Many types of Jewish communal services are provided under organized Jewish sponsorship. Some needs of Jews (and of non-Jews) are exclusively individual or governmental responsibilities, but a wide variety of services is 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 aid by Jews in other parts of the free world.

Geographic classification of services (i.e. local, national, overseas) is based on physical location of areas of program operation.

A more fundamental classification would be in terms of type 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 out-
patient 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, in Europe.

- Welfare services: primarily family counseling, child care, and care of the aged. Some of these services are maintained on regional as well as local bases. They are rarely organized on a national basis, except for coordinating and clearance services. Child care and care of 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: under Jewish sponsorship; among these are 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), giving 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 among national and local agencies of activities in each field of service.

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

The cohesive elements in planning and financing these services are mainly federations and welfare funds for local services, and federations together with national and overseas agencies for nonlocal 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.
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES:
INCOME AND COSTS

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 of the "gross national product" for Jewish communal services was almost $800 million for 1966. In 1967, 1968, and 1969 the response to the Israel Emergency Fund of the UJA brought this annual total over the one billion dollar mark. Excluded from this total are almost all endowment income of federations and local agencies; all local capital fund campaigns, and all internal congregational operating expenses. Also, costs of Jewish education may 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 and tax funds, with moderate changes in contributed income in the last decade. A comparison of data for 1967 with data for 1957, indicates the following major changes:

- Federations raised $6.5 million more in 1967 for regular operating purposes, but the 1967 IEF experience resulted in an increase in total federation campaign results of about $185 million beyond the 1957 level.
- Grants by community chests for local Jewish services rose by over $6 million.
- Hospital income rose by at least $240 million,* income for care of the aged by over $35 million, and center income by about $20 million.
- While nonlocal agencies raised about $50 million more in 1967 than in 1957, most of this sum was earmarked for special and capital purposes (which are not included in federation annual campaigns). The major increases in such special and capital funds were: Brandeis University $10 million, Reform and Conservative drives $6 million, higher education in Israel $5 million, secondary education in Israel $2.2 million, Yeshiva University and Medical School $4.8 million. Other major increases were $3.2 million for the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, mainly for drives in New York and Chicago, and $5 million for national health agencies. Other income rose by about $40 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 $640 million.

* Excludes hospitals with income of about $90 million in 1967, for which reports were not available ten years earlier and which may include additional rises of $50 to $60 million in income in this decade.
from 1957 to 1967 (or about $460 million, excluding the Israel Emergency Fund).

Results of Jewish Federated Fund Raising

Over $3.6 billion was raised by the central Jewish community organizations of the United States in their annual campaigns in the 30-year period 1939 through 1968. This period coincides with the organization of the UJA, which received over $2.0 billion, mainly from welfare funds.

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.
- In 1967 and 1968 the regular campaigns continued to move ahead, reaching totals of $146 million in 1967 and $153 million in 1968. The rise was expected to continue in 1969. Regular funds of $153 million was the highest total since 1949, exceeded in only three out of the last 30 years. However, the rise in regular funds between 1958 and 1968 was roughly in line with the change in the price level during this period.

A threat to Israel’s existence crystallized, in late May 1967, in the United Arab Republic blockade of Israel shipping through the Strait of Tiran, coupled with military encirclement.

As Israel faced and fought off this threat, in which the UAR was joined mainly by Jordan and Syria, Jews in the U.S., Canada, and overseas recognized that the welfare, health, education, and various related needs of immigrants in Israel would require massive additional voluntary support for

---

1 UJA partners raised funds jointly in 1934 and in 1935, but raised funds independently before 1934 and from 1936 through 1938; JDC raised funds since 1914, Keren Hayesod since 1920, and JNF since 1910.
services which the people of Israel could no longer help finance because of their other direct responsibilities.

The result was an historic outpouring of aid for the Israel Emergency Fund of UJA, with $175 million obtained by the community federations and welfare funds, in addition to the proceeds of the 1967 regular campaign. Together, welfare funds raised the record sum of $321 million in 1967.

This campaign continued in 1968 and in 1969 in response to the continuing crisis faced by Israel. Campaign results for 1968, about $85 million, were exceeded only by the 1967 peak year response. Early indications of 1969 experience point to an increase beyond the 1968 level, expected to reach about $100 million.

With minor exceptions, federation campaigns include only maintenance and operating needs. 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.2

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 for independent appeals would hence be grossly inappropriate.3

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York and its beneficiaries obtained, for its building fund, from 1961 through mid-1968, about $129 million in pledges, as well as about $36 million in government grants, $31 million in loans (including $8 million in government loans), $16 million in endowment, investment, property sales, and other income. Additional amounts were raised in 1968–69 for the Long Island Jewish Medical Center, and government grants were secured for the Mt. Sinai Hospital and Medical School. The plan encompasses numerous projects, including the 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.

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 JWB reported that capital fund drives for local centers were halted in

---

2 A group of 27 larger cities, excluding New York City, reported endowment fund assets of $80 million in 1968. Their income and earnings in 1968 were $11.5 million of which about half came from gifts and bequests, with most of the remainder derived from earnings and gains on sales.

3 For example, the N.Y. Federation of Jewish Philanthropies' experience of securing $16 million in capital fund pledges in 1966–67 and $15 million in 1967–68 were unique in size, but not in occurrence; other cities frequently raised substantial capital sums beyond their annual maintenance campaigns. In 1967–69, however, the primacy of the Israel Emergency Campaign resulted in some slow-down in local capital fund efforts.
1967 during the Israel emergency, but were resumed later. In 1967–68 there were eight constructed or expanded community centers. JWB now estimates that, in the 20-year period through 1966, capital investments for local centers had reached $120 million.4

Progress on plans for hospitals and medical centers in 1968 were reported in five cities. New or expanded homes for the aged were planned in seven cities, and sponsorship of nonprofit housing for the elderly was reported in six. Many of these efforts were begun before 1967, and will continue for at least several years after 1968, with noncontributed 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 (including the Mt. Sinai Medical School), that of Philadelphia for $15 million (ended in 1968 but with a new building fund effort planned), that of Chicago for $9 million, and that of Washington, D.C., for over $5 million.5

Reports from cities with Jewish populations of 2,730,000 listed 540,000 individual gifts, but this excluded tens of thousands of individuals covered by organization gifts, Yiddish newspaper gifts, and the like, especially in the largest cities. These reports indicate an estimated total of about one million contributions 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 $21 million in 1967, mainly to federated agencies. Outside New York City, chests provided over $18 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, the stage of development of local services in specific communities, the levels and sources of internal income of local Jewish agencies, and the prevailing relationships among Jewish federations, Jewish local agencies, and chests.

Independent Campaigns

Each federation determines for itself the beneficiary agencies which it supports through allocations. There are about 11 nonlocal appeals which are included by three-quarters or more of all federated campaigns, and 21 additional appeals which are included by more than one-third of all federations. Other agencies receive less extensive inclusion.

---

4 JWB Yearbook, Volume 17, 1968.
5 Reported mainly in 1967 and 1968 issues of JTA Community News Reporter. Since coverage is not complete, figures cited are understatements. Some projects were announced in earlier years.
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 of the 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 have developed policy statements regarding supplementary 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 1967 some 16 overseas agencies (other than UJA) independently raised $35.6 million for both capital and operating purposes. In most cases these were not additions to the allocations received from welfare funds, but represented the sole funds raised by these agencies in communities for particular purposes. Thus, out of roughly half the total raised independently for operating purposes by overseas agencies, two agencies (ORT, American Red Mogen Dovid), which did not appeal to welfare funds, raised $3.2 million; two (National Committee for Labor Israel, Pioneer Women of America) which sought funds independently in large cities, raised $4 million; and one agency (Hadassah), which raised funds independently in half the communities while supplementing its Federation allocations in the other half, raised $10 million independently.

Similarly, out of $60 million raised independently by national agencies, almost $5.6 million was raised by community relations agencies concentrated in New York and Chicago; $18 million was raised by national hospitals and Einstein Medical College, and $14.2 million by Brandeis University, which were excluded by most or all federations but raised a major portion of their funds for nonoperating purposes. Three agencies (B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, Reform Jewish Appeal, Jewish Theological Seminary-United Synagogue) relied on membership support to augment federation allocations by $14.4 million.

The New York United Jewish Appeal's inclusion is limited to the national United Jewish Appeal, National Jewish Welfare Board, and United Hias Service; other nonlocal agencies raise funds independently in New York City. While no accurate estimates of the totals raised in New York City are available, partial information suggests that half of the funds raised independently may have been secured in New York City. These funds are not supplementary to allocations by welfare funds.

Capital and special funds raised independently in 1967 included over $15
million for overseas purposes and about $15 million for domestic purposes. These appeals were not granted federation allocations, but frequently sought clearance from federations for independent fund raising in specific communities (mainly higher education in Israel and Brandeis University).

Operating funds raised by welfare funds in 1967 were about $146 million, compared with over $60 million raised independently for operating purposes. Welfare fund totals do not include capital or special funds in annual campaigns, except for minor amounts.

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 do not appeal to welfare funds or receive significant welfare fund support (e.g. Brandeis University, national health appeals, membership drives of ORT and B'nai B'rith, Jewish National Fund, 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, National Council of Jewish Women, 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, homes for the aged, and vocational service agencies raised about $11.8 million independently for operating purposes in 1967. These were supplementary contributions, with the major share of income derived from Jewish federations and community chests. These amounts do not include capital fund campaign 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 usually paid in succeeding years. Collections in 1967 were temporarily accelerated in response to emergency needs in Israel. An allowance for "shrinkage," averaging 4.8 per cent, was made in 1967 for the difference between cash and pledges for the regular campaign. Shrinkage for the combined regular and IEF campaigns in 1967 was about 2.5 per cent.6

---

6 One hundred and twenty-five federations, which raised $85.5 million in regular campaigns in 1967 (outside New York City), provided for shrinkage allowances of $3.6 million, and set aside $12.5 million for central administration, planning, budgeting and fund raising. Additional costs related to the 1967 IEF were under a million dollars for this group of cities.
Cost of administering federations, including costs of fund raising, budgeting, planning, and other central functions, averaged 14.6 per cent in 1967 for the regular campaign (exclusive of IEF).

These major elements explain the difference in the figures shown for amounts raised (Table 1) and the figures shown for amounts distributed (Table 3). In some cities, amounts distributed also include substantial sums from sources other than current campaigns: unrestricted investment earnings, bequests, unexpended income of prior years, and the like.

About 57 per cent of regular amounts budgeted for 1967 by welfare funds were applied to overseas needs, 4 per cent to national agencies, and almost 39 per cent to local services. From 1966 the percentage shifts for most fields of service 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. In 1963 through 1967 the UJA share was from 54 to 55 per cent.

Regular allocations to UJA by welfare funds rose by about $2.7 million (to $63.3 million) in 1967, with a similar rise indicated in the 1968 regular campaign. Allocations to the 1967 campaign for the Israel Emergency Fund of the UJA were more than twice the level of regular allocations to UJA. As a result, UJA received in 1967 about four-fifths of all funds allocated by welfare funds. In 1968, early indications were that UJA continued to receive about 55 per cent of regular funds budgeted, and about 75 per cent of all funds allocated (including IEF).

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 largest cities. Thus, nonlocal agencies continued to receive about 58 per cent of regular funds budgeted in 1967 in cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over. The smallest communities (under 5,000 Jewish population), 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 70 per cent of budgeted funds.

Local services received from federation sources for operating purposes, about $43 million in 1967, compared with $42 million in 1966. Increases were shared by some local fields of service, where aid was secured from community chests, except hospitals and homes for the aged. Income for Jewish local services from community chests rose by about five per cent in 1967. This was equivalent

Note that amounts raised are larger than amounts budgeted, generally to the extent of shrinkage allowances and costs of operating federations; therefore, percentages of amounts raised will be lower than percentages of amounts budgeted.
to about half the rise of total costs of services eligible for chest support, which had increased (family and child care, and recreation). Jewish federation allocations rose by over three per cent, but this was effected mainly by increased allocations for Jewish education; the need to provide total financing in cities where local Jewish services received no chest support, and the need to supplement chest grants.

There was a moderate increase in allocations for local capital purposes in 1967. Such allocations did not exceed 1.3 per cent of the total nationally, or 1.9 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 $34.1 million provided to fields eligible for chest support in 1967 in 125 cities outside New York City (hospitals, family, child care, centers, aged, and administration), total chest support of $18.2 million should be deducted. The difference ($15.9 million), or about 47 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 not, the approximate value 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 a study of agency programs and finances, utilization of factual reports and intercommunity statistical comparisons prepared by CJFWF, and consideration of recommendations by the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC), consisting of 25 of the largest communities. LCBC recommendations deal with 15 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 United Jewish Appeal and other overseas agencies, and through the Israel Bond drive. From 1948 through 1968 the UJA provided over 1.1 billion dollars for the Jewish Agency for Israel (via the United Israel Appeal, which included transmissions of $115 million to the Jewish National Fund, mainly between 1948 and 1952). The JDC used about $177 million\(^8\) of UJA funds for its program in Israel (as part of its ramified overseas services). Hadassah raised about $184 million in this period. Sales of Israel Bonds were over $1,077 million in the United States.

United States governmental assistance and restitution payments from Germany are the other major external sources of aid to Israel. U.S. government aid to Israel through 1966 was about $1,105 million, but this included $476 million in loans, of which at least $273 million was later repaid; grants and technical aid of $278 million; and surplus food valued at $348 million. This included grants and loans in local currency, partially repaid. In 1967 U.S. government aid, exclusively in the form of loans, rose $32 million on a net basis, after repayment of about $21 million.\(^9\)

By the end of November 1968 foreign currency balances were reported at about $861 million.\(^10\) However, in the last quarter of 1968, there was a sharp drop in foreign currency of about $130 million. Offsetting liabilities had simultaneously increased, mainly because of global sales of Israel Bonds in 1968. These balances have risen in most years since 1958, and have paralleled the rise in foreign debt. This debt was reported at $1,556 million at the end of 1967, and has since risen because of record sales of Israel Bonds of $348 million in 1968. By September 1968 foreign currency debts were reported at $1,666 million.\(^11\)

Israel's own earnings are largely from exports of goods and services, supplemented by foreign investment and private transfers of funds. Exports reached $532 million in 1967, or about 73 per cent of imports of $727 million.\(^12\) The 1967 deficit reached $195 million, the lowest in a decade; but

\(^8\) This was included in total receipts of JDC of over $603 million received from 1948 through 1968. Total JDC receipts in the 55-year period 1914 through 1968, from all sources, was about $893 million.


\(^10\) This includes deposits in Israel, deposits abroad, and deposits with the International Monetary Fund. Statistical Bulletin of Israel, December 1968.

\(^11\) Israel Economist, December 1968 and February 1969—Internal and external government debt rose from $2.3 billion in March 1967 to over $3.2 billion in March 1969.

\(^12\) Annual Report of Bank of Israel for 1967, English Edition, published May 1968. Data for prior years revised from earlier estimate. The annual margin of errors in these annual estimates is usually moderate. However, in 1966 this margin was about $27 million and had risen to $114 million in 1967 accounted for mainly by some omissions in the data which make up the aggregate estimates.
preliminary data for 1968 pointed to at least a doubling of the trade deficit for that year.

These figures deal only with trade in commodities. If services are included (tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $445 million in 1966, and $437 million in 1967. These deficits were partially offset, in 1966, by $292 million in "unilateral transfers" consisting mainly of restitution and reparations, campaign proceeds in the U.S. and other countries, personal transfers, and U.S. government aid. In 1967 these transfers reached $522 million, and resulted in a rise of $216 million in foreign currency reserves.

**Philanthropic Programs for Israel**

Philanthropic funds have continued to be an important source of income for Israel's economy. These funds are specifically earmarked for welfare, health, and educational programs. A byproduct effect is that the exchange of dollars for pounds is helpful to the economy of the country.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies, reporting to the CJFWF, had available for overseas purposes about $283.5 million in 1967, and $101.2 million in 1966. Over 80 per cent of these funds are generally available for Israel purposes; this figure rose to over 90 per cent in 1967. Campaigns in other overseas countries also provide funds for programs in Israel. The Bank of Israel reported global transmissions of about $323 million to Israel in 1967, compared with $97 million in 1966.

In addition, net receipts from sale of Israel Bonds in 1967 totalled $175 million, after redemption and conversion, contrasted with net receipts in 1966 of $11 million after similar redemptions.13

Immigration since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948 through 1968 totalled about 1,300,000 14 while about 184,000 Jews migrated from Israel to other countries. Major immigration took place from 1948 through 1951, when about 685,000 Jews entered Israel. About 90,000 Jews immigrated in the following four years (1952–55); in the next two years (1956–57) there was a surge forward, with over 127,000 settling in Israel.

The immigration pace slackened in the three years, 1958–60, when about 75,000 Jews went to Israel, but the tempo of movement again was heightened in the ensuing four years (1961–64), when almost 230,000 Jews migrated to Israel. Movement in 1966 and 1967 declined to the 1952–55 level, but again rose to the 1965 level (over 30,000) in 1968.

The waves of immigration were related to existing opportunities at particular times: the postwar migration of displaced persons; movements from Eastern Europe when local conditions in Poland, Hungary, and Rumania

---

permitted; movements from North Africa resulting mainly from political changes in Alegria, Tunisia, Morocco, Yemen, and Egypt, and the like.

**Bond Sales for Israel**

The following State of Israel bond issues have been floated since 1951: Independence Issue, Development Issue, Second Development Issue, Third Development Issue, Development Investment Issue, and Fourth Development Issue. Sales of the Third Development Issue began on March 1, 1964, of the First Development Investment Issue on March 31, 1966, of the Fourth Development Issue on September 15, 1967, and of the Second Development Issue on August 1, 1968.

Flotation of the Independence Issue for the 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. These issues were completely redeemed.

Sales of the Second Development Issue were $293.7 million by 1964, the end of the five-year flotation. Sales of the Third Development Issue began on March 1, 1964. At November 1967, $345.2 million had been sold, and were still outstanding.

Total bonds for all issues were $1,277 million at the end of 1968, including $1,077 million sold in the United States. The billion dollar mark for sales in the United States was reached early in 1968.

At the end of November 1968 there were outstanding in the hands of the public $729 million, consisting of $53.4 million First Development Issue; $162.1 million Second Development Issue; $324.5 million Third Development Issue; $29.3 million Development Investment Issue, and $114.8 million Fourth Development Issue.

From the inception of sale of Israel Bonds in May 1951 through 1968, about $88 million worth of State of Israel Bonds were received by UJA in payment of allocations provided from the proceeds of individual pledges. In 1968, $8.6 million worth of bonds were reported to have been received by UJA in payment of individual pledges to local welfare funds.

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. Therefore, these bonds may not be used in payment of pledges during this two-year period.


A substantial portion of the funds received by bondholders on redemption

---

15 This includes $5.6 million in conversion from earlier issues.
16 This includes $24.8 million in conversions from earlier issue.
of their matured bonds was reinvested in State of Israel Bonds sold in 1963 and later years.

Bond sales in the United States totalled $107 million in 1968. It was exceeded only by the 1967 peak of $190 million. These results reflected the response to the critical needs of Israel at the time of the six-day war, and continuing thereafter.

In Canada, 1968 sales amounted to $7.7 million, compared with $8.4 million the preceding year. Elsewhere, $15.8 million in bonds were sold. Worldwide sales amounted to $130.5 million in 1968.

The proceeds from bond sales are used for agriculture, industry, power and fuel, housing and school construction, and transportation and communications.

Reparations and Restitution Funds

Foreign currency income from individual restitution payments from Germany constituted a major source of foreign currency for Israel during 1966 and 1967. It totalled $110.4 million in 1966 and $123.2 million in 1967.

The JDC continues to receive $1 million annually from residual reparations funds. The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1964 with $10.4 million from Claims Conference funds for the support of "Jewish history, religion, education, traditions." Operations began in 1965. Thirty-eight Jewish organizations joined the Foundation, including seven from the United States. In 1966–67 allocations of about $1,246,000 were granted to organizations in 13 countries and to individual scholars for activity in the areas of education, research, publication, and documentation of the Holocaust. Allocations are granted out of current income only.

Overseas Agencies

American Jewish financial support for needs in Israel and in other overseas areas is provided mainly through federation allocations to the United Jewish Appeal and to about a dozen other overseas agencies. UJA continued to receive the major share of overseas allocations by welfare funds.17 Other overseas agencies raised the major portion of their funds independently.

Total income in 1967 of all overseas agencies was $283.5 million, with over $35 million raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities were the Israel Education Fund of the UJA; Hadassah, which raised $10.3 million through activities of its members; the building and special fund drives of the Hebrew University and Technion, which raised $5 million; the drives of the National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women which raised $4 million for welfare activities conducted by Histadrut in Israel; the Jewish National Fund (JNF) cam-

17 The UJA share of all regular funds budgeted was 54.6 per cent in 1967. Its share of gross regular pledges was 47 per cent in 1968; this pledge share was increased to 66 per cent through the Israel Emergency Fund.
paign for "traditional income," which raised $2.9 million; and Weizmann Institute, which raised $3.2 million.

**United Jewish Appeal**

The United Jewish Appeal is a partnership of the United Israel Appeal (UIA; formerly United Palestine Appeal) and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (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 1968, the UJA received about $2,035 million and distributed about $1,220 million to UIA, $608 million to JDC, and about $89 million to United Service for New Americans (USNA), New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), and United Hias Service (UHS).

The peak year was 1967, when UJA received $67.1 million in pledges for its regular campaign and $175 million for its Israel Emergency Fund. In 1968 UJA regular allocations were reported at $71.1 million and the Israel Emergency Fund at $85 million.

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 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 current distribution of UJA funds is in accordance with a formula which has remained unchanged since 1951, and is effective through 1973. 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, nor to the Israel Emergency Funds of 1967, 1968, and 1969.

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 $25.3 million in pledges was received from 1965 until the end of 1968.

Large gifts are sought: $100,000 and over, payable up to five years, with no diminution of the gift from the same source to the welfare fund providing
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 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, exempts the institution from governmental tax, provides funds toward the cost of maintenance, and agrees not to make similar arrangements with other efforts of this kind without prior consultation with UJA and UIA.

**UJA Regular and IEF Funds**

On a *pledge* basis, UJA regular income was $71.1 million in 1968, exclusive of the Israel Education Fund. This was about six per cent higher than the 1967 pledge total of $67.1 million. In addition, pledges for the Israel Emergency Fund were about $85 million.

On a *cash* basis, UJA had receipts of almost $60 million in “regular” funds in 1968, compared with $82 million in 1967. These were the cash amounts received each year, regardless of years in which the pledges were made. In addition, $3.3 million was received in 1967 and $2.2 million in 1968 for the Israel Education Fund.

Cash receipts for the 1967 Israel Emergency Fund were $151.8 million by the end of 1967, and rose to about $170 million by February 1969.

Cash receipts for the 1968 Israel Emergency Fund (of $85 million in estimated pledges) exceeded $50 million by February 1969.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its percentage share of campaign proceeds. UJA regular allocation proceeds for 1968 were about $71.1 million, compared with regular campaign proceeds of about $153 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. The unpaid balance at the end of 1968 was $41.7 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.
UJA funds destined for the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, are disbursed through UIA, one of the two official partners in UJA.

Receipts of UIA from UJA in 1967–68 were about $211 million, and about $36.3 million in 1966–67. In addition, cash receipts for the Israel Education Fund were $3.2 million in 1966–67, and $3 million in 1967–68. Prior to 1967 the peak year of UJA fund raising had been 1948, but 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. The rise in 1967–68 receipts was due to the Israel Emergency Fund and to accelerated collections. These receipts decreased in 1967–68 and rose again in 1968–69, and were second only to the peak receipts of 1966–67.

**Jewish National Fund**

The Jewish National Fund, under the UJA agreement, is permitted to raise $1.8 million annually from "traditional collections" in the United States, after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Its total U.S. income, including traditional income, bequests, and other income, was about $2.9 million in 1966–67, and about $3.0 million in 1967–68. Substantial portions were raised with the help of Hadassah, the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), and other organizations.

**United Israel Appeal, Inc.**

The United Israel Appeal, Inc., resulted from merger of the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. and UIA in 1966. One hundred of the 210-member board of trustees of the combined agency are drawn from names suggested by various communities, and 100 are designated by the American Zionist organizations which had been represented in the earlier UIA. Ten are elected at large.

The new board of trustees elects two-thirds of the board of directors of 27, with the remaining one-third designated by the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.¹⁸

The operating agency for services to immigrants and other programs in Israel is the Jewish Agency for Israel, Jerusalem. These services are provided in line with the specific allocations and instructions of UIA, Inc.

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

The United Israel Appeal is the major beneficiary agency of the United Jewish Appeal, the latter being constituted by periodic agreements between UIA and JDC. The current agreement, provides for UJA campaigns to be conducted during the five-year period 1969–73.

UIA conducts a year-round program of stimulating interest in Israel

¹⁸ 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.
through the use of motion pictures, literature, and direct contact with membership organizations and welfare funds.

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.

**Israel Emergency Fund**

The response of the American Jewish community to the crisis faced by Israel resulted in pledges of about $175 million for IEF of the UJA in 1967, and $85 million in 1968. This was in addition to the proceeds of the regular UJA campaign.

Preliminary estimates for the year ended March 31, 1969 indicate that UIA hopes to have available for allocation about $150 million in cash for both IEF and regular programs. UIA approved allocations of this sum for 1968–69, subject to revision on the basis of actual funds available.

**Jewish Agency for Israel, Jerusalem**

Sources of Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, income have been primarily UIA, Inc.; earmarked grants from the U.S.; a share of Keren Hayesod campaigns in Jewish communities outside the U.S.; grants and loans by the Israel government for costs of agricultural settlement; and earmarked contributions for Youth Aliyah.

From 1948 through 1968, the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, received UJA funds of about $1.1 billion, through the UIA and its predecessor, the United Palestine Appeal. (In earlier years of this period, JNF had received $115 million as part of this total.) JNF received funds indirectly from the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, since 1952, with such support ending in March 1965.

Before 1967, about 80 per cent of contribution income generally came from the United States, but the 1967 Israel crisis brought a rise in the share of contributions by overseas Jewry. Contributions in 1966–67 accounted for about $46 million transmitted to Israel from the United States and other countries. This was about two-thirds of total income (exclusive of loans), but less than half of total income, including loans. Israel government grants for agriculture and remaining receipts, mainly from reparations and heirless property, sales of housing to earlier immigrants, and earmarked funds, covered the balance of income.

The Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, spent about $97 million in the year ended March 31, 1967, including loan repayment of principal and interest. Exclusive of loans, income had been about $66 million annually.

However, in 1967–68 the response of world Jewry made it possible for the Jewish Agency to provide over $250 million for a larger proportion of the
immigrant costs which have been borne by the Jewish Agency since 1948.

The largest single area of functional expenditures was for housing, amounting to almost $72 million in 1967-68, with over $70 million provided for transportation, absorption, and related welfare programs for immigrants. Agricultural settlement amounted to almost $55 million in 1967-68. The objective is eventual self-support for the newcomer. Aid is provided in the form of founding new settlements, irrigation projects, citriculture, equipment, seed, instruction, supplementary employment, and long-term loans.

Youth Aliyah programs for maintenance and education of immigrant and other youth activities cost about $6.4 million in 1967-68. 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 $31.7 million in 1967-68 for institutions of higher learning in Israel (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, Technion, Bar-Ilan University, and Tel Aviv University). Other costs included 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 World Zionist Organization.

Programs Financed by United Israel Appeal, Inc.

The Israel Emergency Fund made possible the allocation by UIA of over $188 million in 1967-68 and $150 million in 1968-69, for welfare and related programs in Israel. This involved increased UIA financing of health services, agricultural settlement, housing, and education.

In 1966-67 UIA, Inc. provided $34.4 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, UIA instructions. In addition, UIA paid $5 million in loans and in interest in the United States.

The programs receiving the largest shares of UIA financing in 1967-68 were for agricultural settlement, housing, education, and higher education. In each case, UIA earmarked its funds for specific programs. Tentative earmarking of UIA funds for 1968-69 included $31.9 million for higher education, $26 million for immigrant housing, $26.4 million for immigrant absorption, and related welfare services, $19.8 million for education (not mandated by the government), and about $18.5 million each, for agricultural settlement and health programs. Other costs for these programs were to be met from gifts by overseas Jewry and from other sources of Jewish Agency income.
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 in cooperation with indigenous Jewish organizations.

It assisted about 340,000 persons in 1968. Of these, 94,000 were in Israel (including some 41,000 receiving aid from Malben, 30,000 in ORT schools, and 17,000 in yeshivot), 74,000 in Western Europe, 33,000 in Eastern Europe, 51,000 in Moslem areas, and about 7,000 in other areas. This does not include 81,000 aided by “relief-in-transit” programs which are less formally organized.

In 1968 disbursements were $21.6 million. Income was $19.9 million, supplemented by use of about $2.6 million in 1967 receipts, which had been accelerated because of the emergency in Israel that year. Regular income included $1 million in residual Claims Conference funds, $0.5 million in related restitution funds, and almost $0.9 million of Malben income in Israel.

The JDC Malben program of service to sick, aged, and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to account for the largest single share of the agency’s appropriations—$6,525,000, or 29 per cent of the 1968 total. An additional $840,000 was provided for aid to yeshivot and other traditional institutions in Israel. In 1968 Malben aided about 41,000 persons. It provided care of the aged in institutions and in their own homes, and medical and psychiatric services. Malben accounts for the greatest portion of the total of over $177 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1968.

The largest number of North African Jews receiving JDC aid was in Morocco, where over 20,000 Jews (more than one in every two Jews remaining in Morocco) were being assisted in 1968. About 26,500 Jews in Tunisia and Iran were also receiving JDC aid. In 1968 JDC appropriated $4,295,000 for work in Moslem areas. JDC assistance is channelled through such agencies as OSE for health services; the Alliance Israelite Universelle, Ozar Hatorah, and Lubavitcher schools for educational work; and ORT for vocational training.

JDC programs operated in other European countries; half of the European total costs were centered in France, and included a large proportion of Tunisian, Algerian, and Moroccan refugees. Jews aided in France were also assisted by federated agencies of the Fonds Social Juif Unifie, which receive JDC aid. The JDC assistance program in Poland was terminated at the end of 1967, at the request of the Polish government; the JDC program in Rumania was reactivated.

The Czechoslovakian crisis and the resurgence of antisemitism in Poland in 1968, resulted in JDC aid to most of the 7,000 Jews who were able to leave these countries.
ORT and Vocational Education

Vocational training overseas is provided through the 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, 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 $15.2 million in 1968, and are projected at $17.3 million for 1969. Total ORT trainees in 1968 numbered 50,200, of which 30,060 were in Israel, 5,600 in France, 3,600 in Italy, 5,300 in Moslem countries, and the balance mainly in Europe.

American Jewish support of the ORT program is channelled in two ways: through JDC grants to ORT ($2,100,000 for 1967, $2,250,000 for 1968, and $2,350,000 for 1969), derived from JDC participation in UJA, and through membership contributions of ORT in the United States. Women's American ORT provided about $2.2 million in 1968. The agreement between ORT and JDC permits ORT to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25, except where there is a mutual agreement for a higher level with specific federations.

World ORT raised about $1 million in other countries in 1968, and secured about $9.8 million locally in the countries of operation, mainly from government sources.

Global income of ORT was estimated at about $15.2 million in 1968, and was expected to reach almost $17 million in 1969. Less than half of the outlay in 1968 was in Israel ($6.9 million) and over one-fourth in France ($4.4 million), where 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 6,250 Jewish immigrants to migrate in 1968 (including 1,945 to the United States), compared with 6,242 in 1967. The number requiring such aid is expected to remain 6,300 in 1969.

A large proportion of the Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remain in New York City, where the New York Association for New Americans provides services aiding their resettlement and absorption. Hence, the financing of the program of NYANA is considered to be a national responsibility, as reflected in NYANA's inclusion as a direct beneficiary of national UJA.

Current annual Jewish immigration to the United States is estimated at about 7,000, including those aided by agencies and those arriving independently. Of those who settled in New York City, about 2,400 received aid
from NYANA in 1968. UJA grants to NYANA in 1968 and 1967 were over $600,000 annually.

**Hadassah**

The largest income of an overseas service agency, other than UJA, was that of Hadassah which received $15.3 million in 1967-68, and $14.3 million in 1966-67. Hadassah's major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah. The new Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem was opened in 1961 at a cost of about $27.6 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.\(^\text{19}\)

The Youth Aliyah program for the maintenance and training of immigrant youth (in the earliest years orphaned, now mainly with families in Israel) and other youth activities is conducted by the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, at an annual cost of about $7 million. Hadassah's transmission to Youth Aliyah was about $1.7 million in 1967-68. Hadassah reports that it has supplied over $56 million for Youth Aliyah since the program was begun 35 years ago. Other women's groups, in the United States and overseas, provide smaller supplementary funds for Youth Aliyah. The number of children cared for annually was about 10,800, including 1,800 in day centers.

**Higher Education in Israel**

Enrollment in 1968-69 at all of the institutions of higher education in Israel totalled about 35,000, compared with about 28,500 in 1967-68 and 18,400 in 1964-65. Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, and Technion had receipts in America of almost $13.8 million in 1967, mainly in contributions. Income of Hebrew University and Technion rose by $2.6 million in that year. In addition, these three institutions, together with four other institutions, received grants of over $30 million each in 1967-68 and 1968-69, from the United Israel Appeal, a beneficiary of UJA funds, and from the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem. The government of Israel had been a major source of support in earlier years.

Weizmann Institute income in the United States is derived from an annual fund-raising dinner and from an investment program.\(^\text{20}\)

In 1967 and 1968 Hebrew University and Technion received about $640,000 annually from federations for maintenance purposes. Together,

\(^{19}\) All hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary, and private) totalled about 21,600 and provided about 7.1 million days' care in 1987. Hadassah had about 650 beds and bassinets, and provided about 193,000 days' care.

\(^{20}\) In 1967-68, Weizmann Institute received about $2,722,000 from the Jewish Agency, Hebrew University $8,749,000, Technion $4,590,000, Bar-Ilan University $1,067,000, Tel Aviv University $2,585,000, Haifa University $1,367,000, and University in the Negev $790,000, with almost $11 million additional subject to distribution among these agencies. These funds included sums provided by the United Israel Appeal.
their building fund and special fund cash campaign proceeds were $5.7 million in 1967. The maintenance appeals of the two institutions were combined; their capital fund drives were conducted separately.

Both institutions had marked enrollment increases in recent years, but these slowed in 1968–69, with about 12,500 students registered at Hebrew University (including a Tel Aviv branch) and 5,600 at Technion.

Hebrew University maintains schools of humanities, social sciences, education, social work, physical sciences, agriculture, law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy. Technion has schools in various branches of engineering, architecture, industrial sciences, as well as a technical high school.

Bar-Ilan University was originally founded in 1955, with the support of the Mizrachi Organization of America, but subsequently evolved as an independent institution. In 1968–69 it had a student enrollment of 3,800 in the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

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 about 9,000 students enrolled in 1968–69 in the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, law, and medicine.

Haifa University began its program in 1964–65, and had an enrollment of 3,000 students in 1968–69. Beersheba University opened in 1965 and had an enrollment of 1,000 students in 1968–69.

Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel

In 1967, there were 17,750 students in 265 yeshivot receiving support from the government of Israel (over $1.1 million in 1968–69). Students in 121 of these yeshivot receive JDC support as well. Many of the yeshivot have no age limits, but most students are aged 14 to 17. They are called "traditional institutions" because their roots are in the traditional religious life in Eastern Europe.

Many of the yeshivot receive JDC support (about $800,000 annually). Some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel Institutions ($168,000 raised in 1967), but a great number also seek funds separately in the United States through collectors (meshulochim) and through mail appeals.

Cultural programs in Israel were supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation ($1.8 million in 1968), including in its appeal some 50 agencies in Israel. These agencies were mainly in the fields of music, theater, dance, art, and literature. AICF seeks building funds, in addition to funds for maintenance. The recent major capital projects were for a new structure to house the National Museum of Israel, and for the Central Library in Jerusalem.
Other Overseas Agencies

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

Hadassah, Pioneer Women, and National Council of Jewish Women have traditionally raised most of their funds through membership activities; the 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; the 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 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 the 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.

In addition, efforts were begun in mid-1967 to avoid interference with efforts on behalf of the UJA Israel Emergency Fund.

Fifteen overseas agencies, other than UJA agencies, had income of $39.3 million in 1967, compared with $31.5 million in 1966.

UHS and AICF participated in the cooperative budget review process of the Large City Budgeting Conference, a grouping of welfare funds in 25 of the largest cities.

The Labor Zionist effort in the United States is channelled through the National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women, which raise funds for activities of the Histadrut in Israel in education, vocational training, health, and immigrant welfare.

There are agencies which center their activities in other areas, but include limited overseas programs: The National Council of Jewish Women, 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.

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency is a worldwide news service reporting news affecting the Jewish people.

---

21 Authorized agencies in recent years were: American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund raising dinner only); American Friends of the 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).
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: American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Section of the World Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, Jewish War Veterans, and Jewish Labor Committee.

**NATIONAL SERVICES—UNITED STATES**

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, and health and vocational services.

Some agencies operate in more than one field of service. As a result, there are 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 means of aid in strengthening fund raising, budgeting, planning and coordination of services, public relations, intercity and national-local relations, overseas services, specialized consultation in such services as family service, child care, care of the aged and health services, and 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 current major 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.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) serves as the coordinating and clearance agency for the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, National Council of Jewish Women, the three congregational associations, and 81 local and regional community relations councils.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council, B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, and Jewish War Veterans have participated in the cooperative budget review process of the Large City Budgeting Conference.

The five national operating agencies and NCRAC received $12.8 million in 1967, compared with $11.9 million in 1966. Most of the increase was secured by the American Jewish Committee and by the Anti-Defamation League through independent fund raising in New York City.

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 TB therapy in recent years led to a shift of emphasis by the TB hospitals to include heart, cancer, 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-eighth 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 1967 were $40 million, compared with $30.5 million in 1966. Its student enroll-
ment in 1967–68 was 455. It awarded 96 M.D. degrees in 1967–68. A new 375-bed hospital was opened early in 1966 by the medical school, at a construction cost of $20 million. An agreement was developed, in 1969, between Montefiore Hospital and the hospital of Yeshiva University, involving operations of both facilities by Montefiore Hospital and availability of teaching facilities of both hospitals to the Einstein Medical School.

Income of the other five agencies was $19.5 million in 1967, compared with $17.6 million in 1966. Two of the agencies (City of Hope, near Los Angeles, and National Jewish Hospital, in Denver) accounted for almost $16.2 million of the 1967 total.

**Service Agencies**

Basic services to individuals are provided by local agencies, financed in large measure by federations and (in some fields) by community chests and United Funds. These local agencies need to know of the experience of other communities and the results of national program planning. To meet this need, five national organizations 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 in their respective fields.

The National Jewish Welfare Board is the largest of these agencies. In 1967 JWB received $1,829,000, out of a total of $2,461,000, 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 financial plan is 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.

The American Association for Jewish Education serves local communities with studies and consultation in educational trends, stimulation of student enrollment, 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 Service (JVS) 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 81 affiliated local community-relations agencies.

**Jewish Culture**

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 include 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.

The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, financed with German reparations funds, allocated $296,000 for activities in the United States in 1966–67. This included a grant for the World Council on Jewish Education, several yeshivot, research grants to agencies, and a grant for projects documenting the Holocaust.

In addition to a number of small agencies dealing with specific aspects of Jewish cultural endeavors exclusively,22 major programs in the Jewish cultural area are conducted by agencies which concentrate their efforts in other fields (e.g., American Jewish Committee, Jewish Welfare Board).

Sixteen agencies had total income of $46.4 million in 1967. Of these, Brandeis University had $28.2 million; B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, $5.3 million; Yeshiva University programs (other than medical and religious), $9.8 million; and Zionist Organization of America, $1.2 million. The remaining 12 agencies received $1.9 million in 1967.

Three of the agencies are institutions of higher learning: Brandeis University, Dropsie College and Jewish Teachers Seminary, and People's University. In addition, Yeshiva University has university courses in the arts and sciences, as well as a medical school and a theological seminary.

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; by the American Academy for Jewish Research; by the American Jewish Historical Society, the American Jewish Archives, the 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 in Hebraics. Population studies are conducted mainly by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) and the Jewish Welfare Board.

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

---

22 The field also includes agencies operated under Jewish auspices with general cultural programs as well as programs with more specific Jewish content.
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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 congregations reported 224,000 family memberships and Conservative congregations reported over 231,000 family memberships in 1968. Orthodox congregations had a membership of well over 200,000 families. In addition, ancillary sisterhoods, brotherhoods, men's clubs, youth groups, and nonmember users of synagogues were related to each of these networks of congregations.

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 such programs should be completely a congregational responsibility.

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion prepares religious

---

23 See Budget Digest series, issued April 1969 by CJFWF, on UAHC and United Synagogue of America.
functionaries for Reform Judaism; the Jewish Theological Seminary, for Conservative Judaism; and Yeshiva University and several smaller institutions, for Orthodox Judaism.

Most Orthodox yeshivot are located in New York City. Major yeshivot 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 Yeshivot, 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.

Fourteen national religious agencies received $24.7 million in 1967, compared with $23.3 million in 1966. This excludes the Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University which received a total of $40 million in 1967, compared with the 1966 total of $30.5 million.

LOCAL SERVICES

Central communal sources (Jewish federations and Chest-United Funds) provided about $65 million for local Jewish services in 1967.

Jewish federations supplied about $44.4 million in 1967, compared with $42.9 million in 1966, 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. Other sources of funds (service fees, public funds and the like) exceeded contributions in most fields of service.

Nonsectarian community chests and United Funds provided an additional estimated $21 million in 1967, in most cases through Jewish federations, but in some cases directly to Jewish service agencies. Of this sum, $14.4 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 centers. A substantial share of contributed communal income even in these fields comes from Jewish federations, particularly for health and care of the aged services; federations also have the exclusive responsibility for sectarian

25 Includes Greater New York Fund and NYC United Hospital Fund.
activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

The budgets of agencies in different fields of service vary widely—as do the proportion of these budgets provided by Jewish federations and community chests, as reflected below in data for 1967 (except for centers, 1966):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of service</th>
<th>Reported receipts (in millions)$a$</th>
<th>Provided by Jewish federations and community chests (in millions)$a$</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>$427.0</td>
<td>$12.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish education</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged care</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers (excl. camps)</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family service</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational services</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available data for 125 communities, for 1967 and 1966, 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. In the fields where chest funds are available there was approximate parity, in the aggregate, in federation and chest levels of financing. The combined rise in funds in 1967 was 4 per cent.

Rises from 6 to 10 per cent in 1967 in central community grants were experienced in the fields of Jewish education, recreation, and family and child care. Hospital grants fell by 6 per cent and refugee care costs by 19 per cent.

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 2.6 per cent of receipts of hospitals in 1967, 8.3 per cent for care of the aged and for Jewish education, 23.3 per cent for child care, 38 per cent for centers, 74.5 per cent for family services and close to 100 per cent for refugee aid and local community-relations programs.

An analysis of allocations for local services by 89 communities over a five-year span (1963–1967) indicates significant changes:

Both chest and Federation grants rose, by 21 and 17 per cent, respectively. The federation share of allocations was stabilized at about 60 per cent during this period.

---

*a These data are largely on a receipts rather than on allocations basis, including minor non-federated chest-supported agencies, but reflecting some minor gaps in reporting and variations in fiscal periods. Hence there are small variations with data on other bases elsewhere in this report.

b Exclusive of about $33 million in research funds, mainly from governmental sources.
The sharpest rises in allocations since 1963 were for Jewish education (33 per cent), centers, employment services, family services and child care (20 to 27 per cent), care of the aged and community-relations services (16 to 19 per cent). Allocations for refugee care fell by 15 per cent. Hospital allocations fell by 4 per cent.

A similar analysis for a full decade indicates that chest grants rose by 39 per cent since 1958, while federation grants rose by 43 per cent. The sharpest rises in the decade 1958–1967 were for Jewish education, 73 per cent; centers, 63 per cent; care of the aged, 58 per cent; employment services, 51 per cent; family and child care services, 48 per cent; and local community relations, 37 per cent. Allocations for refugee care fell by 31 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; 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 averaged about 21 per cent of total combined allocations (federations plus United Funds) in the group of cities with population over 40,000, excluding New York City (a decline from 28 per cent in 1962), as contrasted with 8 per cent for the 15,000 to 40,000 population group, and less than two per cent for other smaller cities.

There were reports on 22,635 beds and bassinets in 63 general and special hospitals in 1967 under local Jewish sponsorship. Federations and chests provided $12.2 million for 58 of these hospitals in 1967.

A total of 6.6 million days' care was provided in 1967 by 63 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, federation allocations accounted for less than 3 per cent of operating receipts in 1967. Payments for hospital service (individual patient fees and Blue Cross insurance) and tax support in 1967 rose to $396 million in 58 hospitals, or about 89 per cent of operating receipts. The sharpest rise was in government payments, which doubled in 1967 and accounted for over $126 million of the total of $396 million in service payments.

The exception is Washington, D.C.
Family and Child Care

Family service agencies provide personal and family counseling, family-life education, psychiatric services, and limited economic aid. An increasing number of agencies provide homemaker services in relation to illness of parents or care of the aged in their own homes, and group treatment where this is indicated as potentially helpful. Activities of family-service agencies are frequently conducted jointly with child-care programs and with refugee services. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most cities with a Jewish population of over 5,000. As in the case of health programs, most services are provided on a local level, although there are several regional programs.

In 1967, reports from 76 family agencies showed on their rolls a total of 79,458 open cases served directly, with about 55,000 cases closed during the year, and a monthly average active caseload of over 19,000 families.

A total of 7,975 children were under care during 1967 in 40 child care agencies for which data were available. About 25 per cent of 4,523 children under care at the end of the year were in foster homes and 31 per cent in residential centers, 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 6 per cent in 1967. Such central allocations continued to account for about 73 per cent of total receipts of family agencies (including refugee service). Central allocations were 22 per cent of the receipts of child-care agencies, with an additional 51 per cent provided by public tax funds.

Refugees

These services in communities are financed locally, although 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 2.8 per cent of local allocations in 1958, they accounted for only 1.4 per cent in 1967.

Because over half of the immigrants tend to settle in New York City, the largest share of refugee costs is borne by the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), financed by the national United Jewish Appeal. In metropolitan New York, it is the specialized refugee service agency. United Hias Service seeks to encourage resettlement in other communities, where prospects for adjustment and self-support may be better than in New York City.

When immigrants arrive in these cities, economic aid and counseling is 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 1967 to over 700 refugee families by 47 family agencies (including aid by NYANA). While this was about 6 per cent of the active cases of these agencies, the financial aid given to refugees was 31 per cent of aid given by these agencies to all families aided outside New York (and 42 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 729,000, in 1966. About 31 per cent of members are under 14 years of age, 18 per cent are aged 14 through 24, and about half are 25 years of age or older.

Estimated total community-center expenditures in 1966 were about $37.2 million, compared with $35.1 million in 1965, exclusive of separate camping agencies. A decade earlier, in 1956, these expenditures had been $17.3 million, while the 1945 level had been $7.2 million for a smaller network of centers. Federation and chest allocations to centers, camps, and other youth services rose by 8.6 per cent in 1967, and by 26.7 per cent in the five-year period 1963–1967 (a rise of 63 per cent since 1958).

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 56 per cent of center receipts in 1956 to 62 per cent in 1966, reflecting higher dues rates by new centers. Central community support from federations and community chests provided the balance of finances. Chests continued to provide greater support than federations in most cities in 1967, but an increasing number of federations were providing more funds to centers than was being provided by chests.

**Homes for the Aged**

There were 72 homes for the aged, which reported 13,555 beds in 1967. They cared for 17,095 residents, who received 4.6 million days' care. Federations and chests provided 8 per cent of receipts, with 85 per cent secured from payments for service, including public funds. Over 52 per cent came from governmental sources, exclusive of OASDI funds paid by clients.

Aggregate federation allocations to homes for the aged were unchanged in 1967; they had risen by about 19 per cent between 1963 and 1967 (a rise of 58 per cent since 1958), 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; over four-fifths were over 75. Family agencies served more than 22,000 persons, aged 60 and over, living in their own homes, including some requiring institutional placement.
The impact of Medicare on homes for the aged was centered on a small number of such institutions certified as hospitals under Medicare. The majority of homes for the aged were affected by Medicare mainly to the extent that they could be used for limited period service to patients transferred from hospitals when medical treatment was no longer required. The impact of Medicaid has varied greatly from state to state because of slowness in introducing adequate levels of aid.

Receipts of about $56 million were reported for 1967 by 69 of the homes. Payments for service accounted for $48.1 million, including public funds. Federation and chest support was reported at $4.6 million. There were 14 homes which received support from neither source.

**Jewish Education**

The estimated gross enrollment of students in 1966–67 was 540,000. Of these, 43 per cent were attending one-day-a-week schools, 43 per cent were attending two to five-day-a-week schools, and almost 14 per cent were in all-day schools. About 92 per cent of them were in schools under congregational auspices; communal schools account for 5 per cent of enrollment.

Over 90 per cent of children of elementary-school age attend Jewish schools (with New York City and Los Angeles below the average), but only 16 per cent of children of secondary-school age attended Jewish schools.

An earlier AAJE National Study of Jewish Education, issued in 1959, arrived at an estimated cost of “over $60 million” in 1958 for 553,600 pupils. Although this total was slightly above present estimates, this was offset by subsequent decline of one-day-a-week schools and the growth of more costly, more intensive programs.

The consumer price index rose by about 23 per cent from 1958 to the end of 1968. Hence, the cost of Jewish education since 1958 may have risen by as much as $15 million. An estimate of “about $75 million” is of the grossest type, and is advanced only in the absence of more reliable data.

The major sources of support of pre-bar mitzvah education are congregational and parental. 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. Variations in scales of tuition fees are frequently dependent on variations in provision for Jewish education from congregational membership dues. The extent of these variations in congregational dues, in tuition scales, in allowances toward tuition from congregational dues, and the inseparability of congregational and educational costs have heretofore accounted for the absence of meaningful data on financing Jewish education under congregational auspices. Taken as a whole, however, it is largely self-supporting. “Scholarship” arrangements

---

27 National Census of Jewish Schools conducted by American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE).
are made by both congregational and communal schools to avoid barring students from low income homes.

Jewish federations provide $7.0 million annually for Jewish education. The total budgets of the supported agencies are not reported, and data are not available on the shares of funds provided through congregations, with 92 per cent of enrollment under such auspices. Allocations to local Jewish schools and to bureaus of Jewish education, reported by Jewish federations, were about $6.2 million outside New York City in 1967. They rose by ten per cent in 1967. A gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education has occurred each year. They were 33 per cent higher in 1967 than they had been in 1963, and 73 per cent higher than they had been in 1958. Payments by parents, either direct 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.

Federation grants of $6.2 million in 1967 outside New York City for Jewish education were 24 per cent of total local allocations from federation sources. Community chests do not provide funds for Jewish education.

The CJFWF Committee on Federation Planning for Jewish Education developed a "guidelines statement," with particular emphasis on the need to upgrade teaching manpower and post-elementary 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 $1.1 million in 1967 (outside New York City, which is served mainly by national agencies)—a rise of 16 per cent since the start of 1963 (a rise of 37 per cent since the start of 1958). Local allocations in 1967 remained virtually unchanged in the aggregate.

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 to guide Jewish youth and others in the selection of trades and professions.

28Note that it would be inaccurate to compare the federation total of $7 million in allocations to the total of "about $75 million" for all costs of Jewish education (9 per cent), since most congregational schools do not seek federation support. Nor would it be accurate to relate this to federation support of hospitals: $12.2 million in allocations toward $427 million in receipts (2.8 per cent). It is coincidental that the percentage of total Jewish educational costs borne by federation (7 per cent) is almost identical with the percentage of enrollment, which is not under congregational auspices (8 per cent).
Jewish vocational agencies or departments of Jewish family services operate mainly in the larger cities. Federations provided about $2.3 million in 1967 (including New York City). Substantial and growing supplementary income was received in recent years from government sources and service payments. About $5.2 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 1967.

Local allocations for vocational programs increased by 3.5 per cent in 1967 outside New York City. The gain since the start of 1963 was 20 per cent.

Changes in Financing Since 1958

The major changes which took place in federation and chest support of local Jewish services in the ten-year period 1958–1967 are briefly noted. Only refugee costs fell, by $0.3 million. The major rises were for:

- Recreation services, about $4.4 million.
- Family and child-care services, over $3.2 million.
- Jewish education, almost $2.6 million.
- Care of the aged, about $1.3 million.
- Hospitals, less than $0.1 million.
- Employment and vocational service, almost $0.5 million.
- Local community relations, almost $0.3 million.

Of total rises of about $12.4 million since 1958, chests provided about $4.8 million; the balance of $7.6 million was provided by federations.

Almost three-quarters of the rises ($9 million) were in fields generally eligible for chest support. The rise in chest support ($4.8 million) in these fields was supplemented by federations for the difference ($4.2 million), and the balance of the federation rise in support ($3.4 million) went to fields receiving federation support exclusively—mainly Jewish education, which received $2.6 of this total of $3.4 million of federation support to fields of service receiving no chest support.

With a rise in the price level in this decade of about 15 per cent, the constant value of the dollar support provided to hospitals and refugee care decreased sharply, while the increases in the other fields of service would need to be deflated in keeping with price level changes during 1958–1967.

S. P. Goldberg
### TABLE 1. AMOUNTS RAISED IN CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS 1939–1968

*(Estimates in millions of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NYUJA</th>
<th>FJPNY</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$28.4</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>$15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>106.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>205.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>135.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 Regular</td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency *</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>127.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 Regular</td>
<td>153.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>100.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency *</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

1939–1968 .... $3,632.3  $844.7  $422.6  $1,267.3  $2,365.0

* Total pledges exclude amounts raised annually in smaller cities having no welfare funds, but include 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 $181 million in 1961–68, including government grants, other non-campaign 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 estimates. Excludes Israel Education Fund of UJA, with pledges of about $25.3 million in 1965–68. Total for both regular and IEF campaigns in 1967 was $321 million, and $238 million in 1968. Subject to some adjustment for inter-city duplications. Includes some allowances by UJA for subsequent shrinkage.
TABLE 1-A. ESTIMATED ANNUAL LEVEL OF INCOME IN 1967 OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES IN U.S.

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds)</td>
<td>$145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Israel Emergency Fund of UJA</td>
<td>$175.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grants by United Funds and Community Chests</td>
<td>$21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>$95.8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including capital funds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>$90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hospital Income Including Research Funds (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$448.0c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Family Service Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Child Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jewish Vocational Service (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$5.2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Aged Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Center Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jewish Education Income (excluding 1)</td>
<td>$68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,140.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This excludes mainly endowment income in most communities; local capital fund campaigns, and internal congregational operating expenses.)

a JWB Yearbook, Table 13, Volume XVII, 1968.
b Approximate; based on revision of estimate in National Study of Jewish Education, less welfare fund allocations. See text.
c Understated; excludes some non-reporting hospitals and local vocational services.
d Of this sum, about two-thirds are for operating funds, and the balance for restricted and capital funds, including $2.2 million for Israel Education Fund.
TABLE 2. STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS, 1951-1968
(In thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cash Sales</th>
<th>Sales in United States</th>
<th>Sales Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incl. Conversions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 (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>91,150</td>
<td>76,176</td>
<td>14,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>217,547</td>
<td>189,967</td>
<td>27,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>130,495</td>
<td>107,019</td>
<td>23,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,277,059</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,077,148</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,911</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Redemption of bonds issued in earlier years began to fall due beginning May 1, 1963. As a result of redemption at maturity, for investment, for tourism, and for payment of philanthropic pledges and the like, outstanding bonds held by the public at the end of November 1968 had been reduced to $729 million. Redemptions included about $220 million at maturity; about $108 million for conversion for investment purposes; and about $88 million in payment of pledges and allocations, received by UJA from 1952 through 1968.

b Excludes conversions of $24.8 million of earlier issues to Development Investment Issue. Data for 1968 exclude conversions of $37.0 million.
### TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION TO BENEFICIARIES OF FUNDS RAISED (EXCLUDING ISRAEL EMERGENCY FUND*) BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS

*(Estimates in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT BUDGETED TO BENEFICIARIES (c, d)</th>
<th>Total 1967</th>
<th>Total 1966</th>
<th>New York Cityb</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>66,281</td>
<td>63,516</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>17,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>63,273</td>
<td>60,582</td>
<td>18,375</td>
<td>17,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,661</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>42,655</td>
<td>41,216</td>
<td>16,425</td>
<td>15,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For gross estimates of pledges see Table 1. Net amounts comparable to data in this table will be available after actual shrinkage and collections are determined by experience. By early 1969 about $170 million of the 1967 Israel Emergency Fund had been collected in relation to pledges of about $175 million.

* Figures for New York include the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) of Greater New York and Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugee costs in New York City are borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of the 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): United Hias Service and National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB). Data for New York UJA based on estimates of distribution of 1967 and 1966 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash was received.

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

* NYANA is included in UJA totals.

1 Less than .05 of one per cent.
### Table 3-A: Distribution to Fields of Service of Funds Raised (Excluding of Israel Emergency Fund) by Jewish Federations

(Excludes New York City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1967 Total</th>
<th>1966 Total</th>
<th>Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5,000-15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>15,000-40,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount Budgeted</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$80,229,092</td>
<td>$77,580,779</td>
<td>$9,539,826</td>
<td>$9,065,721</td>
<td>$12,101,433</td>
<td>$11,570,129</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>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>47,476,169</td>
<td>45,789,015</td>
<td>7,331,545</td>
<td>6,957,354</td>
<td>7,800,930</td>
<td>7,522,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>44,897,892</td>
<td>43,282,083</td>
<td>7,009,112</td>
<td>6,657,784</td>
<td>7,403,574</td>
<td>7,131,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>2,578,277</td>
<td>2,506,932</td>
<td>322,433</td>
<td>299,570</td>
<td>397,356</td>
<td>390,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,527,560</td>
<td>2,479,277</td>
<td>231,153</td>
<td>205,156</td>
<td>371,617</td>
<td>384,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>26,012</td>
<td>36,379</td>
<td>12,423</td>
<td>21,421</td>
<td>7,321</td>
<td>7,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>513,043</td>
<td>491,049</td>
<td>63,834</td>
<td>59,120</td>
<td>70,364</td>
<td>69,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>265,496</td>
<td>277,297</td>
<td>127,769</td>
<td>136,028</td>
<td>103,252</td>
<td>103,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>928,667</td>
<td>903,383</td>
<td>84,359</td>
<td>87,850</td>
<td>142,285</td>
<td>148,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>26,230,150</td>
<td>25,296,890</td>
<td>1,519,630</td>
<td>1,442,733</td>
<td>3,099,178</td>
<td>2,875,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>701,458</td>
<td>874,836</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63,875</td>
<td>74,395</td>
<td>93,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,557,084</td>
<td>1,425,386</td>
<td>167,581</td>
<td>152,938</td>
<td>440,705</td>
<td>379,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per cent</strong></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> 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.

<sup>b</sup> Jewish population.

<sup>c</sup> Includes small undistributed amounts.

<sup>d</sup> Less than .05 of one per cent.
### TABLE 4. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND CHEST ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1966 AND 1967

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
<td>$16.9</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$11.5</td>
<td>$12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less: Provided by Chests (exclusive of administration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>$18.7</td>
<td>$19.6</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
<td>$17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</strong></td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fields Receiving Only Federation Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided by Federations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>$42.9</td>
<td>$44.4</td>
<td>$18.4</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$44.1</td>
<td>$45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided by Chests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>$42.9</td>
<td>$44.4</td>
<td>$18.4</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$44.1</td>
<td>$45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* About $0.7 million provided annually by NYANA, financed by UJA.
* Provided mainly by national agencies.
* Most capital campaigns are excluded because they are conducted apart from annual campaigns; chest funds in non-federated cities are also excluded.
* Includes in N.Y.C. grants by Greater New York Fund and United Hospital Fund to federated agencies. In addition, nonfederated agencies receive about $0.5 million annually.
### TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* A, INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS, FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 125 COMMUNITIES, 1966, 1967

*(Excludes New York City)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount 1966</th>
<th>Per Cent 1966</th>
<th>Amount 1967</th>
<th>Per Cent 1967</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,620,898</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>$7,155,368</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>9,793,151</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>10,386,428</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>+6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>11,463,136</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>12,447,993</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>+8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,650,926</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3,650,089</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,475,958</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,527,581</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>+3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5,653,758</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6,238,205</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>+10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>770,911</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>624,737</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,113,893</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,118,919</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>561,482</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>633,473</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>+12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>498,555</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>543,256</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>+9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,602,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,326,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>+4.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount 1966</th>
<th>Per Cent 1966</th>
<th>Amount 1967</th>
<th>Per Cent 1967</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$25,450,567</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>$26,104,600</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>17,152,101</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>18,221,449</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>+6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of total administrative and fund-raising costs ($11,774,164 in 1966 and $12,472,413 in 1967) reported for these 125 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.

b Less than .05 of one per cent.
### TABLE 5-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS, INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS, FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 125 COMMUNITIES 1966, 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (125) 1966</th>
<th>Total (125) 1967</th>
<th>Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1966</th>
<th>Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1967</th>
<th>5,000–15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1966</th>
<th>5,000–15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1967</th>
<th>15,000–40,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1966</th>
<th>15,000–40,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1967</th>
<th>40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1966</th>
<th>40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,620,898</td>
<td>$7,155,368</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$2,264</td>
<td>$86,385</td>
<td>$86,797</td>
<td>$494,676</td>
<td>$489,357</td>
<td>$7,039,137</td>
<td>$6,576,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service</td>
<td>9,793,151</td>
<td>10,386,428</td>
<td>173,793</td>
<td>174,414</td>
<td>1,358,956</td>
<td>1,460,022</td>
<td>1,421,780</td>
<td>1,481,097</td>
<td>6,838,622</td>
<td>7,270,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Service</td>
<td>11,463,136</td>
<td>12,447,993</td>
<td>1,044,372</td>
<td>1,125,317</td>
<td>2,497,086</td>
<td>2,680,417</td>
<td>2,048,661</td>
<td>2,151,844</td>
<td>5,873,017</td>
<td>6,490,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,650,926</td>
<td>3,650,089</td>
<td>143,759</td>
<td>134,181</td>
<td>559,456</td>
<td>539,782</td>
<td>531,942</td>
<td>498,662</td>
<td>2,415,769</td>
<td>2,477,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,475,958</td>
<td>1,527,581</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>45,202</td>
<td>50,446</td>
<td>216,397</td>
<td>232,739</td>
<td>1,213,909</td>
<td>1,243,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5,653,758</td>
<td>6,238,205</td>
<td>133,881</td>
<td>162,064</td>
<td>628,001</td>
<td>704,896</td>
<td>843,815</td>
<td>885,303</td>
<td>4,048,061</td>
<td>4,485,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>770,911</td>
<td>624,737</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>66,950</td>
<td>65,788</td>
<td>119,759</td>
<td>93,765</td>
<td>584,102</td>
<td>465,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,113,893</td>
<td>1,118,919</td>
<td>18,217</td>
<td>22,511</td>
<td>82,540</td>
<td>83,296</td>
<td>259,321</td>
<td>234,858</td>
<td>753,815</td>
<td>778,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>561,482</td>
<td>633,473</td>
<td>32,050</td>
<td>39,681</td>
<td>80,873</td>
<td>90,260</td>
<td>26,425</td>
<td>23,601</td>
<td>422,134</td>
<td>479,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local Admin.</td>
<td>498,555</td>
<td>543,256</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>86,635</td>
<td>87,085</td>
<td>166,106</td>
<td>184,623</td>
<td>245,814</td>
<td>271,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,602,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,326,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,547,322</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,660,882</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,492,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,848,789</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,128,882</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,275,849</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,434,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,540,529</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

- Federations: $25,450,567
- Chests: $17,152,101

**a** This table includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of administrative and fund-raising costs ($11,774,164 in 1966 and $12,472,413 in 1967) reported for these 125 cities. Federation allocations toward administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund-raising costs cannot be segregated between local and nonlocal programs.

**b** Jewish population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (125)</th>
<th>Under $5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5,000–15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>15,000–40,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Service</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests to Fed. for Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</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**

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> See Table 5-A, note <sup>a</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> Jewish population.

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

<sup>d</sup> Less than .05 of one per cent.
TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 89 COMMUNITIES, 1963 THROUGH 1967

(Amounts in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>$ 7,445</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>$ 7,561</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>$ 7,661</td>
<td>19.7</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>8,062</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>8,495</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8,916</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>9,148</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>9,727</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration(^c)</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,635</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

- Federations \(\ldots\) $21,603 60.0 \(\ldots\) $22,320 59.3 \(\ldots\) $23,259 59.9 \(\ldots\) $24,642 59.9 \(\ldots\) $25,212 59.1 \(\ldots\) 116.7
- Chests \(\ldots\) $14,398 40.0 \(\ldots\) $15,315 40.7 \(\ldots\) $15,598 40.1 \(\ldots\) $16,499 40.1 \(\ldots\) $17,452 40.9 \(\ldots\) 121.2

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

\(^b\) Slight differences due to rounding.

\(^c\) 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.

\(^d\) During this period the United States consumer price index rose by about 9 per cent.
### TABLE 6-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 89 COMMUNITIES, 1963, 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Total (89)</th>
<th>Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5,000-15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>15,000-40,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,444,535</td>
<td>$7,153,597</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$76,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>8,062,497</td>
<td>10,002,937</td>
<td>123,497</td>
<td>111,505</td>
<td>1,038,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>9,148,415</td>
<td>11,590,395</td>
<td>604,372</td>
<td>715,131</td>
<td>1,991,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,945,815</td>
<td>3,515,947</td>
<td>77,491</td>
<td>86,545</td>
<td>367,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,268,778</td>
<td>1,527,487</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>47,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,615,160</td>
<td>6,135,799</td>
<td>103,628</td>
<td>142,021</td>
<td>540,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>683,103</td>
<td>584,139</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>78,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>880,283</td>
<td>1,020,398</td>
<td>9,687</td>
<td>11,443</td>
<td>64,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>471,717</td>
<td>590,516</td>
<td>15,690</td>
<td>23,413</td>
<td>72,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration*</td>
<td>480,142</td>
<td>543,256</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>88,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                     | $36,000,445 | $42,664,471              | $936,015                  | $1,091,169                | $4,365,300                  | $5,441,069                  | $5,290,772                  | $6,275,849                  | $25,408,358                  | $29,856,444                  |

**Sources of Income**

| Federations                          | $21,602,679 | $25,212,458              | $584,095                  | $756,281                  | $2,229,954                  | $2,276,627                  | $2,508,775                  | $3,065,089                  | $16,279,855                  | $18,664,461                  |
| Chests                                | 14,397,766  | 17,452,013               | 351,920                   | 334,888                   | 2,135,346                   | 2,714,382                   | 2,781,997                   | 3,210,760                   | 9,128,503                   | 11,191,983                   |

* Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.

<sup>b</sup> Jewish population.

<sup>c</sup> See Table 6, note *.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total (89)</th>
<th>(29) Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(32) 5,000–15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(16) 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>20.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong>&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> See Table 6-A, note *.
<sup>b</sup> Jewish population.
<sup>c</sup> Less than .05 of one percent.
<sup>d</sup> See Table 6, note c.
<sup>e</sup> Slight difference due to rounding.
### TABLE 6-C. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 92 COMMUNITIES, 1958, 1967

*(Amounts in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th></th>
<th>1967</th>
<th></th>
<th>Index of Change 1958=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,064</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>$7,151</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>101.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>6,704</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>148.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>7,035</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11,449</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>162.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>158.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>151.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>115.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration(^b)</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>132.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total(^c)</strong></td>
<td>$30,033</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$42,396</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>141.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th></th>
<th>1967</th>
<th></th>
<th>Index of Change 1958=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$17,514</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>$25,010</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>142.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>12,519</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>17,386</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>138.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(^b\) Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs.

\(^c\) Slight difference due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1967 AND 1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federations and Welfare Funds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal—Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal—Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish JDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Association for New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT—Women’s American ORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American ORT Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UJA AND BENEFICIARIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overseas Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Mogen David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of Hebrew Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American-Israel Cultural Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra Torah Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Council of Israel Inst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Telegraphic Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Women Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Hias Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Jewish Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERSEAS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including joint community appeals.

b Cash received in each calendar year.

c Excludes income from UJA; also income from campaigns abroad, from intergovernmental agencies and reparations income.

d Traditional collections in the U.S., exclusive of Jewish Agency grants to JNF in Israel.

e Excludes contributions and earnings of Investment Fund; Operating Funds include Restricted Fund income.

f Income from welfare funds estimated.

Includes Swope endowment fund.

g Excludes grants from other organizations.

h Excludes contributions from other organizations.

i Amounts raised for JNF are excluded. Hadassah “Other Income” includes membership dues, sickles and Zionist youth funds.

j Excludes overseas income from Claims Conference, but includes UHS income from NYUJA.

k Excludes overseas and Canadian income.

l CJFWF estimate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Relations Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee</td>
<td>$1,480,636$</td>
<td>$2,583,503^b$</td>
<td>$1,274,971$</td>
<td>$5,339,110$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
<td>$1,280,671$</td>
<td>$2,982,493^b$</td>
<td>$575,257$</td>
<td>$4,838,421$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
<td>416,001</td>
<td>382,066</td>
<td>584,682</td>
<td>1,382,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>192,597</td>
<td>254,233</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>446,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans</td>
<td>123,839</td>
<td>121,307</td>
<td>419,039</td>
<td>542,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRAC</td>
<td>195,976</td>
<td>192,900</td>
<td>76,798</td>
<td>284,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$3,689,720</td>
<td>$6,213,545</td>
<td>$2,930,747</td>
<td>$12,834,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center at Denver</td>
<td>$6,630</td>
<td>$824,418</td>
<td>$259,116</td>
<td>$1,090,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>6,542,053</td>
<td>3,930,200</td>
<td>10,477,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levy Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>38,017</td>
<td>30,816</td>
<td>506,473</td>
<td>845,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Home for Asthmatic Children</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>1,224,495</td>
<td>277,597</td>
<td>1,508,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
<td>25,906</td>
<td>3,542,755</td>
<td>2,060,037</td>
<td>5,628,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University—Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Hospital</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,584,384</td>
<td>34,440,568</td>
<td>40,024,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$80,820</td>
<td>$18,019,920</td>
<td>$41,473,991</td>
<td>$59,574,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$128,892</td>
<td>$97,113</td>
<td>$78,534$</td>
<td>$304,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>25,660</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>121,059</td>
<td>148,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>11,725</td>
<td>9,695</td>
<td>26,403</td>
<td>47,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board</td>
<td>152,534</td>
<td>112,130</td>
<td>192,012</td>
<td>1,628,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>21,345</td>
<td>104,738</td>
<td>6,190</td>
<td>101,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$1,713,156</td>
<td>$283,076</td>
<td>$243,207</td>
<td>$2,461,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoh</td>
<td>$7,987</td>
<td>$510,082</td>
<td>$78,285</td>
<td>$596,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>96,149</td>
<td>980,958</td>
<td>2,521,109</td>
<td>3,598,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC-JIR</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,227,353</td>
<td>$1,654,898</td>
<td>2,392,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>497,667</td>
<td>705,642</td>
<td>266,572</td>
<td>764,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>71,544</td>
<td>7,705,184</td>
<td>3,976,483</td>
<td>11,753,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Synagogue of America</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,342</td>
<td>$1,082,687</td>
<td>748,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Theological College</td>
<td>22,497</td>
<td>265,474</td>
<td>225,919</td>
<td>513,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>208,536</td>
<td>225,919</td>
<td>513,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ner Israel Rabbinical College</td>
<td>6,334</td>
<td>9,738</td>
<td>165,975</td>
<td>380,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Receipts of National Jewish Agencies for Domestic Programs from Federations and Welfare Funds and from Other Domestic Sources, 1967 and 1966.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telshe</td>
<td>$9,036</td>
<td>$8,602</td>
<td>$435,940</td>
<td>$449,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>11,850c</td>
<td>12,166c</td>
<td>146,756</td>
<td>145,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>129,261</td>
<td>138,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Lubavitcher Yeshivoth</td>
<td>18,295c</td>
<td>16,599c</td>
<td>501,204</td>
<td>545,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva U.—Religious Divisions</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$255,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>$261,747</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,168,377</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,627,502</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Research</td>
<td>$4,455</td>
<td>$3,840</td>
<td>$19,591</td>
<td>$19,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society</td>
<td>8,030</td>
<td>7,443</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'hai B'rith</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>10,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal</td>
<td>632,667</td>
<td>599,549</td>
<td>3,952,111</td>
<td>3,581,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braudeis University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,243,627</td>
<td>14,302,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social Studies</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>12,402</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsie College</td>
<td>39,334</td>
<td>49,264</td>
<td>22,663</td>
<td>23,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadruth Ivrit</td>
<td>15,922</td>
<td>19,030</td>
<td>73,376</td>
<td>103,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>18,256</td>
<td>16,730</td>
<td>91,327</td>
<td>78,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>8,114</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>309,441</td>
<td>290,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Society</td>
<td>16,734</td>
<td>14,196</td>
<td>23,864</td>
<td>22,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers Seminary &amp; People's Univ.</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>75,038</td>
<td>70,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture</td>
<td>94,955</td>
<td>81,167</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>25,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO</td>
<td>44,706</td>
<td>38,097</td>
<td>119,609</td>
<td>127,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
<td>18,465</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>976,762</td>
<td>696,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$970,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>$929,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,470,261</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,022,020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Domestic</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,709,643</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,417,419</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,197,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,743,454</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$60,197,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,182,656</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overseas and Domestic</strong></td>
<td><strong>$243,556,015</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,863,141</strong></td>
<td><strong>$95,785,842</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,923,373</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Includes receipts of independent appeals in welfare fund cities and of allocations.
- Cash receipts, N.Y.C. and Chicago campaigns.
- One-half to two-thirds of federation allocations consist of local “Lunch Fund” allocations reflecting public funds received through the FJPNY.
- Excludes overseas income.
- Represents dues from national agencies.
- Including University of Judaism, California; duplicating Seminary income excluded.
- In Yeshiva University and Albert Einstein Medical School restricted and capital funds are reported as received and applied.
- Yeshiva University is reported in part under health and welfare agencies, in part under religious agencies and in part under cultural agencies. In the Medical School “Other Income” includes substantial amounts in government funds and hospital service grants.
- Excludes grants from Conference of Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, and Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.
- Income from centers included in federation income.
- Excludes grants by other national agencies to avoid double counting.
- Excludes gross sales of religious educational publications.
- CFWF estimate.
- Included in listing for Yeshiva University under cultural agencies below.

Cont'd.
June 1967 marked a watershed in contemporary Jewish public affairs—the climax of a generation, the sealing of an era, and the culmination of a 1,900-year cycle. The historical generation, which began with the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, reached its climax in the liberation of Jerusalem after 1,900 years of foreign rule. The six-day war united the members of the generation that witnessed the founding of the state with those of a new generation, one that grew up accepting the existence of Israel as a matter of fact, only to encounter suddenly the harsh possibility of its destruction, making both generations deeply aware of the shared fate of all Jews, and of the way that fate is now bound up with the political entity that is the State of Israel.

The events of May and June also sealed the conclusion of the modern era that began just over three centuries earlier. In Jewish terms, the hallmark of that era was emancipation, the rejection of the idea that the Jewish people had a corporate existence of its own, and the abandonment of diaspora Jewry's limited control over its own destiny through its autonomous communal structure. But the shattering of the formal bonds uniting Jews could not change the reality of Jewish peoplehood. The resurgence of Jewish political life, that began with the rise of Zionism at the end of the 19th century and expanded when the Holocaust reawakened the sense of community among Jews, culminated in the establishment of an independent Jewish state. It took a new turn with the six-day war, which reunited Israel and the diaspora communities (themselves just emerging from a period of reconstitution after World War II) within a commonwealth, no less real for its lack of proper structure and its very special character.

The 1967–1968 literature of Jewish public affairs reflects the crossing of this watershed; its most recent products already deal with the


** Full bibliographical notations of the books and articles mentioned here will be found in a separate section at the end of this paper.
changes wrought by the war. Not the least of the emerging concerns is the redefinition of the psychological and institutional ties binding Jews into a polity of a unique sort, one formed and sustained by consent alone (or, in other terms, by voluntary reaffirmation of the covenant) within an objective framework that encourages such consent by making the Jews a distinctive group, with a common interest in the survival of all of its parts.

The 1967 crisis brought this feeling of consensus to a peak. Even Jews farthest removed from Jewish associations "instinctively" realized how crucial the survival of Israel was to their own welfare as individuals. As one rather casual Jew put it, "it was not only a matter of identifying as Jews, but of being Jews."

For those with more permanent Jewish associations, being Jewish no longer was merely a sociological or psychological question; it was a political one as well, giving rise to thoughts of the Jewish people as a polity, that had long lain dormant in the "emancipated" West. (Milton Himmelfarb points out some of the implications of this, in his usual trenchant manner, in his *Commentary* article, "In the Light of Israel's Victory." *) Hence a survey of the literature of Jewish public affairs, 1967–1968, properly begins with a consideration of the political writings on the six-day war.

SIX-DAY WAR AND ITS AFTERMATH

The literature of the war, the crisis that preceded it, and its aftermath, is already voluminous. The number of battle reports in the first year alone places it among history's better chronicled wars; the number of community relations manuals that followed is equally impressive. Here we are only concerned with this period in its political aspects, however broadly construed. This political literature has several faces: polemics, analyses of immediate issues for immediate consideration, and examinations of the events in the larger context of Jewish and world affairs. The three categories are not always distinct ones, nor are the published items always easily placed within them. For example, General Samuel L. A. Marshall's *Swift Sword*, a book chronicling the military campaign and written with maximum speed, is also a contribution to the understanding

---

* Other good sources documenting this phenomenon among the young are Winter 1967 issue of *Campus: A Hillel Newsletter*, and Jack Luria, "As the Young Saw It."
of Jewish society because of its author's deep insight. The appendix to
the book, describing the mode of operation of the Israeli army, is im-
portant because it shows the way the Israeli military system is based on
the particularly Jewish use of individual responsibility and voluntary
consent to obtain maximum effort in the achievement of common pur-
poses. Similarly, Yael Dayan’s *Israel Journal: June 1967*, a different
kind of battle report, raises important questions about Israel’s emerging
political culture in light of its young people’s constant exposure to war,
or threat of war.

Most of the relevant material is more obviously so than the above
items. *Commentary* quickly provided four probing articles on the war as
a political phenomenon: Theodore Draper writes on “Israel and World
Politics,” Walter Laqueur examines “Israel and the Arabs,” and Arthur
Hertzberg deals with “Israel and American Jewry,” while Amos Elon
offers “Israel: Letter from the Sinai Front.” These articles, in effect,
define the major aspects of the war's political impact and, incidentally,
serve to demonstrate the peculiarly important role of the Jewish people
on the world scene. Special issues, or sections, of *Midstream, Near East
Politics*, as well as intensive coverage in *Atlas* and the summaries of
public reaction in *Patterns of Prejudice* provide much information and
analysis in the first and second categories that add to the understanding
of the political impact of the war and this peculiar importance of the
Jewish people.

*The Middle East in the Contemporary World*, the proceedings of the
first annual conference of the American Professors for Peace in the
Middle East, is just as clearly in the second category. It is an attempt by
an organization of academics, established in the heat of the crisis, to
examine Israel’s security problem in the light of the world situation.
Also, in the second category is the detailed, primarily politically oriented
review of the war and the preceding crisis in a special section of the 1968
*American Jewish Year Book*, emphasizing Israeli and diaspora, Jew-
ish and non-Jewish perspectives. David Kimche and Dan Bawly con-
tribute *The Sandstorm: The Arab-Israel War of June 1967; Prelude and
Aftermath*, perhaps the best book in the second category. In the same
category is James P. Warburg’s *Crosscurrents in the Middle East*. Walter
Laqueur’s very serious study, *The Road to Jerusalem: The Origins of the
Arab-Israeli Conflict—1967* sees the war as ending the “Zionist” phase
of Israel’s statehood. The great task of the restoration of the people to
its land accomplished, Israel, in Laqueur's view, is entering a period of consolidation and "normalization," one of establishing more institutionalized relationships with the world around it.

Amos Perlmutter's article, "Sources of Instability in the Middle East," delineates the sources of Arab opposition to Israel and the West as "colonialist" powers. It is a useful companion to Robert Alter's "Rhetoric and the Arab Mind," a discussion of the very real nature of the Arab psychosis regarding Israel, based on a study by Yehoshafat Harkabi, the former Israeli chief of intelligence ("Basic Factors in the Arab Collapse During the Six Day War"). Samuel Decalo's "Israeli Foreign Policy and the Third World" is a scholarly treatment of a major aspect of the first of the facets, the extent to which Israel's efforts in Asia and Africa bore fruit after the war.

Maurice Samuel's Light on Israel places the war in the larger perspective of Jewish and Zionist history. Samuel's article, "The Shock of Self-Identification," looks at the massive Jewish response to the war from the perspective of a Jew who did not need the events of June to achieve self-recognition.

The hostility of the old Left toward Israel is matched by that of the New Left. The Jews in the ranks of the New Left seem to be reliving a familiar syndrome, which encourages hatred of Israel as a reflex of their own Jewish self-hatred. M. S. Arnoni, a serious man of the Left—neither "old" nor "new"—deals with the immediate responses of the Left to Israel in "The American Left and the Middle East," pointing out the inconsistencies of its position. Arnoni also presents the case for Israel, from the perspective of the Left, in his book, Rights and Wrongs in the Arab-Israeli Conflict. Its effectiveness among the young has been hailed in many quarters. A shorter statement by Arnoni, under the same title, appeared in his journal, Minority of One. Joseph Neyer's article "'A State Like Any Other State'?" is perhaps the best reply, from a more traditional Zionist perspective, to New Left attacks on Israel. It is full of documented information demolishing the myths about Israel, the Middle East, and the Arab refugees, that continue to dominate world thinking on the problem. In a somewhat similar vein, Ronald Sanders discusses "Israel and American Youth" and Robert Alter deals with "Israel and the Intellectuals."

Among the important, if more conventional, statements of the pro-Jewish position on Israel is that of Frank Gervasi, a non-Jew, in The Case for Israel, a very positive reaffirmation of Israel's legitimacy and a
negation of the threats against it. Terence Prittie’s *Israel: Miracle in the Desert* is an example of what has become a new genre—the sophisticated traveller’s report on the Jewish state.

**Stalemate**

Since June 1967 the hardening stalemate has produced a rash of articles of varying quality. Among the better ones are Joel Marcus, “The Long Seventh Day”; Yehuda Amichai’s “Letter from Jerusalem”; Alan Dowty’s “Negotiations or War,” and a panel discussion on “Prospects for Peace” by five Israelis, among them Yitzhak Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Longer works dealing with the larger problems of the war’s aftermath include Aubrey Hodes’s *Dialogue with Ishmael: Israel’s Future in the Middle East* and Arthur Lall’s “unintentionally devastating” study of *The UN and the Middle East Crisis, 1967*. Especially sensitive is Shlomo Avineri’s “The New Status Quo.”

Perhaps the best summary of the reasons for the stalemate that had become fixed by the end of 1968 is *The Arabs Need and Want Peace, But*—, the impressions and conclusions of a mission of American Professors for Peace in the Middle East to Jordan and the United Arab Republic from June 24 to July 5, 1968, where they interviewed members of the government as well as nongovernmental people in positions of influence for creating and molding public opinion. Members of the mission were Professors Albert B. Sabin, David S. Landes, Allen Pollack, and Herbert Stroup. A clear picture emerges of an Arab leadership that believes its own myths and cannot conceive of entering into a reasonable settlement with Israel.

In light of the 1967 events, Samuel Merlin exhaustively examines an earlier effort to seek a peaceful solution in *The Search for Peace in the Middle East*, the story of Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba’s efforts to bring about negotiated peace between Israel and the Arab states.

Israel’s relations with the Arabs in the administered territories are discussed by Amos Elon in “The Israeli Occupation.”

**Jerusalem**

One immediate consequence of the war was the restoration of Jerusalem to physical and psychological, as well as religious and political primacy in the Jewish world. Aside from numerous flossy publications on Jerusalem that appeared after the liberation of the city, there have been some serious efforts to examine its place in the Jewish and general
worlds. E. A. Bayne authored *Jerusalem: Israel Capital* as a background report for American Universities Field Staff. Hadassah Magazine's exceptionally serious Jerusalem issue features articles by Abraham J. Heschel and James A. Michener, and others. The question of the future of the non-Jewish holy places is discussed in *Commonweal* from a Jewish point of view in William Korey's "The Holy Places"; Sylvan M. Berman analyzes the annexation of Jerusalem as a problem in international law in "Territorial Acquisition by Conquest in International Law and the Unification of Jerusalem," and concludes that Israel's action was justified within that context. Pinchas E. Lapide sees the reunification of Jerusalem as enhancing the possibilities for Jewish-Christian dialogue (p. 178) in "Ecumenism in Jerusalem."

**In Israel**

A very sensitive account of the situation in Israel before the war, with a postscript on the war's impact, is provided by Hugh Nissenson in a journal of his stay in a kibbutz near what once was the Syrian border, *Notes From the Frontier*. More personal than political in tone and purpose, it is doubly effective in portraying how private life in Israel is inextricably bound up with public life in the continuing crisis of Israeli existence. Perhaps even more sensitive and revealing here, because of their source, are the views of Israel's soldiers, some of which are now available in English. "Israel's Soldiers Talk" excerpts a very moving discussion by young kibbutz war veterans of "justice and power" in light of the war, which struck a very deep chord with the larger Israeli public. *Mission Survival: The People of Israel's Story in Their Own Words*, edited by Ruth Bondy, Ohad Zmora, and Raphael Bashan, is a massive sampling of Israeli attitudes.

The six-day war led Israelis, as well as diaspora Jews, to discover their essential Jewishness and their primary connections with the Jewish people. Moshe Dayan, the very embodiment of the new Israeli, expressed this new sense of Jewish unity in very traditional ways, as summarized in "Moshe Dayan on Peace and War—An Interview." Ruth Gruber, in *Israel on the Seventh Day*, speaks of the demonstration of national unity within Israel, one of the most positive consequences of the war. Ashkenazim, Sephardim, and Oriental Jews alike set aside as trivial the differences that seemed to divide them, in their common will to defend their homeland.

Quite a different note was struck by Uri Avnery in his book *Israel*
Without Zionists: A Plea for Peace in the Middle East. Editor of a sex-and-sensation Israeli weekly and member of the Keneset, Avnery espouses an Israeli assimilationist position, often labeled "Canaanite," that negates the legitimacy of the existence of the Jews as a people from what he calls a "new" perspective. Actually, it is based on the same old tendency toward national self-denial he has been espousing for a decade or more.

In the war's aftermath, sober questions were raised, especially regarding the need to renew the flow of Jewish settlers to Israel. Professor Eli Ginzberg, one of the American Jews called by the Israeli government to survey the situation after the war, submitted a report on manpower utilization to the Israel Ministry of Labor. An extract of the report appears under the title, "Aliyah: Israel's Manpower Problem." Indeed, manpower, the Jews' perennial problem, is a number one public issue in Israel; even the most valorous army needs men to replenish its losses. Aliyah therefore has become the topic of many articles, popular and analytical, and has earned top billing on the agenda of such diverse organizations as Hadassah and the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. The Israeli view of the problem appears in Midstream, under the title of "Israel—Immigration, Politics and Economics."

The war's aftermath also saw the first steps toward institutionalization of the new ties between Israel and world Jewry. In "Letter from Israel" in Commentary Edward Grossman discusses the economic conference called by Prime Minister Eshkol to mobilize Jewish economic resources for Israel's developments.

Christian-Jewish Dialogue

After twenty years of dialogue and the apparent "era of good feeling," Jews were shocked to find the bulk of the Christian religious leadership studiously refraining from "taking sides" over a "mere political matter," in May and June of 1967, while a number of spokesmen for the more "liberal" Protestant denominations were actively pro-Arab. (For an excellent critique of the Christian reaction by leading Protestant theologians, see A. Roy and Alice L. Eckardt, "Again, Silence in the Churches.") It became apparent that the dialogue had not been quite that, for it had avoided the matters most crucial to the Jewish people.

It was widely recognized that the Jews had not even begun to convey to the Christians the centrality of Israel, the land and the state, in Jewish religion. Nor had they begun to understand the theological difficulties the
very existence of Israel entails for Christians. This issue, above all others coming out of the war, brought to the fore the uniquely theo-political character of Jewish peoplehood and Jewish religion to confront Jews and Christians alike with the necessity of recognizing that land and state have an unusually important religious significance in a religious system that places the attempt to build the good society (hence, the good commonwealth) here on earth at the very center of its faith and practice. This misunderstanding is summarized, in part, in Malcolm L. Diamond, “Christian Silence on Israel: An End to Dialogue?”

After an initial feeling that Jewish-Christian dialogue should be abandoned (for the best statement of that position see Jacob Neusner’s letter to the editor of Judaism, “Reconsideration”), a new realization of the necessity to keep talking took hold, but there was also a new skepticism about the consequences of such dialogues and a resolve not to hold back in future discussions for fear of offending Christian sensibilities. This position was expressed by Marc H. Tannenbaum, one of the major “dialogists,” in “Israel’s Hour of Need and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue.”

More substantively, efforts to understand both the Jewish position and the Christian problem were initiated by such writers as Robert F. Drinan in “Israel: Theological Implications for Christians”; Balfour Brickner in “No Ease in Zion for Us: Christian-Jewish Relations After the Arab-Israeli War,” and Judith H. Banki in Christian Reactions to the Middle East Crisis: New Agenda for Interreligious Dialogue. Papers by three thoughtful men, Mordecai M. Kaplan, Avraham Avi-Hai, and Elwyn Smith, presented at the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation and later published in The Reconstructionist as “Israel: The Jewish People and the World: A Post-War Symposium,” in a most penetrating manner tie the question of dialogue to the larger question of the deep relationship between Israel and the Jewish people.

However, the fact remains that misunderstanding alone is not the source of the difficulties. As A. Roy Eckardt says in his CCAR Journal article, many anti-Israel Christians understand the Jews’ attitude to their land only too well. His analysis is confirmed by James L. Kelso who concludes in “Perspectives on Arab-Israeli Tensions” that American support for Israel makes missionary work among the Arabs well-nigh impossible, thus representing “perhaps the most serious setback that Christiandom has had since the fall of Constantinople, since 1453.”

One bright light in the otherwise dismal response by Christian leaders
is the stand taken by Dr. Eckardt, who not only understands the place of Israel in Jewish life, but appreciates it. His widely distributed statement of that view appears as "Eretz Israel: A Christian Affirmation."

Response of American Jews

Many American Jews also were confronted with the problem of justifying their pro-Israel stand in light of their opposition to the American involvement in Vietnam. Regardless of the objective validity of the problem, it took on subjective reality for many people, from Jewish students with pacifist leanings to President Lyndon B. Johnson, himself. One attempt to dispose of the problem was Morris Laub's "Vietnam Dove and Israel Hawk."

The record of American Jewish mobilization for Israel and the overall impact of the crisis can be read in the 1968 volume of the American Jewish Year Book and Hertzberg's "Israel and American Jewry." Other useful sources include Bernard Postal, How the Jewish Community Centers Mobilized in Support of Israel and Saul Goldberg, compiler, The Campus Response to the Israel Crisis.

No segment of American Jewry was more deeply affected by the crisis than the synagogue movements. While always supporters of Israel, the three major movements were, in some respects, ambivalent in their attitude toward the state as a Jewish phenomenon, and toward its Zionist principles. Their own need to become better rooted in the United States (with its emphasis on religious, rather than national, pluralism), and their struggle to make religious affiliation the dominant mode of attachment to Judaism, mitigated against unequivocal support of a Jewish state. The 1967 events brought them face to face with this ambivalence and, more than that, helped them transcend it to discover the intimate connections between their institutions as centers of Jewish life in the largest diaspora community, and Israel as the center of the totality of Jewish life. One of the literary reflections of this discovery is The Religious Dimensions of Israel: The Challenge of the Six-Day War, a collection of the major papers presented at the third annual conference of the Synagogue Council of America, edited by Henry Siegman.

Israel and American Jewry—1967 and Beyond is a collection of articles and documents and a study guide on the background of the conflict, postwar issues, and the war's impact on Christians and Jews. Published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, it reveals some reactions of Reform Judaism. A more immediate aspect of this relation-
ship, bearing directly on that movement, is Mendel Kohansky's "Reform Judaism Meets in Israel." He describes the equivocal aspects of the World Union of Progressive Judaism meeting in Jerusalem after the war, arising from the opposition of the Orthodox in Israel to giving equal status to non-Orthodox synagogues and rabbis.

From the Orthodox side comes "The Religious Meaning of the Six Day War: A Symposium" in Tradition, whose participants reflect American and Israeli Orthodox viewpoints trying to come to grips with the linkage between the military-political event and larger theological questions. What is perhaps most exciting in that symposium is the belief held by both Israeli participants that we are living in the beginnings of the messianic era.

Something of the old Zionist—anti-Zionist argument can be found in the exchange between Michael Rosenak and Jakob J. Petuchowski in their respective articles "The Old-New Anti-Zionism" and "Zionist Polemics in a Post-Zionist Age," regarding Petuchowski's book, Zion Reconsidered. To this writer, at least, recent events have shown Petuchowski's position to be even wider off the mark than one would have been ready to argue before June 1967.* A more positively pro-Israel diminution of traditional Zionism is presented by Gilbert Kollin in "A Look Back at Zionism."

However, in the last analysis, the reaction of the Jewish man in the street to the discovery of his fundamental connection with the Jewish people was the really crucial one. Marshall Sklare gives us a capsule view of that reaction in "Lakeville and Israel," a partial resurvey of the suburban Jewish community he and his colleagues studied after the war (p. 212). Sklare confirms what every American Jew knows, that the crisis generated a feeling transcending "identity" that can only be described as solidarity with the Jewish state as the fundamental organ of Jewish peoplehood. Bernard Lazerwitz published the results of a survey he conducted in the metropolitan Chicago area in "Some Reactions to the Six-Day War," which demonstrate essentially the same thing. A more impressionistic picture of the war's impact on the institutional aspects of American Jewish life, that also attempted to forecast future trends, is Leonard J. Fein's "Israel's Crisis: Its Effect on the American Jewish Community and Its Implications for Jewish Communal Services."

---

* It should be noted that Petuchowski had modified his own position substantially since the publication of his book, which appeared in 1966, apparently in response to the six-day war. See his opening statement in "More Than a Plank."
Response in Other Countries

The American Jewish commitment to Israel as the center of the Jewish people was more or less expected. Far more surprising was the reaction in France. Even among the substantially assimilated French Jewish intellectuals, there sprouted the same identification with Israel that was encountered throughout the Jewish world. The shift in French policy in the Middle East, given ideological justification by President Charles de Gaulle in his press conference of November 27, 1967 in which he made his now notorious remark about the Jews as a people, gave French Jewry a new self-consciousness. (Joel Marcus examines this policy from its roots in “The Rift Between Israel and France.” David Ben Gurion set forth an important and dignified restatement of the Zionist position, republished in “Ben Gurion and De Gaulle: An Exchange of Letters.”)

This “new nationalism” is reflected in “French Citizenship and Jewish Identity: A Discussion,” the record of views on the subject expressed by six French Jewish intellectuals of varying persuasions. The discussion itself is reenforced in “Jewish Students and the Paris Rebellion: A Conversation with Albert Memmi” describing some of the concrete steps taken by young Jews to come to grips with a new, and still very confusing, Jewish consciousness. There is no consensus among the six on their future relationship with the Jewish people; but all accept the fact that they are fated to remain Jews—the “beginning of knowledge” of identification with the Jewish community.

This new consensus stands in sharp contrast to the widely read book of another French Jew, The End of the Jewish People? by Georges Friedmann, published on the very eve of the six-day war (or to Michel Salomon’s article, “A ‘Jewish Vote’ in France?”, with its skeptical tone regarding the possibility of French Jews voting as a bloc). Friedmann’s somewhat confused book reflects the feelings prevalent just before hostilities began that, as Israel was becoming more normalized, its connections with diaspora Jewry were weakening, and the demands for a Jewish entity, as something more than an Israeli one, were disappearing. The new literature proves the obsolescence of the Friedmann thesis.

Something of the reaction of English Jewry to the war can be seen in “How the Six-Day War Affected Jewish Identity: A ‘Writers for Israel’ Symposium,” in which Lionel Davidson and Wolf Mankowitz, among others, reaffirm what Jews were reaffirming in every country.
One of the few scientific studies of diaspora Jewry’s reaction to the crisis is Ronald Taft’s “The Impact of the Middle East Crisis of June 1967 on Melbourne Jewry.” The completion, just before war broke out, of a major demographic study of Melbourne’s Jewish community provided a fortuitous opportunity for a follow-up survey of the same sample. The results provide more hard evidence that the less scientific assessments of the deep impact of the crisis on virtually all Jews are fully correct.

The continuing repercussions of the war are summarized in a series of country-by-country reports, “World Jewry Since the Six-Day War,” a small but useful follow-up to the more detailed reports published in the 1968 edition of the *American Jewish Year Book*.

Perhaps the most fitting “last word” in this exhaustive literature is that provided by the American Reform rabbinate in the *CCAR Journal* of June 1968, an issue focusing “On Israel’s Twentieth Anniversary.” The seven articles in this special section (six by Reform rabbis), are all fervent with love of Zion and emphatic in their consideration of the political implications of that love. In his introductory comments, the Journal’s editor Daniel Jeremy Silver speaks of Israel’s crucially indispensable role in “the task of creating a voluntary religious nation,” and calls for aliyah programs in congregational schools; emphasis of nation over denomination, and encouragement of a sense of Jewish peoplehood in all Reform institutions and actions.

The steps from emancipation to voluntary nationhood are long ones. We know that our generation has witnessed the completion of the first step, when the oldest heirs of the antinational bias of the Emancipation tell us that, after all, there is a Jewish polity.

**Jewish Political Thought**

Little of the literature of the six-day war is devoted to theoretical questions about the Jewish polity as such, though hints and echoes of such questions abound, at least in the more serious pieces, particularly in the two symposia mentioned above. David Polish reviews the highlights of the political aspects of Jewish messianic thought in his article, “Israel and the Christian Conscience,” in the *CCAR Journal* Israel anniversary issue. Every other article at least touches upon the philosophical questions arising from the fact that the destiny of *Am Yisrael* is inseparable from that of *Medinat Yisrael*. In “Yisrael Goralenu” (Israel Is Our
Destiny), Leon Kronish emphasizes the historical turnabout in Jewish political thought since the denationalizing days of the Napoleonic Sanhedrin and the Pittsburgh Platform, and raises questions about the practical steps to be taken to “convert the crisis reaction into a permanent peoplehood” in light of these old-new and still murky political ideas. The Tradition symposium (p. 181), too, is infused with such questions. Of course, Zionist writers, like Maurice Samuel, touch upon theoretical principles of Zionism, as they bear on the subject.

A recent book coming closest to systematically dealing with the Jewish polity as a theological question is Eugene B. Borowitz's A New Jewish Theology in the Making. A distinguished and pioneering work in every respect, it represents a serious effort to build a theology of contemporary relevance around the Jewish concepts of covenant and peoplehood. However, the fact remains that the systematic revival of Jewish political thought is a task yet to be accomplished. It is possible that the restoration of a sense of polity will also lead to the restoration of systematic politically-oriented inquiry into its nature and purposes.

In the meantime, theoretical works dealing directly or indirectly with Jewish political ideas and institutions continue to appear. Kingship of God, Martin Buber's major effort to ground his political creed on biblical sources, was published in English translation in 1967. As much concerned with the social—or, more correctly, the political—as with the immediately personal aspects of human relationships, Buber properly welds the two into a single whole grounded, as Jewish political thought must be, in the Bible. This theory, which in this writer's view is best described as thearchic federalism, sees the ideal human polity as a “direct theocracy,” created through a covenant between God, the transcendent yet immanent king, and a community of men, which, by its very nature, binds men to one another in real community. The political community created by that covenant is a “direct theocracy”—the political equivalent of the more immediately personal I–Thou relationship which provides the social precondition for it.

Buber's ideal commonwealth, which he sees as having been the Israelite vision during the period of the Judges, seems quite anarchic when conceived as a purely human form of political organization. Though in its original form it is a federation of tribes as well as a federation of men, it has few permanent political institutions and sanctions

* The term “federal” is derived from the Latin foedus, meaning covenant.
almost no political coercion, relying on spontaneous charismatic leadership and voluntary consent to provide and sustain specific acts of governance, as well as the general shaping of the polity. But it transcends and escapes the pitfalls of anarchy because of the kingship of God "who leads the community" (Buber's emphasis). Whether Buber's conclusions about the early Israelite vision of the ideal commonwealth are correct or not, he does give significant expression to what might be called the radical wing of traditional Jewish political thought by extending its thearchic and federalist principles to their greatest extremes.

One aspect of Buber's thesis is supported by Nelson Glueck's study, *Hesed in the Bible*, an English translation of his doctoral dissertation first published 40 years ago. Glueck shows *hesed*—definable as "covenant love"—to be the activating principle of *brit* (the covenant), determining proper conduct in a covenant relationship, personal or political. Thus, *hesed* adds the requisite procedural dimension that can transform the principle of mutual obligation inherent in the covenant into reality of performance. From this principle flow the Jewish requisites for the good political life, as Glueck himself indicates.

Recent translations of two other books by Martin Buber, dealing with political ideas, increase our understanding of the importance of such ideas in his thinking because of his Jewish frame of reference. *On Judaism*, edited by Nahum N. Glatzer, is a collection of Buber's Zionist essays. Largely written before World War I, they remain among the most sensitive and lasting statements of the Zionist world view. Glatzer also edited Buber's *On the Bible*, a collection of eighteen studies on various biblical themes, including discussion of the political meaning of the covenant at Sinai, an important essay on "Biblical Leadership," and many other items of political concern.

In "American Political Theory and the Political Notions of American Jews: Convergences and Contradictions," this author attempts to identify the basic elements in Jewish political thought and to trace their place in the shaping of the political notions of modern, particularly American, Jews. In a somewhat similar vein, Gerson D. Cohen discusses "Messianic Postures of Ashkenazim and Sephardim," showing the differences in their approaches to political solutions of the *galut* problem in premodern eras. Cohen shows that the Sephardim were far more willing to seek political solutions than the Ashkenazim who looked to divine intervention as the only real source of relief.

Three works by Leo Strauss, published in recent years, also contribute
to the literature on Jewish political thought. The English translation of his *Spinoza's Critique of Religion* is significant not only for the discussion of Spinoza's relationship to classical Jewish political theory, but for the intellectual autobiography of the author—the leading student of Jewish political thought in our times—that introduces it. "Jerusalem and Athens" continues Strauss's protracted discourse on the fundamental differences between the biblical and Greek approaches to social and political inquiry. In *Liberalism, Ancient and Modern*, Strauss includes several essays on Jewish philosophy and contemporary liberalism.

Emanuel Rackman discusses "Judaism and Equality." Several of Simon Greenberg's collected essays on Jewish themes for the contemporary reader, *Foundations of a Faith*, attempt to relate the political ideas he sees in Jewish tradition to contemporary democratic ideals.

Abraham Ibn Daud's classic work, *Sefer Ha-Qabbalah*, superbly edited and translated by Gerson D. Cohen as *The Book of Tradition*, is a kind of medieval Jewish political history in that it discusses important questions about the internal governance of Jewish communities particularly in Moslem Spain. Cohen's accompanying essays probe deeply into the power structure of medieval Andalusian Jewry in light of the book's contents, and pave the way for the development of political typologies of Jewish community power in that period.

Aryeh Newman discusses one aspect of the theopolitical thought of one of the great medieval thinkers in "The Centrality of Eretz Yisrael in Nachmanides," showing that Nachmanides was responsible for the development of the most full-blown "ideology of Eretz Yisrael" among the medievals, an ideology based on the idea that the Torah is, first and foremost, the constitution of the land of Israel.

Nathan Rotenstreich touches on the efforts of modern Jewish thinkers to come to grips with political questions in their theoretical formulations, in *Jewish Philosophy in Modern Times, From Mendelsohn to Rosenzweig*. The book deals largely with the work of those German Jews who brought about the exclusion of the political dimensions from Jewish thought. The most actively political thinkers among those analyzed are Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook and Aaron David Gordon, the Zionist pioneers in the land of Israel. Despite their "religious" differences, both shared a common Jewish basis; their political philosophy was grounded in Jewish mysticism and was, in essence, a continuation of the Jewish tradition of theopolitical thinking.

Jacob Neusner focuses on what he considers the discontinuities in
Jewish political thought, in "From Theology to Ideology: The Transmutation of Judaism in Modern Times," a chapter in Churches and States: The Religious Institutional Modernization, edited by Kalman H. Sivert. Neusner examines what he believes are major differences between his conception of theological messianism of premodern Judaism and the ideologically-based efforts to achieve secular redemption that have come to dominate modern Jewish life and thought. One starting point for investigating Neusner’s thesis is the influence of Spinoza on modern Jews. Strauss’s previously cited book is an important introduction to any such inquiry. Another useful volume is Robert J. McShea’s, The Political Philosophy of Spinoza.

The Commentary symposium on The Condition of Jewish Belief (p. 41f.) reveals even more fully the extent to which political concerns are reentering Jewish thought. At least 12 of the 38 contributors explicitly state that there can be no meaningful separation between Jewish belief and the Jewish people as a community, freely using such terms and phrases as “peoplehood,” “Jewish community in being as a distinctive entity,” “communal responsibility,” “covenant,” and “the mitzvah-performing Jewish community” to describe the theopolitical components of Jewish existence.

Even more directly concerned with the problems of community were six articles brought together under the heading “On Jewish Survival” in CCAR Journal. Continuing many of the themes set forth in the journal’s Israel twentieth anniversary issue, they emphasize the problem of Jewish survival as being the survival of a people especially endowed through the covenant, “on its own” in a hostile world, yet charged with special tasks in world history. The authors’ perceptions of these tasks vary widely, from those arising out of a kind of modish “peacenik” messianism to those emerging from a more traditional sense of Jewish mission. Characteristic of all but one of the authors is a concern with the political, mainly with the way a Jewish state makes survival more meaningful by giving the Jewish people a means to participate actively, as a special kind of nation, in the process of human redemption.

Similarly, Milton Himmelfarb’s powerful article, “Secular Society? A Jewish Perspective,” published in the special issue of Daedalus on “Religion in America,” is another effort to restate the traditional Jewish view of the necessary and proper connection between moral values and the social order as it applies in contemporary America.

Jewish life in the modern diaspora is rarely examined from the per-
spective of the relationship of the Jews as an entity to the larger society. This author, in a preliminary way, tries to come to grips with this problem as it exists in the United States, in “The Kenites of America.” He advances the thesis that the relationship between the Jews and the larger American society has something of a precedent in the socially separate, but morally symbiotic, relationship between the Kenites and the ancient Israelites, as described in the Bible, and that this relationship can serve American Jews as a model for defining their own role in American society.

The years 1967–1968 witnessed the continued growth of efforts to apply the principles of Jewish tradition to contemporary political issues. The Commentary symposium attempts this, in part. Among the other serious materials that appeared are Gilbert S. Rosenthal’s article “Civil Disobedience,” and Albert Vorspan’s book, Jewish Values and Social Crisis: A Casebook for Social Action. Aaron Samuel Tamaret’s “Passover and Non-Violence” is a selection from the classics, chosen for its special relevance to today’s problems.

Abraham J. Heschel is co-author, with Robert McAfee Brown and Michael Novak, of Vietnam: Crisis of Conscience. Among other relevant materials on the Vietnam issue are Morris Laub’s pamphlet, Maimonides on War and Peace (With Special Application to Vietnam); Meir Kahane, Joseph Churba, and Michael King, The Jewish Stake in Vietnam; and Rabbi Abraham L. Feinberg’s “Interview in Hanoi.” The opposing viewpoints in the growing controversy in Orthodox ranks on the proper Jewish attitude toward the Vietnam war are explained by Charles S. Liebman in “The Orthodox Rabbi and Vietnam,” and Michael Wyschogrod in “The Jewish Interest in Vietnam.”

Related to this category is Zosa Szajkowski’s “The Pacifism of Judah Magnes,” an account of the ideas of the greatest modern Jewish pacifist. Eugene B. Borowitz addresses a larger theme, the political character of man’s expectations for a better future, in “Hope Jewish and Hope Secular.” A more devastating contrast of Jewish and modern ideas, involving a discussion of the Jewish commitment to community, and the demand for social responsibility that flows from it, is Milton Himmelfarb’s “Paganism, Religion and Modernity.” Himmelfarb calls a pagan a pagan, and explains why. Equally comparative, but far less critical is the CCAR Journal colloquium “Judaism and Ethics.” Here Abraham Edel, Michael A. Meyer, and Irwin M. Blank deal with the question of moral law and the community as the implicit or explicit core of the
Jewish approach to "ethics," and contrast that approach with Christian and modern approaches. Borowitz considers another contemporary issue of more than passing importance in "Judaism and the Secular State," an elaboration of the political aspects of his theology.

The years 1967–1968 witnessed a growing desire among Orthodox Jewish intellectuals to deal with questions of contemporary political and moral concern from the perspective of halakhah. Tradition, the quarterly journal of the Rabbinical Council of America, has become the major vehicle for doing so. The Winter 1968 issue was particularly rich in this regard with, two articles, Jacob J. Ross's "Morality and the Law" and Norman Lamm's "The New Morality under Religious Auspices," dealing with the new morality and society, and two others, Solomon Simonson's "Violence: From the Perspective of the Ethics of the Fathers" and Joseph Grunblatt's "Violence and Some Aspects of Judaic Tradition," with Jewish traditional responses to social violence.

RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS AND PUBLIC PERSUASIONS

One of the most significant byproducts of the six-day war was the renewal of the recognition of the links between "religion" and "politics" in Jewish life. Linked as they always have been in fact, the modern tendency to separate them has been far stronger than the willingness to perceive the reality of their interrelation. The previously cited symposia on Israel in the CCAR Journal and Tradition offer examples of the new recognition of this reality. Norman Lamm makes the connection in the most explicit terms:

...we must acknowledge—humbly and happily—that "they," the nonobservant Israelis, were right when they argued that Jews must forge their own destiny actively and not wait passively for heavenly miracles. Power, we must admit, is not necessarily antithetical to holiness. The "impulse from below," as the Zohar calls it, is necessary in order to evoke the "impulse from above."

What is most striking about this rediscovery of politics (that is to say, the organized and conscious use of power) is the way it is tied in with the revival of the mystical impulse in Jewish thought. Reform and Orthodox contributors alike couch their discussions of the most mundane concern (for that indeed is what politics is, in its most immediate sense) in the language of the Kabbalah and the Zohar. In doing so, they are restoring one of the most important and enduring intellectual alliances in Jewish history. In every great period, the concern with politics has
been closely tied to the Jewish mystical tradition. Rabbi Akiva is the classic example of this link, and it was never stronger than in the Jewish intellectual community of medieval Spain. Its reemergence in modern times as a phenomenon of Zionism is illustrated in Rotenstreich’s previously cited work. (p. 186).

The war also had made it patently clear how narrow the theological gap between the representative thinkers of the various religious movements has become. While this intellectual coming together had been in progress for some years, the war effectively sealed it by demonstrating that the questions Jews hold in common are far more basic than those dividing them. The Commentary symposium is an excellent illustration: One of its most striking aspects is that, with the exception of the few Reconstructionists, ideological differences are narrow and do not follow movement lines.

All this stands in sharp contrast to the situation portrayed by David Rudavsky in Emancipation and Adjustment: Contemporary Jewish Religious Movements, Their History and Thought. He traces the intellectual sources of the divisions, which seemingly have now become entrenched in Jewish life, even as their intellectual basis is disappearing. The institutional consequences of this development continue to have a certain kind of intellectual impact, as Charles S. Liebman demonstrates in “The Training of American Rabbis.” Liebman also discusses the sociological (as distinct from ideological) bases of Jewish religious divisions in America in “Religion, Class, and Culture in American Jewish History.”

At the same time, two books appeared in 1967 to remind us of the penchant for sectarianism within Jewish life in the past. Leah Bronner’s Sects and Separatism During the Second Commonwealth and Marcel Simon’s Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus take somewhat contrasting approaches to the problem, but both illustrate the extent of the divisions in Jewish life during that crucial period, when a certain kind of pluralism was the keynote of “civilized” society.

Orthodoxy

Continuing his campaign to help the Orthodox movement come to grips in a positive manner with the realities of modern American life, Irving Greenberg offers an agenda of problems and possible solutions in “Jewish Values and the Changing American Ethic.”

A cross-section of current modern Orthodox thought is provided in A


Not the least of the new concerns of Orthodox intellectuals is the nature of the Orthodox sub-community. Erich Isaac discusses the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists, a group whose influence within Orthodoxy has been growing rapidly in the past few years, in "The Loneliest Jews of All."

Conservatism

The publication of the anthology, Roads to Jewish Survival: Essays, Biographies, and Articles Selected from the Torch on Its 25th Anniversary, edited by Milton Berger, Joel S. Geffen, and M. David Hoffman, provides a good picture of the ideological patterns within the Conservative movement. The collected pieces were written by the best-known "names" in the Conservative movement for a magazine geared to the average member of the average Conservative congregation, and should be read in that spirit. They deal with such subjects as the nature of the Jewish community, Jewish education, relations with Israel, and other factors in contemporary Jewish life, each with substantial editorial comment. The volume should be read in conjunction with The Maturing of the Conservative Movement by Bernard Mandelbaum, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary. A statement of what might well be called the mainstream view of the movement's schoolmen (to use Marshall Sklare's terminology), it complements the anthology.

In The Waking Heart, Herman H. and Mignon L. Rubenovitz offer a personal look at the development of the Conservative movement, particularly in New England where the late Rabbi Rubenovitz served for many years.

The National Women's League of the United Synagogue published an institutional history, They Dared to Dream: A History of the National Women's League, 1918-1968, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Reform

The ending of the modern era has had the greatest significance for Reform Judaism, the movement most completely dependent on the
assumptions and values of modernism. Nowhere is this dependence more clearly expressed than in David Philipson's *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, reissued in 1967; and nowhere does the contrast between the "orthodoxy" of classical reform and contemporary Reform thinking become more apparent, as Solomon B. Freehof points out in his introduction to the book.

Not surprisingly, then, the Reform movement is the leading producer of self-analytical literature, among the various religious movements in the United States. While each issue of *CCAR Journal* usually carries several such pieces, the April 1968 issue is particularly rich. *Contemporary Reform Jewish Thought*, edited by Bernard Martin, offers a sampling of the diversity of approach and the unity of theme in this self-analysis.

Solomon B. Freehof continues to encourage his fellow Reform Jews to consider questions of Jewish law in *Reform Judaism and the Law* and in his third collection of responsa, titled *Current Reform Responsa*. The movement’s periodical literature seems to indicate that he is making some headway. Lawrence Siegel writes, not altogether happily, about the changes in Reform Judaism in the past generation in "Reflections on Neo-Reform in the Central Conference of American Rabbis." Jay Kaufman, once one of the higher civil servants of the Reform movement, confirms Siegel’s tale, albeit far more positively, in "An Unbiased Look at Reform Judaism."

A representative sampling of mainstream thinking in the Reform movement is made available in *The American Judaism Reader*, edited from the pages of *American Judaism* by Paul Kresh.

One of the few empirical studies of Reform Judaism is Joseph R. Rosenbloom and Paul S. Dobinsky, "Student Attitudes in a Reform Jewish Religious School," dealing mainly with attitudes toward God.

**Reconstructionism**

The Reconstructionist movement’s publication, *Reconstructionist*, remains the main source of material on it and its thought. The events of 1967 affected that movement least; long before the six-day war it had pioneered the idea of Jewish peoplehood as the basis for a renewal of Jewish polity.
Zionism

Marie Syrkin edited the volume, *Hayim Greenberg Anthology*, which includes some of his more familiar essays, as well as an appreciative intellectual biography by the editor. One of the handful of Zionist theoreticians to write in English, Greenberg deservedly remains a popular figure in Jewish publishing circles. Ber Borochov, a Labor Zionist thinker who has been undergoing something of a revival of late, particularly in New Left circles, is discussed by Gershon Winer in an article, "Ber Borochov." On a more popular level is the *Jewish Frontier Anthology*, a selection of the writings of labor Zionists who have appeared in the pages of that periodical since 1945.

*African Zion* by Robert G. Weisbord may well be the definitive study of what is known in Zionist history as the Uganda scheme (as he demonstrates conclusively, the British really suggested Kenya). In documenting its failure, the author offers strong evidence for the attachment of the Jews to the Land of Israel. Weisbord's article, "Israel Zangwill's Jewish Territorial Organization and the East African Zion," is even more telling in this regard.

In a long and heavily documented article, Charles I. Goldblatt reviews "The Impact of the Balfour Declaration in America," from 1917 to 1948. He examines Jewish and Christian, official and unofficial, press and governmental reactions, and finds them generally well disposed toward the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine, with the most vigorous opposition coming from certain Jews, the proponents of the depoliticized Judaism of the emancipation era.

B. Z. Sobel presents a strange phenomenon, a missionary movement attempting to capitalize on Zionism in "The Tools of Legitimation—Zionism and the Hebrew Christian Movement." Rightly sensing what Zionism would mean to the Jewish people, the Hebrew Christians repeatedly sought to identify with the idea and the movement, as a means of securing their acceptance as a Jewish group within what one of their leaders called "the national bond, with its accompanying citizen rights, unbroken." The article is particularly important for its picture of a marginal group precisely assessing the national aspects of Jewish peoplehood, and the role Zionism would play, as early as the 1890s, in defining and activating Jewish nationalism.
DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES OF JEWISH SOCIETY

The problem of defining the boundaries of Jewish society continues to have three aspects: the identity problems of individual Jews, the question of conversion, and the problem of disassociation from the Jewish people. The first two still rank at or near the top of the list of contemporary Jewish concerns, while the last, at best, is considered only indirectly. This, in itself, reflects the social malaise of contemporary Jewry; nearly everyone seems to be either searching for his own “Jewish identity,” or is the object of someone else’s search. The revival of interest in conversion is invariably an antidote to the identity problem. Actual disassociation is so easy and informal (and usually so unnecessary) that it is hardly even discussed. One consequence of all this is the continuing expansion of the gray area surrounding Jewish society, where it is becoming increasingly more difficult to determine who is a Jew. Intermarriage is tied into all three aspects, and generally serves to link them together in real life situations. It therefore is also the great source of the semi-Jews inhabiting the gray area.

The recent literature quite clearly mirrors this situation. The last book by the late Albert I. Gordon, *The Nature of Conversion: A Study of Forty-Five Men and Women Who Changed Their Religion*, shows how all religious groups in America have been Protestantized to the point where most of their members accept as their own Protestant canons of what constitutes religious commitment and group identification. Confirmation of this thesis is found in a report by Irving Jacks of Illinois State University of his research on “Attitudes Toward Interfaith Heterosexual Socializing in a Group of Jewish Teenagers.” Only 59 per cent of the group he interviewed considered it essential to marry within the Jewish faith in order to be a good Jew.

Moshe Davis focuses on the marriage question from an historical perspective in “Mixed Marriage in Western Jewry: Historical Background to the Jewish Response.” His concern with the “Jewish corporate reaction to the contemporary challenge of mixed marriage in the western world” makes the study, and especially his bibliographical appendix, very valuable to students of Jewish public affairs.

Stephen Sharot presents a caricature of the gray-area Jew in “A Jewish Christian Adventist Movement.” The Orthodox concern with the consequences of the gray area for halakhically legitimate Jewish unity
is discussed by Albert Ehrman and C. Abraham Fenster in “Conversion and American Orthodox Judaism: A Research Note.”

Milton Himmelfarb suggests an active proselytization policy as an important element in maintaining interest in Judaism among Jews, no doubt on the theory that the best defense is a good offense. In “The Jewish College Student and the Intellectual Community,” he suggests that one way to make young college students “want in” to the Jewish community is through active proselytization, particularly among Negroes who can be reached precisely because of their alienation from white Christian civilization. The problem of integrating the thousands of existing converts into Jewish life is discussed by Allen S. Maller in “From Gentile into Jew.” He cites a survey of Conservative and Reform rabbis, indicating an addition of over 4,000 converts a year. The survey itself is presented by Benjamin W. Mehlman in “Who is a Jew? Report of a Survey.”

Ultimately, even the studies of Jewish demography must come to grips with the problem of defining the boundaries of Jewish society. This becomes abundantly clear in such articles as S. J. Prais and Marlena Schmool, “The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population, 1960–65,” and Ernest Krausz, “The Edgware Survey: Demographic Results.” Historical perspective for all this is provided by Bernard J. Bamberger in Proselytism in the Talmudic Period, reissued in 1968.

The literature on Jewish identity continues to grow. A good summary of the contemporary discussion is available in Lucy S. Dawidowicz and Milton Himmelfarb, eds., Conference on Jewish Identity, Here and Now.

POLITICAL CULTURE

The bits and pieces that increase our still extraordinarily fragmentary knowledge of the deepest political expectations and demands of Jews, as produced by Jewish acculturation processes, are found in many places, some authoritative and some much less so. This writer’s article on “American Political Theory and the Political Notions of American Jews” (p. 185) deals with the subject directly, if briefly. Nathaniel Weyl’s The Jew in American Politics provides some useful data and documentation of the Jewish penchant for liberalism from a nonliberal perspective. Lloyd Gartner raises some interesting questions about Jewish political culture with his suggestion that Jews seem to have an impulse to follow a certain kind of liberal messianic figure (Adlai Stevenson and Eugene McCarthy in recent American history) in “Candidates, Messiahs, and
Aristocrats.” Recent Jewish political behavior in New York City is analyzed by Milton Himmelfarb in “Are Jews Still Liberals?”, and he concludes that they are. Michael Parenti’s “Political Values and Religious Cultures: Jews, Catholics and Protestants” attempts to make the connections implied in its title, but fails because he misunderstands both the political values and religious cultures involved.

Though not directed toward political matters, Moses Kligsberg’s excellent article, “Jewish Immigrants in Business: A Sociological Study,” offers great insights into the cultural basis of Jewish behavior and its consequences which can be applied to the realm of political activity. Kligsberg looks at the concept of takhlis—the idea that human activity should be directed toward purposive ends—as the key to this aspect of Jewish behavior, and makes a convincing case for his thesis.

**POLITICAL ORGANIZATION AND INSTITUTIONS**

The great bulk of material on the political organization of the Jewish community, published in 1967–1968, is historical in nature; the most significant items are reprints or new translations of much earlier materials. Among them are important studies of Israelite political organizations and institutions in the biblical period, and information on the structure and dynamics of Jewish political life in the Middle Ages.

One of the most illuminating volumes on Israelite political institutions is a collection of studies by the late E. A. Speiser, *Oriental and Biblical Studies*, edited by two of his students, J. J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg. Speiser was one of the few great biblical scholars who had a direct interest in the political and governmental aspects of the biblical period. His detailed and penetrating analyses of the national and local institutions of the Israelite polity under its various constitutions reveal how sophisticated the supposedly primitive tribal democracy of biblical accounts really was. They are most useful in studying the institutional expressions of Jewish political ideas (e.g. hesed, as discussed above), and their impact on political life and thought in general.

Before Speiser, Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth pioneered the study of the political and constitutional aspects of the Bible and the Israelite tribal confederacy, with modern critical methods. Their major essays on the subject are now available in English: Alt’s in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, and Noth’s in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*. 
Solomon Zeitlin's *The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State: A Political, Social and Religious History of the Second Commonwealth*, of which the second volume covering the period 37 BCE–66 CE appeared in 1967, represents a conscious effort to write Jewish history as political history, and to emphasize the political institutions and processes of a period that in itself is defined through a political institution—what Zeitlin terms "the Judaean state." While Zeitlin's analyses and conclusions are frequently controversial, the structure of his synthesis is of crucial importance to students of Jewish public affairs.

The first volume of Shelomo D. Goitein's monumental study of Jewish community life, as portrayed in the public papers found in the Cairo Genizah, appeared as *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza, Vol. 1: Economic Foundations*. It is a major contribution to the understanding of the Jewish communities of the Mediterranean world as polities from the tenth through the thirteenth centuries. The picture drawn by Goitein is reenforced and extended to the three following centuries, in *The Responsa of Rabbi Solomon ben Adreth of Barcelona* and *The Responsa of Rabbi Simon b. Zemah Duran*, edited by Isidore Epstein. Both men were vitally concerned with the government of their communities, and their responsa reflect this.

Arthur Hertzberg's prize-winning study of the Jewish community in late medieval France, *The French Enlightenment and the Jews*, documents the differences between the Sephardi and Ashkenazi communities in organization, scope, and jurisdiction, showing the transition from premodern to modern forms of Jewish organization, and the Sephardim's pioneering role in it.


Though the family is generally conceded to be a prepolitical institution, at least in Jewish life a particular kind of family structure and environment is a precondition for maintaining the Jewish polity in any of its forms. While serious study of this aspect of Jewish family life has been rare, the raw material for such an investigation continues to
accumulate. Ben-'Ami (pseud.) demonstrates in *Between Hammer and Sickle* that the destruction of open community life in the Soviet Union has placed the burden of “organized” Jewish life entirely on those extended families willing to take it on. In the United States, too, the family’s role in creating the environment for Jewish community life continues to be of first importance. The “Lakeville,” Providence, and New York City studies cited below (p. 212, 213, 214) emphasize and document this fact, while giving a picture of the changing structure and life of the American Jewish family.

The persistently stronger character of the Jewish family, as compared with that of its non-Jewish counterpart, is discussed by Robert F. Winch, Scott Greer, and Rae Lesser Blumberg in "Ethnicity and Extended Familism in an Upper-Middle-Class Suburb.” The important role of family commitment to things Jewish in transmitting Jewish ties to the next generation and shaping positive attitudes toward the Jewish community, is documented in Vera West’s article, “The Influence of Parental Background on Jewish University Students.”

The influence of premodern family ties on Jewish communal organization is discussed in a case study by Harvey Goldberg, “Patronymic Groups in a Tripolitanian Jewish Village: Reconstruction and Interpretation.” Benjamin Kaplan provides an overview of the history of Jewish family life in *The Jew and His Family*.

**POLITICAL BEHAVIOR**

Bernard K. Johnpoll’s study of *The Politics of Futility: The General Jewish Workers Bund of Poland, 1917–1943* is a case study, though hardly a definitive one, of a certain form of Jewish political behavior that has become classic in the modern era. He describes a type of assimilationism, justified on messianic grounds, that has repeated itself so often that it must be considered an authentic, if heretical, Jewish manifestation.

Very different, and equally authentic, was the Jewish response to the disintegrative pressures of the Nazi terror. Even in that extremity, what must be recognized as the Jewish genius for communal organization asserted itself. Albert H. Friedlander’s magnificent and moving anthology, *Out of the Whirlwind: A Reader of Holocaust Literature*, includes a section on Jewish community life under stress in Germany and Poland. Three pieces in *Explorations: An Annual on Jewish Themes*,
edited by Murray Mindlin with Chaim Bermant, deal with this theme: Marie Syrkin's "Diaries of the Holocaust" on the Warsaw ghetto, and the memoirs of two survivors, as presented in I.leslotte Themal's "Mother and Child" and Kurt Lindenberg's "Escape to Sweden." Year of Fear, the Holocaust diary of Philip Mechanicus, describes the negative as well as positive aspects of this genius in his picture of the communal organization in Westerbork, the Dutch deportation camp.

Whatever the final judgment about the functionality of the Jews' emphasis on maintaining cohesion, and even creativity, under conditions of terror, the very fact of the effort inspires a degree of awe. They Fought Back: The Story of the Jewish Resistance in Nazi Europe, a collection of memoirs of some resistance fighters, edited and translated by Yuri Suhl, describe Jewish efforts to maintain a cohesion in the camps and, beyond that, in the resistance. In From Doom to Dawn: A Jewish Chaplain's Story of Displaced Persons George Vida adds to the record of the restoration of Jewish communal life at the war's end.

PUBLIC LAW

Relatively few of the increasing halakhic concerns of American Jews deal directly with questions of public law. Over the past two years, Tradition, which has become the major English-language forum for halakhic discussions, has dealt most intensively with such questions as medical ethics, organ transplants, and abortion. In its pages, Immanuel Jakobovits offers a "Survey of Recent Halakhic Periodical Literature," a good starting point for the exploration of contemporary developments in this field; Leo Landman discusses "Gambling in the Synagogue" from the perspective of Jewish law, and concludes that occasional gambling, where part or all of the winnings went to charity, aroused no condemnation and "frequently had the approval of the Jewish communities."

The Reconstructionist published papers on "The Problem of Halakhah Today: A Symposium," presented by Rabbis Bernard Bamberger (Reform), Theodore Friedman (Conservative), and Sidney Steiman (Reconstructionist), at the 1967 Reconstructionist-sponsored Conference on Jewish Life and Thought. The papers deal mainly with ritual and observance.

The problem of defining the Jewish people in non-Jewish public law has been raised anew in connection with legislation on race defamation. As Anthony Dickey points out in "English Law and Race Defamation,"
published in the *New York Law Forum*, the English authorities are operating on the assumption that the English law, forbidding defamation of groups identified by "race, ethnic or national origins," covers the Jews, even though the Jewish Board of Deputies, which prefers a more "religious" definition, has expressed doubts. It should be noted that the same issue of the *New York Law Forum* contains three other articles on the legal problem of race defamation that are related to defining the status of Jews in the countries of the diaspora.

**COMMUNAL AND PUBLIC WELFARE INSTITUTIONS**

In a modest but very interesting contemporary study, Paul Weinberger and Eugene Brussell report on "Religious Leaders' Assessment of Jewish Social Service Priorities." Their data, drawn from San Francisco, point up the differences in ranking various Jewish communal services by rabbis and synagogue presidents. The former give higher priority to education, the latter to hospitals. A critical analysis of the study is offered by E. G. Vermont in "Assessing Group Attitudes Toward Federation Allocations: A Critique of the Weinberger-Brussell Study."

Louis Kraft, a leading figure in the Jewish center movement in the United States, provides a personal view of 40 years of the movement's work in light of its objectives, in *The Development of the Jewish Community Center*. The Reconstructionist commemorated the "Fiftieth Anniversary of the National Jewish Welfare Board" with a special issue. The *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* remains the major outlet for serious discussion of Jewish communal institutions in the United States, even though somewhat circumscribed by its strong residual role as the professional organ of Jewish center workers. Its Winter 1968 issue, for example, reflects both sides of its character in three articles on the possibilities for interagency cooperation: "Jewish Social Service Agencies and the Jewish School" by Benjamin L. Yapko; "Consultative Casework Services to an Afternoon Hebrew School" by Nathaniel Goodman, and "Casework Services to Hebrew Day Schools" by Rosalind Edelstein. Among other more significant articles to appear in the journal's pages were Herbert Millman, "The Role of the Jewish Community Center in Planning and How Federations Can Support It"; Donald Feldstein and William Kahn, "Helping Our Members to Function as Part of the Community"; Judah J. Shapiro, "The Current Manpower Crisis in
Jacob Freid contributed another in the still slender, but increasing, supply of anthologies on contemporary American Jewish institutions, *Judaism and the Community*. Though primarily devoted to social work issues it includes several articles on the larger concerns, among them inter-institutional relations, the role of Jewish values and the problem of their transmission, the role of the public servants in the community, and the Jewish principles underlying Jewish communal institutions.

June Rose discusses in “A Jewish ‘Mayhew’” traditional Jewish professions (e.g. *mohelim*, *mikvah* attendants) which, she believes, are on the wane in the United States (and, no doubt, in other modern societies as well). The changing status of one Jewish profession under new conditions is discussed in “The Status of the Anglo-Jewish Rabbinate, 1840-1914” by Michael Goulston.

Obsolescence and the need for adaptation are also constant problems for the more modern social services, in view of the expanding role of government in this field. Thus, Leon Bernstein discusses “Medicare and the Future of Homes for the Aged”; Morton I. Teicher asks, “How Should Jewish Communal Agencies Relate to the Jewish Family Now and in the Future?”; Charles Miller and Morris Grumer discuss “The Role and Function of the Jewish Vocational Service in a Changing Society”; Bertram H. Gold looks at “The Urban Crisis and Its Effect upon Jewish Communal Services.”

A self-portrait of the National Council of Jewish Women by Bernice S. Graziani appeared under the title, *Where There’s a Woman: 75 Years of History As Lived by the National Council of Jewish Women*.

**CIVIC EDUCATION**

“The Community Organization Component in Jewish Education” by Bernard Olshansky and a “Discussion: Community Organization Component in Jewish Education” by Louis Schwartzman raise crucial questions regarding Jewish education in the United States. The Philip W. Lown Center for Contemporary Jewish Studies at Brandeis University sponsored the publication of *The Education of American Jewish Teachers*—essentially the proceedings of a conference under the center’s auspices—edited by Oscar Janowsky. Generally reflecting the views of
the Jewish educational establishment, the volume reveals almost no concern with civic education in teachers' training programs.

A major problem in Jewish civic education is teaching "Israel," which has become even more pressing in the aftermath of the six-day war. American Jewish educators, who for years had avoided or buried the issue, suddenly realized that Israel is the aspect of Jewish existence most compelling to young and old alike; that this visibly political concern is far more real than much of what passes for Jewish religious life today, and that Jewish education is self-defeating if it fails to do justice to Israel's place in the lives of all Jews. Samuel Dinin, in "The Role of Israel in American Jewish Education," emphasizes the bond of polity that should unite Israeli and American Jewish curricula.

Elias Charry and Abraham Segal authored an attractive history of the Jews for teenagers, The Eternal People, emphasizing Jewish peoplehood and its manifestations.

PUBLIC PERSONALITIES

The shelf of biographical materials about public figures whose work was crucial in Israel's development continues to grow, both in quality and quantity, bringing to light the inner workings of the great political revolution of modern Jewry. The first volume of The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann, edited by Leonard Stein with Gedalia Yogev under the auspices of the Weizmann Institute in Rehovot, deals with his formative years. Weizmann's character and personality are further illuminated by the memoirs of his wife, Vera, as told to David Tutaev, in The Impossible Takes Longer.

Joan Comay's Ben Gurion and the Birth of Israel examines the creation of the state from the perspective of its first great leader. Michael Bar-Zohar's more complete biography, Ben Gurion: The Armed Prophet, treats Ben Gurion with a sympathy made possible by prolonged close contact between author and subject. Almost supplementary to that volume is Amram Ducovny's David Ben Gurion in His Own Words.

The Hill of Life, a fictionalized biography of Joseph Trumpeldor by Roman Freulich and Jean Abramson, is presented in larger-than-life fashion, with considerable romantization. Far more exciting and important in understanding the founding generation of Zionist political figures, is Forward From Exile: The Autobiography of Shmarya Levin, whose electric personality shines through the book, thanks to Maurice
Samuel’s skill as translator. *Morning Stars*, the autobiography of Zalman Shazar, Zionist pioneer, bearer of hasidic tradition, and president of Israel, is less a political document than a work evocative of the milieu of the men and women of the Second *Aliyah*, the group that was decisive in shaping the character of modern Israel. Ezekiel Rabinowitz compiled the Zionist papers of Louis D. Brandeis under the title *Justice Louis D. Brandeis: The Zionist Chapter of His Life*, emphasizing his role in building American Zionism, winning American government support for Zionist aims, and securing a better northern boundary for mandatory Palestine.

Biographical materials on important, if less well known, builders of Israel include: Ben Halpern and Shalom Wurm, editors, *The Responsible Attitude: Life and Opinions of Giora Josephthal*, a pioneer administrator of development in Palestine and Israel, who was personally responsible for founding many of the country’s “new towns”; *Odyssey of an Optimist: Meyer Weisgal; An Anthology by His Contemporaries*, honoring Weizmann’s associate and builder of the Weizmann Institute.

Some interesting documentation of the role of even a humble American Jew in the establishment of the state of Israel can be found in “Two Presidents and a Haberdasher—1948,” a record of Chaim Weizmann’s contacts with Edward Jacobson, Harry S. Truman’s friend.

Reminiscences by American Zionist leaders included Sam Lonschein’s *My 83 Years: The Memoirs of a Veteran Zionist* and Bernard A. Rosenblatt’s *Two Generations of Zionism: Historical Recollections of an American Zionist*. Leon I. Feuer’s “Abba Hillel Silver: A Personal Memoir,” offers a glimpse into the personal attitudes and relations of the last of the great American Zionist leaders. Silver’s role was further described by Emanuel Neumann in *A Galaxy of Zionist Rishonim: Abba Hillel Silver*. A collection of Silver’s own writings, primarily sermons, appeared as *Therefore Choose Life*.

The death of Pierre Van Paassen brought back memories of the days of the struggle for statehood, with that great Christian Zionist in the forefront. His role and his later virtual abandonment by the Jewish community are discussed in Joseph Brainin’s “Pierre Van Paassen: A Memoir.”

Albert H. Friedlander’s *Leo Baeck—Teacher of Theresienstadt*, though a moving portrayal of a man whose efforts to sustain the Jewish community in Nazi Germany make him one of the great Jewish leaders of the century, falls short of a proper analysis of Baeck’s contributions to contemporary Jewish life and thought. Abraham Regelson and Ger-
trude Hirschler translated Shimon Kushnir's *The Village Builder: A Biography of Abraham Harzfeld*.

In the area of American Jewish public affairs, several articles on Isaac Leeser and his contribution to the organization of Jewish life appeared on the centennial of his death. In "Isaac Leeser: Centennial Reflections," Bertram W. Korn, a Reform rabbi, calls Leeser's contribution "to the creation of a viable American Judaism" greater than that of any other single Jewish religious leader. Saul I. Teplitz reveals in "Isaac Leeser: A Spiritual Leader Who Led" how Leeser, though the architect of traditional American Judaism and the precursor of the Conservative movement, consistently reaffirmed the necessity to reestablish a Jewish state in the land of Israel, as the real home of all Jews. Leeser, according to Maxine S. Seller's "Isaac Leeser's Views on the Restoration of a Jewish Palestine," wanted the Jews to be "a nation, a unit, a people with a government and a state of their own in no other country than the land of Palestine." Dr. Seller traces the evolution of Leeser's views during his career from simple religious faith in a messianic restoration to a proto-Zionist political position, and outlines the American Jewish community's responses to his practical suggestions and exhortations.

Max S. Nussenbaum discusses another American Jewish pioneer, "Sabato Morais—Sephardic Defender of Jewish Tradition in America."


Some previously unpublished correspondence on Jewish communal affairs is made available by James N. Rosenberg in *Unfinished Business: The James N. Rosenberg Papers*.

**SUBDIVISIONS IN JEWISH SOCIETY**

The Jewish people is divided organizationally and sociologically along several lines. Under the system of political organization developed very
early in Jewish history, the local community or congregation became, and has remained, the foundation of the entire structure of Jewish communal life. Local congregations or communities have grouped themselves together in different ways at different times, depending in large measure on the external circumstances. From these groupings emerged the major worldwide religio-cultural bifurcation into Sephardim and Ashkenazim, and regional cultural divisions such as “German” and “Polish” Jews, “Litvaks” and “Galitzianer,” Yemenites and Moroccans. With the rise of the modern nation-state, countrywide groupings of local communities have taken on historical permanence and legal status that mark one from the other within the overall confederation of Jewries.

Except in the study of its earliest beginnings, predominantly Ashkenazi American Jewry has almost totally neglected the Sephardi world. Today there are over 100,000 Sephardi Jews in the United States, with at least 32 permanent congregations in 15 states. In cooperation with American and world Sephardi leadership, Yeshiva University has established a Sephardi Studies program, to serve the special religious and communal needs of the American Sephardim. In 1967 the program started regular publication of *The American Sephardi*, which includes material on Sephardi history and culture. In it, Moshe Carmilly-Weinberger offers a documented look at “Sephardic Jews in the Development of Transylvania,” illustrating the diaspora pattern of Jewish colonization of “new” territories under princely patronage.


Lucy S. Dawidowicz edited *The Golden Tradition: Jewish Life and Thought in Eastern Europe*, a fine book which has become a model for presenting regional and cultural characteristics of historic Jewish communities to the American Jewish public. The material deals largely with the social and intellectual life of the community, but only peripherally with the institutions of communal self-government and public affairs. The situation of Eastern European Jewry today is illuminated by *The
Jewish Communities of Eastern Europe: A First Hand Report by a Study Mission of the American Jewish Congress.

Judaism published a special issue "On Judaism and Islam: The Antipathetic Symbiosis," with Erich Isaac as guest editor. The nine articles in it range in concern from "The Jewish Quarter in Muslim Cities and Berber Areas" (a very useful contribution to Jewish political studies by H. Z. Hirschberg) to "Political Philosophy in Islam and Judaism." Though the contributions are somewhat uneven, they constitute a pioneering effort in the field of regional studies of Jewish communities.

Israel

The six-day war did not halt the flow of publications about life in Israel under conditions of relative calm. With the publication of Yehoshu'a Freudenheim's Government in Israel, the best available delineation of the "basics" of Israeli governmental structure reached English-speaking readers. It depicts a system that has begun to inject Jewish political principles into a basic structure substantially borrowed from others. Henry E. Baker's The Legal System of Israel is a largely structural treatment of this subject, not unlike Freudenheim's, as is Asher Zidon's Knesset: The Parliament of Israel.

Martin Seliger's "Positions and Dispositions in Israeli Politics" describes Israel's politics as sui generis because of its basis in Jewish political culture which begins with "the most fundamental question of Jewish existence: To be like or unlike, any other nation?"

An excellent study of Israel's political system is Leonard J. Fein's Politics in Israel, reissued after the June war in an updated version as Israel Politics and People. Using the analytical tools of political science, coupled with his own insights into Israeli political life, Fein avoids many errors of earlier writers who tended to approach Israel's politics from the perspectives of American politics. However, the book fully portraying Israel's political system and culture remains to be written. A basic contribution to that end is Alan Arian's monograph, Ideological Change in Israel, which examines the growing gap between the "official" ideologies of the settlement movement, as expressed through the political parties, and the attitudes of the Israeli public that are becoming the actual basis for public policy-making.

On the economic front, the prestigious Committee for Economic Development published Economic Development Issues: Greece, Israel,
Taiwan, Thailand. The chapter on Israel is written by Nadav Halevi, an Israeli development economist. Halevi is also co-author, with Ruth Klinov-Malul, of The Economic Development of Israel. David Horowitz’s The Economics of Israel, is a more basic book on the subject, and is especially useful because its author is one of Israel’s leading economic policymakers. Meir Heth presents The Legal Framework of Economic Activity in Israel. Volume IV of Harry Viteles’ massive seven-volume documentary study, A History of the Cooperative Movement in Israel was published in 1968. The work is a coherent account of the political, economic, and social aspects of all forms of cooperative settlements and organizations, which are the core of Israel’s social system.

In the same vein is “The Industrialization of the Kibbutz,” written by Joel Darom who points out that, in order to survive today, the kibbutzim are increasingly turning to industry (which provided 30 per cent of kibbutz income in 1966). In the process of successfully industrializing a small society, the kibbutzim may well be helping Israel pioneer in the introduction of the most modern technologies, while maintaining an economy organized to human scale and along federative, rather than hierarchical, principles.

Synthesizing politics and economics, Abraham Cohen discusses “The Emergence of the Public Sector of the Israel Economy.” He delineates a tripartite economic system, with state, workers (Histadrut), and private sectors reflecting a combination of principles and forces that give Israel its distinctive character.


Among the studies of Israeli history to appear is Ernest Stock’s Israel on the Road to Sinai: 1949–1956, a political scientist’s examination of
the state’s security policy from the end of the war of independence to the Sinai campaign. *The Hand of Mordecai* by Margaret Larkin is an account of the battle of kibbutz Yad Mordechai in the war of independence. Samuel Katz’s *Days of Fire: The Secret History of the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Making of Israel* examines one aspect of the founding of the state in light of military and political history. Herbert Parzen’s article, “A Chapter in Arab-Jewish Relations During the Mandate Era” adds to the general understanding of the growth of hostilities between the two peoples, as Jewish settlement expanded. William Braiterman, an American Jew, writes of his *Memories of the Palestine Jewish Legion of 1917*.

Going further back in the history of modern Israel, Isaiah Friedman, in “Lord Palmerston and the Protection of Jews in Palestine 1839–1851,” probes the beginnings of Britain’s active involvement in Jewish resettlement efforts. Dealing with the same period, Moshe Ma’oz’s *Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine 1840–1861* gives an extensive account of the introduction of limited local government in the area, and its adjustment to the needs of a population organized by religious communities.


The creation of an Israeli society out of (or rooted in) the various communal subgroups remains a great concern in Israel, though in a quite different way since June 1967. Harold R. Isaacs discusses one such group, *American Jews in Israel*, based on his *New Yorker* articles on representative American settlers in Israel, their difficulties, and the special character of their adjustment to an environment that makes Americans stand out among most other immigrant groups as people from a new and different world. A. A. Weinberg provides some statistical background for the Isaacs book in “Immigration from Western Countries in Israel.” *Letters from Israel*, edited by Jay David, adds immediacy to these writings by bringing together the responses of Americans, visiting or living in Israel from World War II to the present, to the land and its people.

In the same general vein is Walter P. Zenner’s *Syrian Jewish Identification in Israel*, a study of the Syrian, particularly Aleppo, Jews in Israel. A postscript on the Halabi (Aleppo) Jewish community of New York adds some interesting comparisons. Zenner’s article “Sephardic Communal Organizations in Israel” breaks new ground by focusing on
the communal organization of a subgroup, and not on its problems of identity alone. This author writes about the role of the Sephardi Jews in the development of Israel in "Israel's Sephardim: The Myth of the 'Two Cultures.'"

Some non-Israeli views of Israel's "integration" problem are presented in Harry Salsinger, "Israel: Its Schools Try Much Like Ours to Help the Disadvantaged" and J. Hochbaum, "Social Planning for Immigrant Absorption."

A case study of cultural continuity under the new conditions of Israel is provided by Moshe Minkovitz in "Old Conflicts in a New Environment: A Study of a Moroccan Atlas Mountain Community Transplanted to Israel." Percy S. Cohen reviews recent literature on "Israel's Ethnic Problem." Much of what he concludes has been made obsolete by the intercommunal solidarity generated by the six-day war.

The perspective of yet another kind of sub-community is provided by Morris Mandel and Leo Gartenberg in Israel Through Eight Eyes: An Orthodox View of the Holy Land.

Ernest Stock's From Conflict to Understanding, examines the social and political aspects of Arab-Jewish relations in Israel since 1948 from both the Arab and Israeli sides, and concludes on a cautiously optimistic note in view of the cooperative responses of Israeli Arabs during the six-day war.

Among the general books on Israel to appear in 1967-1968 were Chaim Bermant's Israel; Oden Meeker's Israel: Ancient Land, Young Nation, region by region view; Israel: A Reader, edited by Bill Adler, and The Generations of Israel, edited by Neal Kozodoy.

The six-day war also demonstrated that Israel was, in its own way, a great power—perhaps the smallest great power in the world, entirely in keeping with the record of the Jewish people in the past. This is being demonstrated in many fields, not the least of them Israel's technical assistance to underdeveloped countries. A sober report of some of its aspects is found in Stuart H. Schaar, Patterns of Israeli Aid and Trade in East Africa, and in Leopold Laufer's more general survey, Israel and the Developing Countries: New Approaches to Cooperation. A list of materials on the subject is available in Samuel Decalo, "Israel and Africa: A Selected Bibliography."

Irving Heymont's "The Israeli Nahal Program" shows the attraction of African, Asian, and Latin American countries to this unique project combining military service and agricultural pioneering. Edward Bernard
Glick's *Peaceful Conflict: The Civilian Uses of the Military* not only speaks of Israel's utilization of its army for important educational and pioneering purposes within its own borders, but identifies Israel as one of the two major sources of assistance (along with the United States) to other nations seeking to use their armed forces for such pursuits.


**Area Studies**

**United States**

**National Studies**

Research on the American Jewish community, published in 1967 and 1968, generally fell into patterns established in the past. Judd L. Teller's *Strangers and Natives: The Evolution of the American Jew from 1921 to the Present* is a Jewish insider's look at the acculturation of American Jews, from the end of World War I to the present. Mostly about Jewish life in New York City, it traces the shift of power in communal affairs from the German to the East European Jews; the rise of overseas problems to the forefront of American Jewish concerns, and the growth of the synagogue as a source of communal influence. The book can be read in conjunction with Samuel Joseph's *Jewish Immigration to the United States*, which examines the causes of Jewish emigration from Eastern Europe and the character and movements of those who came to the United States. The record of adjustment of a much later group of immigrants is provided by Philip Soskis in "Ten Years Later: A Report on the Integration of Jewish Hungarian Refugees in the United States."

Since being Jewish has become the "in" thing in some circles, the American Jewish community has become the subject (or the victim) of a number of profiles, done by people of varying degrees of Jewish knowledge and commitment. The two most widely sold books of this type were Roger Kahn's *The Passionate People: What It Means to be a Jew in America*, and James Yaffe's *The American Jews, Portrait of a Split Personality*. Both end up as personal reports revealing more about their authors than their subjects; both are marred by errors based on gross ignorance of things Jewish, contemporary and traditional, making
both excellent illustrations of the ignorance problem of American Jewry. Both authors therefore missed, or misinterpreted, the massive amount of undoubtedly good information and ideas they may have elicited from the impressive groups of people they interviewed. Also, since they view the Jews with the bias of radical assimilationists, both miss much of the real spirit and problem of the American Jewish community. Yaffe, it should be acknowledged, is a perceptive person who at least senses the communal bonds uniting Jews into a kind of polity and the dilemmas arising from them for American Jews, dilemmas which the Jewish "establishment" often papers over too casually.

Morris N. Kertzer's Today's American Jew is of the same genre, written in much the same "profile" style, but from an insider's perspective. Less successful is Morris Gutstein's Profiles of Freedom, apparently a collection of sermons on commonplace topics in American Jewish history that rehash old stories and sources. Another kind of portrait of American Jewry is Louis A. Berman's Jews and Intermarriage, A Study in Personality and Culture, a compendious volume going far beyond its title to summarize virtually all the available studies of American Jewish life.

The continuing problem of organizing the American Jewish community, even for such limited activities as kashrut supervision, is highlighted in Aaron Rothkoff's "The American Sojourns of Ridbaz: Religious Problems Within the Immigrant Community," an account of the failures of the second great European rabbi who tried to create a European-style communal regime in radically individualistic turn-of-the-century America.

In sharp contrast to Ridbaz's experience, Jacob R. Marcus describes "The Quintessential American Jew." He chooses as examples, from each of the conventional three periods of American Jewish history, one man, who rejected or simply neglected things Jewish in his youth yet, once he took on familial responsibilities, found his way back into the community to become a leader and, in some way, an observant Jew. These men, each a pioneer on one of America's successive frontiers, helped forge a new kind of Jewish community, rooted in America's emergent society and attuned to its basically individualistic culture. This theme is expanded in Marcus's The American Colonial Jew: A Study in Acculturation.


A welcome addition to the list of American Jewish historical periodi-
While various community studies, some very important, were published during 1967 and 1968, none really concerns itself with the organized Jewish community as an entity. Rather, the predominance of sociological and demographic studies remain pronounced.

Alaska: In "Jews of Alaska," Bernard Postal gives a brief summary of their history and present activities.


California: Norton B. Stern's *California Jewish History: A Descriptive Bibliography* is a treasure trove of American Judaica. It cites over 550 selected works dealing with nineteenth century California Jewry, from the Gold Rush to the end of World War I. Stern’s annotations make the listing especially useful. Another good bibliography is *Pioneer Jews of the California Mother Lode* by Sara Cogan. Stern and Justin G. Terner co-authored "Marco Ross Newmark, 1878-1959: First Jewish Historian of the Southland," which establishes the connection between the very first Jews in Los Angeles in the 1850's and the development of today's organized community. Stern also edited the "Memoirs of Marcus Katz—San Bernardino Pioneer."

District of Columbia: Robert Shosteck's article, "The Jewish Community of Washington, D.C., During the Civil War," adds to the slim collection of materials on local Jewish history in the nineteenth century.

Illinois: The most important Jewish community study that appeared in 1967-1968 were two volumes of the long-awaited "Lakeville Studies," for which the field work was completed in 1959. *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier*, co-authored by Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, is the core volume in the series. It summarizes the sociological investigation of the Jews of "Lakeville" (Highland Park, Illinois—a suburb of Chicago), the kind for which Sklare is justly famous. The authors delineate an "associational Jewishness" (their term) involving a high level of synagogue membership; little personal Jewish observance; a commitment to Israel and the usual Jewish welfare "causes"; a desire to transmit a sense of Jewish attachment to the children, without seeming
too obviously "clannish," by giving them a Jewish education of sorts, and a continuing, if often haphazard, search for "Jewish identity." Aside from these more or less expected conclusions, the authors indicate that "by-and-large" Lakeville Jews "identify the source of their ethic as a Jewish one," which "in the modern history of the Jew was not always so." Though telling them so would undoubtedly frighten the Jews of Lakeville, what Sklare and Greenblum have described is not really a "religious community," as the official ideology of American Jewry would have it, but a family (a term used by one of the respondents) or tribe (this writer's term), whose common concerns are primarily political—Israel, "defense," communal welfare, and the like. When added to earlier studies of greater Chicago Jewry, the Lakeville study makes that community one of the best studied in the United States.

**Kansas:** The attempt to create a Jewish agricultural colony is further chronicled in "Beersheba, Kan.: 'God's Pure Air on Government Land'" by A. James Rudin (see AJYB 1967 [Vol. 68], p. 212).

**Maryland:** Milton Goldman's article, "Characteristics of the Jewish Poor Served in a Family Agency: A Case Study," provides useful information on the Baltimore Jewish Family and Children's Service, and its clients.

**Massachusetts:** A demographic basis for community studies of the greater part of Massachusetts Jewry is provided by *A Study of the Jewish Population of Greater Boston* by Morris Axelrod, Floyd J. Fowler, Jr., and Arnold Gunn, and *A Population Survey of the Greater Springfield Jewish Community* by Sidney Goldstein.

**Michigan:** In 1967 and 1968 the Jewish Historical Society of Michigan published Volumes 7 and 8 of *Michigan Jewish History*, which contain material ranging from brief historical reports on Jewish community activities, to documents of interest to social historians.

**New Jersey:** A picture of the Jewish farmers of New Jersey emerges from Eva Sher's reminiscences of growing up on her father's farm, *Life with Farmer Goldstein*.


relationship among clients of the New York City Jewish Family Service.


Rhode Island: A work of high standard is Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*, the full report of their study of Providence, Rhode Island, that focuses on the change in the style and level of Jewish life across the generations. Data from their study is presented by the authors in two articles “Fertility of the Jews” and “Generational Changes in Jewish Family Structure.”

South Dakota: A genealogical work of some importance to South Dakota Jewish history is *The Loevinger Family of Laupheim: Pioneers in South Dakota* by Ludwig D. Kahn.

Texas: Some information on the founding and early development of the El Paso Jewish community is contained in the memoirs of one of its founders, “Samuel J. Freudenthal: Southwestern Merchant and Civic Leader,” edited and annotated by Floyd S. Fierman.


**Other Countries**

Australia: Peter Y. Medding’s study of Melbourne, *From Assimilation to Group Survival* joins the very select list of first-rate community studies. Political in orientation, it goes beyond the attitudinal to look at the community as a functioning entity.

Austria: *The Jews of Austria*, edited by Josef Fraenkel, attempts to present a record of a major community that is no more. It is little more than compilations of names of men born Jews who, in some way, participated in Austrian life.

Belgium: Jacques Gutwirth analyzes “Antwerp Jewry Today.”

Canada: The *Jewish Digest* (May 1967) devotes a special issue to “A Salute to Canada on Her Centennial Year and to the Canadian Jewish Community,” a fine selection of articles.

Czechoslovakia: The Society for the History of Czechoslovak Jews published the first volume of the projected series, *The Jews of Czechoslovakia*, which deals with the first 20 years of Czechoslovakia as a state (1919–1938). It includes essays on the history of the Jewish communi-
ties of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Slovakia, and Ruthenia; on their legal position, religious and organizational life, and economy.

**Germany:** Leo Katcher's *Postmortem: The Jews in Germany Today* deals with Jews in both Germanies. Based on several hundred interviews, it concludes that the German Jewish community is slowly dying out. Generally, studies of the community in Germany take the form of memorial volumes which, in the process of commemorating what has been destroyed, add to our knowledge of organized Jewish community life. Such a volume is William Aron, *Jews of Hamburg: Memoirs*.

Some insight into the character of German Jewry at the height of its "emancipation" is provided by Lamar Cecil in his biography of *Albert Ballin: Business and Politics in Imperial Germany, 1888–1918*, which discusses Ballin's mostly superficial relations with the Jewish community, and the status of the Jewish elite at the time. Another biography illuminating the pre-Nazi Jewish community is John K. Dickinson, *German and Jew: The Life and Death of Sigmund Stein*.

The Leo Baeck Institute *Studies*, edited by Max Kreutzberger, contains articles on Dr. Baeck and German Jewish life, four of them authored by eminent scholars.

**Hungary:** Randolph L. Braham edited *Hungarian Jewish Studies*.

**Mexico:** Seymour B. Liebman examines the connections (or lack thereof) between "The Mestizo Jews of Mexico" and the Marranos, a major element in Spanish Mexico after the conquest.

**New Zealand:** Ida G. Cowan describes a dying Jewish community, once the largest in New Zealand, in "Jews Down Under: Dunedin."

**Portugal:** The life of the Marrano community in Belmonte is described by Anita Novinsky and Amilcar Paulo in "The Last Marranos."

**USSR:** The plight of Soviet Jewry continued to be a matter of highest priority on the agenda of world Jewry. For obvious reasons, studies of Jews and Jewish life in the Soviet Union were few, and even those were produced from afar. One, *Ethnic Minorities in the Soviet Union*, edited by Erich Goldhagen, consists of 11 papers that were presented at a symposium of the Brandeis University Institute of East European Jewish Studies, whose scholarship adds to the limited literature in a difficult field. The best book on the subject to appear in many years is Ben-'Ami's *Between Hammer and Sickle* (p. 198), a penetrating account of the conditions of Soviet Jewry by an Israeli, who spent considerable time in the Soviet Union and visited Jews in all parts of that country. He discusses the substitutes for communal life devised by Soviet Jews, which,
in the main, are grounded in a return to the extended family as the basic unit of "organization." Joshua Rothenberg investigates "How Many Jews are There in the Soviet Union?", using Soviet census data and other sources.

Most publications about Soviet Jewry are enlarged travelers’ reports. Among the better ones is Shelomo Ben-Israel, *Russian Sketches: A Visit to Jews Without Hope*. Elie Wiesel asks "Will Soviet Jewry Survive?". Ronald I. Rubin is the editor of *The Unredeemed: Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union*.

The little information available on the situation of the Jews in the various Soviet republics continued to confirm the worst. In "An Appeal to Comrade A. Snietskus, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party," 26 anonymous Jewish residents of Vilna protest the growing antisemitism in the Lithuanian S.S.R., and document the systematic destruction of its Jewish communal life. Avraham Kariv writes of an earlier *Lithuania, Land of My Birth*.

A slightly less depressing picture is presented by Joshua Rothenberg in "The Special Case of the Georgian Jews," describing the one surviving organized Jewish community in the Soviet Union. *Yemen*: The history, dissolution, and possible remnant of Yemenite Jewry are given considerable attention in a full chapter in Dana Adams Schmidt’s *Yemen: The Unknown War*.

**INTERCOMMUNITY RELATIONS**

Systematic research on the intercommunity relations of the Jews still does not go beyond a handful of historical case studies, not directly aimed at the question as such. Zosa Sajkowski, who is becoming the leading American historian in this area, contributes several meticulously documented studies: "Private and Organized Jewish Overseas Relief and Immigration (1914–1938)"); "Private American Jewish Overseas Relief (1919–1938): Problems and Attempted Solutions" (emphasizing the role of *Landsmanschaften*), and "Paul Nathan, Lucien Wolf, Jacob H. Schiff and the Jewish Revolutionary Movements in Eastern Europe (1903–1917)." The general theme of the first and second studies is that financial aid by American Jews was the first step in making possible the emigration of many Central and East European Jews in the period from the outbreak of World War I to 1939.

Morton Tenzer discusses the successful drive by American Zionists
to secure for the Jews "due consideration in the making of the peace" in a chapter on "The Jews" in The Immigrants' Influence on Wilson's Peace Treaties, edited by Joseph P. O'Grady. Moshe Gottlieb talks of American Jewry's organized response to the initial Nazi measures against the German Jews in "The First of April Boycott and the Reaction of the American Jewish Community." He chronicles the problems of formulating a common course of action in a terribly fragmented community, and the Nazi responses to the action taken.


In "The Israeli Shaliach in the Jewish Community Center," Irwin Shaw discusses a concrete aspect of intercommunity collaboration between Israel and American Jewry in the program of the Detroit Jewish Community Center, which is now becoming institutionalized in others as well.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS

The six-day war undoubtedly was the most important factor in Jewish-Gentile relations in 1967 and 1968. Its ramifications have extended to the second most important factor, the Negro-Jewish confrontation. In the minds of the black militants, their "war" against their Jewish neighbors is akin to the struggle of the Arabs in the so-called third world against Israel. By making this connection and basing their anti-Jewish doctrines upon it, the black militants have generated the first crisis in a generation within the United States (if not the first in American Jewish history), that forces American Jewry to look upon itself as an entity and, beyond that, as one tied to the Jewish people in Israel and in the world. The most pronounced consequence is a reenforcement of the emerging sense of polity among Jews. Thus, defense organizations which, until May 1967, saw themselves as part of a broad American front fighting all forms of prejudice and discrimination, have gone beyond their discovery of Jewish separateness, produced by the June events, to enunciate
positions of aggressive defense against any assault on any Jew from the outside.

**Negro-Jewish Confrontation**

The confrontation between black militants and the Jewish community grew into a headline problem in 1968. One of the first large-scale examinations of it was a *Midstream* symposium, edited by Shlomo Katz and republished as *Negro and Jew: An Encounter in America*. However, subsequent events make much of the symposium appear dated. Equally dated, it seems, is Gary T. Marx’s study of Negro antisemitism, *Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community*, which concludes on the basis of data collected in the early 1960’s, no doubt correctly, that Negroes were less antisemitic than comparable white population groups. Later developments may have changed this finding substantially, particularly among the young and the militant. Lawrence A. Kogan’s “The Jewish Conception of Negroes in the North: An Historical Approach” adds to the understanding of the Jewish aspect of the picture, and its changes over time. A normative view of the problem is presented by Henry Cohen in *Justice, Justice: A Jewish View of the Negro Revolt*. One recent aspect of the confrontation is discussed by Marie Syrkin in “The Hatchett Affair at N.Y.U.”

Some of the Jewish community’s responses to the problem are discussed in the recent literature. Theodore Walden, executive director of the Indianapolis Jewish Community Relations Council, reports the experiences of his organization in “Intervention by a Jewish Community Relations Council in a Negro Ghetto: A Case Illustration.”

**Jewish-Christian Relations**

Negro-Jewish confrontations notwithstanding, the usual issues of Jewish-Christian relations persisted in 1967–1968. In *The American Sociological Review*, a review symposium on Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism* (AJYB, 1967 [Vol. 68], p. 67), leading social scientists Robin M. Williams, Jr., Andrew M. Greeley, and Daniel J. Levinson sharply challenge the authors’ manipulation and evaluation of their data; their overemphasis of negative findings (i.e. that Christian beliefs cause antisemitism), and their tendency to confuse perceptions of reality with prejudice.

Benjamin B. Ringer provides a sober study of the limits of Jewish-Christian interaction in *The Edge of Friendliness: A Study of Jewish-
Gentile Relations, the second volume of the "Lakeville Studies." Morton Irving Seiden's The Paradox of Hate is a quasi-psychoanalytic study of antisemitism, of interest primarily because of the antisemitic documents it contains.

The eruption of an antisemitic incident in a school-board election campaign in Wayne, New Jersey (AJYB 1968 [Vol. 69], pp. 238–241), offered Rodney Stark the opportunity to support his theoretical studies of antisemitism with a case study. He and Stephen Steinberg authored It Did Happen Here: An Investigation of Political Anti-Semitism: Wayne, New Jersey, 1967, a short analysis of the incident, reflecting the sensationalism of its title. A small body of literature has already grown up about the Wayne incident, as every Jewish defense organization rushed in with its own analysts.

Two new works represent Christian schools of thought. In Dialogue with Israel, Jean Daniélou presents what may be called orthodox Catholic tolerance, the thesis that God loves the Jews despite their continuing error; ergo, so should we Christians. Jacob Agus's "Response" appears in the same volume. A similar exchange takes place between Daniélou and André Chouraqui in The Jews: Views and Counterviews; A Dialogue. Very different is A. Roy Eckardt's Elder and Younger Brothers: The Encounter of Jews and Christians, a sensitive sympathetic discussion.

Recent developments in Catholic-Jewish relations are discussed by Pinchas E. Lapide in Three Popes and the Jews, and Arthur Gilbert presents a full account of The Vatican Council and the Jews. Ben Zion Bokser takes a rather conventional Jewish approach to Christianity in Judaism and the Christian Predicament. Harry Fleischman argues, in "Anti-Semitism in the United States," that antisemitism has theological as well as nonreligious roots. He cites studies of Catholic and Protestant textbooks and of school curricula in support of his thesis, and suggests programs which would help eliminate this problem. Face to Face, a collection of 17 articles from Jewish Heritage, edited by Lily Edelman, is designed to serve as a primer for Jewish-Christian dialogue. The question of the Jewish role in such dialogues is discussed by Walter S. Wurzburger and Eugene B. Borowitz in Judaism and the Interfaith Movement.

Armand L. Mauss examines "Mormon Semitism and Anti-Semitism" to show that the high level of self-identification with Jews among Mormons holds down their antisemitic potential.
Communist Bloc and the Jews

The rise in active antisemitism and denunciation of Israel and Zionism in the Communist countries after the six-day war is documented by Moshe Decter in *Israel and the Jews in the Soviet Mirror: Soviet Cartoons on the Middle East Crisis*. The National Community Relations Advisory Council discusses its meaning in *Implications for Soviet Jewry in the Middle East Crisis*.

Even more virulent was the response in Poland, whose government in effect restored the antisemitic policies of its non-Communist predecessors.* Stuart S. Smith deals with “The Revival of Anti-Semitism in Poland”; Joel Marcus describes “Turmoil in Poland”; Reuben Ainsztein analyses “Poland’s Anti-Semitic Mania.”

Ronald I. Rubin examines the role of Jewish organizations representing the interests of the Jews in the UN Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, in “Soviet Jewry and the United Nations: The Politics of Non-Governmental Organizations.” His study is important also as a portrayal of an important, but neglected, aspect of Jewish political life.

THE COURSE OF JEWISH PUBLIC AFFAIRS

By far the finest article in this category was Lloyd Gartner’s thorough and enlightening study of “Roumania, America and World Jewry: Consul Peixotto in Bucharest, 1870–1876.” Tracing the strange story of America’s Jewish representative in Rumania, who actually had been sent by American Jewry to help persecuted fellow-Jews, Gartner provides a picture of Jewish life (including its community structure) during Rumania’s emergence as an independent state. He gives an absorbing account of the dynamics of international Jewish politics in the late 19th century, when a “concert” of wealthy Jewish aristocrats in Europe served as a kind of worldwide war cabinet for the protection of Jewish interests. The nearly 100-page article decisively demonstrates the existence of a Jewish “national” policy and politics, developed and directed by the most “liberal” Western Jews, even while they were busy denying Jewish nationhood.

The widest-selling general Jewish history published in 1967–1968 was Abba Eban’s *My People: The Story of the Jews*. A highly personalized

* See review of Poland, p. 395.
account, it both gains and suffers from the emphasis on the personal interest of the author, and deals with Jewish public affairs primarily in regard to the rise of Israel.

Jacob Neusner's *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (Volume III) reflects the new trends in Jewish historiography with his clear interest in the political life of the Jewish community. D. M. Dunlop's classic, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, which presents the available material on the political life and organization of Khazaria, was reissued. Volumes XI and XII of Salo W. Baron's *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* bring this series up to 1650, roughly the beginning of the modern era. Volume XI, *Citizen or Alien Conjurer*, portrays the uncertain legal and political standing of the Jews and their communal structures, as the medieval system of corporations crumbled in the face of new political and social forms. Volume XII, *Economic Catalyst*, documents the Jews' invaluable role in creating the system that so radically changed their way of life.

The trend in Jewish concerns from 1650 to 1950 can be capsulized as a three-stage movement: from national redemption to emancipation; from emancipation to cosmopolitan messianism; from cosmopolitan messianism to genocide and national rebirth.

Michael A. Meyer, in *The Origins of the Modern Jew: Jewish Identity and European Culture in Germany, 1749–1824*, deals with the intellectual history of the Jewish vanguard of emancipation in Germany. His data show how the transmutation of Jewish political ideas into religious ones (paradoxically, at a time when Christian religious ideas were being secularized and given political form) created the possibility for educated Jews to accept a worldview more suitable to the conditions of emancipation. In an important footnote to this point, Jacob Katz discusses "Free-masons and Jews," concentrating on the European, particularly the German, experience, and ignores the very different relationship that developed in America.

The failure of Jewish cosmopolitan messianism in the first half of the 20th century was documented in two works. Ezra Mendelsohn discusses the failure of the Socialist labor unions of turn-of-the-century Russia to bridge the gap between Jews and Gentiles in "Jews and Christian Workers in the Russian Pale of Settlement." Bernard Johnpoll's previously cited study of the Jewish Workers' Bund of Poland (p. 198) examines its failure to establish itself as a respectable part of that country's political life in the interwar period. Both studies tell the sad
tale of Jews talking internationalism to other Jews (and attacking "Jewish" particularism at the same time), while their non-Jewish neighbors continued to reject them forcibly on antisemitic grounds.

The end results of this trend are made clear in Lothar Kahn's *Mirrors of the Jewish Mind*, a study of the ideas and intellectual conflicts in the minds of the foremost European Jewish writers in the period between the emergence of modern antisemitism and the rise of Hitler, and how the rightness of the Zionist solution became even more apparent.

From antisemitic rejection to genocide was an easy step. Publications on the Holocaust continue to occupy an important place in the world of Jewish writing. Several important recent books on the Jewish response have already been cited (p. 196). A second, revised and augmented edition of Gerald Reitlinger's *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe 1939–1945* appeared in 1968. Simon Wiesenthal presents his highly personal account of the effort to find and punish those responsible, in *The Murderers Among Us*.

The problem of the American response to the destruction of European Jewry remains one of the major concerns of students of contemporary Jewish public affairs. The publication of Arthur D. Morse's damning *While Six Million Died* puts the question before a large reading public, and answers it in the most critical terms. Sheldon Spear draws similar conclusions, in more muted tones, in "The United States and the Persecution of the Jews in Germany, 1933–1939." Nora Levin's *The Holocaust: The Destruction of European Jewry (1933–1945)* is a simplified retelling of the gruesome story.

**CONTEMPORARY ISSUES**

Philip M. Klutznick offers a sequel to *No Easy Answers*, his earlier diagnosis of the problems of the contemporary Jewish community, in *After Victory, Vigil: A Prospectus for the Jewish Community*.

In "Perspectives on American Jewry," Eli Ginzberg presents a fairly conventional five-point program for reinforcing the Jewish cultural background of the American Jews by strengthening Jewish education and ties with Israel, and raising the educational level of Jewish communal leadership.

The question of the Jewish college student's ties with Judaism became a major public issue. Irving Greenberg gives an overview of the situation in "Jewish Survival and the College Campus." Speaking for the
student generation, Richard Narva discusses "Judaism on the Campus—Why It Fails." He advocates the application of the students' quest for participation to Jewish life on the campus, and a simultaneous corporate thrust toward intellectual excellence and social involvement.

RESEARCH APPROACHES, METHODS, AND RESOURCES

Elmer N. Lear suggests an approach to the study of American Jewish communal functions in "'Relevance' and the Structure of American Sub-Cultures." Friederike Wilder-Okladek discusses the problem of studying contemporary Jewish life in Germany and Austria in "A Note on Jewish Research in 'Tainted' Countries," listing sources of data for such research.

David H. and Daniel J. Elazar authored *A Classification System for Libraries of Judaica*, the first comprehensive Judaica classification system that is constructed entirely on Jewish principles, and classifies Jewish political concerns as such.


Paul Glikson provides a bibliographic survey of the works of Jacob Lestschinsky, the foremost student of contemporary Jewish life in his time, in "Jacob Lestschinsky: A Bibliographical Survey." Yonah Alexander compiled *Israel: Selected, Annotated and Illustrated Bibliography*. 

If 1967 was the turning point it seems to have been in the rediscovery of the Jewish polity, it is reflected only in the most immediately relevant discussions of Jewish public affairs. American Jewish intellectual effort is still primarily concerned with questions of theology and Jewish identity. While the volume of material touching on Jewish public affairs is immense, and growing, the number of studies that approach it from a political perspective lag behind. Yet the fact that the most immediately relevant discussions have taken a turn in that direction may well foreshadow a more direct concern with the Jews as a certain kind of political community—a most helpful development in the continuing task of trying to understand the nature of this people.

_Daniel J. Elazar_
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Cuban Jewish Community in South Florida

No demographic study had ever been made of the Jews in Cuba. Estimates of their number before 1960 ranged from a low of 11,000 to a high of 16,000. Appraisals of the size of the two principal communities, Ashkenazi and Sephardi, and their respective percentages of the total population, differed widely. Those of the smaller group, the Sephardi, varied between ten per cent and one-third of the total. Jacob Schatzky in Yiddische Yischuvim en Latin Amerika (Buenos Aires, 1952, p. 185), put the number of Ashkenazim at 5,300 and Sephardim at 2,700 in 1925, and the total at 12,000 in 1951.

According to well informed sources, the Jewish population, both citizens and permanent residents, in Cuba before Castro was some 14,500. Of this number, 10,000 were Ashkenazim and 3,500 Sephardim. There was a third group of approximately 1,000 consisting of English-speaking Jews and many unaffiliated. The latter included descendants of Jews living in Cuba before the Spanish-American War in 1898 and who, though not converted to another faith, had little identification with their own. It also included the intermarried who did not adopt the faith of the non-Jewish spouses. Some of these unaffiliated secretly contributed to local Jewish and Israeli philanthropies.

Except for the small Jewish communities in the provinces of Camaguey and Oriente with a total membership of about 1,200, and a few other small settlements, most Jews lived in Santa Suarez, Habana Vieja, or Miramar, three districts of the capital. Miramar, the newer residential area of Havana, attracted the more affluent.

Jewish Settlement in Cuba

Jews have lived in Cuba ever since it was settled by Spain about 1502. Despite the edicts of their Catholic majesties, Ferdinand and Isabella, and their successors that no Jews, Moors, or other heretics, or their fourth-generation descendants, could reside in any part of the Spanish empire in the new world, the Jews were there.

The early Jewish inhabitants were known as Marranos. Their number increased rapidly, and, as the Bishop of Cuba wrote to Spain in 1508, practically every ship docking at Havana was filled with Hebrews and New Christians, as Jews recently converted to Christianity were called.

Inquisition proceedings against the Marranos in Cuba began as early as
In the 17th century large-scale persecutions against the secret Jews were instituted. Among the arrested were some of the wealthiest and most influential people in the country: Antonio Méndez, Luis Rodríguez, Blas Pinto, Luis Gomez Barreto, Manuel Alvarez Prieto. Trials continued almost up to the abolition of the Spanish Inquisition in 1834. Two wealthy merchants, Antonio Santaella and Juan Rodríguez Mexia, were tried in 1783.

Many of the Jews who settled in Cuba during the colonial period, particularly in 1580–1640, were Portuguese or their descendants. In the 17th and 18th centuries Portuguese and Jewish were synonyms in the New World. Twenty-three Jews, who fled Brazil in 1654 when it was retaken from Holland by Portugal, stopped at Cuba en route to New Amsterdam in the Colonies, and established contacts with the Cuban Marranos. Among others, the secret Jews of Cuba arranged for trade between the Thirteen Colonies and the Jews of Jamaica, Barbados, and other Caribbean islands, enabling the Colonies to sell goods as well as to buy military and civilian supplies.

The new Spanish Constitution of 1869 removed all restrictions on the settlement of Jews in Latin America. One writer, in 1898, stated that there were over 500 Spanish Jews engaged in commerce in Cuba at that time and earlier, and that five or six Jewish families were among the wealthiest on the island. Jews were also among the founders of the commercial cane sugar fields and the first sugar refineries. Several important families such as Brandon, Marchena, Machado, and Dovalle had come from Panama, Curacao, and Surinam. The famous Cuban actress and poetess, Dolores de Dios Porta, who died in Paris in 1869, was an observant Jewess.

Many American Jews joined Cubans in their fight for independence as early as 1892 and in their revolution of 1895. Among them were August Bondi, Louis Schlesinger, General Roloff formerly known as Akiba Roland, Captain Kaminsky and Horacio Rubens. Joseph Steinberg, a captain in the army of liberation, and his brothers Max and Edward were personal friends of Cuba's Apostol, José Marti.

The first Jewish cemetery in Cuba was established by the United States Army for the American Jewish soldiers who died during the Spanish American War in 1898, following demands by American Jewish organizations for separate interment according to Jewish law. The cemetery was sold in 1906 to the United Hebrew Congregation, the first official Cuban Jewish body created primarily by American Jews. Most members of the congregation, later named Temple Beth Israel, were Americans who fought in Cuba or who came from Key West and other parts of Southern Florida immediately after the end of the war.

Many Sephardi Jews were established in Cuba in 1908; they began to come in 1902. Among them were Young Turks who had participated in the earlier abortive revolt against the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire. Others came from Mexico, North Africa and other areas of the Mediterranean. The Sephardim spoke Spanish and were of swarthy complexion, which made them indistinguishable from the great majority of Cubans. This was an
important reason for the almost total absence of overt antisemitism in Cuba. There were other factors militating against antisemitism: the Cuban non-Jew was the most extrovert of all Latin Americans and had less guile; the fight for independence was too recent to be forgotten, and many Cubans remembered the part some Jews played in it; Catholicism in Cuba was female-oriented and little affected the life of Cubans outside the Church; the Cubans had not forgotten that they too had been a persecuted people. The Sephardim, then, integrated into their new milieu with little difficulty.

In 1914 the American Jews and the Sephardim, who until then had been together for religious purposes, parted ways; the latter established Congregation Shevet Achim. The parting was due partly to the differences in ethnic and social background. The American Jews maintained a higher standard of living, moved in upper Cuban social and economic circles, and were accepted in the most exclusive clubs. By contrast, the Sephardim were small merchants, artisans, and peddlers, who did not speak English. However, many American Jews were made honorary members of Shevet Achim in recognition of their assistance to the Sephardi community. Later the Ashkenazi Jews, too, expressed appreciation to the American Jews for assisting East European Jews.

Two significant events occurred before the large immigration of Ashkenazim. One was the activity of David Blis, who used the newspaper El Día to agitate for Cuban endorsement of the Balfour Declaration. Blis, a Jew, came from Mexico, and quickly established himself in Cuba as an active Zionist. The other was the first display of Jews as an ethnic-religious group in Cuba, when a contingent marched as Jews in the Havana parade on November 11, 1918, celebrating the armistice.

Ashkenazim began to come to Cuba in 1920. They were considered German nationals. Their first shops, whether dry cleaning, grocery, textile, or general merchandise, bore names such as Bazaar Aleman, Berlin, or Hamburg. Shortly after becoming established, they ceased attending the Sephardi Shevet Achim and built their own synagogue. Since this split, both groups maintained their own complex of institutions. There was little socializing between them, except at large social functions and in the B'nai B'rith lodge. There were friendly relations as well as some intermarriage between individuals of both groups.

The friendlier relations between the Ashkenazi and Sephardi groups in the decade before the Castro revolution may be attributed to the coming of age of a generation of native-born Jews who attended the same parochial elementary schools and secular secondary schools. Spanish became the leading language and began to replace Yiddish and Ladino as the immigrant generation passed away.

The Cuban Ashkenazim have had a twenty-year history of internecine disputes. Personal rivalries and religious and ideological differences were insurmountable obstacles to communal unity. The Jewish Communists were the most intransigent on all issues; some of them remained in Cuba to the
present day. They and the Bundists were viciously anti-Zionist. The Communists even attempted to sabotage fund-raising campaigns for Israel. However, there was also feuding among the Zionists; Labor Zionists with General Zionists and Mizrachi.

One of the factors contributing to the failure to achieve unity in the Ashkenazi ranks was difference of origin. The earlier wave of immigrants came mainly from Russia and Poland. The immigrants of the 1930s and the post-World War II period came from Austria and Germany. The most notable exception to the divisiveness of Cuban Jews was evinced during the period of virulent antisemitism between 1938 and 1940, which coincided with the worst outrages against the Jews in the Third Reich.

Cuban antisemitism was fostered by the Nazis (Camisas Doradas), Falangists (Spanish merchants and a few clerics), and the Catholic-owned newspapers *Diario de la Marina*, *Alestá*, and *El Día*, apparently with funds provided by the German embassy in Havana. Responsibility for the tragic incident of the S.S. *St. Louis*, which sailed from Hamburg on May 13, 1939 with 1,000 Jewish refugees, has been laid at the door of some Spanish merchants in Havana who feared business competition from these unfortunates. The passengers were in possession of valid Cuban visas, which had been issued at the direction of Minister of Migration General Manuel Benítez, against a payment of $300 to $500 per visa by Cuban Jews wishing to save their brethren from Hitlerism. The Cuban merchants revealed the details of the transaction, and President Laredo Bru, for reasons best known to himself, voided the visas while the ship was on the high seas, and refused the ship permission to land in Havana. Appeals to the United States to use its good offices to bring about a reversal of this decision brought no action.

Adolfo Kates and his brother Gustave have been acknowledged as principally responsible for the Cuban government's reversal of the antisemitic trend. The former, now residing in Miami, was outstanding among Cubans of all faiths with respect to the number of decorations he received from Cuba, Spain, France, and Belgium for his civic, philanthropic and diplomatic works.

The number of Jews in the various professions were: 20 lawyers, of whom one was a judge; close to 50 doctors and dentists, and about 40 architects, engineers and accountants. There were over 300 Cuban Jews who were pursuing higher studies at universities in Cuba, the United States, and Europe.

The Cuban Jews left five communal structures in Havana, in addition to their cemeteries: The buildings of the Centro Hebreo Sefaradi de Cuba, a religious and communal center resulting from a merger of the Union Hebreo Sefaradi and Congregation Shevet Achim; the Jewish Community House, known as Patronato para la Comunidad, of the Ashkenazi; Congregation Adath Israel; the Zionist building on the Prado, and the Autonomous Jewish Circle School. The total cost of these buildings exceeded $2 million.

Fidel Castro assumed power in January 1959, following an armed revolu-
tion against the Batista dictatorship. In the summer of 1960 the Jews began a great emigration from Cuba. They looked upon Castro’s Communism as a danger to their way of life and to their property interest. It was the fear of expropriation, not antisemitism, that was the primary motive for their departure. Some also feared that Castro might stifle a Jewish way of life in order to achieve his communal society.

**CUBAN JEWS IN SOUTH FLORIDA**

South Florida includes the Greater Miami area, also known as Dade County; Hollywood, and Fort Lauderdale in Broward County; Key West and Tampa on the West Coast of Florida. It was not possible to ascertain the exact number of Cuban Jews now residing in this area. While the Cuban Jews have formed two indigenous organizations, not all Cuban Jews were members of them. Many chose to integrate into the American Jewish community. Among these were some Orthodox, many who had socialized with American Jews who permanently lived in Cuba, and former members of the Reform Temple Beth Israel in Havana.

A large number of Cuban Jews had friends and relatives in Florida and had invested money in the Miami area for many years before 1960. Some had spoken mainly English in their homes in Cuba. The statistics of the National Council of Jewish Women and United HIAS Service (p. 289), the two organizations that have participated in the Cuban refugee program since 1961, were not representative of the total number of Cuban Jews who migrated to the United States. Many had come earlier, and many came via Venezuela, Colombia, Spain, Israel, Puerto Rico, and other places, making definite identification difficult.

**Areas of Settlement**

The HIAS figure of Cuban Jews registered under the Cuban refugee program, was approximately 4,500. Another 2,500 Cubans probably came to Miami from other countries, and even from other cities in the United States. HIAS resettled over 3,000 from the Southern Florida area in almost 300 cities in thirty-one states, in Puerto Rico and Costa Rica. A partial breakdown of the HIAS resettlement in 1961-67 revealed the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware &amp; District of Columbia</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since HIAS did not follow up on the activities of those it resettled, there was no assurance that many of the Cuban refugees did not return to South Florida once they accumulated enough money, or to join friends or relatives. This was particularly likely since, of all states, the climate of Florida most closely resembles that of Cuba.

Extensive investigation produced an estimate of about 3,500 Cuban Jews living in South Florida, many of them, if not most, in Miami Beach. Here they were to be found in the northern part (North Shore area running from 62nd Street to 95th Street) and in the South Beach area, below Lincoln Road.

For many years since World War II, Cubans of all faiths came to Miami Beach during the summer, when hotel and restaurant rates, as well as prices in general, were much lower than in the winter season. This was particularly so before 1959. Local residents of Miami Beach called the summers the “Cuban invasion.” Cubans were familiar with the streets, shops, and general area of Miami Beach. This familiarity and the proximity to the ocean contributed to their choice of this city for settlement.

**Composition of Community**

Cuban Jews in the United States continued to maintain some of their former divisions. There were three distinct groups in South Florida: Sephardim, Ashkenazim, and the youth—under sixteen years of age—of both groups. The youngsters, who associated with other children at school, integrated rapidly and were mixing with all types of Jews. They fail to see any significant distinctions between Sephardim and Ashkenazim.

Ashkenazi adults and children differed little in appearance and religious practice from the general Jewish community. By contrast, the Sephardim, who remained in the minority, stood out because of their olive complexion, their volatility, emotionally and otherwise, and their strong adherence to tradition. They lived within voluntarily prescribed areas, and their pattern of life facilitated the preservation of their customs. However, the movement away from one area, loosening of family ties, and greater exposure to outside influences, soon may break down Sephardi distinctiveness. Also the lack of American-trained Sephardi rabbis may alienate Sephardi youth reared in America.

**Commitment to Judaism**

Synagogue affiliation of Cuban Jews was comparable to that of American Jews in the various neighborhoods. Still, one of the first things the Cuban Jews wanted to know when they arrived was the location of synagogues and schools where their children could receive a Jewish education. As with most American Jews, their identification with Judaism was much greater than observance of ritual. But their commitment to Jewish education for their children was stronger than that of American Jews. A strong inducement for many Cubans to settle on the North Shore was that Temple Menorah (Con-
in the area was the most hospitable of all Greater Miami congregations. It invited the newcomers to share, without charge, its services, including seats for the High Holy Days, and its Talmud Torah for the education of their children. It continued this practice for five years. Most other congregations, including the Sephardi Jewish Center in Miami Beach, requested nominal payment, thus antagonizing the Cuban Sephardim. They now organized the Cuban Sephardi Hebrew congregation, which they named after Shevet Achim in Havana.

The new Shevet Achim had a membership of 150 families, a Cuban rabbi, Nissim Mayer, and Sunday School classes. Not all Cuban Sephardi Jews belonged to this congregation. Some attended the original Sephardi Center, also in Miami Beach. It was rather surprising that the Floridian Sephardim did not show more cordiality toward the new arrivals, since many of them, like the Cubans, were of Turkish ancestry. The Sephardi Center, with about 200 member families, also conducted Sunday School classes, but the Cuban congregation had a larger enrollment. The two institutions were only two blocks apart. They had a combined student body of 60. Both considered themselves Orthodox, but many of their members, who were scattered throughout Dade county, had to travel on the Sabbath and Holy Days in order to attend. Kashrut was observed by a small percentage. To many, it meant only abstinence from pork and shellfish.

A distinguishing feature between Ashkenazi and Sephardi religious observance was attendance by Sephardim at all synagogue services, morning and evening, and total participation in the recital of all prayers. There was no problem of having a minyan (quorum) on weekdays or Saturdays and Sundays.

The Ashkenazim held religious services in the Circulo Cubano Hebreo, with Rabbi Dov Rosenzweig officiating. Also located in South Beach, the Circulo was more than a religious institution; it was the largest social center for all shades of Cuban Jews, with over 700 member families. Its New Year's party was attended by more than 800 people. It also conducted weekday classes for some 20 children with a staff of three teachers.

Religious affiliation of the more affluent Ashkenazim was centered in the North Shore area. The few Orthodox Jews belonged to congregations close to their homes. The American Jews and those who belonged to the Reform Temple in Havana were affiliated with Reform temples in South Florida. However, with the exception of the Conservative Temple Menorah, more Cuban Jewish children attended the Orthodox all-day Hebrew Academy than any other single school. Their parents saw no conflict between the Orthodox education their children were receiving and their much less rigid religious observance at home.
Social Life

As most other Latin Americans, Cuban Jews were family-centered. In the United States, this kind of relationship was breaking up because of resettlement and a high degree of mobility. Cuban Jews still had Christian Cuban friends, but there was a loosening of ties. They also tended to maintain friendships with other Cuban Jews, but new relationships with American Jews were encroaching on them. Working hours in the United States differed from those in Cuba, and the pace was much faster. While in Cuba there was little socialization between Jews and Christians during the evening hours, there was much during the day. They found little time for such day-time activity in South Florida.

Economic Situation

The adjustment of Cuban Jews to American economic life has been phenomenal. Two lawyers were in high posts in the banking field. The main occupations of Cuban Jews were engraving, manufacture of leather goods, and selling insurance. Several Cubans have built multimillion dollar exporting and importing businesses, dealing in sugar and other articles, especially shoes. Many of the retail stores in the Miami downtown business area were now Cuban-owned and-operated. Cuban Jews also were predominant in the sale of textiles and remnants, but they also were engaged in all retail businesses, except food services. Many successful Cuban Jews took their Cuban Jewish friends and members of their families into their businesses, as junior partners. Within the younger generation, the division between Ashkenazim and Sephardim was quickly disappearing in all fields of activity.

Cultural Life

The newcomers have become citizens of the United States and, despite the use of Spanish in some homes, succeeded in their desire to assimilate into American life. Their adherence to Spanish as the language of the home was remarkable. In several homes, where Yiddish had been the main language before emigration, it now was Spanish. Parents wanted their children to speak Spanish. Of course, Spanish was spoken with pride by all who came to South Florida from Latin America. This was quite unlike the reaction to Yiddish by first-generation Americans, who wanted their parents to discard Yiddish.

The Cuban Jew did not seem to have been a great participant in Cuban or Spanish cultural life. His knowledge of Spanish was, and continued to be, confined to its use as a means of communication. The most plausible explanation of their devotion to Spanish in their new home may be found in what immigrants generally considered the most agreeable aspect of life in Cuba, namely their acceptance as equals by Cubans. Having themselves been exposed to persecution or having heard stories of what pogroms in Russia,
Poland, and other East European countries and Nazi persecution did to their families, the Jew found Cuban acceptance of him as a citizen a most heartwarming experience. His gratitude to that country was expressed by adherence to its tongue.

**Future of the Community**

The Cuban Jews in South Florida had no intention of returning to the island in the event of Castro's downfall. Of the more than 100 interviewed, only three thought they would do so. Many said that they would go back to try to regain some of the possessions they were forced to leave behind, and then return to the United States. The children, like their parents, have become completely integrated into American life.

Few of the immigrants expressed a desire to settle in Israel. Some explained that for them America was the third home, and the mere thought of having to establish a new life for a fourth time in Israel was too much. However, they were active in pro-Israel causes. In December 1968 they sponsored an Israel Bond dinner with Adolfo Kates as guest of honor. The attendance was over 350 and the drive was a success, not so much in the total amount sold as in the number of sales. However, in the view of this writer, the disintegration of traditional ties among former Cuban Jews precluded many more such annual affairs. As individuals, they were likely to continue attending similar functions, sponsored by their temples, synagogues, Zionist organizations, or fraternal groups.

The 1969 Greater Miami Jewish Federation campaign marked the third year of participation by Cuban Jews as a group. Each year the number of contributors and the amount of their gifts showed marked increases. Sender Kaplan was coordinator of the Federation's annual dinners and drives among the Cuban Jews. He was former editor of *Habaner Leben*, a Yiddish semi-weekly and the sole publication of the Cuban Jewish community, which he published for over 20 years.

The Cuban Hebrew Circle was making a valiant effort to maintain the insularity of Cuban Jewish life. Its leaders sponsored a professionally directed cultural program of lectures and discussions for youths and adults. Since one of the program's aims was to have the new citizens acquire a greater understanding of the American way of life, its long-range effect might be the dissolution of the community of former Cuban Jews.
THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY RESPONDS TO
ISSUES OF THE DAY: A COMPENDIUM

URBAN CRISIS

Poverty

American Jewish Committee (February 14), American Jewish Congress (February 22), Synagogue Council of America (March 13) pledged support to Urban Coalition.*

American Jewish Committee endorsed proposed federal housing and redevelopment act to provide 300,000 new low-income housing units annually (April 24).

Workmen's Circle resolved to support Urban Coalition, Model Cities Program, and other programs to abolish poverty and eliminate urban blight (May 11).

American Jewish Congress recommended to Joint Economic Council of U.S. Congress establishment of guaranteed income to families and individuals whose incomes fall below subsistence level (July 7).

Synagogue Council of America, joining with groups of other religious denominations in support of Poor People's Campaign, urged Congress to pass legislation to alleviate poverty and unemployment (July 8).

B'nai B'rith Young Adults issued statement urging guaranteed annual wage and steps to provide employment for all capable of work (August 10).

National Jewish Welfare Board announced that great majority of directors of Jewish community centers and YM and YWHA's believed involvement of their agencies in urban rehabilitation activities to be "valid expression of Jewish commitment and values." Centers and Y's in 59 cities operated or participated in programs for disadvantaged (October 20).

Civil Disorders

American Jewish Committee, American

Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, United Synagogue of America, National Council of Jewish Women, and 17 Christian groups jointly issued 23-page pamphlet containing official summary and recommendations of National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission) report; sponsors announced extensive programs suggested by report (April 2).

Synagogue Council of America urged implementation of recommendations of Kerner Commission report (April 30).

American Jewish Committee announced 11-point program designed to prevent riot and violence, help riot victims, support legislation for law and order (May 3).

Anti-Defamation League submitted to Senate subcommittee conducting hearings on gun control report, Extremism, Violence and Crime, recommending legislation to restrict sale of firearms (June 25).

Hadassah adopted resolutions urging effective law enforcement and legislation for control of firearms sales (September 11).

American Jewish Committee executive board called for prompt federal law-enforcement assistance to state and local authorities; better training of police and increased employment of minority-group policemen; revision of unjust court procedures; improved handling of riot control procedures (October 29).

American Jewish Congress released report on 1967 Newark riot impact on Jewish community, concluding that Jewish landlords and merchants in city's ghetto were "increasingly" likely to "be the target of Negro anger, hostility and violence" (February 23).

National Community Relations Advisory Council reported "definite and substantial withdrawal of rank and file Jewish support" for civil rights and related issues as a result of survey it sponsored in 30 Jew-

* For listing by organization and page references see Appendix at the end of this piece.
ish communities (including 19 where riots occurred) on impact of riots (March 22).

**Negro-Jewish Tensions**

New York Board of Rabbis criticized New York city school decentralization plan, advocated by Mayor's Advisory Panel under McGeorge Bundy, as "potential breeder of local apartheid" (February 1). American Jewish Committee's New York chapter endorsed New York State Board of Regents decentralization plan (April 18). It denounced Ocean Hill-Brownsville Governing Board's summary dismissal of 17 teachers as "irresponsible act" (May 16). Chapter later called on United Federation of Teachers (UFT) to end strike and form joint UFT-community committee to develop decentralization plans with Negro leaders (September 9).

American Jewish Congress called on UFT to end strike and on Ocean Hill-Brownsville to recall teachers who did "not have a fair hearing"; expressed support of decentralization "subject to adequate safeguards of the interests of teachers, parents, and children" (October 19).

Synagogue Council issued policy statement asserting New York city teacher's strike had assumed "implications" of national concern and deploring injection of anti-semitism into school conflict (October 29).

New York Federation of Reform Synagogues condemned all actions that "have made the process of school decentralization the cause or excuse for setting group against group" (November 15).

Anti-Defamation League recommended guidelines for "structural change" of New York city public schools system, including decentralization but not "community control" as interpreted by some groups (December 24).

Anti-Defamation League's New York Board accused New York city schools and police officers as well as Ford Foundation of "abdicating their responsibilities" in allowing "kill whitey" and antisemitic themes in public school memorial meeting program for Malcolm X, which probably reflected feelings of only "miniscule segment of the Negro community" (February 25).

American Jewish Committee (July 25), Anti-Defamation League (July 28), Jewish Labor Committee (July 28), American Jewish Congress (August 12), Union of American Hebrew Congregations (August 26), Synagogue Council of America (October 1), and N.Y. Board of Rabbis (October 1) opposed appointment of John F. Hatchett, Harlem school teacher and outspoken antisemite, as director of New York University's Martin Luther King, Jr. Afro-American Student Center.

Anti-Defamation League urged New York Mayor John V. Lindsay to take appropriate action against Oliver Ramsey, educational director of city's Council Against Poverty, for alleging "Jewish Mafia" had urged Lindsay to "kill Ocean Hill-Brownsville" (October 3).

**Negro-Jewish Rapprochement**

American Jewish Committee and Rabbinical Assembly, in cooperation with representative Protestant and Catholic groups, joined militant Negro leaders in "Operation Connection" demonstration projects in five cities, to meet needs of poor. A major objective was to develop integrated national strategy for meeting crisis in cities (March 29).

American Jewish Congress announced program to reverse decline of middle-class neighborhood and to "overcome fear, restore community confidences . and deal with blight decay." Aiming at joint Negro-Jewish action in "specific projects of mutual concern," program was begun in New York city (Grand Concourse area), Detroit, Los Angeles, and Boston (May 18).

Synagogue Council members and Negro ministers of several Protestant denominations in New York area met in effort to overcome communication gap between Jewish and Negro communities; joint statement asserted there were shared as well as diverse interests, and that "ongoing communications" were essential (December 7).
American Jewish Congress pledged to work for better Negro-Jewish relations on national, state, and local levels; rejected tactic of antisemitism used by some blacks and backlash reaction of some Jews (December 19).

ANTISEMITISM IN UNITED STATES

Conferences and Resolutions

National Community Relations Advisory Council conducted three-day conference, with the participation of 70 Christian and Jewish clergymen, social scientists, Negro spokesmen, and other community leaders, on ways of dealing with antisemitism in relation to religion, political movements, racial conflict, and social trends (September 16).

Jewish Labor Committee sponsored conference on school decentralization, including workshop on antisemitism in schools (October 26).

United Synagogue of America Joint Commission on Social Action condemned “vitriolic and distorted accusations” of “irresponsible racists” in Negro community; pledged to combat antisemitism, black or white; and also expressed concern over tendency by some Jewish organizations to equate entire Negro community with small group of militant Negroes (October 9).

Labor Zionist Organization of America—Poale Zion expressed “contempt and indignation at the vicious antisemitism, anti-Israel agitation and racism which has been part of the hate campaign of some black and white extremist organizations” (November 11).

Studies

Results of five-year Anti-Defamation League subsidized research program, reported at University of California, Berkeley, symposium on “Patterns of American Prejudice,” revealed most American church members and one-third of clergy are racially and religiously prejudiced (March 25).

Anti-Defamation League’s fact-finding report on extremism revealed many pledged electors of presidential candidate George Wallace represented far right and “dangerous hate fringe,” to which the Wallace campaign might give political voice it never had (September 13).

Manifestations

American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and Union of Orthodox Jewish congregations condemned acts of vandalism and arson against 11 Jewish places of worship and schools in three-month period. Urged civic authorities to investigate incidents and take steps to halt desecrations (November 29).

American Jewish Committee report charged that, while dispute around appointment of Abe Fortas as chief justice of U.S. Supreme Court was not “rooted in antisemitism . . . it seems clear that antisemites and extremists are exploiting and aggravating it” (September 18). Committee also called for apologies to Larry Zeidel, only Jewish player in the National Hockey League and member of Boston Bruins, who reported antisemitic slurs from team members, including reference to “gas chambers” (March 13).

ANTISEMITISM IN EASTERN EUROPE

Poland

Accusations Against Jews

American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B’nai B’rith, and World Jewish Congress denounced attempts by Polish Communist officials and communications media to exploit antisemitism by blaming wave of demonstrations in Poland on “pro-Zionist” and other Jews (March 14). Committee delegation to Polish embassy in New York expressed disappointment at failure to elicit assurance public manifestations of antisemitism would be suppressed (March 19).

Endorsing a student protest against Polish government attacks on Jews, chairman of
Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations demanded assurance Jews of Poland "may live and work in dignity and security" (March 20).

Synagogue Council accused Polish regime of exploiting traditional hatred of Jews for "their own internal purposes" (March 21).

Jewish Labor Committee appealed to President Lyndon B. Johnson to lodge an official protest against antisemitism in Poland (March 28). Hadassah, called on U.S. government to "take every possible measure to influence the Polish government to reverse a course that . threatens the position of its Jewish population" (September 11).

Charge of Espionage

American ORT Federation rejected as "preposterous" accusations made over Polish state television system that it had been involved in espionage activities in Poland (April 10). Joint Distribution Committee called similar charge against itself "all the more astounding because of the Polish Government's recent acknowledgement of JDC's contributions and assistance" (April 2).

Requests for Emigration

American League for Russian Jews, charging "the position of Polish Jewry has become intolerable," proposed emergency airlift to transport Jews from Poland to Israel (March 28). American Jewish Committee urged the Polish and U.S. governments to expedite emigration of Jews having expressed desire to leave Poland (April 3). National Community Relations Advisory Council asked U.S. government to permit immigration of Polish Jews; called on Jewish communities to combine 25th anniversary observance of Warsaw ghetto revolt with demonstrations against present policies of Polish regime (April 15). United HIAS Service offered financial and technical assistance to Jews leaving Poland for resettlement in Western countries (April 30).

Soviet Union

Suppression of Cultural and Spiritual Rights


American Jewish Conference called for Simhat Torah demonstrations of solidarity with Soviet Jewish youth by American Jewish organizations (August 23). Hadassah asked Soviet Union to permit unrestricted Jewish communal and religious life, to provide means for Jewish educational advancement, to remove all discriminatory measures, and to permit emigration of Jews (September 11).

American Jewish Committee warned, "antisemitism inspired by Moscow is becoming an integral part of the domestic and foreign policy of several East European nations," and called upon "people of all ideologies and social systems, and especially progressive and liberal elements throughout the world, to join forces to prevent this new expression of an old disease from spreading" (October 26).

Visit of Rabbi Yehuda Leib Levin

American Council for Judaism invited Rabbi Yehuda Leib Levin to visit U.S., major Jewish organizations joined in welcoming him (May-June). Synagogue Council of America, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, and National Community Relations Advisory Council sent Rabbi Levin cable voicing hope his visit would "initiate a process that will lead to genuine and
meaningful dialogue and relationships with Soviet Jews” (May 8).

United Synagogue of America charged Rabbi Levin had been allowed to accept invitation to U.S. only when sponsorship “came from anti-Zionist groups” (June 21). American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry expressed regret at discourtesy shown Rabbi Levin during his Hunter College address, but termed his speech a “ritualistic defense” of Soviet policy toward Jews” (June 27).

American Association for Jewish Education sent Rabbi Levin letter pointing out “salient aspects of Jewish life” in U.S. and asking about lack of Jewish cultural and spiritual opportunities in USSR (June 24). Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations asked Rabbi Levin to use his “great prestige” with Soviet authorities “to obtain permission for an international conference of orthodox rabbis and Jewish lay leaders to be held in Moscow” (June 27).

ISRAEL AND MIDDLE EAST

Support of Israel Policies

United Jewish Appeal, Israel Bond Organization, and 55 national Jewish organizations pledged moral support in achievement of peace, and material support for 1968 Israeli economic programs. Organization heads praised Prime Minister Levi Eshkol’s leadership, Israel, and its people, and pledged continued aid in all fields (January 11).

American Israel Public Affairs Committee urged U.S. to insist on negotiated peace settlement between Israel and Arab governments; to provide Israel with enough arms for parity with Arab states; to grant Israel financial aid for desalination program; to help Arab countries improve living standards, and withhold aid used to finance aggression; to promote resettlement of Arab refugees in countries where there is room and opportunity for them; to resist Arab boycott practices (March 10). American Jewish Congress urged President Johnson to invite Prime Minister Eshkol and King Hussein of Jordan to meet and discuss with him peace between two countries (April 1).

Congress called on Johnson administration to seek agreement with Moscow on ending Middle East arms race, and urged U.S. to take lead in bringing about direct peace talks (May 21).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations appealed to President Johnson to supply Israel with Phantom jets as deterrent “to Arab extremism and war-like acts” (September 10).

American Council of Judaism’s acting president expressed concern at Gunnar Jarring’s failure to resolve Israel-Arab conflict; called upon Jews to ask that peace in Middle East be in keeping with U.S. national interests there (November 25).

American Israel Public Affairs Committee submitted to Republican and Democratic national conventions platform plank on Middle East stressing need for direct peace negotiations and sufficient arms to Israel as deterrent to threatened aggression. Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations endorsed plank (July 12). American Council for Judaism urged Democratic platform committee not to seek Jewish support in presidential election on basis of partisanship for Israel (August 21).

Hadassah reaffirmed commitment to Zionist aims, as defined in Jerusalem platform of 1968 World Zionist Congress: aliyah, Jewish education, close relations between Israel and Jews in the diaspora (September 11).

Hijacking and Reprisals

New York Jewish Youth Council staged demonstration against hijacking and detention of El Al plane in Algeria at Algerian Mission to UN (July 31). Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations urged immediate release by Algeria of hijacked airliner and twelve Israeli nationals, and called incident “barbaric threat to the political and economic
security of Israel and its national civilian airline” (August 1).

American Jewish Congress, New York Board of Rabbis, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, Zionist Organization of America, and American Jewish Committee criticized U.S. condemnation of Israel reprisal raid on Beirut airport as unfair because of its failure to make reference to Athens act that involved not only destruction of Israeli property, but loss of life (December 30).

Relations with Diaspora

Workmen’s Circle, while declaring its intention to retain non-Zionist orientation, pledged continued support for Israel, and initiated alliance with Histadrut, Israel’s Labor Federation (May 12).

Central Conference of American Rabbis and Rabbinical Assembly executive boards, acknowledging necessity for a “liberal religious alternative” in Israel, met to discuss such common concerns as recognition of rights of Reform and Conservative rabbis to perform marriages and exercise other religious functions in Israel (October 30). Rabbinical Council of America president’s reply was, “the people of Israel have failed to welcome the brand of Reform and Conservative Judaism which they wish to export to Israel. The people of Israel are well able to take care of their own spiritual needs” (October 27).

Jews in Arab Countries

American Jewish Committee made public survey revealing that, at beginning of 1968, only few Jews were left in Arab Middle East countries, most of them virtual prisoners who were prevented from leaving by special laws or police action (January 29). Hadassah resolved to call upon U.S. government to insure that “Jewish prisoners in Arab countries are accorded elementary human rights, and that all Jewish citizens in Arab lands be permitted to live in dignity and freedom” (September 11).

Joint Distribution Committee announced some 25,000 Jews left North African countries for France and Israel after June 1967 war (October 20).

AMERICAN COMMUNITY

Jewish Youth

B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundations reported some 350,000 Jewish students, about 80 per cent of Jewish college-age population, are attending colleges. Enrollment record sampling showed Jewish attendance had risen 23 per cent at large schools, and 15 per cent at small schools (January 10).

Alienation

At joint convention of Conservative movement’s college group Atid and United Synagogue Youth, students attributed alienation from Jewish cultural and spiritual life to synagogue’s failure to deal with such social issues as poverty, civil rights, and peace (January 2).

United Synagogue Youth criticized failure of rabbis and Jewish groups to counsel them on such issues as pacifism, draft, and conscientious objection (December 28).

B’nai B’rith Youth Organization conference discussed such aspects of antisocial behavior of youth, as drug addiction and acts of vandalism and irresponsibility (January 22).

American Jewish Committee released report on findings of three-year apostasy study, indicating 13 per cent of Jewish students in American colleges rejected Jewish ties by their senior year, but half of these reaffirmed Jewish identity within three years of college graduation; also, “forces making for the reintegration of apostates seems to be more powerful than those generating new apostasy” (May 26). American Jewish Congress released report of visits to college campuses stating many young Jewish people reject a “Judaism [that] is just like other institutions—stagnant, demanding conformism and status quo adherence” (May 19). Under AJCongress auspices, panel of scholars explored means of arresting alienation of Jewish college student. While disagreeing on solutions,
there was consensus Jewish federations
and welfare funds must place high priority
on Jewish education (December 23).
B'nai B'rith convention reports stated be-
behavior of Jewish institutions had no rele-
vance to Judaism's "ethical and religious
distinctiveness." Young Jewish activists,
said to be "powered by a deep-felt ethic"
in concern about social problems, accused
their elders of being "fake liberals" (Sep-
tember 8). B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations
directors considered possibility of attracting
Jewish students through experimental
forms of worship, but were not in agree-
ment on value of such "underground
services" (December 19).

Community Programs

National Jewish Welfare Board considered
"a pooling [by all institutions] of knowl-
edge, skill, organizational and even material
resources in the pursuit of solutions" to
the unsolved problems of American Jewry,
such as "the serious shortage of profes-
sional manpower in the Jewish community,
the need to intensify service to Jewish col-
lege youth, and the implications of the
six-day war" (April 29). JWB also an-
nounced plans to help affiliated centers
and Y's improve relationships with Jewish
college youth through new and creative
approaches in experimental or demonstra-
tion projects. Newly appointed ad hoc
National Advisory Committee on Jewish
College Youth was to implement projects
(November 1).

Student Zionist Organization announced
1968 summer plans to send its volunteer
domestic education corps of counselors,
discussion leaders, and teachers to several
small Jewish communities having no Jew-
ish education facilities (January 26).

American Zionist Youth Foundation's week-
end seminar on approaches to alienated
youth in American colleges hoped to bring
it closer to Jewish community through
personal confrontation with Israel and its
citizens (September 2). AZYF representa-
tives, working with some 40 pro-Israel
Jewish student groups on American cam-
puses, reported cooperation with black and
white radical student groups (November
29).

North American Youth Council, compris-
ing 24 major national Jewish youth organi-
izations in U.S. and Canada, designated
March 15-April 15 "Jewish Youth Month,"
to call attention to contributions and sig-
nificance of Jewish youth organizations
and encourage unaffiliated young people to
join (March 1).

Central Conference of American Rabbis' Youth Committee issued 44-page booklet, Working With College Students—A Hand-
book for Rabbis, containing ideas on how
to bridge generation gap alienating Jewish
college youth from home and synagogue
(April 1).

Workmen's Circle called for American Jew-
ish community to channel funds to cultural
and educational institutions in order to
stem tide of assimilationism among younger
Jews (May 11).

National Foundation for Jewish Culture
launched survey "to determine the criteria
and standards for competent scholars to
teach Jewish studies in American colleges
and universities" in a desire to have es-
tranged college youths receive introduction
to Jewish culture and thought in Judaica
courses of high intellectual caliber (Octo-
ber 25).

Textbook Ruling

Agudath Israel of America charged nine
national non-Orthodox organizations that
filed brief in U.S. Supreme Court against
New York Textbook Law with "undermin-
ing Jewish interests" by their opposition to
furnishing publicly-owned textbooks to
children in nonpublic schools (April 28).
Agudath Israel's executive president called
Supreme Court decision upholding N.Y.
State Text Book Law, a "major victory"
for nonpublic school children, which
"opens new perspectives for additional
benefits" (June 21). At National Com-
community Relations Advisory Council plenary
session, American Jewish Congress spokes-
man called Supreme Court decision allow-
ing use of public funds for parochial
schools violation of First Amendment;
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations spokesmen said court decision acknowledges parochial schools serve public interest (July 1).

**DISCRIMINATION**

**Employment**

Anti-Defamation League's report on its study of racial and religious bias among employment agencies maintained 87 per cent of 388 private employment agencies in six major cities disregard federal, state, and local statutes forbidding employment discrimination, and accept requests for "white Gentile" workers (January 18). In New York ADL worked out program with New York State Commission on Human Rights to combat discrimination in job orders by state's 1,300 private agencies (February 27).

American Jewish Committee and Jewish Occupational Council established joint advisory committee to work in 10 major American cities for increased employment of Jews and other minorities in corporate management posts. A major goal of committee was to break down "historic barriers to the hiring of Jews in such fields as banking, insurance, public utilities, railroads and steel" (November 4).

**Social Segregation**

Anti-Defamation League, in cooperation with National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and American Italian Committee Against Discrimination, protested against a U.S. Navy directive instructing sailors to comply with New Orleans Mardi Gras policy of discrimination against Jews, Negroes, and Italians (January 10); in cooperation with NAACP and Urban League against alleged discrimination in New York Athletic Club (February 14). ADL reported out of 38 athletic clubs in key American cities, only three maintained religiously and racially open membership policies (May 5).

American Jewish Committee executive board urged all "social clubs not directly church affiliated or having affirmative religious, racial or ethnic purposes to eliminate the membership eligibility criteria of religion, race or ethnic origin"; it asked Jewish clubs to do the same (October 27).

**Housing**

Anti-Defamation League hailed inclusion of open housing provision in comprehensive civil rights bill approved by Senate, but warned equal access to housing "will ultimately depend on the availability of adequate housing and upon equal ability to pay" (March 13).

**INTERFAITH**

Agudath Israel of America's president warned against renewing interfaith dialogues, calling them ineffectual (January 11).


Union of American Hebrew Congregations' Religious Action Center, U.S. Catholic Conference Social Action Department, and National Council of Churches Department of Social Justice together urged U.S. Congress to adopt guaranteed employment act to provide one million new government jobs for nation's unemployed, pointing out to permit "involuntary poverty" was to "desecrate the image of God" (May 8).


Anti-Defamation League and New York Archdiocese of the Catholic Church launched a closed-circuit television series on Jews and Judaism, and incidence and causes of misunderstanding and misrepresentation, as in-service course for teachers in Catholic parochial schools and for viewing on specific Catholic programs (November 22).

Synagogue Council, National Council of Churches, and U.S. Catholic Conference also joined in forming interreligious committee for consultation and cooperation on such top-priority matters as urban problems, world peace, and international development (December 2).

VIETNAM WAR AND DRAFT

Support for Peace Efforts

Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) and Union of American Hebrew Congregations appealed to President Johnson to “test” peaceful intentions of North Vietnam by calling an immediate halt to its bombing. CCAR also stated its opposition to tax increase, used for the “senseless struggle” in Vietnam, and asked government to put its “best efforts into eliminating... domestic crises” (January 11).

New York Board of Rabbis supported President Johnson’s efforts to seek honorable peace in Vietnam and commended government for “continuing to call North Vietnam to the conference table” (January 31).

B’nai B’rith Women called for vigorous effort at negotiation to end war, warning further escalation might lead to World War III (March 27).

National Jewish Welfare Board called on U.S. government to intensify efforts for negotiated settlement of war and, at the same time, maintain and encourage full freedom of dissent from its policy on war (April 29).

Workmen’s Circle endorsed President Johnson’s peace efforts in Vietnam (May 9).

Position on Draft

Rabbinical Council of America president condemned burning of draft cards as “clear violation of the basic process of democracy.” Yavneh, religious Jewish students association, held five-day seminar on Jewish position on war. One of its leaders called Vietnam war immoral and asked that current draft be amended to allow for selective conscientious objection (September 2).

American Jewish Congress urged Selective Service Act be amended to permit conscientious objection to military service on ethical and religious grounds (October 14).

United Synagogue Youth convention voiced opposition to draft because of Vietnam conflict and asked Jewish agencies and rabbis to offer direct counseling on military service, conscientious objection and pacifism (December 31).

Chaplaincy

Yeshiva University agreed to a request from rabbinical students to suspend for one year its participation in Jewish community’s self-imposed draft of rabbis for military chaplaincy duty, making such service voluntary (March 6). Rabbinical Assembly suspended its system of assigning newly-ordained rabbis to military duty, and substituted a voluntary system which, it said, would increase number of Jewish chaplains in armed forces (March 26).
gave its newly ordained rabbis right to seek deferment as military chaplains on grounds of conscientious objection to a particular war (June 20).

Association of Jewish Chaplains of the Armed Forces president, in communication to heads of seminaries, rabbinical organizations and association members, strongly opposed refusal by any rabbi to serve as military chaplain in Vietnam war on grounds of "selective conscientious objection," since the "military chaplain's task [is] to give spiritual solace and religious guidance to troubled human beings, not to act as a special pleader for any particular ideology or course of political action" (March 24).

American Jewish Congress asked armed forces to replace military chaplains with civilian religious counselors not subject to military discipline; it urged official religious groups to end military chaplaincy system and employ civilian chaplains who would bear "no responsibility or duty other than ministering to the religious needs of the soldiers" (May 21).

Rabbinical Council of America president criticized American Jewish Congress recommendation for civilian chaplains and said the military chaplain, though employed by government, was "simply treating the spiritual needs of the soldier as if he were still a private citizen" (June 26).

**BIAFRA RELIEF**

American Jewish Emergency Effort for Biafran Relief, central committee for 21 major Jewish organizations, pledged to raise money for food and medical aid to starving Biafran community (August 8). Synagogue Council of America asked rabbis and congregants to make nationwide relief effort for Biafrans, and urged members to arouse public opinion and petition U.S. government to undertake "massive relief effort" (August 18).

B'nai B'rith Foundation sponsored relief plane carrying food, drugs, and clothing to Biafra (September 29).

The National Community Relations Advisory Council urged the U.S. government to airlift relief supplies to Biafra and to seek international relief action through the United Nations (October 2).

The American Jewish Committee, joining the Catholic Relief Services and the Church World Service in a corporation called Joint Church Aid, purchased eight cargo aircraft from the U.S. Air Force. According to an agreement with State Department and Air Force officials, the planes would be used solely in the airlift bringing relief supplies to Biafra (December 30).

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

Hadassah called attention to need for U.S. support of Protocol of the United Nations Relating to the Status of Refugees, pointing out that giving asylum to oppressed and persecuted was in keeping with American principles, and action during International Year for Human Rights would be appropriate (September 11).

American Jewish Committee asked for U.S. ratification of Genocide and other Human Rights conventions pending before UN (December 10).

*Geraldine Rosenfield*
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