Tyler's "The Legacy of the Jewish Labor Movement" examines another facet of Jewish organizational life, albeit one which is dying. Although, as he says, "Yiddish—the mark of the old Jewish labor movement—is almost a dead language" in the American labor movement of today, "the ideals of social
unionism, with which that same movement was identified are today as lively a language as ever.” Raw material for Jewish organizational history is provided in two jubilee volumes: *Arbeiter Ring: The Strivings and Achievements* and *The Federation of Jewish Women’s Organizations of Maryland, 1916–1966*, the latter being one of the few state-level organizational histories available to students of American Jewry.

**Civic Education**

It is generally agreed that one of the major functions of Jewish educational institutions is to foster what might properly be called civic education. Indeed, it can be shown that, in the United States, the increased interest of Jewish welfare federations in Jewish education is in direct proportion to federation leaders’ concern with the problems of civic education. A particular problem is the lack of commitment by the younger generations of Jews, a commitment necessary for the continuation of the federations’ operations, and of their related agencies and programs. Therefore civic education, whether defined as the kind of “Torah education” designed to produce an Orthodox “citizen,” or the kind of “peoplehood”-oriented education of other groups, ranks very high on the agenda of Jewish public affairs today. The literature of civic education is becoming a vast one, ranging in content from discussions of proper curricula, to questions of first premises, to studies of the receptivity of the population that is to be educated.

One of the best starting points for reading in the field is *Judaism and the Jewish School*, edited by Judah Pilch and Meir Ben-Horin, an anthology of the works of 45 authors published over the past 50 years, which covers the several schools of thought underlying Jewish education in the United States.

Parallel to these ideological considerations is the double debate over the form and control of Jewish education, centering on two questions: the degree of communal responsibility, and the day school versus the afternoon Hebrew school. The most important recent statement on the first is the *Jewish Education* symposium on “The Jewish Community School.” Its contributors include supporters and opponents of community schools which they visualize in different ways. Also of interest is the article “Jewish Education and the Community” by Louis Kaplan, one of the deans of Jewish education in the United States.

Alvin Irwin Schiff’s volume, *The Jewish Day School in America*, provides us with an optimistic history and survey of the day school movement. Unfortunately, it does not go beyond a compilation of statistics.

The concern for civic education extends deeply into matters of curriculum. Zalmen Slesinger writes on “The Need for Jewish Social Studies Programs,” and sets up eight major fields of social studies concern: structure and dynamics of the American Jewish community, unity in diversity (intracommunal pluralism), preserving tradition, relations with Israel, maintaining Jewish society in the United States, community leadership, community fi-
nance, and the Jews' role in general public affairs. These are to be supplemented by second-level studies touching on similar problems in other Jewish communities, current Jewish affairs and problems, and intergroup relations. Meanwhile, the National Curriculum Research Institute of the American Association for Jewish Education has begun publishing experimental editions of specialized curricula in several of these fields. *The Concept of Eretz Israel in Jewish Literature* and *The Concept of Jewish Peoplehood in Jewish Literature* appeared in 1965.

With the proliferation of Jewish college students and the attendant discovery of the problems that come from exposure of ill-prepared young Jews to the college environment, a growing literature has developed about the role of Jewish education on the campus. Again, the emphasis is implicitly on civic education in the sense that communal identification and responsibility are considered to be the most important ends of the educational process. By and large, this literature focuses on the role of the Hillel Foundations on campus, either alone or in conjunction with other Jewish movements that have been entering the campus scene in recent years. As a result of numerous studies, the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations themselves have come up with at least a preliminary picture of the Jewish college student today; and some of their findings, very sad, indeed, are reported in *Campus, 1966: Change and Challenge*. Jewish college students, while much less self-consciously alienated from Judaism, are increasingly more ignorant and indifferent to Jewish life.

At the same time, there is a strong attempt by national Jewish organizations, particularly the synagogue movements, to enter the campus scene, displacing the traditionally communal approach of Hillel. The implications of this development were discussed in a pamphlet published by the 1965 annual conference of Hillel directors, *Jewish Pluralism on the Campus and Its Implications for the Hillel Program, Three Case Studies*. One remedy suggested for the problem of Jewish ignorance on the campus is the expansion of formal Jewish studies at the university. Efforts in this direction are described in Robert Michaelsen's, *The Study of Religion in American Universities* and Arnold J. Band's article "Jewish Studies in American Liberal-Arts Colleges and Universities."

**Public Personalities**

The study of Jewish public affairs would be incomplete without reference to the powerful and not so powerful personalities who are the leaders of the Jewish community; hence biographies of such leaders must necessarily occupy a significant place in the field. But here, too, the kinds of materials that tend to be published often minimize the analytical approach in favor of a more adulatory one.

Two works were published in 1965 on David Ben-Gurion who remains the most frequently portrayed modern Jewish figure. Maurice Edelman, a member of the British parliament, has written *David, The Story of Ben-
Gurion, the most frank biography of Ben-Gurion yet to appear. Himself a political figure, Edelman is able to penetrate into the political life of Ben-Gurion, but, in a brief 214-page book, is hardly able to do justice to his long career. Moshe Perlman's book, Ben-Gurion Looks Back, is based on interviews with the ex-prime minister and, thoroughly uncritically, reflects the world through the principal's eyes. Simcha Kling's The Mighty Warrior: The Life Story of Menachem Ushishkin is a brief and generally oversimple biography of one of the great pre-state Zionist leaders.

Considerably more valuable are the recently published biographies of American Jewish leaders. Morton Rosenstock's Louis Marshall, Defender of Jewish Rights focuses on Marshall's role as a Jewish communal leader. Done by a professional scholar, it makes every effort to maintain the standards of scholarship appropriate to the subject. Of a different order, but equally important, is Eli Ginzberg's memoir of his father, Keeper of the Law: Louis Ginzberg, a very personal yet penetrating biography. From it, the personality of one of the great American Jewish scholars of the 20th century emerges quite clearly.

Harold U. Ribalow edited Autobiographies of American Jews, a collection of excerpts from the autobiographies of 25 significant Jewish figures who came to maturity during the period between 1880 and 1920. While not all were leaders in the Jewish community, a significant number of them were, and the others provide us with insights into the development of American Jewish life in the critical period of its formation. Melech Epstein's Profiles of Eleven delineates the lives of leading personalities in the American Yiddish milieu at the turn of the century and immediately thereafter. Concentrating heavily on labor leaders, secularists, and pioneers of Yiddish literature and culture in the United States, Epstein provides us with important insights into the same era from a different perspective.

Several serious biographical essays on rabbinical leaders also appeared during the two years. Bertram W. Korn discusses the life of "The Hacham De Cordova of Jamaica," one of the first rabbis to come to the New World and the author of Emeth V'Emunah ("Reason and Faith"), a defense of revealed religion against the assaults of the Enlightenment. M. David Hoffman's "Charles Isaiah Hoffman: One Hundredth Anniversary (1864–1964)" is a useful contribution to the history of the early years of the Conservative movement, just as Eugene Markovitz's study of "Henry Pereira Mendes: Architect of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America" throws considerable light on the formative years of mainstream American Orthodoxy.

The 25th anniversary of the death of Louis D. Brandeis in 1966 produced a number of articles about his life and role in the Jewish community. Yona-than Shapiro's "American Jews in Politics: The Case of Louis D. Brandeis" is a valiant attempt to develop a larger thesis based on Brandeis's career; it has been subjected to heavy criticism on factual grounds. Rabbi Edgar E. Siskin provides a personal memoir in "Mr. Justice Brandeis: A Rabbi's Recol-
lection" which describes his 1934 visit with Brandeis and gives us insight into Brandeis's hopes for Israel and Zionism and his concern over Soviet persecution of Zionists.

Israel and Zionism

While all topics of concern in the study of Jewish public affairs also include the Israeli dimension, the special place occupied by Israel in the structure of Jewish civilization puts the State of Israel and the Zionist movement in a special category. The sheer volume of material about Israel reveals the special place it occupies in the hearts and minds of Jews. Consideration here must be restricted to recent books, with only passing reference to the most significant items in the periodical literature.

Barnett Litvinoff's *To the House of Their Fathers: A History of Zionism*, like many other comprehensive popular histories of the Zionist movement and the creation of the State of Israel that appeared in recent years, concentrates on the more romantic aspects of its effort and leaves the more serious aspects of Zionist public affairs relatively untouched. Somewhat more probing, though still tailored to the popular market, is *The Jews in Their Land*, conceived and edited by David Ben-Gurion. It is primarily an account of Jewish settlement in the land of Israel from the days of Moses onward, with individual chapters written by political figures, historians, and archeologists, and Ben-Gurion contributing the one on modern Israel. As a history, it is written within the framework of Zionist thought; but because of its unique thrust, it adds to the general knowledge about Jewish settlement in those periods when the Jews were considered by most to have been absent from the land. Marnin Feinstein's *American Zionism, 1884—1904* is a serious study of the formative years of American Zionism.

Of more theoretical interest is Yonathan Shapiro's essay "The Zionist State" which contributes significantly to an understanding of the complexities of Zionism. Shapiro's thesis is that "the essence of the Zionist faith is the need to preserve the distinctiveness of the Jewish people," a theme common to Eastern European and American, as well as Israeli Zionism. Immediate differences in the social conditions and cultural traditions of each, he maintains, led to differences in their responses to that theme.

Norman and Helen Bentwich published another volume on their experiences in Palestine, *Mandate Memories, 1918—1948*, which not only gives us insights into the overall history of the development of Jewish Palestine, but also provides valuable information about the development of the governmental institutions of the Jewish state. In a different vein, Joseph B. Schechtman writes of the *Mufti and Fuehrer*, a study of the relationships between the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and the Nazis during World War II in their common effort to destroy the Jewish people and prevent the establishment of a Jewish national home. A second book by Schechtman, *The United States and the Jewish State Movement: The Crucial Decade—1939—1949*, chroni-
cles and documents shifts in American policy on Zionism and Palestine in the period between the issuance of the British White Paper and Israel's establishment. It is effectively supplemented by Murray Frank's article "Duplicity on Palestine in 1944." Reviewing the State Department papers in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1944*, vol. 5, Frank points to the "duplicity of the State Department and the White House during that crucial period" in matters regarding Jewish aspirations in Palestine. Regarding the struggle for statehood itself, Geula Cohen's *Woman of Violence: Memoirs of a Young Terrorist, 1943–1948* and Colonel Benjamin Kagan's *The Secret Battle for Israel* each add some details to our knowledge of that period.

The two years under consideration here saw the inevitable publication of a number of books on the State of Israel. Among the best of these are Robert Gamzey's *Miracle of Israel*, a sensitive and perceptive account by the editor of the *Intermountain Jewish News* of Denver, Colorado. Meyer Levin's *The Story of Israel* has the dual advantage of having been written by a first-rate author who has lived much of his life in Israel. A short, politically sophisticated picture of the state is Nadav Safran's *Israel Today: A Profile*.

More personal, and somewhat more critical, is *Israel: The View from Masada* by Ronald Sanders, an editor of *Midstream*, which is a collection of his own articles on the contemporary scene. While clearly sympathetic, he does not pull his punches. Much less revealing is Abba Eban's *Israel in the World*, a published version of two television interviews with the Israeli foreign minister, in which he very carefully echoes the official policies of his government on a wide range of issues.

There were several good studies of social change and intercommunity relations in Israel, written by Americans long resident in that country. The political realm gets some attention in all of them. Judah Matras has a limited discussion of changing political outlooks in the Jewish population of Palestine and Israel in *Social Change in Israel*, though his book is primarily about social change within families. It is particularly useful for the historical statistics he has compiled. Moshe Lissak attempts to relate some of the same variables to political ideology in "Patterns of Change in Ideology and Class Structure in Israel." In the very delicate field of intercommunal relations which has become one of the chief concerns of Israeli public affairs, Alex Weingrod, an anthropologist who spent many years in Israel studying the problem in the field, published *Israel: Group Relations in a New Society*.

The question of the communities relates to the entire problem of post-state settlement, which, in turn, is tied significantly to the development of the basic social and political institutions which will be serving Israel for the foreseeable future. This relationship has been well illustrated in Professor Weingrod's *Reluctant Pioneers: Village Development in Israel*, a study of post-1948 immigrants in rural Israel, whose settlement was predetermined by the Jewish Agency of Israel and who have had to adjust simultaneously to rural living and to the problems of centralized bureaucratic direction. Viscount Samuel's article, "Where Did Israel Put Its Million Jewish Immigrants?"
offers a less intimate and more institutionally oriented look at the overall settlement patterns of this immigration. He deals particularly with the expansion of the old agricultural settlements into local councils (the equivalent of townships) and their transformation from the kind of integrated socio-political communities represented by the kibbutz or the moshav, into more politically discrete formal structure. Samuel also discusses the development of new towns, which, as urban centers, never had the kind of socio-political unity characteristic of the rural settlements, and such political problems as over-centralized planning, ministerial rivalries in Jerusalem, and the growing demand for local government on the part of the local residents, which their development brought. An important fact emerging from Samuel's discussion is that the first significant power acquired by the new towns is the power of taxation which, despite the control imposed by the ministry of the interior, gives the local community some concrete means to express its own value preferences.

Two other articles expand on this theme. Dorothy Wilner's "Politics and Change in Israel: The Case of Land Settlement" speaks of "a decline in the intensity of ideology and party loyalty in recent years," and suggests that their replacement with more concern for practical politics is likely to further the nation's integration. Ernest Stock's "Grass Roots Politics—Israel Style," a study of local politics in Kiryat Gat, the painstakingly planned town in the most comprehensively planned new settlement area in Israel, the Lachish region, traces the emergence of local civic consciousness in a culturally mixed community, and its first strivings for local self government in the face of heavy centralizing pressure from Jerusalem. He shows how the complex of emerging local institutions make Kiryat Gat not merely a simple municipality but a "civil community" with various paths of access to the national government that, in turn, increase local decision-making powers.

Israel remains a fascinating field for inquiry by political scientists, and the years 1965 and 1966 saw their share of books about its government and politics. E. A. Bayne contrasts Israel with three other Mediterranean and Near Eastern nations in Four Ways of Politics: State and Nation in Italy, Somalia, Israel, Iran. Benjamin Akzin and Yehezkel Dror, both researchers in the political science department, Hebrew University, wrote a short monograph Israel: High Pressure Planning. Leonard J. Fein, a political scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, published "Ideology and Politics in Israel," which is based on sections of his book Politics in Israel. Moshe Czudnowski and Jacob Landau wrote on The Israel Communist Party and the Elections for the Fifth Knesset, 1961.

Shlomo Avineri's study of the party struggle preceding the elections for the sixth Knesset, "Israel in the Post Ben-Gurion Era," places that struggle in a larger context by reviewing Israel's political history before statehood. His analysis of Israeli political processes in light of the voluntaristic origin of the country's settlement leads him to make the extremely important point that its political background is not merely a product of Eastern Euro-
pean culture, but also a direct outgrowth of the autonomous Jewish *kehilla* with its congregational, republican, and confederal principles which, for many generations, provided the training ground for Jewish political leaders and ultimately influenced those who became Israel's leaders. Avineri sees the dilemmas of contemporary Israeli politics as rooted in the contradictions between the foreign ideological institutions brought from Eastern Europe and the political culture of the Jewish people, and views the present conflict as reflecting a new state of affairs in which the amalgam of Jewish and Eastern European political patterns is no longer effective.

The other major consideration in Israeli public affairs in recent years is the question of the relationship between religions and the state. Here, too, the periodical literature has been voluminous and the amount of seriously reflective material small. A serious discussion of the question was featured in *Judaism*. Nathan Rotenstreich, professor of philosophy at the Hebrew University, states the case for church-state separation in the liberal pattern in "Secularism and Religion in Israel." Aharon Lichtenstein of Yeshiva University replies in "Religion and State: The Case for Interaction," a cogent discussion of traditional Jewish political theory, providing a *halakhic* approach to the problem that offers substantial grounding for an interrelationship that does not rest on the political premises of the ultra-Orthodox. Indeed, Lichtenstein provides a useful point of departure for studying the entire question as one of Jewish political theory. Meanwhile, the controversy goes on and continues to evoke comment from the non-Orthodox religious movements in the United States. Two of the more authoritative recent statements are "Judaism in Israel" by Wolfe Kelman and "The Problem of Recognizing the Reform Rabbi in the State of Israel" by Jakob J. Petuchowski.

Joseph L. Bentwich, in a compact book on *Education in Israel*, devotes considerable space to the function of the school system in developing an idealistic attitude towards public needs and public service, characteristic of Zionist days, within the context of an emerging affluent society. Interestingly enough, he concludes that the best integrated curriculum in the country is to be found in the yeshivahs which, he says, are "far from being a dying relic of the past," but are becoming "a growing force."

Growing concern in Israel over this very problem, over retaining or transmitting the idealism of the pre-state and early state periods into a permanent feature of Israeli life, is discussed by Dwight J. Simpson in "Israel: The State of Siege." Simpson concludes that "The siege mentality, induced by 17 years of isolated existence in a hostile Arab world, has developed to such a point that all Israelis seem increasingly present-minded, with little or no thought of the future."

National, Community, and Area Studies

The study of specific Jewish communities on the national, local, and regional levels is closely related to the field of Jewish public affairs. The char-
acter of the material is varied, ranging from casual travelers’ reports to serious social science studies of the organized Jewish communities in most parts of the world. Expectedly, the data on the United States is best, while material on the smaller countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is sparse indeed. Our focus here will be limited to national, state, and community studies within the United States, of which at least a hundred must have been published in 1965 and 1966.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES

The Jewish Education Committee of New York published an anthology of articles, selected from Louis Finkelstein’s *The Jews* and from the American Jewish Year Book: Nathan Glazer’s “Social Characteristics of American Jews,” Joseph L. Blau’s “The Spiritual Life of American Jewry,” Herman D. Stein’s “Jewish Social Work in the United States,” and Oscar and Mary F. Handlin’s “The Acquisition of Political and Social Rights by the Jews in the United States.” Basic Books, reflecting the new general interest in Jewish affairs, published Ruth Gay’s *Jews in America: A Short History* which was not well received by historians, who saw in it a poor selection of materials and a number of errors of fact and analysis. Another popular history was Morris U. Schappes, *A Pictorial History of the Jews in the United States*.

Oscar Janowsky presented a summary reappraisal of the American Jewish community in “A New Look at American Jewry,” a digest of relevant statistical information that adds up to a portrait of certain of its quantitative aspects. He goes over familiar ground concerning the acculturation of the Jews and their integration in American society, and then raises the questions, “Do we have cause for complacency? What have we done with our wealth, security, education and leisure?” In his view, there is hope in a saving remnant of committed Jews. However the future holds many problems ranging from the content of Jewish education to those of the growing nonsectarian approach of Jewish service agencies in a community “that regards itself as primarily a religious community.” Eli Ginzberg updated his earlier work, *An Agenda for American Jews* in an article “The Agenda Reconsidered.” While acknowledging the changes that have taken place in the American Jewish community, he expresses discontent over the limited progress made toward the goals which he had set for it.

In the same spirit of self-examination was the republication of a study of American Jewry in 1872, taken from *A History of all Religions: etc.*, edited by William Burder and apparently written by Sabato Morais, then rabbi of Congregation Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia. Morais’s article, titled “Jews of the United States of America,” presents a fairly comprehensive picture of the half-million Jews in the United States nearly a century ago: the history of local settlement as it emerged from the variety of their congregations; the differences in rituals, primarily between German and Spanish-Portuguese; the struggle between Reform and Orthodox; the organization of
their charities; their schools and Sunday schools; their attempts and failures to create colleges; their secret societies; their journals and literary associations, and their position in American society as a whole.

Another early analysis and program for the American Jewish community by Isadore Bush appeared under the title, "The Task of the Jews in the United States—1857." Bush, a Prague-born Jew who became a St. Louis banker, politician and communal leader, based his program on two assumptions: that the American political system corresponds "more closely than any other of our days to the spirit of our own Holy Scriptures," and that the Jews must be "champions of light" and a "blessing for all the people on earth." He therefore urged the Jews to venerate the Bible, maintain the unity of the Jewish people, and build their lives and social order on the social principles set forth in the Bible, particularly those regarding limitations on interest, promotion of land distribution and agriculture, and the prevention of usury in land sales.

The growing literature of acculturation of American Jews is beginning to show signs of more sophisticated division into its proper subcategories. Robert D. Cross, a noted non-Jewish scholar, discusses in "Some Reflections on Jewish Immigration" (originally an address to the American Jewish Historical Society) the present state of scholarly thinking about the impact of Jews on the United States. A contemporary account of the coming of the Eastern European Jews by David Philipson, a German-born Reform rabbi, was published as "Strangers to a Strange Land."

Specific studies of particular Jewish groups in recent years have tended to be the province of the German-Jewish organizations in the United States. The Leo Baeck Institute's Yearbook, vol. 10, 1965, contains a detailed article by H. G. Reissner on "The German-American Jew (1800–1850)." The more recent immigrants, refugees from Hitlerism, published the proceedings of their Conference on Acculturation, 1965: Papers Delivered at the First Lerntag of the American Federation of Jews from Central Europe. This small, high-quality publication discusses problems in the United States of Central European Jews in particular, and of Jews in general.

Comparative Americanization has also come in for serious treatment. Rudolf Glanz's Jew and Irish: Historic Group Relations in Immigration is a study of the two groups perhaps most frequently compared. "Accultura-
tion and Identity in American Society: Irish and Jewish Separateness 'Beyond the Melting Pot' " was also the subject of a joint meeting, in 1964, of the American Historical Association, the American Committee for Irish Studies, and the American Jewish Historical Society. The published proceedings contain papers delivered by Irving Greenberg and William V. Shannon, and a discussion by Marshall Sklare. Richard Robbins compares in "American Jews and American Catholics: Two Types of Social Change" their "immigration and ethnicity, social class or mobility, institutional separatism, and problems of minority group status and ethnic prejudice." Robbins's article evoked an
extensive observation by Jacob Neusner in "Jews and Catholics: A Comment."

In a somewhat similar vein, Bernard J. Coughlin's book *Church and State in Social Welfare* discusses, among other things, the differences in Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish self-perceptions of their responsibilities in society. He describes the Protestant perception as one of responsibility for the character of society only through changing individuals. By contrast, Catholics feel that their church must become one of the institutions of society, while for Jews, social responsibility is an integral part of their religious system and social philosophy. Tracing the implications of these differences for responses to social welfare issues, Coughlin concludes that all groups generally accept some form of state support of sectarian welfare institutions.

Among recent historical articles one of the most important "The Charleston Organ Case" by Allen Tarshish is a detailed examination of the rise of the Reform movement in Charleston, South Carolina, within a framework of the larger history of Charleston Jewry and, indeed, of Jewish and non-Jewish religious movements in the 19th century. In discussing a major controversy in what was, in 1820, probably the largest Jewish community in the United States, he conveys a sense of the transitions in Jewish and American life as the 19th century moved into full gear. The author's hints of possible ties between Marrano ideas and Reform tendencies are especially worthy of consideration.

Of the same period is "Mordecai Emanuel Noah's Ararat Project and the Missionaries" by S. Joshua Kohn who, like Tarshish, discusses a particular aspect of an outstanding event in American Jewish history by placing it in the context of the time and the non-Jewish community. His focus is on the manner in which Christian missionaries picked up the Noah plan for their own purposes.

American Jewish history in the Civil War period is elucidated in Stanley K. Brav's "The Jewish Woman, 1861–1865" and Joakim Isaacs' "Candidate Grant and the Jews." Brav discusses the role of organized Jewish womanhood in maintaining Jewish communal life during the Civil War, even in the smallest communities. Isaacs attempts to show that the concept of the "Jewish vote" emerged for the first time in the presidential campaign of 1868, when the Democrats used it against Grant's reputed antisemitism.

Evelyn Levow Greenberg's "An 1869 Petition on Behalf of Russian Jews" sheds more light on the Jewish community's involvement in American politics in its efforts to protect the rights of fellow Jews. Her emphasis on the connections between the American Jewish protest and protests of Jewish groups in other parts of the world is particularly interesting. Jewish political activities to aid immigrants are chronicled by Esther Panitz in "In Defense of the Jewish Immigrant (1891–1924)," a study of the shift in the attitude of the established American Jewish community from opposition to Jewish immigration in the 1890's to efforts to prevent closing the doors to immigration in the 1920's.
Abraham J. Karp, writing on the “Reaction to Zionism and to the State of Israel in the American Jewish Religious Community,” traces changes in the reaction of American Jewry to Zionism as reported in the Jewish press from the days of Herzl to the establishment of the State, from one of anti-Zionism to solidarity with Israel. He emphasizes how these changes paralleled other changes in the organization and outlook of the American Jewish community.

Herbert Parzen’s “New Data on the Formation of Dropsie College” quotes extensively from letters providing information on the internal maneuverings of the founders of the college. Much of the political struggle was immediately connected with the relationship between the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and the proposed new institution, which indirectly reflected the shifting of the center of American Jewish life to New York.

Increasing consideration is being given to methodological refinements in the study of aspects of American Jewry, particularly in the field of demography. Fred Massarik’s “New Approaches to the Study of the American Jew” is a discussion of the research method used in his study of the demography of Los Angeles Jewry. Among the obstacles encountered by the students of American Jewry, Massarik feels, are problems in arriving at an operational definition of Jewishness; little likelihood of obtaining foundation support for research because of the high socio-economic level of the American Jewish community; the American Jewish communal structure which makes the acquisition of funds for, and the conduct of, comprehensive studies difficult; the “personal identity conflicts” of Jewish scholars in the United States which have led them away from research in contemporary Jewish affairs, and the separation of church and state which denies researchers adequate census data. In another article, “Methodological Problems in Jewish Population Studies in the U.S.A.,” Gad Nathan examines the needs for demographic research, selected methods that have been used for such studies, and the role the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds should play in promoting such research.

American Jewry is generally studied as if it were one entity. It is beginning to become apparent, however, that there are significant regional differences in American Jewish life. To date, almost the only regional aggregation of Jews to be studied is that of the South which, as in general studies of the country, stands out most obviously. Alfred O. Hero, Jr., writing on “Southern Jews, Race Relations, and Foreign Policy,” presents the results of personal interviews with 194 Southern Jews between 1959 and late 1962, as part of a larger study of Southern attitudes on foreign affairs. Louis Berg’s “Peddlers in Eldorado” is typical of the other kind of prevailing regional history, the chronicling of the adventures of Jews in the trans-Mississippi West, in this case mainly in California.

STATE AND LOCAL STUDIES

Turning to the field of community studies, we find a wide variety of ma-
terials ranging from filiopietistic chronicles to sophisticated demographic analyses. What is lacking are studies of the way in which the public business of Jews is conducted at the local level in this country. New York City is a case in point: Although it has the largest concentration of Jews in the world and much has been written about its Jewish life, we know almost nothing about the community's public affairs, except perhaps for the period of the ill-fated New York kehillah. Some of the typical 1965–1966 publications about New York City include a guide book, several articles on the lower East Side, published in honor of the Jewish museum exhibit, and a reissue of Hutchins Hapgood's *The Spirit of the Ghetto: Studies of the Jewish Quarter of New York*.

The sampling of Jewish community studies outside New York City reveals the variety of available material and the paucity of serious analytical work being done. The following list is presented on a state-by-state basis. It is, no doubt, far from exhaustive.

**Georgia:** Malcolm H. Stern published "The Sheftall Diaries: Vital Records of Savannah Jewry (1733–1808)" containing family and personal data about the Jews in Savannah and in Georgia as a whole, from the founding of the colony until the 19th century. The *Southern Israelite* of Atlanta published a 40th anniversary issue in 1965 which reviews the development of Atlanta Jewry since 1925.

**Indiana:** An interesting study is Whitney H. Gordon's "Jew and Gentiles in Middletown—1961," a resurvey of the 174 Jews in Muncie, Indiana, the fabled "Middletown" of the Lynds. Predominantly small businessmen, the Jews are particularly active in interfaith work and other civic projects primarily designed to earn them "good will." They face little overt antisemitism but almost all have a strong belief that it exists. On the whole, Muncie's Jews are Reform, heavily assimilationist, and have a great deal of self-hate.

**Kansas:** The *American Jewish Archives* published documents relating to "A Colony in Kansas—1882" that chronicle a chapter of the history of the Beersheba colony, one of the settlements supported by the Hebrew Union Agricultural Society to encourage Jewish immigrants on the land. The documents are Isaac Mayer Wise's "A Humble Plea for a Russian Colony," the diary of a colonist, Charles K. Davis, and M. H. Marks' report to the Hebrew Union Agricultural Society, "Beersheba Colony—an Insured Success." Of course, what the optimistic reports chronicle is the beginning of a complete failure.

**Louisiana:** Louise Matthews Hewitt's *Days of Building, History of the Jewish Community of Shreveport, Louisiana* is a more complete history of a continuing community. While still in the filiopietistic mold, it offers a reasonably comprehensive portrait of a Southern Jewish community of rather long lineage. Also adding to our knowledge about Louisiana Jewry is Bernard Lemann's *The Lemann Family of Louisiana*, a personal memoir of a distinguished Southern Jewish family.

**Michigan** is one of the states furthest advanced in chronicling its Jewish
history. There, a group of Detroit Jews interested in local history have created the Michigan Jewish Historical Society and publish *Michigan Jewish History* biannually. While few of the contributing authors are professional historians, they are all concerned with important historical questions. The June 1966 issue, for example, includes articles on "Forty Years of the Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation" and "The Story of the Adas Shalom Religious School." The United Jewish Charities, a constituent agency of the local federation, sponsored Albert J. Mayer's painstakingly thorough study, *The Detroit Jewish Community, Geographic Mobility, 1963–1965 and Fertility* portraying a highly mobile Jewish community in its most mobile period.

**Minnesota:** Minneapolis is one of the best studied Jewish communities in the United States, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Most recently, Nancy J. Schmidt published a paper on "An Orthodox Jewish Community in the United States: A Minority within a Minority," which focuses on the local Orthodox day school and the parents of its pupils. The Minneapolis community is exceptional in that it has a substantial Orthodox group, despite its relatively small Jewish population, and Miss Schmidt's study tells us much about it.

**Missouri:** Howard F. Sach's article, "Development of the Jewish Community of Kansas City, 1864–1908," reflects an upgrading in the standard of local Jewish historiography.

**New Jersey:** More typical of the kinds of Jewish community studies being published is Charles F. Westoff's *Population and Social Characteristics of the Jewish Community of the Camden Area, 1964* which was sponsored by the Jewish Federation of Camden County.

**New York:** Very different in purpose and style is Joan Gould's "A Village of Slaves of the Torah." Her discussion of New Square, New York, a hasidic colony near Spring Valley, is that of a slightly amazed, reasonably sympathetic outsider viewing a form of American exotica. Still another kind of source material for Jewish community studies is B. G. Rudolph's autobiography, *Tell Me More*, an account of a veteran Jewish leader's experiences in Jewish organizational life, offering some insights into the Syracuse Jewish community and considerable raw data for the future historian.

**North Dakota:** The fascination with putative Jewish agricultural colonies is such that their histories are among the best chronicled in the American Jewish world. Among them is Lois Field Schwartz's "Early Jewish Agricultural Colonies in North Dakota."

**Ohio:** Leo Wiesenfeld's reminiscences, *Jewish Life in Cleveland in the 1920's and 1930's*, provides rarely recorded information about local Jewish public affairs. As former editor of the *Cleveland Jewish World*, he was in the midst of the city's Jewish public life. A different aspect of communal affairs is the subject of Oscar Janowsky's "The Cleveland Bureau of Jewish Education: A Case Study (1924–1953)." Using minutes, reports, and files of the bureau, he constructs the history of educational activities in one community which accepted responsibility for certain aspects of Jewish education.
Of course, limitations of source material prevent him from going beyond a surface picture of the dynamics of bureau operations; but it is a first step. From the perspective of Jewish public affairs, the study enriches our knowledge of the evolution of community involvement in Jewish life through common community institutions.

Rhode Island: Sidney Goldstein's "The Changing Socio-Demographic Structure of an American Jewish Community," a study of Providence, R.I., and its suburbs, is in many respects a model of its kind and an excellent addition to the body of data about Jewish life in the United States, particularly in the light of the excessive claims made for the universality of the findings in the Washington, D.C., and Iowa studies conducted a few years ago. Goldstein's findings indicate a much more traditional pattern of identification among Providence Jewry than among the Jews of Washington or Iowa, showing a higher level of synagogue membership and a greater degree of religious observance with little intergenerational shift in either. They reveal a very low intermarriage rate—less than 5 per cent of the total married Jewish population and only half of that not converted—that is less frequent in the 20-39 than in the 40-59 age group.

Vermont: "Religion in a Northern Vermont Town: A Cross Century Comparative Study" by Louis S. Feuer and Mervyn W. Perrine contains statistics on religious observance of Burlington Jews which, of course, show them to be less devoted synagogue attendees than their Protestant and Catholic fellow citizens are church-goers.

In a more general vein, Lloyd P. Gartner, a most active historian of local Jewish communities, encourages further activity in that field in "The History of North American Jewish Communities, a Field for the Jewish Historian." He suggests possibilities in the field of local history, based in part on his own experiences as collaborator in the series of histories of local Jewish communities now appearing under the auspices of the American Jewish History Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Charles Miller's "Research in the Intermediate Community: Its Role and Uses" discusses the kinds of sociological and demographic research that are useful to Jewish welfare agencies and their constituent agencies.

Intercommunity Relations

An aspect of Jewish public affairs, commanding growing attention, is the relationship between the various Jewish communities in the world, particularly between Israel and the diaspora, between the United States and smaller diaspora communities, and the agonizing problem of the relationship between Soviet and world Jewry. To date, most attention has been paid to the first and the last of these. The Soviet-Jewish problem has been widely discussed and its literature well-recognized. We will therefore confine ourselves here to looking at some of the more significant publications dealing with the first. One caveat: the tone of discussion in this field remains overwhelmingly
polemical, and serious study of these problems has yet to be undertaken.

Yitzhak Harkavi’s "Israel and the Diaspora: Problems and Cultural Interdependence" examines the problem and the possibilities from the point of view that such a relationship is essential for the preservation of Jewish life, whatever its points of emphasis. On the more negative side, S. Z. Abramov's article, "The Danger of a Religious Split in Jewry" voices concern about the clash between the Orthodox supporters of established religion in Israel and the non-Orthodox and secularists in Israel and abroad and projects some of its possible consequences. On the other hand, Louis Shub discusses "The Diaspora Factor in Israel's Foreign Policy," an exposition of the Israeli government's way of taking cognizance of the need Israel has for close relations with diaspora Jewry.

**External Relations**

Traditionally, one of the most important concerns of Jewish public affairs has been the relations between the Jewish people and the rest of the world. Indeed, this aspect has been so significant that it has become commonplace to think that all political concerns of Jews, as Jews, are wrapped up in the problems inherent in these external relations. This, we have seen, is emphatically not the case. Nevertheless, the importance attached to this problem is reflected in the sheer volume of written and published material about it. Here we can only identify the major recurrent themes in 1965–1966. The discussion of the place of the Jewish people in modern society has been recurring for uncounted years variously estimated to range from two generations to two centuries. Typical of the kinds of serious material recently published are "Judaism in the Secular Age" by Jacob Neusner and "The Cost of Jewish Survival" by Immanuel Jakobovits. Neusner, a Conservative Jew, explains why he feels that "Judaism is both admirably equipped and completely unprepared" for life in a secular world, while Immanuel Jakobovits, a leader of Orthodoxy, is concerned with the immediately practical question of what Jews must do to survive in the modern world.

Jewish-Christian relations represent another major area of concern, particularly as evolving from Vatican Council II and the ecumenical movement. Responding to certain pressures from Christian groups for dialogue, much of the published material focuses on the possibilities for such confrontations. While, on the surface, they appear to be more theological than political, there are behind the theological statement also clearly political concern about the possibility that true dialogue may touch upon matters offensive to the non-Jewish majority or that ostensible "dialogue" could open the gates to Christian missionary activity.*

* This feeling is supported by the publication of such books as Edward H. Flannery's *The Anguish of the Jews: 23 Centuries of Anti-Semitism*, a well-meaning study by a Catholic priest who concludes by putting on Jews and Christians "coreponsibility" for antisemitism and virtually whitewashing the New Testament.
Among the most scholarly discussions of this problem is Solomon Zeitlin's "The Ecumenical Council, Vatican II and the Jews." Leon Poliakov, a French Jewish historian, surveys the development of the anti-Jewish mentality in "Anti-Semitism and Christian Teaching." His conclusion, less than startling, is that the original source for persecution "continues to be an interpretation of the New Testament." He discusses the role of Lutheran theology and 19th century German scientism in reinforcing this interpretation, and analyzes long-term trends in light of the Ecumenical Council's action.

Significant for the study of Jewish-Christian relations is the publication of the first two volumes in the ADL-sponsored University of California study of antisemitism in the United States by Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark. Volume one, *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism*, is a thorough and scientifically exacting survey on the extent to which different kinds of Christian beliefs influence antisemitic attitudes. The second, *The Apathetic Majority: A Study Based on Public Responses to the Eichmann Trial*, reveals the large-scale indifference on the part of Christians to the trial, and its implications.

*Jews in the Mind of America* (New York: Basic Books, 1966) by Charles Herbert Stember and others, perhaps the most thorough scholarly analysis of the evolving Jewish position in the United States, was published under the auspices of the American Jewish Committee. Its emphasis on the role of the political system in determining the place of the Jews as individuals and as a group in American society is pronounced and most appropriate. So, too, is the stress it places on the Jews' needs to establish and respect their own boundaries for self-definition within an open society.

B. Z. Sobel writes on "Protestant Evangelists and the Formulation of a Jewish Racial Mystique: the Missionary Discovery of Sociology." Stepping away from the immediate issue of Catholic-Jewish relations, he looks at the attempts to evangelize and convert the Jews on the part of fundamentalist Protestants and the manner in which they have updated their approach in the light of their understanding of contemporary social science.

One final note. There has been a marked tendency among certain Jewish elements to take the offensive in matters of Christian-Jewish relations as a result of the recent Christian acknowledgment of culpability in regard to antisemitism. Orthodox and neo-Orthodox Jews in particular have begun to raise fundamental questions in print as to how Judaism really threatens Christianity and how it will necessarily and inevitably continue to do so. See, for example, Eliezer Berkovits, "Judaism in the Post-Christian Era.”

Much of the American-Jewish literature deals with Negro-Jewish relations. Several symposia on the subject have been published, including “Negro-Jewish Relations in America: a Symposium”; *Negro-Jewish Relations in the United States*, the product of a conference called by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies, and “Changing Race Relations and Jewish Communal Service: A Symposium.” While the first two tend to dwell on highly personal reactions to contact between individuals and masses, the last is concerned
with the response of the organized Jewish community and, most particularly, of its institutions.

In addition, there have been numerous specialized studies of aspects of Negro-Jewish relations. In fact, some of the best social science work on American Jews has been done in this field in recent years. Elijah E. Palnick discussing "Southern Jewry and Civil Rights" makes the point that the Southern Jews have been active in civil rights; but this has become "the best kept secret in Judaism" because they dare not boast of it openly. One recurring theme in this discussion is the idea that Jews and Negroes have much in common as ex-slave and marginal peoples. See, for example, James A. Moss, "The American Jew and the Negro Civil Rights Struggle" and Charles Silberman, "A Jewish View of the Racial Crisis." Marion Wright, Henry Aaronson, and John Mudd, writing in New South (Atlanta, Ga.), one of the umbrella journals of the civil rights movement, offer a proposal with Jewish roots in "Proposed: A Kibbutz in Mississippi," an idea which has been bandied about in the civil-rights movement for several years and has apparently influenced some experimental efforts at community reorganization among Southern Negroes.


In the second of a two-part article, Hazel Gaudet Erskine analyzes "The Polls: Religious Prejudice, Part II; Antisemitism" reviewing questions on antisemitic issues that were asked in national surveys from 1937 through 1965. She found a decline in incidence of overt antisemitic responses in that period. In a Jewish response to Christian efforts to improve relations, the American Jewish Committee sponsored the Dropsie College study of textbooks, and published Jewish School Textbooks and Intergroup Relations: Summary of Findings by Bernard Weinryb and Daniel Garnick.

In the historical realm, Bernard Klein examines "Hungarian Politics and the Jewish Question in the Inter-War Period." His study takes a good look at the kind of minority group problems that dominated Central Europe, and the failure of "diaspora nationalism" as a viable solution to them. Hans Rogger's "The Beilis Case: Anti-Semitism and Politics in the Reign of Nicholas II" examines that incident as part of the decay of the Czarist regime. Alex Bein discusses "The Jewish Question and Modern Anti-Semitic Literature; Prelude to 'The Final Solution'." Edward A. Synan, in The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages, develops the thesis that, in many cases, the Popes protected the Jews from external antisemitic pressures.

The Course of Jewish Public Affairs

In The Jewish People in Metamorphosis, a historical analysis presented as
a B. G. Rudolph lecture at Syracuse University, Moshe Davis discusses the continuing subject matter of Jewish public affairs. In reviewing the changes of the past century, he poses many significant questions that must be considered by students in the field. With the publication of *The Dynamics of Emancipation: The Jew in the Modern Age*, Nahum Glatzer completes his trilogy of readers in the Judaic tradition. While his concern is primarily intellectual and theological, he does make available important sources on matters relating to Jewish public affairs—particularly in the final volume which deals with the emancipation in Europe, the rise of Zionism, and the development of the Jewish community in America.

*The Five Stages of Jewish Emancipation* by Josue Jehouda is a major, though brief, work on the social theory of modern Jewish life and Jewish relations with the larger world. Jehouda, a social theorist in the grand European manner whose works are just now being published in the United States, has rooted his social theory in highly traditional Jewish categories, even though his conclusions are not necessarily those of the traditionalists. In his examination of the course of Jewish emancipation since the 18th century, Jehouda discovers a generational pattern based on four forty-year intervals from Mendelssohn through Herzl, each representing a different stage and, in turn, giving rise to the next stage. Jehouda, writing in the late 1930's, speaks of the needs of the then just emerging fifth stage, that of spiritual revival, in which the Jews rediscover that their lives are healthy only insofar as they recognize monotheism as Judaism's central principle and the unity of their spiritual and temporal goals in a sanctified secularism that is anticlerical but not atheistic. Looking back with the advantage of hindsight some 30 years after his book was first written in its original French, he concludes, not without reason, that something akin to this spiritual revival has become the major concern of this fifth generation since emancipation. Concerned Jews have, indeed, been attempting to infuse spiritual meaning into both the triumphs and disasters of our generation.

The second volume of *The World History of the Jewish People*, edited by Cecil Roth, appeared in 1965 simultaneously in the United States, Great Britain, and Israel. This volume, titled *The Dark Ages 711–1096* and actually numbered as volume 10, offers a major summary of the latest knowledge of the Jews of that period.

Salo W. Baron completed volumes 9 and 10 of his monumental *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. They deal with the late middle ages and the era of European expansion (1200–1650), and together initiate the third great segment of his work. Emphasizing the historical data of Jewish socio-political experience, both within the Jewish community and in that community's relations with the world around it, Baron provides valuable source material for the study of Jewish public affairs, particularly in the realm of external relations.

The large literature of anguish on the Nazi holocaust that continues to appear ranges from highly personal memoirs dealing with the innermost
reactions of human beings to attempts to understand the role of Jews *qua* Jews in the extreme circumstances in which they found themselves. Our concern necessarily lies at the latter end of the spectrum. In 1965 and 1966 the focus was on the Eichmann trial and its meaning. To a great extent, it centered around Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, which was reissued in 1965 in a revised and enlarged edition. Miss Arendt's discussion of "The banality of evil" in which she appeared to be more critical of the Jews for not resisting than of Eichmann and his cohorts, provoked wide controversy in the Jewish world and in the literary world at large. Her criticisms struck to the heart of the entire Jewish ethos. The replies they provoked then were equally sharp. Perhaps the most important is Jacob Robinson's *And The Crooked Shall Be Made Straight; the Eichmann Trial, the Jewish Catastrophe, and Hannah Arendt's Narrative* refuting Miss Arendt's "case," point by point, in a masterful and thorough document that is more in the nature of a legal brief than a book. Gideon Hausner, the prosecutor for the State of Israel at the Eichmann trial, published his version of Israel's actions and Eichmann's guilt in *Justice in Jerusalem*, another work with highly legal overtones. Both volumes were widely recognized as authoritative in the Jewish community, at least partly because of their heavy emphasis on the legalistic approach which has been the traditional manner of Jewish response to questions of public affairs, even among those Jews who do not consider themselves bound by Jewish law.

Turning to accounts of the holocaust itself, only a few of the most relevant materials can be cited here. *To Die with Honor: The Uprising of the Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto* by Leonard Tushnet is one of the best because it not only chronicles the story of the resistance, but provides a detailed, if not an analytic, account of the setting in which the uprising took place: the Warsaw Jewish community in the pre-revolt and pre-war period, with its party system and internal political cleavages which were so important in mounting the operation.

A number of individual community histories of the period also appeared. *Bergen-Belsen, Holocaust and Rebirth: 1945–1965* edited by Sam E. Bloch and published by the World Federation of Bergen-Belsen Survivors as a commemorative work, introduces a haunting chapter in the aftermath of the holocaust. It describes the way in which the Jewish survivors, battered though they were, created a self-governing community on the very site of one of the worst concentration camps. Lucy S. Dawidowicz elaborates on this phenomenon in "Belsen Remembered." The 10,000 Jews who lived in the DP camp at Belsen from 1945 to 1950 created a Jewish police force, Jewish courts, the full range of Jewish religious institutions, Talmud Torahs and secular schools, an adult vocational-educational program, a library, a newspaper, and even a drama studio. A full range of Zionist and non-Zionist parties competed for representation on a democratically elected central committee providing full internal self-government. The Belsen experience, which
was not unique, should lead social scientists to give the study of the reorgani-
ization of Jewish communities on the very sites of the concentration camps
more attention, not only for its historical significance but as an important
potential lesson in the "genius of Jewish politics."

Contemporary Issues

Not the least important of the concerns of Jewish public affairs are the
contemporary issues facing the Jewish community as a community. A review
of the topics considered above makes most of these issues obvious. A few
recently published sources may be mentioned here.

One of the acknowledged issues of major importance, Jewish religious
unity, is discussed in "Towards Jewish Religious Unity: A Symposium." The
participants representing the four main sectors of Judaism in America—Ir-
vig Greenberg of Yeshiva University, Seymour Segal of the Jewish The-
ological Seminary of America, Jakob J. Petuchowski of the Hebrew Union
College, and Mordecai M. Kaplan, the founder of Reconstructionism—
agree that unity is not in the offing, but that greater cooperation among
the committed Jews could be expected in the future. A more practical view
of the problem is provided by Baruch Levine in "Divisiveness in American
Jewry: A Case in Point," the chronicle of a controversy over a bequest to
Brandeis University for "studying the literature of traditional Judaism,"
which was challenged by three Orthodox groups on the ground that Brandeis
is an heretical institution.

A specific public issue in American Jewry today is the community's atti-
tude on government aid to church-related schools. The position that has
become traditional was clearly stated by the American Jewish Congress in
Schools, Subsidy, and Separation: A Statement on Federal Aid to Education.
A newer view endorsing federal aid to church-related institutions is stated
with equal succinctness in the Jewish Observer, "Brief: Amicus Curiae," the
full text of a brief submitted by Agudath Israel of America appealing a New
York State Supreme Court decision of August 19, 1966. That decision de-
clared unconstitutional an act permitting the use of public funds to provide
nonpublic schools with textbooks (p. 94). Two discussions of the respective
positions, which in effect summarize current thought on the subject, are
Milton Himmelfarb's "Church and State: How High a Wall?" and Carol
Weisbrod's "Church, State and Schools." Miss Weisbrod defends the radical
separationist position, while Himmelfarb calls it into question.

In an entirely different vein are discussions of what the Jewish community
role should be in the anti-poverty program. Richard G. Hirsch, executive
director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations' Commission on
Social Action, authored There Shall Be No Poor , a thorough discussion
of the Jewish attitudes towards poverty and the effective participation of
Jewish institutions in fighting poverty in the United States.
Research Approaches and Methods

As the foregoing pages reveal, the great quantity of work touching upon problems of Jewish public affairs offers no substitute for the relative paucity of serious study in the field, despite great opportunities and the urgent need for such study.

Some of those who are involved in the scholarly study of Jewish public affairs have written on the problems of working in the field; several of their articles have already been cited here. Among the others, Howard Morley Sachar, a leading American Jewish historian, discusses in "Objectivity and Jewish Social Science" the new style Jewish history now coming into its own, its virtues, and its implications.

In a different vein, O. Schmelz's article "The Israel Population Census of 1961 as a Source of Demographic Data on the Jews in the Diaspora" reveals how the new statistical tools developed in Israel for reasons of state, combined with the methods of modern statistics, can be used to apply the usual demographic data in the study of a wide variety of Jewish social problems and situations. Professor R. Bachi of the Hebrew University, writing on "Recent Progress in Demographic Research on the Jews," outlines the problems facing demographers of the Jews.

This, then, is a sampling of the 1965–1966 literature bearing on Jewish public affairs. In many respects, it is a summary of questions rather than of answers, a delineation of areas of concern rather than an explication of the nature of those concerns. What should be evident, even from this far from exhaustive sampling, is the vital importance of Jewish public affairs in the spectrum of Jewish life. The literature itself should further indicate that the mere expression of the concerns of Jewish public affairs is one very important way in which the Jewish people enter into their encounter with western civilization and human civilization as a whole.

Daniel J. Elazar
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