MANY TYPES of Jewish communal services are provided under organized Jewish sponsorship although some needs of Jews (and of non-Jews) are exclusively individual or governmental responsibilities. While the primary aim is to serve Jewish community needs, some types of services may traditionally 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 limited 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.

Types of service provided or needs met 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 to other areas.
- Absorption and resettlement of migrants: also a global function involving economic aid, housing, job placement or retraining, and social adjustment. The complexity of the task is related to the size of movement, the background of migrants, the economic and social viability or absorptive potential of the communities in which resettlement takes place, and the availability of resources and structures for absorption in the host communities.
- Health: mainly general hospitals, some specialized hospitals and outpatient clinics in larger cities in the United States, including facilities for the chronically ill aged. This also includes health facilities in Israel and, to a lesser extent, Europe.
- Welfare services: primarily family counseling, child care, and care of the aged; some of these services are maintained on a regional as well as a
local basis. Child care and aged care are also major activities in Israel and Europe.

- Youth and recreational services: mainly Jewish centers, summer camps, Hillel units on campuses and youth services provided by B’nai B’rith, and other college youth projects.
- 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 and including 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), providing individual and group guidance; in the form of sheltered workshops and sometimes as part of family agencies; overseas, in the form of vocational education programs conducted by ORT, Histadrut, Hadassah, and other agencies.
- Service agencies: mainly specialized national agencies designed to make for more effective clearance of activities in each field of service among national and local agencies.

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

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 of 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 Jewish "gross national product" of such services.

Beginning in 1967, the response to the Israel Emergency Fund of the UJA and the high proportion of service payments by hospitals brought this annual total over the $1.3 billion mark in 1969. 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.

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. If data for 1969 were compared with those for 1959, the following major changes are indicated:

- Federations raised $44 million more in 1969 for regular operating purposes, but the 1969 IEF experience resulted in an increase in total federation campaign results of about $143 million beyond the 1959 level.
- Grants by community chests for local Jewish services rose by over $8 million.
- Hospital income rose by at least $400 million, care for the aged income by about $60 million, and center income by about $15 million (other than federation and chest allocations).
- While nonlocal agencies raised about $70 million more in 1969 than in 1959, most of this sum was earmarked for special and capital purposes (which are not included in federation annual campaigns).

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 about $640 million from 1959 to 1969 (or about $530 million excluding the Israel Emergency Fund).

Results of Jewish Federated Fund Raising

About $4.2 billion was raised by the central Jewish community organizations of the United States in their annual campaigns in the 32 year period, 1939 through 1970, with about $1.1 billion of this total raised in the four-year period 1967–70. The 32-year period coincides with the organization of the UJA, which received almost $2.4 billion, mainly from welfare funds.

The annual totals for campaign proceeds for this period show the following major changes:

---

1 UJA partners raised funds jointly in 1934 and in 1935, but independently before 1934 and from 1936 through 1938; JDC raised funds since 1914, Keren Hayesod since 1920, and JNF since 1910.
• 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 $123 million in 1963, with results in 1959–64 within a narrower range of $123 to $129 million. Most of these year-to-year changes reflected the introduction of special fund efforts to supplement regular campaigns.
• 1965 results of $131 million and 1966 results of $136 million were the highest since 1957.
• In 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970, the regular campaigns continued to move ahead, reaching a total of $145 million in 1967, $153 million in 1968, $163 million in 1969, and $174 million in 1970. The rise continued in 1971. Regular funds for 1970 reached the highest total since 1948. However, the rise in regular funds between 1960 and 1970 was roughly in line with the rise of about 32 per cent in the price level during this period.

Since the six-day war in 1967, Jews in the U.S., Canada, and other countries began to recognize that the welfare, health, education, and related needs of immigrants in Israel would require massive additional voluntary support for 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 $173 million obtained by the community federations and welfare funds in addition to the proceeds of the 1967 regular campaign. Together, welfare funds raised a record sum of $318 million in 1967. This record was expected to be exceeded in 1971.

This campaign continued in 1968, 1969, and 1970 in response to the continuing crisis faced by Israel. Campaign responses of about $80 million in 1968, of $99 million in 1969, and $128 million in 1970 were second only to the 1967 results. However, this peak was exceeded in 1971.

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 A group of 25 larger cities reported endowment-fund assets of about $100 million in 1970. Their income and earnings in 1970 were $7 million, of which about
By contrast, the data for independent efforts of national and overseas agencies include major capital- and endowment-fund drives, mainly for educational and religious institutions and hospitals. Comparisons between totals for annual federation campaigns and for independent appeals would hence be grossly inappropriate.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York and its beneficiaries obtained for its building fund, from 1961 through mid-1970, about $162 million in pledges, as well as about $37 million in government grants, $39 million in loans (including $8 million in government loans), $19 million in endowment, investment, property sales, and other income. Earlier campaigns for capital purposes 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. They are largely apart from annual federation campaigns. There appears to have been a diminution of such efforts during the emergency campaign period, which began in 1967.

In 1969 eight community centers were constructed or expanded at a cost of $15.5 million. JWB estimated that, in the 22-year period through 1969, capital investments for local centers reached $132 million.3

The amounts raised by federations are augmented by funds provided by nonsectarian United Funds and community chests for local Jewish services. These grants totaled $22.5 million in 1969, mainly to federated agencies. Outside New York City, chests provided $20 million to federations. Most larger cities and intermediate-sized cities received such support.

Independent Campaigns

Each federation determines which beneficiary agencies it supports through allocations. There are ten nonlocal appeals which are included by three-quarters or more of all federated campaigns, and 20 additional appeals included by more than one-third of all federations. Other agencies receive less extensive inclusion.

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

Agencies raise funds directly in cities where they are not included by federations, frequently with federation clearance of 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.

one-third came from gifts and bequests, with most of the remainder derived from earnings and net gains on sales.

3 JWB Yearbook, Volume 18, 1969.
A number of federations have developed policy statements regarding supplementary appeals, which stress the primacy of the federation campaign, commitment of community leaders to such primacy, clearance procedures on approved appeals, and public reporting by these appeals.

The major independent fund-raising efforts for overseas programs in 1970 were: Hadassah, which raised $11.6 million in addition to amounts secured from federations in half the communities; Hebrew University, Technion, and Weizmann Institute, which raised $14 million for capital and special funds; the America-Israel Cultural Foundation and National Committee for Labor Israel, which each raised about $2.8 million (the former mainly for building and special funds; the latter mainly in large cities); the Jewish National Fund, ORT, and American Red Mogen Dovid, which did not appeal to welfare funds but independently raised $2.9 million, $3.1 million, and $1.1 million, respectively.

The major independent efforts for national programs in 1970 were by Brandeis University, which raised $12 million without appealing to welfare funds; two hospitals, City of Hope and National Jewish Hospital, which raised $12.1 million with only nominal support from welfare funds; Yeshiva University including Einstein Medical College, which raised $10.4 million; the Reform Jewish Appeal and the Jewish Theological Seminary-United Synagogue appeal, which raised $10.8 million mainly from membership sources; B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, which raised $4.5 million, also from membership sources; and the American Jewish Committee and Anti-Defamation League, which raised $4.4 million and $4.0 million, respectively, mainly in New York City and Chicago campaigns.

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. No accurate estimates are available regarding the totals raised in New York City.

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.

Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies (generally arranged by agreement with federations) provides smaller sums for operating purposes. Local hospitals, centers, family agencies, child care agencies, and homes for the aged independently raised about $13 million in 1969 for operating purposes. 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. An allowance for "shrinkage" averaging about five per cent is usually made for the difference between cash and pledges for the regular campaign.

Cost of administering federations, including costs of fund raising, budgeting, planning, and other central functions average about 15 per cent annually outside New York City for the regular campaign (exclusive of IEF). Inclusion of IEF would lower this figure to about 8 per cent in 1969 and 1968.

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

About 55 per cent of regular amounts budgeted for 1969 by welfare funds were applied to overseas needs, 4 per cent to national agencies, and almost 41 per cent to local services.4 The UJA share (included in Overseas) rose from 58 per cent in 1955 to 65 per cent in 1957, and leveled off at 56 to 60 per cent in 1958 to 1961. In 1963 through 1968, the UJA share was from 54 to 56 per cent.

Regular allocations to UJA by welfare funds rose by about $4 million (to $74 million) in 1969, with a similar rise indicated in the 1970 regular campaign. In 1969 UJA received almost three-quarters of all funds allocated (including IEF). Overseas agencies other than UJA continued to receive under 3 per cent of totals budgeted. Together with national agencies, all nonlocal non-UJA agencies continued to receive about 6 per cent of totals budgeted.

A major factor affecting the distribution of funds is the existence of Jewish hospitals in almost all of the large centers of Jewish population. This is reflected in higher shares of funds for local Jewish services and lower nonlocal shares in the very largest cities. Thus, nonlocal agencies continued to receive about 56 per cent of regular funds budgeted in 1969 in cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over. The very smallest communities (under 5,000 Jewish population) with the least developed networks of local Jewish services, continued to give non-local agencies 80 per cent of their budgeted funds. Intermediate-size cities provided nonlocal agencies with about 68 per cent of budgeted funds.

4 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.
Local services received for operating purposes from federation sources about $52.1 million in 1969, compared with $46.6 million in 1968. Income for Jewish local services from community chests rose by about five per cent in 1969. Jewish federation allocations rose by almost 14 per cent, but this was reflected mainly by increased allocations for Jewish education and care for the aged, by 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 little change in allocations for local capital purposes in 1969. Such allocations did not exceed 1.3 per cent of the total nationally, or 2 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 communities of all sizes were community centers and Jewish education programs. Those in smaller cities received a greater proportion of the funds than those 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, community chest contributions must be taken into account.

Thus, from a total of $40 million provided to fields eligible for chest support in 1969 in 127 cities outside New York City (hospitals, family, child care, centers, aged and administration), total chest support of $20 million should be deducted. The difference ($20 million) represents federation support for these fields combined. In addition, federation support of over $13 million was provided for services which receive no chest support.

In making inter-city comparisons of allocations for specific fields of service, it is important to note whether the federations being compared have the same inclusion pattern, and if they do not, the approximate 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 inter-community statistical comparisons prepared by CJFWF, and consideration of recommendations by the Large City Budgeting Conference consisting of 25 of the largest communities. LCBC recommendations deal with 15 nonlocal agencies.
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 purchases of Israel Bonds. From 1948 through 1970, the UJA provided almost $1.5 billion 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 UJA funds for its program in Israel (as part of its ramified overseas services) to the extent of over $190 million. Hadassah transmitted over $190 million in this period. Sales of Israel Bonds were $1,379 million in the U.S.

United States governmental assistance and restitution payments from Germany are the other major external sources of aid to Israel. U.S. government economic aid to Israel up to mid-1970 was about $1,276 million, but this included $907 million in loans, of which $458 million was later repaid, and grants and technical aid of $369 million. This included grants and loans in local currency. Net aid stood at $818 million through 1969-70.

By the end of September 1970, foreign currency balances were reported at about $830 million. Offsetting liabilities had simultaneously increased mainly because of global sales of Israel Bonds. Foreign debt was reported at $1,556 million at the end of 1967 and has since risen mainly because of record sales of Israel Bonds of almost $500 million in 1968, 1969, and 1970. By September 1970, foreign currency debts were reported at about $2,530 million.

Israel's own earnings are largely in the form of exports of goods and services, supplemented by foreign investment and private transfers of funds. Commodity exports reached $747 million in 1969, or about 60 per cent of imports of $1,255 million. The 1969 deficit in commodity trade reached $508 million. Preliminary data for 1970 pointed to a further rise of the trade deficit.

These figures deal with trade in commodities only. If services are included

---

5 This was included in total receipts of JDC of about $650 million received from 1948 through 1970. Total JDC receipts in the 56-year period, 1914 through 1970, from all sources was about $939 million.
7 This included deposits in Israel, deposits abroad, and deposits with the International Monetary Fund. *Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (Jerusalem)*, December 1970.
(tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $893 million in 1969; $718 million in 1968, and $531 million in 1967.\textsuperscript{10} These deficits were partially offset in 1969 by $478 million in "unilateral transfers" consisting mainly of restitution and reparations, campaign proceeds in the U.S. and other countries, and personal transfers. In 1968 these transfers reached $435 million.

\textbf{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 by-product effect is that the exchange of dollars for pounds is helpful to the country’s economy.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF had available for overseas purposes about $208 million in 1969, and $237 million in 1970. In recent years, over 80 per cent of these funds were allocated for Israel purposes. Campaigns in other overseas countries also provide funds for programs in Israel.\textsuperscript{11} The Bank of Israel reported global transmissions by philanthropic institutions (exclusive of costs outside Israel) of about $181 million to Israel in 1969 and $164 million in 1968. In 1966 and earlier years, the annual level of transfers was generally under $90 million.

In addition, \textit{net} receipts from the global sale of Israel Bonds in 1967 totalled $172 million, after redemptions and conversions, contrasted, with \textit{net} receipts in 1968 of $78 million and $63 million in 1969 after similar redemptions.\textsuperscript{12}

Immigration to Israel, from the creation of the state in 1948 through 1969, totalled about 1,370,000\textsuperscript{13}; about 200,000 Jews migrated from Israel to other countries. Major immigration took place from 1948 through 1951, when some 685,000 Jews entered Israel. About 90,000 Jews immigrated in the next four years (1952–55); but there was a surge forward in the next two years (1956–57) when over 127,000 Jews settled in Israel.

The immigration pace slackened in the next three years (1958–60) when about 75,000 Jews went to Israel, but the tempo of movement was heightened again in the next four years (1961–64) when almost 230,000 Jews came to the country. In 1965–68 the total movement exceeded 80,000; it rose to about 40,000 annually in 1969 and 1970.

The waves of immigration were related to conditions prevailing at par-

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{11} Karen Hayesod raised about $55 million in 1968 and $77 million in 1969, \textit{(Jerusalem Post, Nov. 24, 1969)}. These funds were exceeded in 1970 and again in 1971.

\textsuperscript{12} Bank of Israel Annual Report for 1969, Table III–19.

ticular times: the post-war migration of displaced persons; movements from Eastern Europe, when local conditions permitted and required this in Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; movements from North Africa, mainly as a result of political changes in Algeria, 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, five Development Issues, and three Development Investment Issues. Two of these issues were offered in 1971.

Flotation of the Independence Issue for a three-year period, from May 1, 1951 to May 1, 1954, resulted in sales of $145.5 million. The First Development Issue, which was floated for a five-year period, from 1954 to 1959, resulted in sales of $234.1 million. These issues were almost completely redeemed.

Sales of the Second Development Issue were $293.6 million by 1964, the end of the five-year period of flotation. Sales of the Third Development Issue began on March 1, 1964. By September 1970, $282.7 million had been sold and were still outstanding.

Total bonds for all issues were $1,640 million at the end of 1970, including $1,379 million sold in the United States.

At the end of September 1970 there were outstanding in the hands of the public $885 million, including $135.5 million Second Development Issue; $282.7 million Third Development Issue (floated March 1, 1964); $343.8 million Fourth Development Issue (floated September 15, 1967); $14.1 million Development Investment Issue, and $98.6 million Second Development Investment Issue (floated August 1, 1968).

From the inception of sale of Israel Bonds in May 1951 through 1970, about $117 million State of Israel Bonds were received by the UJA in payment of allocations provided from the proceeds of individual pledges. In 1970 UJA reportedly received $17.1 million in bonds in payment of individual pledges to local welfare funds.


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

Bond sales in the United States totaled almost $176 million in 1970. It was exceeded only by the 1967 peak of $190 million. These results reflected the response to the critical needs faced by Israel since the six-day war.

Outside of the United States, 1970 sales amounted to $34.7 million, compared with $27.3 million the preceding year. Worldwide sales amounted to $210.7 million in 1970.
The proceeds of bond sales are used for agriculture, industry, power and fuel, housing and educational 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: $1,482 million from 1955 through 1969. This included $137 million in 1969 and $143 million in 1968.

JDC received its last grant of $1 million in 1969 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, and tradition." Operations began in 1965. Thirty-eight Jewish organizations joined the Foundation, including seven in the United States. Allocations in 1968-69 of about $1,145,000 were granted to organizations in 17 countries and to individual scholars for work 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 welfare fund overseas allocations. Other overseas agencies raised the major portion of their funds independently.

The UJA share of all regular funds budgeted was about 55 per cent in 1969. The Israel Emergency Fund went entirely to UJA and resulted in increasing UJA's total share. In 1969 UJA received about three-quarters of total funds raised.

Total cash receipts in 1970 of all overseas agencies was about $237 million, with some $43.5 million raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities were the Israel Education Fund of UJA; Hadassah, which raised $11.6 million through activities of its members; the building and special fund drives of Hebrew University and Technion, which raised $11 million, mainly in cash payments of prior year pledges; the drive of the National Committee for Labor Israel for welfare activities, conducted by Histadrut in Israel, which raised $2.8 million; the Jewish National Fund campaign for "traditional income," which raised $2.9 million; and Weizmann Institute, which raised $3.1 million.

United Jewish Appeal

The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) 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 1970, UJA received cash payments of about $2,363 million\(^{14}\) and distributed about $1,479 million to UIA, $666 million to JDC, and about $92 million to USNA, NYANA, and UHS. In addition, there were pledges of about $120 million for earlier years (mainly 1969), most of which, judging from past experience, would be paid in 1971.

The peak campaign year was 1967, when UJA received $67 million in pledges for its regular campaign and $173 million for its Israel Emergency Fund. In 1968 the UJA regular allocations were reported at $69.7 million and the Israel Emergency Fund at $80 million. In 1969 they rose to $74 million for the regular campaign and $99 million for the Israel Emergency Fund. In 1970 regular UJA allocations were $78 million and the Israel Emergency Fund totaled $124 million.

UAJA 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 directly operate any service programs. These are conducted through the agencies which share in UJA proceeds: UIA (actually by the Jewish Agency in Israel), JDC, the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), and United Hias Service, 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 largely 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. For 1969 JDC was to receive $685,000 above the formula, and up to $1,250,000 more for 1970, if up to $10 million were raised above the $55 million level. The formula was not applied to the proceeds of the Israel Emergency Funds of 1967, 1968, and 1969.

UAJA initiated its Israel Education Fund in September 1964 for the purpose of conducting 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 $32.3 million in pledges was received from 1965 to the end of 1970, of which $20.6 million had been received in cash.

Large gifts are sought: $100,000 and over, payable in five years or less, with no diminution of the gift from the same source to the welfare fund which provides support for the UJA annual campaign, and in consultation

---

14 Exclusive of Israel Education Fund.
with local welfare funds so that conflict with other solicitation efforts are avoided.

JDC does not share in these funds. They 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 agency in Israel.

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

**UJA Regular and IEF Funds**

On a *pledge* basis, UJA regular income was $78 million in 1970, exclusive of the Israel Education Fund. This was about 5 per cent higher than the 1969 pledge total of $74 million. In addition, the pledges for the Israel Emergency Fund were about $124 million.

On a *cash* basis, UJA had receipts of $80.7 million in “regular” funds in 1970, compared with $69.3 million in 1969. These were the cash amounts received each year regardless of years for which the pledges were made. In addition, $4.8 million was received in 1969 and $3.3 million in 1970 for the Israel Education Fund.

Cash receipts for the 1967 Israel Emergency Fund were $151.8 million by the end of that year; they rose to about $172.7 million at the end of 1970.

Cash receipts for the 1968 Israel Emergency Fund (of $80 million in estimated pledges) totaled $71.8 million at the end of 1970.

Cash receipts for the 1969 Israel Emergency Fund (of $99 million in estimated pledges) totaled $81.5 million at the end of 1970.

Cash receipts for the 1970 Israel Emergency Fund (of $124 million in estimated pledges) totaled $66.9 million at the end of that year.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its percentage share of campaign proceeds. UJA regular allocation proceeds for 1970 of about $78 million compared with regular total campaign proceeds of about $174 million.

**UJA Special Loans**

**CURRENT LOAN**

Borrowing from banks has been a major factor affecting the financing of UJA and UIA in the last decade. A 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 1970 was $36.2 million. The terms of this loan also limited short-term debt (for 12 months) at any time to $10 million. The
loan of $50 million did not include financing by some of the insurance companies of capital requirements for housing in Israel.

An additional series of bank loans of $45 million were secured by UIA early in 1970. Unpaid balances of both the 1965 and 1970 loans were about $78.4 million at the end of 1970.

Jewish National Fund

The Jewish National Fund, under the UJA agreement with UIA, JDC and NYANA, is permitted to raise $1,800,000 annually from "traditional collections" in the United States, after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Amounts raised beyond that level would result in an equivalent reduction in the UIA share of UJA funds. Total U.S. income of JNF, including traditional income, bequests, and other income, was about $3.3 million in 1968–69 and about $3.5 million in 1969–70. Substantial portions were raised with the help of Hadassah, ZOA, and other organizations.

United Israel Appeal, Inc.

The United Israel Appeal, Inc., resulted from merger of the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. and the United Israel Appeal in 1966. One hundred of 210 members of the 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 former UIA. Ten are elected at large.

The new board of trustees elects two-thirds of the 27-member board of directors, with the remaining one-third designated by the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.¹⁵

The operating agency for servicing immigrant and other programs in Israel is the Jewish Agency for Israel, Jerusalem. Services are provided in line with the specific allocations and instructions by 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 the UIA and the Joint Distribution Committee. The current agreement provides for UJA campaigns to be conducted during the five-year period 1969–73.

UIA conducts an all-year program of stimulating interest in Israel through the use of films, literature, and direct contact with membership organizations and welfare funds.

¹⁵ The Jerusalem Jewish Agency maintains a separate branch in the United States (Jewish Agency–American Section, Inc.) for activities which are not financed through the United Jewish Appeal.
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 Israel crisis brought pledges of about $173 million for IEF of UJA in 1967; $80 million in 1968; $99 million in 1969, and $124 million in 1970. This was in addition to the proceeds of the regular UJA campaign.

Preliminary estimates for the year ended March 31, 1971, indicate that UIA hoped to have available for allocation about $180 million in cash from both IEF and regular programs, as well as from proceeds of loans. On this basis, UIA approved 1970-71 allocations for this sum, subject to revision on the basis of the actual funds available.

**Jewish Agency for Israel, Jerusalem**

Sources of Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, income have been primarily grants from the U.S. earmarked for UIA, Inc.; 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.

Before 1967, about 80 per cent of contribution income generally came from the United States, but the 1967 crisis faced by Israel resulted in a rise of the share of contributions by overseas Jewry.

Receipts of UIA in 1967–68 from UJA were about $211 million, in 1968–69 were about $105 million, and in 1969–70 about $125.5 million. In addition, cash receipts for the Israel Education Fund were $3 million in 1969–70, $2 million in 1968–69, and $3 million in 1967–68. Before 1967, the peak year of UJA fund raising was 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 declined. The rise in 1967–68 receipts was due to the Israel Emergency Fund. These receipts decreased in 1968–69, and rose again in 1969–70 and in 1970–71.
Allocations for programs in Israel by the UIA are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration &amp; Absorption</td>
<td>$14.4</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
<td>$9.4</td>
<td>$11.6</td>
<td>$20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social Welfare Services</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Settlement</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Care (includes Youth Aliyah)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service (in U.S.)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$39.7</td>
<td>$188.6</td>
<td>$150.4</td>
<td>$130.9</td>
<td>$180.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional funds were provided by overseas Jewish communities for more requirements of the Jewish Agency for Israel in the categories specified above.

Because of devaluation in November 1967, UIA expended about $20 million less than allocated for 1967-68, and this windfall income was carried forward for use in 1968-69.

Includes $45 million from proceeds of 1970 loans.

**Immigration and Absorption** allocations finance activities outside Israel to help immigrants move to the state: documentation, screening, counseling, transit centers, transportation, and initial reception in Israel.

**Social Welfare** allocations include relief payments, old age assistance, work relief, sheltered workshops, and new projects to advance integration of immigrants.

**Health** allocations are for medical care (in-patient and out-patient) services to immigrants in development towns, medical care for the aged and the chronically ill, and services for the mentally ill.

**Agricultural Settlement** allocations provide for absorption of immigrants into agriculture through new housing, and for renovation of housing in agricultural settlements and in moshavim (cooperative farming), reclamation, aid to settlements moving toward self-support (water projects, livestock, tools, farm buildings, fruit and citrus plantations, establishment of new settlements, and related planning services).

**Housing** allocations provide for new housing, rehousing, and rent subsidies for immigrants.

**Youth Care and Training** allocations include maintenance of youth in settlements and schools, operation of youth centers and youth clubs, busing students, and related services.

**Higher Education** allocations for 1969-70 included aid to seven institutions of higher learning for operations and for capital purposes: Hebrew University ($14.2 million), Technion ($8.9 million), Weizmann Institute
($4.4 million), Tel Aviv University ($4.4 million), Bar Ilan University ($1.8 million), Haifa University ($0.8 million), and Beersheba University ($0.7 million).

*Education* allocations support pre-kindergartens for children of working mothers, high school scholarships (academic, vocational, agricultural, and other specialized areas), and Ulpanim (rapid language instruction).

**Reorganized Jewish Agency for Israel**

The Jewish Agency for Israel was reconstituted in 1971: The main governing body was the Annual Assembly, consisting initially of a maximum of 296 members, of which 50 per cent were to be designated by the World Zionist Organization, 30 per cent by the UIA, and 20 per cent by the Jewish communities in 25 other countries. The first Assembly was scheduled to meet in June 1971 in Jerusalem.

The Assembly was to elect officers and the board of governors from among its members, the board was to have power to act between meetings of the Assembly, and to elect members of the executive. Initially, the board was to consist of 40 members representing the same 50–30–20 proportion as the Assembly.

The activities of the Jewish Agency were to continue to be limited to the kind that may be carried on by tax-exempt organizations. It was to be independent of the World Zionist Organization. The UIA was to continue to be autonomous, to contract with the Jewish Agency for work done on its behalf in Israel, and to maintain control of funds transmitted for specific functions.

**American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee**

JDC is an American agency conducting a global program of aid to Jews directly through its own staff overseas and through cooperation with indigenous Jewish organizations.

It assisted about 235,000 persons in 1970. Of these, 95,000 were in Israel (including about 30,000 receiving aid for Malben; 38,000 in ORT schools, and about 18,750 in yeshivot); 67,000 in Western Europe; 16,000 in Eastern Europe; 45,000 in Moslem areas, and about 12,000 in other areas. This was exclusive of 80,000 aided by less formally organized "relief-in-transit" programs.

Disbursements were $21.9 million in 1970; receipts were $22.6 million. Regular income included about $0.2 million in overseas campaign income, $0.2 million in restitution funds, and about $0.8 million in Malben income within Israel.

The JDC Malben program of service to sick, aged, and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to account for the largest single share of JDC's
appropriations: $7 million, or 30 per cent of the 1970 total. An additional $880,000 was provided for aid to yeshivot and other traditional institutions in Israel. In 1970 Malben cared for about 30,000 persons including the aged in institutions and in their own homes with medical and psychiatric services. Malben account for the greatest portion of the total of about $192 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1970.

The largest number of North African Jews receiving JDC aid was in Morocco, where over 17,000 Jews were being assisted in 1970. About 23,500 Jews in Tunisia and Iran were also receiving JDC aid. JDC appropriated $3.9 million in 1970 for work in Moslem areas. JDC assistance is channelled through such agencies as OSE in the health field; the Alliance Israélite Universelle, Ozar Hatorah, and the Lubavitcher schools in the educational fields; and ORT for vocational training.

JDC programs operated in other European countries, with most of the European total costs centered in Rumania, Italy, and France. A large proportion of Tunisian, Algerian, and Moroccan refugees was aided by JDC in France with the assistance of federated agencies of the Fonds Social Juif Unifié, which received JDC aid.

**ORT and Vocational Education**

Vocational training overseas is provided through ORT facilities which operate in Western Europe, Moslem countries, and Israel. Vocational education in Israel is also conducted as part of the program of Histadrut, Hadassah, Youth Aliyah and Technion, as well as by the Israel government and municipalities.

The global expenditures of the World ORT Union were at an annual level of about $19.7 million in 1970, and are projected at $22 million for 1971. Total ORT trainees in 1970 were 59,100, of whom 38,200 were in Israel, 5,400 in France, 4,400 in Italy, and 5,000 in Moslem countries.

American Jewish support of the ORT program was channelled in two ways: through the JDC grant to ORT ($2,350,000 for 1969, $2,450,000 for 1970, and $2,600,000 for 1971) derived from JDC participation in UJA and from membership contributions of ORT in the United States. Women's American ORT provided about $3.2 million in 1970. 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 with specific federations for a higher level.

**Migration Services**

United Hias Service (UHS) provides a worldwide service designed to enable Jews to migrate to countries where they can make an economic and social adjustment. In 1970 UHS helped 6,130 Jewish immigrants migrate
(including 2,020 to the United States), compared with 6,360 in 1969. A migration level of about 4,000 is expected in 1971.

A large proportion of the Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remains in New York City, where the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA) provides services for resettlement and absorption. Hence, financing the program of NYANA is considered a national responsibility, reflected in its inclusion as a direct beneficiary of National UJA.

Recent annual Jewish immigration to the United States was estimated at about 7,500, including persons aided by agencies and those arriving independently. Of those who settled in New York City, about 2,000 received aid from NYANA in 1970. UJA grants to NYANA are about $1 million annually.

**Hadassah**

The largest overseas service agency income, other than UJA's, was that of Hadassah, which was $16.6 million in 1969–70. Hadassah's major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah. The new Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem was constructed at a cost of about $31 million. Medical services in Israel are also provided by the Kupat Holim of Histadrut, by governmental departments, and by JDC's Malben program.16

The Youth Aliyah program for maintaining and training immigrant youth (in the earliest years orphaned, now mainly with families in Israel) and other youth activities are conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) at an annual cost of about $7 million. Hadassah transmitted to Youth Aliyah about $2.1 million in 1969–70. Hadassah reports that it has supplied over $60 million for Youth Aliyah since the program was begun 37 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 11,000.

**Higher Education in Israel**

Enrollment in 1970–71 at all institutions of higher education in Israel totaled about 46,000, compared with about 42,000 in 1969–70. Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, and Technion had receipts in America of about $18 million in 1970, mainly in contributions. In addition, these three institutions, together with four others, received grants of about $33 million annually from the United Israel Appeal, a beneficiary of UJA funds.

---

16 Hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary, and private) totaled 22,742, and provided about 8.2 million days' care in 1969. Hadassah had about 650 beds and bassinets and provided about 204,500 days' care.
Weizmann Institute income in the United States is derived from an annual fund-raising dinner and from an investment program.\textsuperscript{17}

Hebrew University and Technion receive from federations about $700,000 annually for maintenance purposes. Together, their building fund and special fund \textit{cash} campaign proceeds were $11 million in 1970. The maintenance appeals of the two institutions were combined; their capital-fund drives were conducted separately, but were suspended except for collections in 1971 to give priority to the IEF campaign.

Both institutions had marked enrollment increases in recent years. There were about 15,450 students registered at Hebrew University (including a Tel Aviv branch) and 7,150 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 later evolved as an independent institution. It had a student enrollment of 4,500 in the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities.

Tel Aviv University, affiliated to the municipality, was reorganized as an independent agency and, in 1964, began seeking public financial support for capital needs on a limited basis. Its 1970–71 student enrollment was about 12,000 in the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, law and medicine.


Hadassah Community College was initiated in 1971 with an enrollment of 125. The Holon Institute of Technology had an enrollment of 110 in 1970.

\textit{Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel}

There were about 20,000 students in attendance in 1969 in some 300 \textit{yeshivot} receiving support from the government of Israel. Students in some of the \textit{yeshivot} received JDC support as well. Many \textit{yeshivot} have no age limit, although most students are between 14 and 17 years old. They are called "traditional institutions" because their roots are in the traditional religious life of Eastern Europe.

Many of the \textit{yeshivot} receive support from JDC (about $800,000 annually). Some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel institutions ($178,000 raised in 1970); but a large number

\textsuperscript{17} In 1969–70 UIA allocated Weizmann Institute about $4.4 million, Hebrew University $14.2 million, Technion $8.9 million, Bar-Ilan University $1.8 million, Tel Aviv University $4.4 million, Haifa University $0.8 million, and Beersheba University $0.7 million.
also seek funds separately in the United States through collectors (*meshulokhim*) and through mail appeals. Altogether, annual expenditures were reported at $5 million in 1967–68.\(^{18}\)

Cultural programs in Israel are supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation ($3.0 million in 1970), which includes in its appeal some 50 agencies in Israel, mainly in the fields of music, theater, dance, art, and literature. In addition to funds for maintenance, AICF also seeks building funds. 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; National Committee for Labor Israel has raised funds independently in the largest communities where its membership strength is centered, while seeking federation allocations in smaller and medium-sized communities; American Friends of the Hebrew University and American Technion Society have concentrated their independent appeals on their building and special funds, while seeking federation support for maintenance needs.

Almost all these agencies were authorized to conduct campaigns for Israel by the Jewish Agency Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns\(^{19}\) under conditions regarding timing, goals, scope of campaigns and clearance with welfare funds, set by that committee. The objective of the committee is to help assure the primacy of UJA among appeals for Israel through the cooperation of other authorized campaigns and avoidance of a multiplicity of campaigns.

There also were efforts beginning in mid-1967, to avoid interference with activities on behalf of the UJA Israel Emergency Fund. Campaigns for capital and special needs of Hebrew University, Technion, and other in-

---

\(^{18}\) *Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1970, Table S-34.*

\(^{19}\) Authorized agencies in recent years were: American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund-raising dinner only); American Friends of Hebrew University; America-Israel Cultural Foundation; American Red Mogen Dovid for Israel, Inc. (membership campaign only, no application to welfare funds); American Technion Society; Federated Council of Israel Institutions; Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish National Fund (traditional collections only; no application to welfare funds); Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women's League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).
stitutions of higher learning were suspended in 1971 to facilitate fund raising for the Israel Emergency Fund. Both agencies were to continue to receive a portion of IEF funds, as budgeted by the United Israel Appeal. Other agencies limited their public functions.

Thirteen overseas organizations, other than UJA agencies, had income of $46.8 million in 1970, compared with $45.7 million in 1969.

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 where activities are predominantly 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; the Jewish Labor Committee, for aid to political and labor refugees in Europe and in Israel.

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency is a world-wide news service reporting news affecting the Jewish people.

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

Some agencies operate in more than one field of service. Therefore, 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 aid in strengthening fund raising, budgeting, planning and coordination of services, public relations, overseas services, specialized consultation in such services as family service, child care, care of the aged, and health services, and in basic community organization.
Community Relations

Response to threats to the status of Jews in other countries was an important factor in the creation of modern Jewish community relations agencies. Currently, the 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, and 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 beyond 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 Jewish 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, and the three congregational associations, and for 87 local and regional community-relations councils.

NCRAC serves as coordinator of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, which consists of 28 national Jewish organizations, including nine national member agencies of NCRAC.

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

The five national operating agencies and NCRAC received $15.5 million in 1969, compared with $16 million in 1970.
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). These institutions were established in Denver and southern California because it was believed that the climate of these areas was helpful in TB cases. They came into existence before many of the present local Jewish hospitals were organized. Improvement in the health status of Jews and medical advances in recent years in TB therapy led to a shift of emphasis by the TB hospitals to include heart, cancer, research, and treatment of asthma in adults. However, TB still continued to represent a major share of day's care provided for all ailments.

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

The Albert Einstein Medical School, under the sponsorship of Yeshiva University in New York City, opened in 1955. Its receipts in 1970 were $56.6 million, compared with $60.4 million in 1969. Its student enrollment in 1970–71 was 449. An agreement between Montefiore Hospital and the hospital of Yeshiva University involves operations of both facilities by Montefiore Hospital and availability of teaching facilities of both hospitals to the Einstein Medical School.

Income in 1970 of the other four agencies was $25.3 million. Two of the agencies (City of Hope near Los Angeles and National Jewish Hospital in Denver) accounted for about $21.9 million of the total.

Service Agencies

Basic services to individuals are provided by local agencies, financed in large measure by federation 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. This need is met by five national organizations that furnish service to local Jewish community centers, programs for the Armed Forces, Jewish education, religion, and vocational guidance. These agencies serve as coordinating and consultative bodies in their respective fields.

The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) is the largest of these agencies. In 1970 JWB received $2,062,000 out of a total of $2,789,000 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 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 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 in their efforts to foster intergroup cooperation and relations with corresponding Christian bodies, as well as in their relations with governmental agencies.

NCRAC also provides service to 87 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 undertaken 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 $266,300 for activities in the United States in 1969-70. This included scholarship and fellowship grants, aid to several yeshivot and research grants to agencies.

In addition to a number of small agencies dealing exclusively with specific aspects of Jewish cultural endeavors,20 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).

Fourteen agencies had income of $60.4 million in 1970: Brandeis University accounted for $30.7 million; B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal for $6.4 million; Yeshiva University programs (other than medical

20 The field also includes agencies operated under Jewish auspices with general cultural programs as well as programs with more specific Jewish content.
and religious) for $18.8 million; and Zionist Organization of America for $1.7 million. The remaining ten agencies received $2.8 million in 1970.

Three of the agencies are institutions of higher learning: Brandeis University, Dropsie University, and Herzliah-Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University. In addition, Yeshiva University offers university courses in the arts and sciences and maintains 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 for Hebraics. Population studies are conducted mainly by local federations and by CJFWF (a major national study was under way in 1971).

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 University publishes a Jewish quarterly review. CJFWF issues research reports on community organization, health and welfare planning, campaigning and budgeting, as well as studies of specific local service agencies.

Reference yearbooks are published in a number of fields; the AMERICAN JEWISH YEARBOOK (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 the Jewish Chautauqua Society emphasize youth activities. BBNYSA agencies conduct local operations, coordinated on a regional and national level.

Religion

National religious agencies provide training for 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 Jews.

Each of the three religious wings has its own rabbinical and congregational associations, with affiliated national 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 major seminaries rely extensively on associated congregations for financial support, sometimes through per capita arrangements; but they also receive federation support. They generally campaign independently in larger cities, and in communities where, in the view of federations, such programs should be completely a congregational responsibility.

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

Most Orthodox yeshivot are located in New York City. Major yeshivot in other cities are: Jewish University of America-Hebrew Theological College, Chicago; Rabbinical College of Telshe, Cleveland; Ner Israel Rabbinical College, Baltimore, and Chachmei Lublin Theological Seminary, Detroit. The Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, in Philadelphia, was established in 1968.

Aid to religious day schools is a major function of Mizrachi National Council for Torah Education, United Lubavitcher Yeshivot, 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.

Nine national religious agencies received $22.8 million in 1970, compared with $21.8 million in 1969.

LOCAL SERVICES

Central communal sources (Jewish federations and Chest-United Funds) provided about $77 million for local Jewish services in 1969, a rise of almost 10 per cent.

Jewish federations supplied about $54.3 million in 1969, compared with $48.7 million in 1968, 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 services.

Nonsectarian community chests and United Funds provided an additional estimated $23 million in 1969, in most cases through Jewish federations,
but in some cases directly to Jewish service agencies. Of this sum, $15.1 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 have also the exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

Outside New York City, agencies eligible for chest support received $3.7 million more in 1969 than in 1968; but chests provided $1 million of this increase, while federations gave the major portion ($2.7 million). Other services not supported by chests had increased allocations of 10 per cent ($1.3 million), mainly for Jewish education.

The budgets of agencies in different fields of service vary widely, as does the proportion of these budgets provided by Jewish federations and community chests. This is reflected below in data for 1969 (except for centers and some nonreporting agencies, 1968):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Service</th>
<th>Reported receipts (in millions)*</th>
<th>Provided by Jewish federations and community chests (in millions)*</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>$545.5</td>
<td>$10.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers (excl. Camps)</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Services</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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 from data with other bases, found elsewhere in this report.

Available data for 127 communities for 1969 and 1968 show how central communal funds (federation and chest income) were distributed among various fields of local service (see Table 5). Federations provided roughly five-eighths and community chests three-eighths of central communal funds received by local agencies in these communities; but the 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 in 1968, but the balance shifted for the first time to federation support in 1969.

Rises from 11 to 13 per cent in 1969 in central community grants were...
experienced in the fields of Jewish education, recreation, community relations, and vocational services. Hospital grants fell by almost 2 per cent. The sharpest rise was for care of the aged (29 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. Funds from these sources have risen more than community funds. In 1969 such communal grants accounted for 1.9 per cent of receipts of hospitals, and 6.2 per cent of funds for the care of the aged, 10 per cent for Jewish education, 22.4 per cent for child care, 36.4 per cent for centers, 64.8 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 102 communities over a five-year span (1965-1969) indicates significant changes:

Both chest and federation grants rose: the former by 23 per cent, the latter by 38 per cent. The federation share of allocations rose from about 59 to 62 per cent during this period.

The sharpest rises in allocations since 1965 were for care of the aged (70 per cent), Jewish education (50 per cent), centers and community relations services (40 to 42 per cent), family, child care, and employment services (31 to 33 per cent). Allocations for refugee care were relatively stationary. Hospital allocations fell by 9 per cent.

A similar analysis for a full decade, 1960-69, indicates that chest grants rose by 42 per cent and federation grants by 62 per cent. The sharpest rises were for Jewish education, 86 per cent; care of the aged, 106 per cent; centers, 78 per cent; family and child care services, 59 per cent; local community relations, 59 per cent; employment services, 54 per cent; and refugee care, 10 per cent.

Health

Most local Jewish hospitals are in the largest centers of Jewish population. Fifteen of the 16 cities in the United States and Canada with a Jewish population of more than 40,000 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 in 1969 averaged about 18 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 26 per cent in 1963—as contrasted with 6 per cent for the 15,000 to 40,000 population group, and less than 1 per cent for other smaller cities.

In 1969, there were reports on 24,077 beds and bassinets in 65 general and special hospitals under Jewish sponsorship. Federations and chests

---

22 The exception is Washington, D.C.
allocated $10.4 million for local Jewish hospitals in the United States. These hospitals (general and special) provided a total of 6.6 million days' care during the year.

In recent years, "third party" payments for service (Blue Cross, tax-support) have borne the major share of increases, while central grants from federations have been rising moderately in some communities and declining in others. Together with chest grants, federations allocations accounted for almost 2 per cent of operating receipts in 1969. Payments for service to hospitals (individual patient fees and Blue Cross insurance) and tax support rose to $513 million in 1969 in 56 hospitals, or over 91 per cent of operating receipts. Governmental payments accounted for about $208 million of total service payments.

Family and Child Care

Family service agencies provide personal and family counseling, family life education, psychiatric services, and a limited amount of economic aid. An increasing number of agencies provide homemaker services in cases of 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 refugee services. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most of the cities with a Jewish population of more than 5,000. As in health programs, most services are provided on a local level, although there are several regional programs.

In 1969, 68 family agencies reported a total of about 81,000 open cases on their rolls, with about 58,000 cases closed during the year, and a monthly average active caseload of over 19,000 families.

A total of 7,532 children were under care during 1969 in 43 child care agencies for which data were available. Most of the children under care at the end of the year were in foster homes and in residential centers.

Central communal allocations by federations and community chests for family and child care services rose by 9 per cent in 1969. Such central allocations accounted for about 66 per cent of total receipts for family agencies (including refugee service). Central allocations were 23 per cent of the receipts of child care agencies, with over 58 per cent provided by public tax funds.

Refugees

Services to refugees 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, except for brief upturns, has declined since then. There
was a parallel decline in local refugee costs for most of these years. Refugee costs accounted for only 1.3 per cent in 1969.

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, financed by the national United Jewish Appeal. United Hias Service seeks to encourage resettlement in other communities where the prospects for adjustment and self-support may be better than in New York City.

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

In 1969 aid was provided monthly to an average of 652 refugee families by 49 family agencies (excluding aid by NYANA). While this was about 5 per cent of the active cases of these agencies, the financial aid given to refugees was 42 per cent of aid given by them to all families.

Centers, Camps, Youth Services

According to the National Jewish Welfare Board, there were, in 1969, over 300 Jewish community centers, with a membership of about 766,000. About 31 per cent of members were under 14 years of age and 21 per cent were 14 through 24 years old; almost half were 25 or older.

Estimated total community-center expenditures in 1968 were about $44.5 million, compared with $40.7 million in 1967, exclusive of separate camping agencies. A decade earlier, in 1958, these expenditures had been $20.4 million. Federation and chest allocations to centers, camps, and other youth services rose by 12 per cent in 1969, and 42 per cent in the five-year period 1965-69 (a rise of 77 per cent since 1960).

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: from 57 per cent of center receipts in 1958, to 63 per cent in 1968. Central community support from federations and community chests provided the balance of finances.

Homes for the Aged

There were 76 homes for the aged, which reported 14,352 beds in 1969, a rise of 20 per cent since 1960. They cared for 18,462 residents, who received 5 million days' care. Federations and chests provided 7 per cent of receipts, with 88 per cent secured from payments for service, including public funds. Over 58 per cent came from governmental sources, exclusive of OASDI funds paid by clients.

Aggregate federation allocations to homes for the aged rose by 29 per
cent in 1969. They rose by about 70 per cent between 1965 and 1969 (and by 106 per cent since 1960), increasing as the proportion of aged in the population continued to grow.

Over 60 per cent of the residents in homes for the aged were over 80 years of age. Over four-fifths were over 75.

The impact of Medicare on homes for the aged was centered on those certified as hospitals under Medicare. The impact of Medicaid has varied greatly from state to state because of variations in levels of aid.

Receipts of about $88 million were reported for 1969 by the homes. Payments for service accounted for $78 million, including public funds. Federation and chest support was reported at $4.5 million. There were 14 homes which received support from neither source.

Jewish Education

The estimated gross enrollment of students in 1966–67 was 540,000.23 Of these, 43 per cent attended 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 accounted for 5 per cent of enrollment.

Over 90 per cent of children of elementary-school age, but only 15 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 that enrollment total was slightly above more recent estimates, it was offset by a subsequent decline of one-day-a-week schools and the growth of more intensive and more costly programs.

The consumer price index rose by about 40 per cent from the beginning of 1958 to the end of 1970. Hence, the cost of Jewish education since 1958 may have risen by as much as $25 million. An estimate of “about 85 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 and staffing, and the pivotal role played by bar mitzvah preparation in Jewish education. Variations in scales of tuition fees are frequently related to variations regarding the inclusion of Jewish education in congregational membership dues. The extent of these variations in congregational dues, in tuition scales, in allowances toward tuition in congregational dues, and the inseparability of congregational and educational costs have thus far restricted the availability of meaningful data on financing of Jewish education under congregational auspices.

---

23 National Census of Jewish Schools conducted by American Association for Jewish Education.
Jewish federations provide almost $9 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 $7.9 million outside New York City in 1969, a rise of 11 per cent from the year before. A gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education has occurred each year; they were 50 per cent higher in 1969 than in 1965, and 86 per cent higher than in 1960. 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, teacher training, and the coordination and common service functions performed by bureaus of Jewish education.

Federation grants of $7.9 million in 1969 for Jewish education outside New York City were 24 per cent of total local allocations from federation sources. Community chests do not provide funds for Jewish 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. Local activities financed by federations received about $1.3 million in 1969 (outside New York City, which is served mainly by national agencies), a rise of 40 per cent since the beginning of 1965 (a rise of 59 per cent since the beginning of 1960).

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

Employment and Vocational Services

These programs are designed to assist Jews in finding employment and in guiding Jewish youth and others in the selection of trades and professions. Jewish vocational agencies or departments of Jewish family services operate mainly in the larger cities. Federations provided about $2.3 million in 1969 (including New York City). Substantial supplementary income was received in recent years from government sources and service payments. About $5 million in annual noncontributed income was identified by the Jewish Occupational Council. A complementary program was provided by a network of vocational service bureaus, financed by the B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, at a cost of about $0.6 million in 1969.

Local allocations for vocational programs increased by 13 per cent in 1969 outside New York City. The gain since the start of 1965 was 31 per cent.
Changes in Financing Since 1960

The major changes in federation and chest support of local Jewish services in the ten-year period 1960–1969 are briefly noted: only health costs fell, by $0.5 million; the major rises were for:

- Recreation services, about $6.0 million.
- Family and child care service, over $4.2 million.
- Jewish education, over $3.5 million.
- Care for the aged, about $2.7 million.
- Employment and vocational service, about $0.6 million.
- Local community relations, almost $0.5 million.

Of total rises of about $17.6 million since 1960, chests provided about $5.6 million, while the balance of $12 million was provided by federations. About two-thirds of the rises ($12.4 million) were in fields generally eligible for chest support. The rise in chest support ($5.6 million) in these fields was augmented by federations for the difference ($6.8 million) and the balance of the federation rise in support ($5.2 million) went to fields which received federation support exclusively, mainly Jewish education, which had received $3.5 million of the rise in the total of $5.2 million of federation support to fields of service receiving no chest support.

With a rise in the price level, of about 25 per cent in this decade, the constant value of the dollar support provided to hospitals and to refugee care decreased sharply, while the increases in the other fields of service would need to be deflated for change in the price level from 1960 through 1969. As a result, the rise in local allocations of 53 per cent during this decade would be closer to a rise of 24 per cent after adjustment for changes in the price level.

S. P. Goldberg
TABLE 1. AMOUNTS RAISED IN CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS 1939–1970

(Estimates in Millions of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totala</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>121.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>43.1</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>129.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>124.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>152.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>100.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>109.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>117.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total:
1939–1970 .... $4,172.7 $945.8 $468.1 $1,413.9 $2,758.8

*a Total regular pledges are shown at the end of each campaign year, prior to shrinkage and adjustments. Israel Emergency Fund (IEF) amounts were apportioned between New York City and other cities in relation to total pledges known to National UJA. IEF totals for "other cities" include some amounts raised in smaller cities without welfare funds. Pledges exclude amounts raised annually in smaller cities having no Welfare Funds but include some 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 and in 1971 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 $162 million in 1961-1970 including other noncampaign income and endowment funds of beneficiary agencies. Also excludes some endowment funds and capital-fund raising by federations for local agencies outside New York City (FJPNY data includes unrestricted legacies and earnings on investments).

b Provisional estimates; excludes Israel Education Fund of the UJA with pledges of about $32 million in 1965–70. Total for both regular and emergency campaigns in 1967 was $318 million, $233 million in 1968, $262 million in 1969, and $298 million in 1970. Data are subject to adjustment for inter-city duplications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Annual Level of Income in 1969 of Jewish Communal Services in U.S.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds) ......................</td>
<td>$162.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus: Israel Emergency Fund of UJA ...........................................</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grants by United Funds and Community Chests ..................................</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies (including capital funds)</td>
<td>126.1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies ................................</td>
<td>125.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hospital Income Including Research Funds (excluding 1 and 2) ..............</td>
<td>569.2e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family Service Income (excluding 1 and 2) ...................................</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Child Care Income (excluding 1 and 2) .......................................</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jewish Vocational Service (excluding 1 and 2) ................................</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Aged Care Income (excluding 1 and 2) .......................................</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Center Income (excluding 1 and 2)a .........................................</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jewish Education Income (excluding 1)b ....................................</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,315.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

a JWB Year Book, Volume XIX, 1970.
b Approximate; based on revision of estimate in National Study of Jewish Education, less Welfare Fund allocations.
c Understated: excludes some nonreporting hospitals.
d This sum includes operating funds, restricted funds, and capital funds.
### TABLE 2. STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS, 1951–1970

*(In Thousands of Dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cash Sales</th>
<th>Sales in U.S.</th>
<th>Sales Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>37,248</td>
<td>31,242</td>
<td>6,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>42,302</td>
<td>35,598</td>
<td>6,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>54,089</td>
<td>45,287</td>
<td>8,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>49,334</td>
<td>40,203</td>
<td>9,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>46,235</td>
<td>37,493</td>
<td>8,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>52,105</td>
<td>42,488</td>
<td>9,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>51,625</td>
<td>41,097</td>
<td>10,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>57,214</td>
<td>45,162</td>
<td>12,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>58,047</td>
<td>46,350</td>
<td>11,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>69,172</td>
<td>55,472</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>85,380</td>
<td>70,277</td>
<td>15,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>91,393</td>
<td>76,656</td>
<td>14,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>90,894</td>
<td>76,176</td>
<td>14,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>217,547</td>
<td>189,966</td>
<td>27,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>130,495</td>
<td>107,019</td>
<td>23,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>159,042</td>
<td>131,701</td>
<td>27,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>210,679</td>
<td>175,945</td>
<td>34,734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total Sales ...... $1,639,830$\(^a\) $1,378,705$ $261,125$

Less: Redemptions ... 754,830

Total Outstanding at September 30, 1970 $ 885,000

---

*a Redeemtion of bonds issued in earlier years began to fall due in 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 September 1970 had been reduced to $885 million. Redemptions included about $117 million (including accrued interest) in payment of pledges and allocations, received by UJA from 1952 through 1970. Data for prior years were adjusted in 1971 to secure greater year-to-year comparability.

*b Excludes conversions of $24.8 million of earlier issues to Development Investment issue. Data for 1968 excludes conversions of $37 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></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUDGETED TO BENEFICIARIES*a, d</td>
<td>$134,062</td>
<td>$123,860</td>
<td>$40,624</td>
<td>$38,392</td>
<td>$93,438</td>
<td>$85,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</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>74,208</td>
<td>69,930</td>
<td>21,015</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>53,193</td>
<td>49,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>70,966</td>
<td>66,775</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>50,466</td>
<td>46,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>3,242</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>500*</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>5,268</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>4,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>2,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>470*</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>52,140</td>
<td>46,619</td>
<td>19,124</td>
<td>17,422</td>
<td>33,016</td>
<td>29,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care*</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* For gross estimated collections 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 1971, about $71.8 million on the 1968 Israel Emergency Fund had been collected in relation to pledges of about $80 million.

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

b Figures for New York include the United Jewish Appeal 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 1968 and 1969 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash is received.

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

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

* NYANA is included in UJA totals.

† Revised.

* Less than .05 of one per cent.
## TABLE 3-A. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF FUNDS RAISED (EXCLUSIVE OF ISRAEL EMERGENCY FUND) BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS*

(Excludes New York City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT BUDGETED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>53,192,547</td>
<td>49,430,278</td>
<td>7,694,385</td>
<td>7,246,663</td>
<td>8,484,408</td>
<td>7,913,094</td>
<td>9,050,350</td>
<td>8,238,254</td>
<td>27,963,404</td>
<td>24,631,367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>50,465,624</td>
<td>46,775,228</td>
<td>7,373,956</td>
<td>6,942,130</td>
<td>8,068,981</td>
<td>7,500,400</td>
<td>8,457,074</td>
<td>7,656,027</td>
<td>26,565,613</td>
<td>24,676,671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>2,726,923</td>
<td>2,655,050</td>
<td>320,429</td>
<td>304,533</td>
<td>415,427</td>
<td>413,594</td>
<td>593,276</td>
<td>582,227</td>
<td>1,397,791</td>
<td>1,354,696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,782,620</td>
<td>4,530,729</td>
<td>562,586</td>
<td>536,043</td>
<td>757,457</td>
<td>719,761</td>
<td>808,793</td>
<td>784,132</td>
<td>2,653,784</td>
<td>2,490,793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,759,040</td>
<td>2,663,008</td>
<td>246,723</td>
<td>232,658</td>
<td>415,337</td>
<td>395,170</td>
<td>482,530</td>
<td>481,445</td>
<td>1,614,450</td>
<td>1,553,735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>25,605</td>
<td>29,808</td>
<td>15,696</td>
<td>18,327</td>
<td>7,413</td>
<td>6,116</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>622,124</td>
<td>556,303</td>
<td>67,620</td>
<td>63,465</td>
<td>82,350</td>
<td>71,066</td>
<td>111,279</td>
<td>96,157</td>
<td>360,875</td>
<td>325,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>317,820</td>
<td>284,826</td>
<td>131,148</td>
<td>126,850</td>
<td>94,087</td>
<td>94,783</td>
<td>30,835</td>
<td>33,693</td>
<td>55,750</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,058,031</td>
<td>996,784</td>
<td>95,399</td>
<td>94,743</td>
<td>158,270</td>
<td>152,626</td>
<td>182,653</td>
<td>169,472</td>
<td>621,709</td>
<td>579,943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>698,213</td>
<td>672,599</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>57,074</td>
<td>121,432</td>
<td>85,922</td>
<td>529,932</td>
<td>529,963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,744,316</td>
<td>1,631,781</td>
<td>216,290</td>
<td>198,141</td>
<td>327,000</td>
<td>317,308</td>
<td>505,832</td>
<td>491,981</td>
<td>695,094</td>
<td>624,351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* The difference between totals budgeted for beneficiaries and gross budgeted for all purposes represents "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses and contingency on 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.

* Jewish population.

* Includes small undistributed amounts.

* Less than 0.05 of one percent.
### TABLE 4. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND CHEST ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1969 AND 1968

(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><strong>Fields Receiving Chest Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Provided by Chests (exclusive of Administration)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provided by Federations</strong></td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fields Receiving Only Federation Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services (incl. Free Loans)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Aid</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Chests</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* About $1.0 million provided annually by NYANA, financed by UJA.

*b* Provided mainly by national agencies.

*c* Most capital campaigns are excluded because they are conducted apart from annual campaigns; Chest funds in nonfederated cities are also excluded.

*d* Includes in N.Y.C. grants by Greater New York Fund and United Hospital Fund to federated agencies. In addition non-federated agencies receive about $0.5 million annually.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>Per cent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>$7,071,845</td>
<td>$6,956,740</td>
<td>−1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Service</strong></td>
<td>11,267,844</td>
<td>12,265,192</td>
<td>+8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</strong></td>
<td>13,682,601</td>
<td>15,295,505</td>
<td>+11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aged Care</strong></td>
<td>4,360,118</td>
<td>5,609,778</td>
<td>+28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment and Guidance</strong></td>
<td>1,633,384</td>
<td>1,839,765</td>
<td>+12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jewish Education</strong></td>
<td>7,099,623</td>
<td>7,866,883</td>
<td>+10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee Care</strong></td>
<td>671,720</td>
<td>695,789</td>
<td>+3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relations</strong></td>
<td>1,276,710</td>
<td>1,423,063</td>
<td>+11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>688,442</td>
<td>776,258</td>
<td>+12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</strong></td>
<td>548,972</td>
<td>565,569</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>48,301,259</td>
<td>53,294,542</td>
<td>+10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

| **Federations**        | 29,236,230      | 33,295,679      | +13.9           |
| **Chests**             | 19,065,029      | 19,998,863      | +4.9            |

*Includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of total administrative and fund-raising costs ($13,301,101 in 1968 and $14,780,556 in 1969) reported for these 127 cities. Federation allocations for administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund-raising costs cannot be segregated between local and nonlocal programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS, FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES 1968, 1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chest to Fed. for Local Administration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Jewish population.

* This table includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of administrative and fund raising costs ($13,301,101 in 1968 and $14,780,556 in 1969) reported for these 127 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 non-local programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Admin. and Fund Raising Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 and Over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8,026,147 | 8,859,272 |
### TABLE 5-B. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS, INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES, 1968, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (127)</th>
<th>(55)</th>
<th>(40)</th>
<th>(19)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Educationd</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24.3)</td>
<td>(23.6)</td>
<td>(16.4)</td>
<td>(15.1)</td>
<td>(23.5)</td>
<td>(22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local Administrationa</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalsb</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>Federations</th>
<th>Chests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* See Table 5-A.

* Figures within parentheses are percentages of Jewish Education allocations to total Federation allocations.

* Less than 0.05 of one per cent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$ 7,664</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>$ 7,621</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>$ 7,132</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>$ 7,061</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>$ 6,941</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Service</td>
<td>9,040</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>9,582</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>10,174</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11,075</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11,987</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>132.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>10,367</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>11,068</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12,044</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>13,153</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>14,712</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>141.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4,228</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>170.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>131.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5,595</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6,968</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7,739</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>150.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>140.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>147.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Admin.</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>126.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$23,494</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>$24,956</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>$25,766</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>$28,556</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>$32,484</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>138.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>15,940</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>16,835</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>17,891</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>18,695</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>19,559</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>122.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes both federation and community chest fund; 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 15 percent.
### TABLE 6-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 102 COMMUNITIES, 1965, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total (102) 1965 ($)</th>
<th>Total (102) 1969 ($)</th>
<th>Under $5,000(^b) 1965 ($)</th>
<th>Under $5,000(^b) 1969 ($)</th>
<th>$5,000-$15,000(^b) 1965 ($)</th>
<th>$5,000-$15,000(^b) 1969 ($)</th>
<th>$15,000-$40,000(^b) 1965 ($)</th>
<th>$15,000-$40,000(^b) 1969 ($)</th>
<th>40,000 and Over 1965 ($)</th>
<th>40,000 and Over 1969 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,664,442</td>
<td>$6,940,669</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$199,775</td>
<td>$1,139,001</td>
<td>$1,513,716</td>
<td>$1,322,002</td>
<td>$1,663,958</td>
<td>$6,441,753</td>
<td>$8,609,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>9,040,091</td>
<td>11,986,857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>10,366,649</td>
<td>14,712,012</td>
<td>833,690</td>
<td>1,051,977</td>
<td>2,088,177</td>
<td>2,897,075</td>
<td>1,924,451</td>
<td>2,856,065</td>
<td>5,520,331</td>
<td>7,906,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,180,265</td>
<td>5,418,021</td>
<td>117,213</td>
<td>98,931</td>
<td>475,936</td>
<td>752,988</td>
<td>442,032</td>
<td>570,541</td>
<td>2,145,084</td>
<td>3,995,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,395,889</td>
<td>1,833,395</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,677</td>
<td>65,962</td>
<td>203,879</td>
<td>257,858</td>
<td>1,146,883</td>
<td>1,509,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5,158,411</td>
<td>7,738,994</td>
<td>113,667</td>
<td>183,789</td>
<td>498,234</td>
<td>812,966</td>
<td>805,197</td>
<td>1,195,384</td>
<td>3,741,313</td>
<td>5,546,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>675,098</td>
<td>691,494</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>60,038</td>
<td>39,214</td>
<td>111,215</td>
<td>120,093</td>
<td>503,745</td>
<td>529,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,004,150</td>
<td>1,411,078</td>
<td>15,910</td>
<td>22,180</td>
<td>74,314</td>
<td>95,524</td>
<td>220,609</td>
<td>261,737</td>
<td>693,317</td>
<td>1,031,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>503,722</td>
<td>745,030</td>
<td>17,755</td>
<td>31,967</td>
<td>62,148</td>
<td>100,663</td>
<td>21,664</td>
<td>77,058</td>
<td>402,155</td>
<td>535,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration(^c)</td>
<td>445,918</td>
<td>565,569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58,629</td>
<td>74,497</td>
<td>150,513</td>
<td>218,611</td>
<td>236,776</td>
<td>272,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources of Income</strong></td>
<td>$39,434,635</td>
<td>$52,043,119</td>
<td>$1,238,120</td>
<td>$1,591,213</td>
<td>$4,582,049</td>
<td>$6,398,905</td>
<td>$5,717,697</td>
<td>$7,692,485</td>
<td>$27,896,769</td>
<td>$36,360,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(^b\) Jewish population.

\(^c\) See similar note Table 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (102)</th>
<th>(39)</th>
<th>(33)</th>
<th>(17)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Services</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Admin.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Income</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- See Table 6-A.
- Jewish population.
- Less than .05 of one per cent.
- See similar note Table 6.
- Slight difference due to rounding.
### TABLE 6-C. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 81 COMMUNITIES, 1960, 1969

*Amounts in Thousands of Dollars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>$7,470</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>$6,951</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>7,244</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11,483</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>158.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>177.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>206.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>153.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>(21.2)(^a)</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>186.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>158.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>166.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration(^c)</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>126.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total(^b)</strong></td>
<td>$32,594</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$50,167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>153.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$19,305</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>$31,310</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>162.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>13,289</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>18,857</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>141.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

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

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

\(^d\) Figures within parentheses are for Jewish Education allocations to total Federation allocations.
### TABLE 7. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS
FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1970 AND 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UJA &amp; Beneficiary Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal—Regular</td>
<td>$80,685,703</td>
<td>$69,281,092</td>
<td>$1,079,312</td>
<td>$988,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Emergency</td>
<td>97,678,065</td>
<td>80,716,094</td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Education Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish JDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Israel Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Association for New Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT—Women's American ORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—American ORT Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340,849</td>
<td>4,837,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UJA AND BENEFICIARIES</strong></td>
<td>$178,363,768</td>
<td>$149,997,186</td>
<td>$9,420,176</td>
<td>$10,483,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Overseas Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,057,321</td>
<td>$3,055,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Mogen David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,097,242</td>
<td>683,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal</td>
<td>748,135</td>
<td>702,484</td>
<td>6,186,001</td>
<td>9,389,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of Hebrew University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,853,104</td>
<td>2,967,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,853,104</td>
<td>2,967,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America-Israel Cultural Foundation</td>
<td>211,050</td>
<td>205,660</td>
<td>2,869,529</td>
<td>1,990,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra Torah Fund</td>
<td>6,848</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>401,429</td>
<td>385,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Council of Israel Institutions</td>
<td>103,743</td>
<td>106,194</td>
<td>73,954</td>
<td>97,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>11,651,019</td>
<td>11,635,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Telegraphic Agency</td>
<td>209,216</td>
<td>204,743</td>
<td>19,414</td>
<td>217,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel</td>
<td>229,947</td>
<td>238,610</td>
<td>2,822,752</td>
<td>2,191,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>753,494</td>
<td>712,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Hias Service</td>
<td>1,325,000</td>
<td>1,301,004</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>214,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER OVERSEAS AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td>$3,403,939</td>
<td>$3,336,015</td>
<td>$34,073,269</td>
<td>$33,350,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERSEAS</strong></td>
<td>$181,767,707</td>
<td>$153,333,201</td>
<td>$43,457,445</td>
<td>$43,833,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes joint community appeals.

*Cash received in each calendar year.

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

*Collections in the U.S. exclusive of global income of JNF.

*Excludes contributions and earnings of Investment Fund; other income includes research grants.

*Excludes income from UJA.
### TABLE 8. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1970 AND 1969

<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>$1,039,221</td>
<td>$899,327</td>
<td>$4,404,936b</td>
<td>$4,282,429b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1,073,976</td>
<td>3,974,575b</td>
<td>3,939,339b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
<td>458,665</td>
<td>438,189</td>
<td>875,670</td>
<td>933,369e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>199,207</td>
<td>199,783</td>
<td>285,362</td>
<td>238,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans</td>
<td>103,050</td>
<td>101,533</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJCRAC</td>
<td>254,130</td>
<td>232,491</td>
<td>22,750</td>
<td>23,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,154,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,945,299</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,563,293</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,431,423</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Welfare Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds*</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope</td>
<td>$3,275</td>
<td>$3,390</td>
<td>$8,304,222</td>
<td>$7,727,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>28,655</td>
<td>31,938</td>
<td>342,390</td>
<td>388,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Asthma Research Inst. and Hospital</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,915</td>
<td>1,783,411</td>
<td>1,901,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
<td>15,297</td>
<td>9,485</td>
<td>4,351,027</td>
<td>4,410,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva U.-Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Hospitalb</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,109,222</td>
<td>6,343,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49,728</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,890,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,771,238</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Service 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 Assn. for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$208,731</td>
<td>$189,570</td>
<td>$114,905</td>
<td>116,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>43,098</td>
<td>40,759</td>
<td>18,585</td>
<td>17,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>11,545</td>
<td>11,003</td>
<td>11,263</td>
<td>8,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Boardf</td>
<td>1,711,800</td>
<td>1,648,835</td>
<td>157,339</td>
<td>160,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>23,107</td>
<td>25,235</td>
<td>152,377</td>
<td>104,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,998,281</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,915,402</strong></td>
<td><strong>$454,469</strong></td>
<td><strong>$409,152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds*</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reform Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>$94,801</td>
<td>$94,432</td>
<td>$849,719</td>
<td>$945,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC-JIR</td>
<td>5,520,534</td>
<td>2,227,739</td>
<td>1,615,944</td>
<td>1,498,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>515,730</td>
<td>567,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminaryf</td>
<td>76,727</td>
<td>78,429</td>
<td>5,925,299</td>
<td>6,545,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Synagogue of Americak</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telshi</td>
<td>$9,485</td>
<td>$11,808</td>
<td>$491,861</td>
<td>$395,528</td>
<td>$239,672</td>
<td>$287,319</td>
<td>$741,018</td>
<td>$694,655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>$9,065</td>
<td>$8,330</td>
<td>$232,867</td>
<td>$179,671</td>
<td>$265,096</td>
<td>$265,724</td>
<td>$507,058</td>
<td>$453,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah</td>
<td>$5,955</td>
<td>$6,655</td>
<td>$209,110</td>
<td>$152,937</td>
<td>$74,844</td>
<td>$73,797</td>
<td>$289,909</td>
<td>$233,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva U-Religious Affiliates</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$381,300</td>
<td>$226,650</td>
<td>$1,194,538</td>
<td>$1,188,950</td>
<td>$1,575,838</td>
<td>$1,415,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$196,063</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,654</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,126,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,241,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,486,794</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,320,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,809,277</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,761,754</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society</td>
<td>$9,163</td>
<td>$9,644</td>
<td>$2,239</td>
<td>$4,127</td>
<td>$140,688</td>
<td>$139,715</td>
<td>$152,090</td>
<td>$153,486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitzaron</td>
<td>$2,455</td>
<td>$2,225</td>
<td>$12,826</td>
<td>$8,423</td>
<td>$15,035</td>
<td>$14,811</td>
<td>$30,316</td>
<td>$25,459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>$891,288</td>
<td>$842,798</td>
<td>$4,507,434</td>
<td>$4,613,405</td>
<td>$1,007,286</td>
<td>$936,298</td>
<td>$6,406,008</td>
<td>$6,392,501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsie University</td>
<td>$58,705</td>
<td>$50,505</td>
<td>$250,008</td>
<td>$393,695</td>
<td>$132,062</td>
<td>$101,200</td>
<td>$440,775</td>
<td>$545,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadruth Ivrit</td>
<td>$18,422</td>
<td>$20,707</td>
<td>$60,354</td>
<td>$71,752</td>
<td>$122,798</td>
<td>$103,365</td>
<td>$201,574</td>
<td>$195,824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>$21,714</td>
<td>$19,584</td>
<td>$222,655</td>
<td>$216,645</td>
<td>$27,428</td>
<td>$20,389</td>
<td>$50,994</td>
<td>$271,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>$10,541</td>
<td>$9,985</td>
<td>$355,074</td>
<td>$336,144</td>
<td>$24,951</td>
<td>$51,505</td>
<td>$390,566</td>
<td>$397,934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Society</td>
<td>$15,868</td>
<td>$18,355</td>
<td>$47,777</td>
<td>$26,150</td>
<td>$516,049</td>
<td>$530,057</td>
<td>$579,694</td>
<td>$574,562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T.S.P.U. and Herzliakah</td>
<td>$6,303</td>
<td>$7,630</td>
<td>$169,803</td>
<td>$179,171</td>
<td>$59,780</td>
<td>$61,630</td>
<td>$235,886</td>
<td>$248,431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture</td>
<td>$157,545</td>
<td>$135,488</td>
<td>$14,295</td>
<td>$6,567</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$171,840</td>
<td>$140,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva U. (Other than Medical, Religious) b</td>
<td>$52,431</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$5,343,435</td>
<td>$5,991,726</td>
<td>$13,360,287</td>
<td>$14,970,199</td>
<td>$18,756,153</td>
<td>$21,029,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO d</td>
<td>$41,136</td>
<td>$43,937</td>
<td>$271,553</td>
<td>$151,176</td>
<td>$62,789</td>
<td>$69,163</td>
<td>$321,478</td>
<td>$264,276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Organization of America d</td>
<td>$27,474</td>
<td>$32,280</td>
<td>$584,351</td>
<td>$582,043</td>
<td>$1,078,378</td>
<td>$771,384</td>
<td>$1,690,203</td>
<td>$1,385,707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total**                                   | **$1,313,045** | **$1,259,138** | **$23,806,171** | **$40,452,106** | **$35,272,729** | **$35,616,660** | **$60,391,945** | **$77,327,904** |          |          |          |          |

**Total Domestic**                               | **$6,713,771** | **$6,369,221** | **$65,840,625** | **$82,305,142** | **$111,353,038** | **$114,318,459** | **$183,907,434** | **$202,992,822** |          |          |          |          |

**Total Overseas and Domestic**                  | **$188,481,478** | **$159,702,422** | **$109,296,070** | **$126,138,816** | **$123,057,630** | **$125,327,660** | **$420,837,178** | **$411,168,898** |          |          |          |          |
The Effects of Jewish Education

The effectiveness of Jewish education is becoming a major concern of the American Jewish community. In the wake of numerous charges about the alienation of Jews from Judaism and its life style, Jewish education has increasingly been perceived as the appropriate medium to provide relief for Jewish identity problems. An assessment of the various forms of Jewish education currently available in this country offers a rational basis for communal planning so that educational programs that perpetuate Judaism can be identified and supported.

For two immigrant generations which grew to maturity before World War II an understandable preoccupation with making a living was underlined by the devastating experience of the Great Depression. The realization that the majority of these Jews had lost meaningful touch with their historic tradition came when their own children became adults in the postwar era. It was then that discerning observers of Jewish life recognized that several generations of Jews had obtained merely fragmentary knowledge about their religious and cultural heritage, and had often transmitted to their children only ambivalent feelings about Jewishness. It became clear that massive new efforts were required to acquaint Jews with their historic past and its implications for the present.

This paper will present phases in the development of the American Jewish community; the institutional modalities which have been employed to cope with social and cultural problems in the past; an overview of past and current educational programs in Jewish life, and an evaluation of their utility in promoting a distinctive, transmittable Jewish life style.

DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

While Jews have been in the United States for more than three centuries, their numbers were limited and they were widely dispersed. Beginning in 1880, this country witnessed a mass ingathering of Jews originating from Eastern Europe, who settled in large numbers in fast-growing metropolitan areas. This immigration continued on a massive scale until 1920, then tapered off after the adoption of restrictive immigration laws. Immigration on a lesser

scale resumed in the 1930's, with some Central European Jews finding refuge from Nazi persecution in this country; millions of others perished.

To facilitate the integration of immigrants into American life, the Jewish community established, before the turn of the century, a network of health and welfare services, including hospitals, community centers, and family counseling programs. These organizations helped newcomers fit into a strange and occasionally frightening environment until they adapted to their new life situation and achieved financial independence.

Since World War II, demographic data have indicated the large majority of American Jews were native-born. Occupational patterns have shifted from manual labor and skilled trades to a wide array of professions, clerical and administrative jobs, and self-employment. The average American Jew was native-born, college educated, and of middle or upper-middle class social status.

Changes in the social characteristics of American Jews have stimulated questions about the usefulness of the existing health and welfare service system for meeting current needs in Jewish life. The appearance in the Jewish periodical literature of critiques of prevailing services and allocation patterns coincided with the emergence of concern about the Jewish identity crisis in America. For the critics the issue came to be posed in rather simplistic terms: whether the Jewish welfare establishment was willing to divert funds from health and welfare agencies and allocate them to educational organizations. Prodded by student demonstrators and by a handful of academics, many welfare federations managed some shift in their priorities and allocated a greater proportion of their funds for education. This shift in policy is likely to continue over time. Perhaps prematurely, some welfare federation executives now prognosticate the abandonment of the "health and welfare model" in Jewish life in favor of what is euphemistically termed a "survival model" emphasizing education.

---


5 From 1964 to 1968 federation allocations to Jewish education rose by 43 per cent; centers received an increase of 31 per cent, and family, child care, care of the aged, and community relations services an increase of 28 per cent. See S. P. Goldberg, "Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 71 (1970), pp. 285-86.

6 In a panel discussion of Jewish welfare priorities, conducted by the School of Jewish Communal Service of Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles, on July 21, 1970, David Rabinowitz, now executive director of the St. Louis Jewish Welfare
For the serious student of Jewish life the role hastily assigned to existing educational programs as the panacea for Jewish survival calls for careful evaluation. Problems need to be assessed with a view to identifying the current scope of Jewish education and its capacity to cope with the realities of American life.

In the Eastern European shtetl, Torah le-sh'mah, learning for its own sake, and religious practices were natural concomitants of a definable way of life, and survival was a result of these normal and natural activities. On the American scene, the process of assimilation and economic betterment placed primary emphasis on secular education as the vehicle for status mobility. Jewish education was relegated to a secondary and supplementary role. Only with such seemingly deviant groups as the Hasidim the notion persisted that a job did not have to flower into a career, but was simply a way of earning a living which would not interfere with one's religious duties and sensibilities. Most Jews have a different conception of the world of work, and Jewish education occupies an ill-defined, not too prominent place in their scheme of things.

NATURE OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Evolution and Current Characteristics

Traditionally, Jewish life has been based on the pillars of study, correct living, and showing of kindness. Communal responsibility for the education and welfare of all Jews is an essential part of the Jewish tradition. Organized support for education began in the days of the Second Commonwealth, when the Sanhedrin and Joshua ben Gamala established schools in every town and hamlet of ancient Judea to make it possible for fatherless children to study Torah. Since then, there has been continued concern for both the quality and quantity of education for all Jewish children.

This concern found a variety of new and strange expressions in the United States. Rebecca Graetz and her friends began to conduct Sunday schools on the Protestant model for the children of the poor and needy; the "uptown German" Jews of New York sought to establish Hebrew Free Schools for Federation, asserted that a "survival model" was replacing health and welfare services as the main feature of the Jewish communal service system.

---

the children of "downtown East European" Jewish immigrants; later, the Eastern European Jews began to establish the first Talmud Torahs for their own children.\footnote{Alexander M. Dushkin and Uriah Z. Engelman, \textit{Jewish Education in the United States} (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1959), p. 141.}

Out of these diverse sources the current pattern of Jewish education emerged. It is a system which emphasizes supplementary education through one-day-a-week Sunday schools and midweek afternoon schools. In the past three decades, a smaller number of all-day schools have developed, which are maintained by voluntary contributions from parents, patrons, and sponsoring organizations.

The idea of some form of total community responsibility had also taken hold, often more in theory than in practice and, by 1930, bureaus of Jewish education had been established in most major cities.\footnote{Ackerman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 3.} These bureaus coexisted with congregational schools functioning under Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or Yiddishist auspices. The bureaus sought to coordinate the community's educational efforts by identifying and extending the elements in Jewish education that are common to all schools. On the other hand, the ideologically committed individual schools aimed to perpetuate a specific religious world view by stressing the unique aspects of their particular program. As a result, the relationships between local bureaus of Jewish education and congregational schools occasionally have been strained.

\textit{Enrollment and Auspices}

The estimated gross enrollment of students in Jewish schools in 1966–1967 was 540,000, or only slightly more than one-third of Jewish school-age children in the United States at the time. Of these, 43 per cent attended one-day-a-week schools, 43 per cent were in two- to five-days-a-week schools, and almost 14 per cent (75,000) attended all-day schools. The latter were, in the main, affiliated with Torah Umesorah, the (Orthodox) National Society for Hebrew Day Schools.

About 92 per cent of all schools were under congregational auspices; communal schools accounted for 5 per cent of total enrollment.\footnote{S. P. Goldberg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 289.} Of the 2,727 Jewish schools of all types found in the United States, 35.7 per cent were under Reform auspices, 34.3 per cent were in Conservative congregations, 21.5 per cent were under Orthodox auspices, and 1.0 per cent were Yiddish schools.\footnote{Ackerman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 4.}

An analysis of enrollment figures for Jewish children considered eligible to receive a Jewish education (the 3- through-17-year age range) showed the following:
TABLE 1. ENROLLMENT-POPULATION RATIO BY SCHOOL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Estimated percentage of total Jewish population</th>
<th>Eligible Children</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery and Kindergarten (3-5-year-olds)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>263,789</td>
<td>30,572</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7-year-olds</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>175,989</td>
<td>37,759</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary department (8-12-year-olds)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>443,079</td>
<td>308,833</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school department (13-17-year-olds)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>439,651</td>
<td>69,484</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,318,951</strong></td>
<td><strong>446,648</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The Jewish population of the 455 communities participating in this survey was 5,495,635.
b Children in the 3-17-year-age range were assumed to represent 24 per cent of the Jewish population. Therefore, each of 15 age groups was assumed to represent 1.6 per cent of the Jewish population.
c Enrollment figures are based on survey tabulations from 2,070 out of 2,727 known Jewish schools; the estimated enrollment for all Jewish schools was 540,000.

Jewish schools were enrolling the substantial majority of elementary-school children, but failed to retain most of them once they reached high-school level. Data on the proportion of college-age students continuing to receive Jewish education are not readily available. Their number is believed to be slight.

Approximately 73,000 high-school students attended Hebrew schools in the United States. Areas of attendance and types of school are shown below.

TABLE 2. HEBREW HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT BY LOCATION AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Greater New York</th>
<th>Outside New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-day school</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-day school</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-day school</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-day school</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day school</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Totals** | **23,328** | **100.0** | **49,944** | **100.0** |

---

17 The figures in Table 2 are derived from Eisenberg and have been combined with more recent figures on high school enrollment in Torah Umesorah schools; see Torah Umesorah Report (New York, October 1970), p. 3.
The raw figures indicate that close to 40,000 of these students attended Hebrew school classes one day a week; 17,500 attended afternoon Hebrew high schools, and 15,600 were enrolled in Jewish day schools. These facts shed sobering light on the impact of Jewish education on adolescents.

In summary, it should be stressed that fully two-thirds of all Jewish school-age children in the United States were not attending any Jewish school at a given time. Forty-three per cent of the one-third in attendance at a Jewish school were there one day a week; an almost equally large proportion received six or fewer hours of instruction a week, and only some 15 per cent of students in Jewish schools spent more than six hours a week on Jewish subjects.18

Aims of Jewish Education

The broad purpose of Jewish education is to contribute to the continued existence of Jews as an identifiable group. Under this general goal, a number of specific objectives have been identified which are considered to be congruent with the religious sensibilities of the three major groups in American Judaism.

Ackerman defines these objectives as follows:19

1. To provide knowledge of the classical Jewish texts and the tradition embodied therein;
2. To foster a lifelong commitment to the study of Torah;
3. To develop some form of personal observance;
4. To develop a facility in the Hebrew language and a familiarity with its literature;
5. To nurture an identification with the Jewish people through a knowledge of its past and to encourage a concern for its survival and welfare world over;
6. To stimulate a recognition of the unique place of Israel in the Jewish imagination, both past and present, and to foster the acceptance of some sort of personal obligation to participate in its development;
7. To encourage participation in American society, based on a conscious awareness of the relationship between Jewish tradition and democracy; and
8. To inculcate faith in God and trust in His beneficence.

The formulation of these objectives is implicitly based on a framework which conceptualizes for the Jewish people a special and unique role in the world. While there are ideological differences around the interpretation of this role, Judaism emphasizes practices and responsibilities designed to produce a distinct and pervasive life style for its adherents. This stress on the


19 Ackerman, op. cit., pp. 17-18. This ranking of objectives is likely to reflect the priorities of the majority of Jewish educators. For those who believe in divine revelation, "To inculcate faith in God and trust in His beneficence" (item 8) probably constitutes the paramount goal.
performance of a vast array of practices designed to guide man's relationship to God, as well as man's relationship to man, produces a way of life in which the focus is on doing rather than on verbal affirmations of belief.

Basically, Jewish education transmits knowledge not for its own sake, but as a guide for achieving desired behavior among Jews. This latent function of Jewish education in which more informal educational ventures, such as summer camps and youth groups, play a vital part can best be described as an effort at socializing the child to a way of life which differs from that of the larger society, and rejects many of its assumptions. The practical implications of this approach test the extent to which parents, who ostensibly wish their children to learn about *yidishkayt*, are themselves steeped in it.

Many social scientists have asserted that Jews join congregations not because of their religious belief and practice, but rather as a means for Jewish identification compatible with American mores. If this is so, the congregational school has the very difficult task of teaching children to adopt a mode of life that is not their parents'. Otherwise, the school, too, would become a symbol of Jewishness rather than the transmitter of an embracive code of distinctive behavior, as religious imperatives dictate.²⁰

The problems of the educator, who seeks to mediate between the practices of parents and the imperatives of the religious school, may be illustrated by the following account: A teacher in a West Coast Reform Sunday school informed his third-grade class that Christmas trees were not part of the Jewish celebration of Hanukkah. A week later, several of the youngsters reported having discussed his comments with their parents, who insisted that they had been used to Christmas trees in their homes since childhood and intended to adhere to this custom. The teacher continued to reiterate that the parents were in error, while stressing that respect for parents was an integral feature of Jewish conduct. Similar examples drawn from all types of Jewish schools abound.

The underlying problem is one which has a powerful influence on the potential effect of Jewish education. The problem is that for several generations Jews have lived in an atmosphere where a basic assumption has been that blending in with the majority culture is one of the requirements for making a living. In the Jewish view, habitual behavior becomes second nature (*ha-regel na'seh teva' sheni*).²¹ Currently, there are many Jews who make considerably more than just a living,²² but to whom "fitting in" and the shedding of all forms of distinctiveness have become second nature, an approach totally at odds with the aims of Jewish education. The difference in outlook is well summarized in a story told by a Satmarer Hasid:

²⁰ Ibid., p. 5.
²² See, for example, Milton Himmelfarb, "Is American Jewry in Crisis?", *Commentary*, March 1969, pp. 33–34.
Once when the time came to put the Torah back in the covering it was too difficult to fit in, and the man who was putting it in suggested that they cut the Torah to make it fit. Ridiculous? Of course. You have to cut the covering to shape. We will adjust our environment to fit the Torah and not the reverse.  

**EFFECTS OF JEWISH EDUCATION**

There is an important distinction between assessment of effects, which is the focus of this presentation, and the general public's concern with effectiveness. The distinction lies in the introduction of the concept of values. Studies of effect simply ask, "What happened?". Studies of effectiveness ask, "Was what happened desirable?". Individual conceptions of the desirable will influence evaluation of the effectiveness of various programs of Jewish education.

Despite many impressionistic articles about the need for more and better Jewish education, there is a dearth of well-designed empirical studies comparing the results of different educational efforts. The material presented here focuses primarily on the somewhat limited findings of empirical research. While individual insight is frequently the basis for fruitful hypotheses, their validation should rest on observations objectively derived from a random sample of respondents.

Study findings are organized under topic headings which reflect the explicit or implicit goals of Jewish education. Topics include the relationship of Jewish education to the observance of *mitzvot* and other aspects of Jewishness, to the attainment of Jewish knowledge, to involvement with Israel and with the American Jewish community, to marriage and family life, and to Jewish identification and the so-called generation gap.

**Jewish Education and Jewish Practices**

In a recently concluded study of the relationship between Jewish religious orientation and the performance of religious obligations, and Jewish social service priorities, this writer obtained data from 107 adult West Coast respondents, who were donors to, or board members of, the Jewish welfare federation, or were members of a modern Orthodox synagogue. The duration and type of Jewish education received in childhood by study participants, listed by what they considered to be their religious orientation, is shown below:

---

TABLE 3. YEARS OF EDUCATION BY RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Study</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 or more years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 7 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4. TYPE OF JEWISH EDUCATION BY RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools Attended</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heder or Hebrew school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday school, other*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Yiddish school or other secular Jewish school.

More than two-thirds of Orthodox respondents, as compared with slightly less than one-half of Conservative and somewhat more than one-half of Reform respondents, received more than seven years of Jewish schooling. It was also found that almost three-fourths of the Orthodox and two-thirds of the Conservative study participants had attended a heder or week-day Talmud Torah in their youth, while two-thirds of the Reform respondents had been enrolled in a one-day-a-week Sunday school.

When religious self-definition was related to Jewish religious practices, statistically significant differences were found among study subgroups.

TABLE 5. RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION AND LEVEL OF JEWISH PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 25.16$, 6 d.f., $p < .001$.

Since the Reform wing of Judaism does not require of its members the same ritual observances as do Conservative and Orthodox groups, differences in level of practice could have been expected. However, Reform respondents were also significantly less likely to have read the Bible or other religious literature in an average year than Orthodox or Conservative study participants. They were less frequently enrolled in adult Jewish education programs and considerably less likely to be familiar with the Hebrew language. The majority of Reform respondents attended a one-day-a-week Sunday
school. It appears that this form of education seldom attains the objectives that would characterize its graduates as knowledgeable Jews.

Pinsky surveyed alumni of the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School, one of New York's oldest Orthodox day schools, through a mail questionnaire, which produced a 40 per cent return rate.\footnote{Irving Pinsky, "The Graduates of Rabbi Jacob Joseph School: A Follow-Up Study," \textit{Jewish Education}, Spring 1962, pp. 180–83.} Graduates generally identified themselves as Orthodox or traditional in orientation. Eighty-three per cent adhered to \textit{kashrut} regulations, 66 per cent did not travel on the Sabbath, and 52 per cent prayed three times daily. Respondents overwhelmingly stated that the school had exerted a positive influence on their ethical conduct, their participation in Jewish life, and their adjustment as Jews in the larger secular society. The strongest identification with Jewish values occurred among those respondents who had received the most intensive Jewish education.

Positive relationships were found between the attainment of high levels of Jewish and secular education, and between the levels of Jewish education of the alumnus and his wife. Two-thirds of the graduates had completed college while concurrently continuing their Jewish education beyond the elementary-school level. One-third of the graduates entered professions, and 20 per cent were in business; only 11 per cent were employed as rabbis, cantors, and other Jewish community professionals.

In another study of day school graduates, conducted at least eight years after graduation, questionnaire responses were obtained from 166 of 472 individuals contacted (35 per cent).\footnote{George Pollak, "The Jewish Day School Graduate," \textit{Jewish Spectator}, February 1962, pp. 11–14.} It was found that individuals who had continued with their Jewish education on a higher than elementary-school level conformed more closely to Jewish law than those who discontinued Jewish studies after graduation from an elementary day school. Study participants' compliance with Jewish law was significantly related to their home background, particularly the religious background of the spouses they married. Those who chose a mate from a more religious background were more observant than those whose spouses had no background of Jewish piety.

Studying the impact of differing types of Jewish education on religious attitudes, Geller addressed his research to 12-year-old youngsters attending one-day temple schools, communal schools, afternoon synagogue schools, and day schools, respectively.\footnote{Joshua Geller, "The Impact of Jewish Education on Student Religious Attitudes," \textit{The Synagogue School}, Winter 1970, pp. 9–13.} While 25 per cent of Sunday-school students considered prayer important, this figure rose to 82 per cent for day-school respondents. Similarly, 71 per cent of day-school and 66 per cent of synagogue-school study participants considered the abandonment of Jewish rituals a threat to Jewish survival, as compared with 42 and 32 per cent, respectively, for students in communal and one-day temple schools.
Day school respondents adhered most strongly to religious tenets requiring a definite commitment, such as daily prayer and other religious rituals, and moral behavior. Essentially, they were more in congruence with traditional beliefs and behavior than students attending other types of religious schools.

Attainment of Jewish Knowledge

The day school student obviously acquires more Jewish content than does the Sunday school or afternoon Hebrew school student. Day schools "devote from an average of 11½ hours in the first grade to an average of 20 hours weekly in the top grade to Jewish studies." The total time allotted by supplementary Jewish schools varies between two and seven and one-half hours weekly. At that, only 10 per cent of all afternoon Hebrew school students, those in communal afternoon schools, attend for seven and one-half hours. Thus the time element alone enhances the day school's potential for intensive Jewish education in a totally Jewish school environment. Some day schools attempt to integrate Jewish and secular studies by utilizing the many opportunities for using Jewish themes and experiences in their general studies department, and in this way tend to minimize conflicts between practices of the larger society and those of Judaism.

Basing their opinion on the test results of a New York qualitative survey, Alexander M. Dushkin and Uriah Z. Engelman, authors of a national study of Jewish education, concluded that not only is achievement in the day schools "very much higher than in the afternoon schools (the average nine-year-old in day schools does much better than the average 13-year-old in the afternoon schools), but ... achievement progresses more regularly." Many areas of study in the Orthodox day school are seldom covered in the supplementary school. Among them are Bible in the original unabridged text with Rashi and other commentaries, Talmud, Schulchan Aruch (as distinguished from study about holidays and observances), prayer reading and prayer comprehension.

Characteristic of the assessment by Jewish educators of the inadequacy of supplementary schools is the following comment on the one-day-a-week school, which is primarily identified with the Reform wing of Judaism:

32 Ibid., pp. 206–7.
33 Schiff, op. cit., p. 144.
When judged by even the least demanding standard of what it means to be an educated Jew, it is hard to avoid the feeling that the academic aspirations of the one-day-a-week school are either a colossal joke or an act of cynical pretentiousness. The plethora of subject matter of its curriculum is certainly beyond serious treatment in the available time, and even the most serious and able student cannot hope to acquire more than a hopeless hodge-podge of information. The jump from subject to subject from year to year and even within the same year militates against the serious treatment of any one topic.\textsuperscript{34}

The three-day-a-week school, peculiar to the Conservative movement, is vulnerable to many of the charges leveled against the Sunday school. The low achievement level is related not only to the limited number of hours devoted to Jewish studies, but also to the reduced capacity of students for absorbing new material in the late afternoon. The rate of continuation beyond the elementary level is lowest in the Hebrew afternoon school, and may reflect its ineffectiveness.\textsuperscript{35}

The inadequacy of the Conservative afternoon schools was one reason for the stress put by the Conservative movement on the development of their Solomon Schechter day schools in the 1960's. However, the movement was also designed to establish a school system in harmony with the philosophy of Conservative Judaism. The Solomon Schechter schools are committed to the purposeful interrelationship of Judaic and general studies departments, including infusion of Judaic-religious facts and concepts into general studies, and the introduction of content and perspectives from the larger society into Judaic studies.\textsuperscript{36} Research findings about the effectiveness of this type of day school in promoting a distinctive Jewish life style among its graduates should soon be available in the literature.

\textbf{Involvement with Israel and American Jewish Community}

Irrespective of type of school attended, Jewish teenagers identify with Israel's aspirations and take pride in its development and achievement. They see no conflict between their support of Israel and their Americanism.\textsuperscript{37} In a study of high school and college students in New York, Victor Sanua found that a majority of his respondents expressed interest in Israel.\textsuperscript{38} Some 28 per cent indicated a desire to settle there; 28 per cent, to visit for a period of one year; 37 per cent, to visit for a brief period of time. Seven per cent expressed total disinterest in a visit. Slight differences in reaction were found among adolescent samples drawn from public high school,

\textsuperscript{34} Ackerman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{35} Walter I. Ackerman, \textit{An Analysis of Selected Courses of Study of Conservative Congregational Schools} (New York: Melton Research Center, Jewish Theological Seminary, 1968), mimeographed.
\textsuperscript{36} Malzberg, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 10–11.
Sunday schools, afternoon Hebrew schools, and day schools. Of two groups of college students studied, one attending a public municipal college and the other Yeshiva University-Stern College, males at Yeshiva expressed the strongest positive attitudes toward Israel.

Research on North American Jewish settlers in Israel was conducted March-August, 1967. Of 703 potential study participants, data were received from 443 respondents, representing a 63 per cent return rate. Of the respondents, 34 per cent defined themselves as Orthodox, 24 per cent as Conservative, and 8 per cent as Reform; the rest did not indicate a religious preference. With reference to Jewish education, it was found that 37 per cent of the settlers had received a day school education, 54 per cent had attended a Sunday and/or afternoon Hebrew school; 9 per cent received no formal Jewish education. Since, as indicated earlier, about 14 per cent of Jewish students in the United States attend day schools, compared to 85 per cent enrolled in Sunday or afternoon Hebrew schools, the proportion of day school graduates who settled in Israel was significantly larger than that of graduates of other Jewish schools.

In a subsequent study Engel obtained data about American Jews who, after having lived in Israel for at least one year, returned to the United States. The proportion of Sunday and Hebrew school graduates among returnees was significantly larger than that of day school graduates. Orthodox study participants were significantly less likely to return to America than were Conservative or nonreligious respondents. No particular pattern emerged with respect to Reform Jews.

Brandeis Camp Institute is a well-known West Coast summer camp that combines features of the Israeli kibbutz with observance of kashrut and the Sabbath. The camp has been conceptualized to provide a positive initial exposure to Jewish life, particularly for young Jews whose home atmosphere provided neither knowledge nor practice of Judaism. The camp offers a one-month concentrated Jewish experience for high school and college students in a setting where the intrusion of the non-Jewish world can be kept to a minimum. College students are limited to one session; youths of high-school age may return as many times as they wish.

Preliminary findings derived from a questionnaire survey of those who had attended the camp as college students between 1941 and 1968 indicate that 80 per cent of the 1,449 respondents considered Brandeis a worthwhile experience. Reaction to the completely Jewish environment was overwhelmingly favorable.

Figures on participation by respondents in the affairs of

---


the organized Jewish community in the years following residence at the camp exceeded those noted by Sklare and Greenblum in a suburban community.\textsuperscript{42} For example, while 58 per cent of the suburbanite respondents attended synagogue only on the High Holy Days, the percentage for the Brandeis group was 27. For the same samples, attendance at least once a week was 5 and 10 per cent, respectively; a few times a month, 11 and 16 per cent, and once a month, 13 and 27 per cent, respectively. The effects of the brief Brandeis educational experience on adult Jewish life style merit careful consideration.

**Marriage and Family Life**

Statistically significant differences in attitudes regarding intermarriage and the relative importance of love and religion as considerations in a marriage were found between 12-year-old youngsters who attended day schools and those of the same age in supplementary Jewish schools. Day-school students were strongly opposed to intermarriage, while pupils in one-day-a-week schools tended to be favorably inclined toward it.\textsuperscript{43}

The bulk of day-school students (84 per cent) did not consider love more important than religion as a factor in marriage; other respondents were more divided on this question. A majority of one-day-a-week students (52 per cent) believed love outweighed religion as a factor in marriage.\textsuperscript{44}

In Pollak's previously cited study\textsuperscript{45} of day school graduates, 70 per cent of 166 respondents were married, none out of the Jewish faith. The religious background of spouses was similar to that of respondents: about half of the graduates had married women from Orthodox homes, while 28 per cent married women with Conservative backgrounds. The others were either Reform or unaffiliated.

Recent studies indicated that the social class status of Orthodox Jews was not significantly different from that of the other segments of the American Jewish community.\textsuperscript{46} Although in the general population family size frequently has been found to be related to social class, among Jews family size appeared to be related to religious identification. Students enrolled in all-day schools or in colleges under Orthodox auspices had an average of 2.8 children in their families, compared to a mean of 2.2 children per family among students attending supplementary or public schools.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{44} Geller, “The Impact of Jewish Education . . .,” *op. cit.*, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{45} Pollak, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{47} Sanua, *ibid.*, p. 34.
Jewish Identification and "Generation Gap"

Defining what it means to be Jewish poses a problem for youngsters and their parents. An attempt to establish what "being Jewish" meant to a group of adolescents revealed that approximately 10 per cent were not able explain it. For 15 per cent it had a negative connotation; 30 per cent indicated it was something to be "liked" or to be "proud of." The rest could only give the prosaic answer that "it is a religion." This lack of clarity can be attributed in part to the parents' inability to give their children more than a vague understanding of their ethnic origin and its significance. Approximately 40 per cent of these adolescents did not know what "being Jewish" meant to their parents.

The problems encountered by parents in defining their Jewish identity were revealed in an interview survey of a sample of Jewish mothers. These women were described as going through the motions of such selected Jewish practices as lighting Hanukkah candles or attending seder on Passover, but their relative ambivalence in the matter of formal religion did not make Judaism particularly convincing to their children. Responses such as, "I would like my son to be confirmed because I don't want him to be different from the rest of us. But if he didn't want this, I wouldn't care, especially now that his grandparents are not alive," led the authors to conclude that these women's attitudes toward Judaism were less than positive, though they appeared to be positive about almost everything else:

Some wives spoke vaguely of how the Jewish religion would somehow endow their children with "security" for the future, but they made it sound much like an umbrella for somebody who is already bundled up in a raincoat. Certainly, the laissez-faire attitude they generally expressed about their children's future religious orientation was quite different from the zeal that the same women displayed when it came to making their children practice the piano.

Other investigations showed that "positive family attitudes and parental support are essential if Jewish children are to be committed to Jewish life." Adolescents who were highly identified with the Jewish group were likely to come from homes which they viewed as being similarly highly identified. The youngsters' psychological well-being was found to be positively related to the degree of identification. Supporting this finding was a report that yeshivah students showed a greater degree of emotional security, more positive

attitudes toward themselves, and a greater degree of self-acceptance than did Jewish children attending secular schools.\textsuperscript{52}

A comparison of religious observance by families of day-school and afternoon Hebrew-school students showed that the proportion of fully observant families was significantly greater in the day school group, and that the proportion of nonobservant families in the Hebrew-school group significantly exceeded random expectations.\textsuperscript{53}

The Jewish identification of parents is a pertinent variable in the study of the relationship between Jewish education and a child's identification with Judaism. A range of studies showed that:

1. Synagogue attendance of adolescents appeared to reflect frequency of attendance of their parents.
2. Of the adolescents with an extensive Hebrew education, 50 per cent indicated that dietary laws were observed in their homes. This response was given by only 25 per cent of the adolescents with a limited Hebrew education.\textsuperscript{54}
3. Little difference was found between the extent and degree of "religiousness" of parents and their children. There was no evidence to support conflicting views between the two generations.\textsuperscript{55}

Absence of generational conflict around adherence to religious tradition was illustrated by alumni of the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School.\textsuperscript{56} Over one-half of the respondents to a questionnaire considered themselves equally or more observant than their parents. They devoted some time during the week to Jewish study while pursuing secular careers, and managed to cope with pressures which might have deterred them had they not been sufficiently motivated.

There also was no "generation gap" in religious identification and practices between religiously oriented settlers in Israel and their parents.\textsuperscript{57} They did not share the growing alienation from Judaism of each new generation as it sought to align itself with a religious group making fewer demands for ritual observance and a distinct mode of life.

In summary, these findings show that there is only a very slight difference in religious practices between the generations. The frequently mentioned hypothesis that the younger generation is breaking away from the Jewish tradition is not supported by the available research evidence. A different

\textsuperscript{54} Victor D. Sanua, "The Relationship Between Jewish Education and Jewish Identification," \textit{Jewish Education}, Fall 1964, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{55} Sanua, "A Comparative Study of the Religious Attitudes . . . ," \textit{op. cit.}, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{56} Pinsky, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 182.
\textsuperscript{57} Engel, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 163.
hypothesis might fruitfully be studied: that the practices and attitudes of the young accurately reflect those of their elders.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Widespread alienation from Jewish life, particularly noticeable among young people, has increased uneasiness in segments of the American Jewish community that are dedicated to Jewish survival. More and more, education has been perceived as the most promising tool to remedy Jewish identity problems.

While American Jewry has enthusiastically seized on secular education as an appropriate vehicle to further career aspirations and facilitate upward social mobility, Jewish education has remained a peripheral enterprise for most American Jews. Preoccupation with secular education, to the exclusion of all else, was understandable for immigrants and first-generation Jews, whose primary goals were to make a decent living and become integrated into American society. Although these goals have now been fully achieved, Jewish education continues to remain peripheral.

Jewish education offers a body of knowledge which serves as a guide for ethical behavior and for a distinctive minority life style. Disillusionment with the marketplace values prevalent in American life has helped make deviant life styles more attractive. But the growing interest in such ethnic subcultures as the black and brown movements by nominally Jewish intellectuals does not yet extend to their acceptance of an identifiable Jewish subculture. While latent Jewish self-hatred is related to this curious bias, trends in the larger society are pressing for ethnic differentiation, and may force a shift in orientation among the intelligentsia.

A realistic assessment of Jewish education in America leads to the inescapable conclusion that supplementary Jewish education is a poorly conceptualized afterthought utilized by parents as a placebo for any guilt feelings they might otherwise have about their failure to expose their offspring to "the Jewish heritage." The day-school movement constitutes a distinct entity which provides a more complete Jewish educational experience. It meets the needs of Orthodox and other Jews who consider Jewish learning central to their lives.

Parental ambivalence about the importance of Jewish education is reflected in high drop-out rates from supplementary schools at the secondary level when the demands of music lessons and other extracurricular activities lead to the abandonment of Jewish studies. Even though attending Sunday or Hebrew school requires an investment of no more than two to four hours a week, only 16 per cent of youngsters of secondary-school age are enrolled in these schools.

Proliferation of subject matter, limited number of hours per week for instruction, and a variable teaching staff have been cited as reasons for the low retention rate in supplementary schools. Without trying to minimize
these reasons, this review of research on the effectiveness of Jewish education makes it abundantly clear that the interest and meaningful involvement of parents in Jewish life is a vital ingredient in the success of Jewish educational efforts. College-educated parents are experiencing difficulty in defining for themselves how to live as Jews, and this has put a strain on what Jewish education can accomplish with and for their children.

Despite these limitations, research findings clearly indicate that duration and intensity of Jewish education in childhood are positively related to an identifiable Jewish life style among adults, as they are to performance of mitzvot, synagogue attendance, and involvement with Israel and with the Jewish community. There was a difference between day school and supplementary school graduates in the extent of Jewish knowledge as well as in their adult life style. Day school graduates were strongly opposed to intermarriage. One survey of married day school graduates showed that not a single one had chosen a non-Jewish spouse.

While these results might have been anticipated, the finding that a disproportionately large percentage of American Jewish settlers in Israel were graduates of the day-school movement and/or religiously observant is not widely known. They not only came in greater numbers, but they were also more likely to remain in Israel permanently. Their childhood exposure to a total, positive Jewish school environment stimulated a desire to spend their adult life in a more total Jewish atmosphere. Also, the uncompromisingly traditional teaching in day schools promotes an orientation in which Jews are identified as a Chosen People with a special mission and with a country of their own—Israel.

The importance of a total Jewish environment is underlined by ideologically oriented summer camps. The Brandeis experience illustrates that in the space of a month a camper, who was removed from the ambivalence and occasional Jewish self-hatred of his family and had not previously had the opportunity to live in a Jewishly meaningful setting, could acquire a positive outlook toward Judaism.

This review found no evidence of a generation gap in Jewish identification and practices. On the contrary, the research findings indicate a high degree of congruence between the practices of parents and children in such areas as synagogue attendance, extent of "religiousness," and observance of ritual. Children of religious Jews were found to be as observant as their parents. One is left with the uncomfortable conclusion that the behavior of nonreligious young Jews often reflects the low level of their parents' Jewish involvement.

This conclusion finds support in the literature. Many parents consider

58 57.6 per cent of permanent settlers, compared to 45.3 per cent of returnees, considered themselves to be religiously observant. See Gerald Engel, "Comparison Between Americans Living in Israel and Those who Returned to America: Part II, Israeli Background," The Journal of Psychology, 1970, p. 247.
formal adherence to Judaism to be mostly a gesture toward their children's more devout grandparents. For others, it is a matter of pride in a historical people, but not too much else. According to sociologist Manheim Shapiro, Jewish children are often aware that their parents are saying, in effect, "Be as I say, not as I am," and that they want religious schooling "to make their children Jewish, but not too Jewish."^59

This ambivalence, often interlarded with Jewish self-hatred, poses a massive problem for the Jewish educator who is confronted, in the main, with a group which might be characterized as practicing "negative" Judaism. They have been born Jews and are gamely trying to make the best of it, although their Jewish educational background has provided them with only the most superficial knowledge of what Judaism is all about. As a result, Judaism offers them little that is positive. They look upon it as a burden to be carried, for it would not do to turn one's back on the Jewish people after the Holocaust and in the face of the constant threat to Israel's survival.

One positive approach to this endemic problem in Jewish life lies in the expansion and creation of educational facilities which not only dispense knowledge, but also provide a setting for acculturation to Judaism. In addition to the kind of day school now operating, the Jewish community requires boarding schools, particularly at the high-school level, that can serve as centers for Jewish socialization and house students from small Jewish communities who are being denied a Jewish education because of lack of boarding facilities. The socialization potential of summer camps for children with limited prior exposure to Jewish education has already been discussed. Among the more widely known camps with a clear ideological orientation are the Conservative movement's Ramah camps; the Histadruth Ivrit-spon-

sored Massad camps, and the Bnei Akiva camps of the Religious Zionists.

In areas of Jewish population concentration there is also a need for informal half-way houses where Jews of all ages, having a limited Jewish background, can correct the imbalance between their secular and their Jewish education. Here, children beyond elementary-school age and adults who become interested in Jewish studies but know no Hebrew can be provided with crash programs that will quickly allow them to study with their peers in a day school or adult education program. It has been suggested that day school expertise and teaching skills be applied in running these half-way houses.^^

Jewish community centers which, in the past, spurred assimilation^^ could provide the physical setting for current efforts to further Jewish learning.

In the Talmud it is written that the Jewish people and the Torah are like fish and water: the Jews cannot survive when taken out of the living waters

---

^59 Quoted in Schwartz and Wyden, *op. cit.*, pp. 264–266.


of the Torah. Graduates of traditional Jewish educational institutions were found to have both more knowledge and greater motivation to perpetuate Judaism than did those who completed other Jewish educational programs. This writer's survey of empirical research findings provides validation for the wisdom of the Sages. Hopefully, it will also stimulate greater community support in our time for institutions that are truly dedicated to Jewish survival.

PAUL WEINBERGER

62 Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Brochos, 61b.
THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY RESPONDS TO
ISSUES OF THE DAY: A COMPENDIUM*

JEWS COMMUNITY

Institutional Concerns

National Jewish Welfare Board voted to streamline its structure to help meet existing and emerging needs of Jewish individuals, groups, and communities more effectively (March 19).

Union of American Hebrew Congregations held an institute on synagogue tax problems for synagogue officers and administrators to clarify the effects of tax reform on religious organizations (May 6).

Union of American Hebrew Congregations launched a self-study that was to determine how Reform Judaism could help "secure the continuity of the Jew and Judaism a generation hence" (August 1).

National Jewish Welfare Board Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy was advised by Selective Service Commission that draft boards had been asked to grant requests, when possible, from Jewish registrants for postponement of physical examination or induction into Armed Forces during Jewish High Holy Days (September 1).

National Council of Jewish Women, in cooperation with women's divisions of American Jewish Congress and B'nai B'rith, launched new national program for adult Jewish education with seminar for 35 potential study group leaders on relevance of classical Jewish writings to current problems (September 28).

National Jewish Welfare Board and American Jewish Committee published booklet presenting problems and conflicts experienced by Jewish community center members, staff, and lay leaders, and recommending ways to overcome ambivalent attitudes among them (September 13).

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations and 14 national Orthodox organizations issued joint statement on Jewish survival, asserting validity of Torah law as sole basis for Jewish identity and practice (October 11).

Yeshiva University's rabbinical seminary alumni in convention examined problem of shortage of rabbis (November 9-10).

National Jewish Welfare Board announced 66 students had been granted fellowships valued at $166,400 to pursue graduate social work studies for careers in Jewish community centers (November 13).

National Jewish Welfare Board, in volume XIX of its Year Book, disclosed Jewish community center membership has steadily grown since end of World War II and is now 765,000 (November 20).

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America convened to consider Jewish identity, political action by synagogue forces, and generational differences (November 25-29).

American Jewish Committee New York Chapter called on all Jews "to repudiate the lawless and self-defeating conduct of the Jewish Defense League" (November 30). American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry condemned actions of Jewish Defense League as "counterproductive" to cause of Russian Jewry (December 21).

Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. announced establishment of Synagogue Corps to provide security for Jews in the inner cities of major urban areas (November 30).

Agudath Israel of America stressed as convention keynote the "total commitment to Torah law as sole guarantor of the survival of the Jew as an individual, of the Jewish people as a nation, and of Israel as a land of the Jews" (December 2).

National Jewish Welfare Board, American Association for Jewish Education, and Full-Time Executives of Jewish Communal Camps sponsored conference to examine new program ideas being tested at summer camps under Jewish auspices (December 4).

New York Association for New Americans provided in 1970 settlement, voca-

* Compiled mainly from press releases supplied by organizations.
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tional and rehabilitation services for 1,000 Jewish refugee families, representing 3,000 individuals, most of them from Poland, some from Arab lands (December 30).

**Jewish Education**

Torah Umesorah, at delegates assembly of principals, administrators, and parent representatives from 150 day schools in New York Metropolitan area, adopted resolution calling for a “strategy of confrontation politics” to obtain from New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies at least 30 per cent of its budget (about $6 million) for intensive Jewish education (January 8). At another convention, delegates from 400 day schools in United States and Canada discussed problems of communication between generations (February 12).

Central Conference of American Rabbis vice-president David Polish described Jewish education in United States “total and devastating failure” and asked that Reform synagogues spend $5 million of annual school budgets to send youngsters on part-time study programs to Israel (March 9).

Rabbinical Assembly of America at 70th annual convention discussed mainly Jewish education and how to increase pressures on Jewish federations and welfare funds to meet larger share of costs of intensive Jewish education, especially Jewish all-day schools (May 9).

American Association for Jewish Education at four-day meeting discussed blueprint for combating growing Jewish assimilation and recommended involvement of younger generation in social action programs based on Jewish ethical teachings and in teaching Judaism at home and in formal classes. Association voted to undertake $250,000 scientific study to determine residual effect of day school on its graduates (May 14-17).

Torah Umesorah announced “crash” program to provide United States and Canada during next decade with additional 200 Jewish day schools (November 15).

**Jewish Youth**

American Jewish Committee urged improvement of Jewish education in the United States as means of strengthening Jewish communal life and commitment to Judaism (December 6).

American Zionist Youth Foundation, Inc., in three conferences attended by students from 20 campuses on the West Coast, discussed: Jewish student “underground” newspapers; free universities; links between Israel and American Jewish community, and Israel and the Third World (January 3, February 6, February 13).

National Jewish Welfare Board invited young Jewish activists from college campuses to take part in 1970 Biennial Convention, which dealt with Zionism on campus, Jews in the campus rebellion, assimilation of Jewish students, and radical Judaism (March 18-22).

American Zionist Federation admitted young people as delegates to its founding convention, coopted three as members of the executive committee, two as vice presidents, and 12 as members of the national board (May 31).

National Jewish Welfare Board participated in sponsorship of International Israel Youth Festival attended by 100 American boys and girls, 15 to 17 years of age, and 500 youths from South America, South Africa, and Israel (July 15-August 5).

American Zionist Youth Foundation, Inc. at three-day conference considered problems of contemporary Zionist thought and the changing world Zionist movement (August 30-September 1). Its university service department sponsored seminar for campus representatives to examine such topics as peace movement and its implications, creation of a Jewish counter-culture, and establishing a university-sponsored program (September 4-6).

National Jewish Welfare Board research center published summary of findings on adolescents and their meaning for Jewish community center services to teenagers (October 23).
American Zionist Youth Foundation organized meeting of Jewish student activists from 90 campuses in United States and Canada with Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir to discuss various facets of U.S.-Israel-Arab relations (October 25).

Agudath Israel of America at mid-West convention considered “new methods to enable Orthodox Judaism to capture hearts of a groping youth, and their disillusioned elders” (November 20).

American Jewish Committee released findings of Jewish college freshman study prepared by American Council on Education, according to which Jewish young men and women were seen to retain some traditional life goals but rejected achievement values of parent generation (December 4).

Young Judaea, Hadassah's youth movement, held midwinter convention in Israel at which American high school seniors met with Israel Scouts to dramatize the ties between Jews of both countries (December 15).

Yeshiva University's Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary conducted seminar for teenagers from more than 50 cities in 9 states, offering basic instruction in Judaism, leadership, and group skills (December 24-30).

INTERFAITH

American Jewish Committee, cooperating with U.S. United Presbyterian Church, sponsored conference of ministers, rabbis, seminarians, and college professors to study ways of injecting moral values of religion into development of science (February 8-10).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith announced publication of first extensive body of instructional material on Jews and Judaism prepared especially for Christian parochial schools (March 26). Synagogue Council of America joined with Catholic and Protestant leaders in recommending that Congress pass the welfare reform bill under consideration (April 6).

American Jewish Committee and the division of theological studies of the Lutheran Council in U.S.A. co-sponsored academic colloquium on importance of Israel to Judaism and concept of land in Lutheran thought (May 26-27).


American Jewish Committee and Institute of Judaeco-Christian Studies of Seton Hall University co-sponsored four-day interreligious convocation of theologians and scholars in commemoration of fifth anniversary of Vatican's Conciliar Statement on Jews (October 25-28).

American Jewish Committee and department of theology of St. John's University co-sponsored lecture series on Catholic-Jewish relations (November 12, December 3, January 7).

American Jewish Committee made public results of five-year study on impact of Vatican Council II on interreligious understanding throughout Western world (December 4).

Synagogue Council of America and American Jewish Committee, as constituents of International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations, attended high-level meetings with Roman Catholic representatives in Rome to discuss plans to improve relations between the two communities (December 20-23).

American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with Evangelical Theological Society, invited 15 Jewish scholars and theologians to participate in Jewish-Evangelical dialogue as part of 22nd annual meeting of Evangelical Theological Society (December 29).

CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

American Jewish Congress (January 9) and American Jewish Committee's New
York chapter (January 14) expressed opposition to New York Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller's proposal to repeal Blaine amendment prohibiting state aid to parochial schools. Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America declared support for Rockefeller's stand favoring repeal of Blaine amendment (January 22).

Agudath Israel of America announced support of Parent-Aid (Speno-Lerner) bill introduced in New York State legislature to provide grants to parents of children in non-public elementary and high schools; saw measure as financial lifesaver for parents of children in yeshivot (February 4).

Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty (PEARL), statewide coalition of 25 civic, religious, and educational organizations including American Jewish Congress and American Jewish Committee, urged retention of constitutional ban on state aid to parochial schools (February 10).

PEARL charged Governor Rockefeller was working with legislators to "jam through Mandated Services Bill in Albany" that would "open state treasury to private and parochial secondary schools" by providing $28 billion to keep attendance and other records (April 10). American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and B'nai B'rith joined six major civil and religious institutions in appeal to New York State legislature not to rush bill through (April 17). American Jewish Congress announced, after bill's passage, it would file suit to challenge its constitutionality (April 21). Agudath Israel of America issued public call to ten Jewish organizations to drop plans to bring legal action against act (May 1). PEARL named Rockefeller as defendant in suit challenging constitutionality of act (July 27).

American Jewish Congress acting as plaintiff won two test cases, in Rhode Island and Connecticut, involving state aid to private and parochial schools. The courts held unconstitutional a law authorizing state to pay salaries of teachers of secular subjects in private and parochial schools (June 15, October 19).

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America supported federally-sponsored plan to set up an experimental "education voucher" system in several cities in 1971, although it was rejected by National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council (July 20).

Synagogue Council of America and National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, representing 13 major Jewish organizations, asked U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., to rule U.S. military academies may not compel cadets to attend religious chapel services (November 10).

National Council of Jewish Women called "education voucher" plan unconstitutional and "subversive of public education" since it would "subsidize religious schools and violate constitutional guarantees for separation of church and state" (November 17).

American Jewish Congress distributed to community relations councils and group relations agencies Suggested Guidelines for the Public Schools Concerning Religious Holidays, recommending "no religious celebrations . . . be held in public schools during the Christmas-Chanukah season, the Easter-Passover seasons, or other religious holidays" (November 27).

Agudath Israel of America censured American Jewish Congress and American Jewish Committee for "smearing the Yeshivos" in Supreme Court brief challenging constitutionality of state law which reimburses religious schools for certain expenses (November 27).

Joint Advisory Committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council objected to issue of Christmas postage stamp reproducing nativity painting as unconstitutional and bad public policy (December 16).

PEARL announced launching of "statewide campaign" opposing state legislature effort to provide state aid for parochial school tuition (December 31).
DISCRIMINATION AND ANTISEMITISM

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith published study of high school social-studies textbooks revealing "inaccuracy, omission and half-truths" mark treatment of American Negroes, Jews, and other minorities (May 9).

American Jewish Committee asked college and university administrators not to sponsor college or university functions at clubs having exclusionary membership policies based on race, religion, or ethnic origin (July 31).

Passion Play

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and National Community Relations Advisory Council protested federal financing of road leading to Eureka Springs, Ark., site of Passion Play, sponsored by family foundation of "notorious antisemite" Gerald L. K. Smith as "fostering] attendance at a manifestation of anti-Semitic bigotry" (January 20, February 16). American Jewish Congress, responding to accusation by Gerald Smith, acknowledged it had been active in attempting to stop grant for road construction (August 13).

New Left

Zionist Organization of America charged attacks of Leftists and militant blacks stemmed from Soviet propaganda and were designed to undermine Israel's position as a democratic nation in the Middle East (September 6). Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. warned that alliance of New Left, black militant extremists, and Arab propagandists is "becoming a threat of major proportions to Jewish communities throughout the world" (November 6).

American Jewish Committee president Philip E. Hoffman described New Left as "a global phenomenon" which "used anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism interchangeably" (December 5).

Black Panthers

American Jewish Committee charged that activities and statements of Black Panthers were so anti-Zionist and anti-Israel that it was almost impossible to make distinction between that attitude and antisemitism (February 15).

URBAN PROBLEMS

Plans to Ease Tensions

American Jewish Committee's New York chapter urged Mayor Lindsay to make City Commission on Human Rights full city department, with authority and budget to implement programs for easing inter-group tensions (January 22). American Jewish Congress announced establishment of National Commission on Urban Affairs to mobilize new attack on city problems through "joint efforts of labor leaders, college professors, and working poor among Negroes, Jews and other racial and ethnic groups" (February 1).

American Jewish Congress and Interracial Council for Business Opportunity announced joint sponsorship of "Project Transfer," program to arrange orderly sale of profitable businesses in New York City ghetto areas from white to black owners (March 1).

American Jewish Committee convened "National Consultation on Shaping Safer Cities" at which leaders of 30 national organizations considered new ways to reduce crime and create more effective criminal justice system (April 18).

American Jewish Committee's New York Chapter announced campaign to aid Jewish poor, elderly, and drug addicts in New York (April 19).

Synagogue Council of America organized seminar on urban problems for rabbinical students of three major New York City seminaries to study such urban phenomena as racial conflict, family conflict, problems of crime and narcotics, and needs of elderly (April 25).
American Jewish Committee presented ten-point program to help New York and other cities avert clashes over planned school decentralization, such as occurred in New York City in 1968-1969 (May 18).

Jewish Labor Committee urged members to vote in school board elections and provided list of preferred candidates who were pro-labor and advocated equal educational opportunity and integration (May 25).

American Jewish Committee and 15 civic, religious, and educational organizations called for "unassembled examination" as means of rapidly increasing number of black and Puerto Rican principals in New York City elementary schools (August 5).

American Jewish Congress established Information Center on Jewish-Negro Relations as repository of facts on current programs, activities, and studies relating to Negroes and Jews for use by 1,000 institutions, organizations, and individuals working in intergroup relations (August 10).

American Jewish Committee announced intensification of programs aimed at "defusing tensions between blacks and whites, students and workers, leaders and masses, government and cities"; at same time it moved to aid Jewish poor and merchants in inner-city neighborhoods (December 5).

Synagogue Council of America announced appointment of Robert Coleman, a black Jew, to head its division of social justice, with major responsibility for developing relations with black Jewish community and easing tensions between blacks and Jews in urban areas (December 15).

Racial Tensions

American Jewish Congress Commission on Urban Affairs, asserting hostility between Jews and blacks was caused by insufficient resources to meet human needs, called for coalition of Jews, blacks, and organized labor to demand more government funds for urban problems (May 22).

National Conference of Synagogue Youth of Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America urged Jewish federations and welfare boards to hand over hospitals in minority group areas to representatives of the local community and free federation money for Jewish education (July 13).

American Jewish Congress charged black militant student uttered a "gross libel" when he told delegates to United Nations World Youth Assembly that "Jews, predominantly" were the exploiting landlords of Harlem slum buildings (July 17).

Jewish Labor Committee asserted existence of antisemitism among black extremists must not give us "excuse to abandon common struggle for a more democratic social and economic system" (October 31).

American Jewish Congress denounced ouster of Dr. Arnold Einhorn by New York City's Lincoln Hospital and called for an investigation by Mayor John V. Lindsay and the City Health and Hospital Corporation. American Jewish Committee warned hospital against substituting political considerations for professional qualifications (November 19). Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith charged firing of Einhorn for "ethnic" reasons made Lincoln Hospital "guilty of racism" and violated civil rights (November 23).

SOCIAL ACTION

Civil Rights

National Community Relations Advisory Council urged Congress to repeal Emergency Detention Act because "concept of preventive detention is thoroughly repugnant to American tradition" (February 6).

Central Conference of American Rabbis predicted rise of revolutionary groups in United States unless government agencies replaced token civil rights and poverty programs with adequate projects to meet needs of Negroes, poor, and minority groups (February 12).

American Jewish Committee called on fellow Jews and all Americans to "stand firm against growing tide" eroding civil rights progress, especially administration and congressional attempts to slow down school
desegregation and administration efforts to weaken Voting Rights Act (March 11).
American Jewish Congress deplored President Nixon's statement on school integration, asserting he has "sounded the death knell of . . . efforts . . . to provide better racial and social class balance in the public classroom" (March 26).

Health and Education
American Jewish Committee called for presidential approval of $19.7 billion health and education appropriations bill passed by Senate January 20 (January 21). Torah Umesorah asked President Nixon not to veto bill so that programs aiding disadvantaged children in public and non-public schools in poverty areas could be maintained (January 23).
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith issued study of state universities throughout United States showing stronger trend to curtail out-of-state enrollment that would lead to "provincialism" and limitation of educational goals (March 31).
Workmen's Circle passed resolutions asking for all-inclusive national health program and full educational opportunity for all through college or vocational school (May 10).
Jewish Labor Committee advocated more federal and state aid to education for open enrollment and a quality education and stronger resistance to efforts to create separatist institutions, as well as full national health services for all (October 31).
American Jewish Congress testified before New York State Commission on Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, urging that state take over from local communities responsibility for school funding (November 13).
Torah Umesorah, as participant in White House Conference on Children, presented thinking of Hebrew day school movement on such subjects as expression of identity, educational techniques, and changing families in changing society (December 17). Hadassah presented to White House Conference on Children its experience in Israel that could help solve problems of day care and education for the disadvantaged in U.S. (December 18).

Dissent and Fair Trial
American Jewish Congress charged "Chicago Seven" were denied right to fair hearing by Judge and urged "guarantees of fair trial be applied to every person charged with crime" (February 18).
National Jewish Welfare Board convention discussed major concerns of American society and Jewish community: inner city problems, drug addiction, new needs of the aging, student rebellion on campus (March 13).
National Council of Jewish Women convention examined campus unrest and drug addiction (April 3).
Workmen's Circle expressed sense of outrage at fatal shooting of four students at Kent State University on May 4, and affirmed support of nonviolent dissent (May 10). Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America expressed shock at fatal shooting of Kent State University students, declaring these killings "indefensible attacks" against American democracy and right of public dissent (May 20).
Synagogue Council of America denounced fatal shooting incident at Kent State University and deplored "gulf that separates many of this nation's youth from the institutions of government" and its leaders (June 1).
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith protested increasing legislative restrictions on Constitutional liberties and called upon federal government to protect freedom of dissent (May 12).
American Jewish Committee and Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in cooperation with 32 religious, civil-rights, and labor organizations, sponsored publication of pamphlet summarizing and commenting on recommendations of final report by National Commission on Violence (May 13).
Jewish Labor Committee warned dissenters "not to trample on rights of fellow citizens" and asserted "right to dissent is basic civil liberty" (October 31).

Electoral Process and Voting Rights
American Jewish Committee recommended massive campaign to increase citizen participation in electoral process, with specific goal of at least 100 million voters in 1976 presidential election (April 1).
American Jewish Committee urged President Nixon to sign into law voting rights bill which would lower voting age to 18 (June 18).

Conscientious Objection and War
American Jewish Committee filed *amicus curiae* brief with U.S. Supreme Court in case of John Heffron Sisson, Jr., who refused induction into armed forces on grounds of moral and ethical conscientious objection, and claimed that section of Military Selective Service Act of 1967 permitting exemption by reason of "religious training and belief" was unconstitutional (January 8).
American Jewish Congress asked U.S. Supreme Court to extend right of conscientious objection to young men who oppose particular wars for personal moral rather than religious reasons (January 18) and to strike down provision of draft law limiting CO status to total pacifists (September 25).
Workmen's Circle expressed regret at increased American involvement in Vietnam war and hope for early end (May 10).
American Jewish Congress and American Jewish Committee called for removal of United States military personnel from Cambodia (May 6, 10).
American Jewish Committee convention resolved that America "avoid any enlargement of our military participation in Indochina," but that "nightmare of Vietnam" must not be replaced by "delusion of isolationism" (May 18).

Abortion
American Jewish Congress urged state assembly to pass "enlightened" abortion reform bill approved by state senate (March 30).
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and Rabbinical Council of America called "indiscriminate abortions a terrible danger to the moral underpinnings of our society" in criticism of recently passed New York State legislation (May 17).

SOCIAL WELFARE
American Jewish Congress announced support of congressional effort to restructure welfare system and recommended improvements in areas of social security, hospital and health insurance, minimum wage standards, elimination of discrimination in housing, education and employment, and expansion of moderate and low cost housing (April 14).
Workmen's Circle resolution recommended revision of tax policy to produce national income needed by a more equitable distribution of taxes; massive attack on housing shortage; extension of model cities program, and action against air and water pollution (May 10).
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America urged President Nixon to call "White House Conference on National Purpose and Unity" in view of "increased polarization of American people" (May 17).
Synagogue Council of America joined with United States Catholic Conference and National Council of Churches to proclaim June 1–7 "Welfare Reform Week" in support of President's proposals for welfare reform legislation. Council, speaking for five major rabbinic and synagogal agencies, expressed support for grape pickers strike under leadership of Cesar Chavez, calling it a "struggle for justice and human dignity" (June 1).
Hadassah called on U.S. government to take all necessary action for assuring full integration in public schools throughout country and to appropriate funds for adequate housing, especially for low and moderate income families (August 19).

Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A. warned that greatest dangers student unrest posed for United States were "polarization and abdication" (August 27).

American Jewish Congress national women's division saluted 50th anniversary of passage of 19th amendment, and called for fulfillment of its "inherent promise of equal opportunity for women" (August 26).

National Council of Jewish Women declared "Women's War" against hunger and instructed members to help implement federal school lunch legislation and assure that needy receive food stamps, surplus food commodities, and free school lunches (October 13).

Jewish Labor Committee advocated increased minimum wages; increased basic Social Security income; guaranteed employment for all; strict enforcement of equality of opportunity in apprenticeship and job training; adequate housing for low-income groups, and elimination of all discrimination in housing; utilization of all techniques to fight air and water pollution (October 31).

HUMANE CONCERNS

Immigration and Refugee Aid

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee reported: from December 1961 to December 1969, over 3,000 North African Jewish refugee families in France were granted loans to help pay for decent housing (May 28); it cared for 60,000 Jews who fled North Africa and Eastern Europe since June 1967 war, at cost of $4 million (October 14).

United HIAS Service helped 6,360 men, women, and children leave Eastern Europe, Middle East, North Africa, and Cuba, and resettle in United States and other free Western countries during 1969 (August 8).

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee distributed four million pounds of Food for Peace in first six months of 1970 to Jews in Israel, Iran, Morocco, and Tunisia (November 11).

UNITED NATIONS

American Jewish Committee applauded recommendation by Justice and State Departments to President Nixon to seek ratification of UN Genocide Convention tabled by U.S. Senate for 21 years (February 4). American Jewish Congress hailed President Nixon's "statesmanlike and far-seeing action" urging Senate ratification of convention (February 24).

Workmen's Circle asked President, the Senate and Foreign Relations Committee to take necessary steps for immediate ratification of convention (May 10). Jewish Labor Committee urged government to ratify Genocide Convention (October 31).

Hadassah, on occasion of 25th anniversary of the UN, commended it for achievements and urged it to take necessary action for peace with justice and freedom (August 19).

Hadassah reaffirmed support of Agency for International Development, calling its programs an important tool for international economic stability, social progress, and peace (August 19).

ISRAEL AND MIDDLE EAST

Support for State of Israel

American Jewish Committee issued policy paper urging United States not to yield to Arab and Soviet demands on Middle East; to reaffirm principle of direct negotiations for peace between concerned parties, and to meet Israel's request for military and economic assistance (January 14).

American Jewish Congress called on Nixon administration to bring both sides in Middle East conflict to conference and to provide Israel with "sufficient military power to defer attack" (January 14).

National Council of Jewish Women charged U.S. Middle East policy favoring
Four Power talks was impeding efforts to achieve lasting peace and urged direct negotiations between “people who have to live together” (January 22).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (CPMAJO) called National Emergency Conference on Peace in the Middle East to express “deep concern and apprehension” over U.S. policy statements on Middle East. Synagogue Council joined in urging U.S. administration to support direct dialogue between Israel and her Arab neighbors (January 25–26).

Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith responded to President Nixon’s statement to CPMAJO emergency conference, praising “public commitment by the United States to the sovereignty and safety of Israel” (January 26). American Jewish Committee called President’s statement “timely reassurance in the light of continuing unfriendly actions of the Soviet Union and France” (January 29).

American Zionist Federation was created by 13 Zionist organizations for purpose of unifying Israel-oriented action in behalf of aliyah, youth, Jewish education, public information and internal Jewish communal affairs (February 3).

Central Conference of American Rabbis, at convention in Israel, declared Yom Ha’atzmaut (Israel Independence Day) a new festival observance on its religious calendar; called for end to “second-class status for Reform rabbis” in Israel; pledged to work for preservation of united Jerusalem (March 6–10).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called on Japanese government and Expo ’70 authorities to intervene in Arab-instigated withdrawal of invitation to Israel to participate in fair’s opening ceremonies, March 15 (March 9).

National Jewish Welfare Board urged U.S. government to provide Israel with “essential military and economic” aid, to “stand firm against Soviet pressure,” and “bring both sides to the conference table” (March 22).

American Jewish Committee regretted U.S. decision not to sell additional aircraft to Israel but was encouraged by U.S. statement of “commitment to Israel’s independence, security and economic viability” (March 24).

Rabbinical Assembly of America recommended program to implement proposal that American Jews accept concept of cultural dualism, that “minority lives in America and majority lives in Israel” (April 9).

American Jewish Committee urged President Nixon, in view of reports that Russian pilots were flying fighters for United Arab Republic, to give “new and serious consideration” to Israeli requests for additional planes. Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. appealed to President to release more jets and “other equipment” to Israel (April 29).

Synagogue Council of America denounced Beirut conference in support of Palestinian Arabs which alleged Zionists manipulated “biblical texts for the purpose of political power,” and expressed shock at “unbelievable presumption” of Christians telling Jews they do not understand Old Testament (May 11).

American Jewish Committee statement on Middle East called on U.S. government to maintain balance of power, to counter encroachments of Soviet Union in Egypt by strong support of Israel, and to encourage “the parties to embark on negotiations for a just and lasting peace” (May 17).

Hadassah received $4,850,000 from Agency for International Development for purchase in the United States of supplies and equipment to expand teaching and research facilities at Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center (June 2).

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee pledged greater professional and financial support to improve Israel’s services for the aged and handicapped children (July 1).

National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) urged Jewish community relations agencies to try to convince American public opinion, particularly
young radicals, blacks, and Christian groups "unable to grasp concept of Jewish peoplehood," that Soviet intervention is threat to American interests in Middle East (July 1). American Council for Judaism called NCRAC statement "unwarranted support of basic Zionist ideology" and deplored use of term "Jewish peoplehood" (July 6).

National Jewish Welfare Board announced it was bringing 15 Israeli communal workers to join Jewish community center professional staffs as part of program to strengthen ties between American and Israeli centers and Y's (August 21).

American Jewish Committee called on U.S. to stand firm in commitment to Israel's security by making clear it would not tolerate "any tampering with the spirit or the letter of the cease-fire and standstill" agreement in Middle East (August 25).

American Zionist Youth Foundation called conference of Zionist youth movements in U.S. and Canada on problems of contemporary Zionist thought and changing world Zionist movement (August 30).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations voiced deep concern at "mounting level of Soviet military intervention in Egypt" and urged Nixon administration to strengthen Israel's ability to confront grave Soviet threat (July 8).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations accused two of Japan's leading auto manufacturers and Japan Air Lines of compliance with Arab economic boycott of Israel (July 15).

American Jewish Congress sponsored American-Israel dialogue in Israel; speakers recommended winning allegiance of young Americans by stressing Israel's "social accomplishments," not its "skill with arms, as necessary as this has come to be" (August 10).

Hadassah urged U.S. government to stop expansion of Soviet power in Middle East, grant Israel generous financial support, and achieve solutions consistent with Israel's viability as state (August 19).

American Jewish Congress asked U.S. insist on removal of Soviet missiles installed by Egypt along Suez Canal in violation of cease-fire agreement (September 2).

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee announced agreement with Hebrew University to institute Israel's first graduate program in social work, leading to master's degree (September 10).

American Zionist Federation sponsored Jewish leaders' seminar at which scholars and political experts recommended American Jews concentrate efforts on correcting false impression created by Palestinian claims (September 29). Jewish Labor Committee called on U.S. to extend all possible aid to Israel to insure adequate defensive capability (October 31).

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America launched program to promote aliyah and guide settlers through period of adjustment in Israel (November 4).

American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with Hebrew University's Harry S. Truman Research Institute and Israel Inter-Faith Committee, sponsored colloquium on "Religion, Peoplehood, Nationalism and Land"; 75 major scholars and religious leaders from the five continents considered how to lessen tensions throughout world (November 1–8).

Agudath Israel of America urged German ambassador to United States to intervene with German firm sponsoring auto races in Israel for postponement of event from Sabbath to weekday (November 16).

American Jewish Congress accused American Friends Service Committee of "unconscious anti-Jewish bias" in its report, "Search for Peace in the Middle East" (December 20).

Arab Terrorism

American Jewish Congress, responding to destruction of Israel-bound Swissair plane, called for sealing off from air travel all Arab countries whose governments provide "protection and support that make
American Jewish Community responds to issues

Arab terrorism possible" (February 24). Union of American Hebrew Congregations, responding to bombing of Swiss airliner, near-fatal bombing of Austrian airplane, and machine gun attack on tourist bus in Hebron, called on responsible leaders to take adequate steps to thwart Arab terrorism and impose sanctions on Arab states which encourage lawlessness (February 24). Poale Zion, United Labor Zionist Organization of America, asked International Labor Movement to enforce "peaceful passage on our airways by refusing to service or fly aircraft of those countries who continue to shelter and encourage Arab terrorists engaged in hijacking and murder in the air" (February 27).

American Jewish Congress convention delegates said kaddish outside Lebanese Embassy in Washington, D.C., for 13 persons killed in a school bus attacked by Arab terrorists near Lebanese border (May 24). American Jewish Committee urged United States to exert every effort to convince Arab countries and United Nations that "toleration of such acts . . . gravely intensifies dangers of war in area." Synagogue Council of America expressed grief over incident and called on world leaders to "dissociate themselves from activities which lend moral and practical support to murderous objectives of Arab terrorist organizations" (May 25). Poale Zion expressed horror at terrorist ambush and deplored silence of "respected organizations in community" (May 26).

American Jewish Congress criticized U.S. proposals for deterring air hijacking as "hesitant, half-way measures" that fail to deal with problems "in a manner commensurate with danger" (June 19). Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith called release and pardon of seven Arab terrorists by Greek government "a dangerous precedent which threatens international aviation" (August 13). United Synagogue of America called on United Nations to adopt convention whereby no country would yield to threats of violence, ransom, and blackmail (August 18). American Jewish Committee (September 8), Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (September 9), Poale Zion (September 10), National Council of Jewish Women (September 11), Synagogue Council of America (September 11) urged U.S. government to take action against countries that aid and abet hijackers, expressing dismay on hijacking of plane to Jordan and separation of passengers on basis of religion. American Jewish Congress called on King Hussein of Jordan to warn Arab terrorists holding two planes captive that their own lives would be forfeit if anything happened to passengers (September 9). American Jewish Committee (September 16), Agudath Israel of America (September 17) lauded President Nixon's insistence on nondifferentiation among American hostages in negotiations with Palestine guerrillas. Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. registered protest to Columbia Broadcasting System for permitting terrorist Leila Khaled to "justify her criminal behavior" on nationally televised program (October 30).

**Jews in Arab Countries**

American Jewish Committee reported Libya took new steps to deprive Jews having property in that country of its use or income (March 14).

**Antisemitism in Western Europe**

**France**

American Jewish Congress condemned France's sale of 100 combat aircraft to Libya as "shabby pursuit of influence and oil rights among the sheikdoms and dictatorships of the Arab world" (January 22). Poale Zion urged France to reconsider its "dangerous decision" to supply war planes to Libya (February 9). New York Board of Rabbis and New York Jewish Community Relations Council sponsored picketing at Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, where French President Pompidou attended dinner, to express opposition to French policies in Middle East (March 2).
Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations expressed dismay at Pompidou's sudden decision to cancel his meeting with Jewish leaders and pointed out majority of Frenchmen repudiate their government's Middle East policies (March 2).

American Jewish Congress sharply criticized President Pompidou for telling Jewish groups that Israel must cease being a "racial and religious state" and become a "state in the geographical sense like all other states" (March 4).

**Oberammergau Passion Play**

American Jewish Committee's comparative analysis of 1960 and 1970 versions of Oberammergau Passion Play showed latter contained fewer overtly anti-Jewish references, but remained fundamentally hostile to Jews and Judaism (March 26). Committee said it would embark on decade-long educational program to counteract antisemitic effects of play (August 5).

American Jewish Congress and Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith called on Archbishop of Munich not to attend or associate himself with Oberammergau Passion Play because text remains "deeply hostile to Jews and Judaism" (March 30). Both organizations commended a statement by the Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations of the U.S. Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, labeling play offensive to Austrians and Jews (July 17).

### ANTISEMITISM IN EASTERN EUROPE

American Jewish Committee Paris office reported Jews in Soviet Union resisting official pressures to discourage emigration; described growing efforts of Georgian Jews to emigrate to Israel (January 30).

Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., referring to staged Moscow press conference at which Jews expressed anti-Israel sentiment, deplored "cynical use of captive, helpless Jews in the Soviet Union to exploit its anti-Israel policies" (March 9).

American Conference on Soviet Jewry* denounced Soviet denial of self-expression for Jews and refusal to grant them permission to emigrate to Israel. Laundered declaration of 39 Soviet Jews asking permission to emigrate (March 12).

Synagogue Council of America accused Soviet Union of compelling Soviet Jews "to deny spiritual links with the land and people of Israel" (March 17).

National Jewish Welfare Board called on affiliated Jewish community centers and YM-YWHA's to cooperate with American Conference on Soviet Jewry in fight for rights of Soviet Jews (March 22).

American Jewish Congress on Soviet Jewry urged House Foreign Affairs Committee to ask State Department to raise issue of antisemitism in USSR directly with Soviet Foreign Ministry (April 13).

Jewish Labor Committee held Labor Conference in support of Soviet Jewry (May 4).

American Jewish Committee condemned continued use of antisemitism in Soviet Union for political purposes. Pledged to focus world opinion on plight of Soviet Jews (May 17).

American Jewish Congress convention delegates in Washington, D.C., demonstrated in front of Soviet Embassy to urge end of suppression of Jews in Soviet Union (May 23).

American Conference on Soviet Jewry and Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews cosponsored meeting at which declaration of solidarity with Soviet Jews, signed by nearly 170 American artists, writers, educators, and other intellectuals, was made public. Copies of declaration were sent to Communist party chairman Leonid I. Brezhnev and Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin (May 28).

American Zionist Federation expressed strong opposition to Soviet policy of dis-* For excerpts from a report of conference's 1970 activities, prepared by Abraham J. Bayer of NCRAC and submitted to the World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry, at Brussels in February 1971, see Appendix to compendium.
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criminal against Jewish citizens (May 31).
American Jewish Committee called on
Soviet Union to stop campaign of anti-
Jewish propaganda and grant Jews same
religious and cultural rights enjoyed by
other national minorities (June 2).
American Jewish Conference on Soviet
Jewry charged Soviet Union with exploiting
alleged attempted hijacking "as means of
persecuting Jews who have sought per-
mission to leave Soviet Union to go to
Israel" (June 22).

Hadassah urgently appealed to Soviet
leaders to permit emigration of Jews to
Israel and to grant Jewish citizens same
religious and cultural rights as other
Soviet citizens (August 19).

New York Conference on Soviet Jewry,
composed of New York Jewish Community
Relations Council, New York Board of
Rabbis, and Student Struggle for Soviet
Jewry, organized demonstration near UN
as part of World Day for Soviet Jewry.
New York sections of all national Jewish
organizations participated (September 17).

American Jewish Congress national officers
picketed Soviet Mission to United Nations
in week between Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom
Kippur to dramatize solidarity with Russian
Jews (October 5–9).

North American Jewish Youth Council
sponsored Simhat Torah Mobilization for
Soviet Jewry in Washington, D.C., at which
over 2,000 Jewish youth leaders marched
with local community and met with State
Department officials (October 11–12).

Jewish Labor Committee condemned anti-
semitic policies of Polish and Soviet gov-
ernments, calling on them to end such policies
(October 31).

American Jewish Committee contradicted
Soviet official denial of antisemitism and
revealed "more than 200 petitions from
Soviet Jews have already been made public
outside of the Soviet Union" (October 30).

American Jewish Congress charged in a
"hot line" (telephone recording device)
message that "notorious antisemite" S.Y.
Soloviev, chief city prosecutor of Leningrad,
was preparing case against 31 Jews ar-
rested in 4 cities for alleged hijacking. Described action as part of Soviet policy
decision to crack down on Jews attempting
to leave for Israel (November 15).

American Jewish Conference on Soviet
Jewry announced heads of 27 major na-
tional Jewish organizations had cabled
Soviet President Nikolai Podgorny, chal-
ling validity of Leningrad trial of 31 Jews (November 18).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
made public U.S. State Department
response to appeal on behalf of six Soviet
Jews seeking emigration to Israel. The
State Department expressed "strong con-
cern" but also fear that American inter-
cession would do more harm than good
(November 24).

American Jewish Congress deplored bomb-
ing of Soviet offices in New York as harm-
ing cause of Soviet Jewry (November 25).

American Jewish Conference on Soviet
Jewry called trial of Leningrad Jews a
travesty of justice (December 15).

American Jewish Conference on Soviet
Jewry and Conference of Presidents of
Major Jewish Organizations led demon-
stration of 10,000 against trial of Leningrad
Jews (December 20).

American Jewish Committee called on
Soviet government to reverse death sen-
tences reportedly requested by prosecutor
in trial of Leningrad Jews, to "release all
defendants, and to permit all who wish to
do so to emigrate" (December 22). Re-
ported increasing apprehension among
Czechoslovak Jews and fears of a repeti-
tion of the purges of the 1950's since the
coming to power of Gustav Husak
(December 23).

American Jewish Conference on Soviet
Jewry and Conference of Presidents of
Major Jewish Organizations called national
emergency conference on Soviet Jewry in
Washington, D.C., which was attended by
400 American Jewish leaders (December
30).

Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. asserted
death sentence imposed on two Soviet Jews was "another indication that the Soviet Union is pursuing a relentless antisemitic crusade against its Jewish citizens" (December 29).

American Jewish Committee president applauded commutation of death sentences in both Leningrad and Basque trials (December 31).
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American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry
Summary Report of Activity During 1970


* * *

The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry (AJYB, 1969 [Vol. 70], pp. 111-118) is the organizational instrumentality through which its 28 constituent national Jewish organizations coordinate their activities for Soviet Jewry. One of the constituents, the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, which contributes the staff to AJCSJ, includes within its membership autonomous local Jewish community relations agencies in 87 cities and maintains continual communication with the central communal organization in some 150 other cities. . . . The contributions of individual constituent organizations to programs . . . are not specified, except in the case of responsibilities undertaken on assignment by or at the request of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry or by agreement within it. . . .

Statements by Governors and Mayors

Toward the close of 1969, a coordinated campaign was launched for signatures of state governors on a statement on behalf of Soviet Jewry. The campaign continued through February, 1970. By then 30 governors had endorsed the statement as had scores of mayors and state legislators. Maximum public impact of this official recognition of the plight of Soviet Jewry was achieved as a result of the publicity attendant upon the signings, which took place in many cases at public ceremonies. Paid advertisements were published in many cities to add to the impact. Wherever possible, the public acts were tied in with Human Rights Day and the festival of Chanukkah. Many Jewish communities sponsored a special “Sabbath for Soviet Jewry” to give the proclamations reinforced emphasis.

Response to Soviet Anti-Semitic Campaign

By February, 1970, the new Soviet anti-Jewish campaign, designed to terrorize and intimidate Soviet Jews into ceasing their thrust toward Jewish self-expression and abandoning their determined requests for permission to emigrate, was already evident. It was met, of course, by an intensification of efforts to sensitize the American people to the oppressive official treatment of Russian Jews by the Soviet regime. The famous open declaration of 39 Soviet Jews in protest against the Soviet government’s staged press conference was given wide dissemination in the United States. Many petitions by Soviet Jews, seeking help in their efforts to emigrate were publicized in the United States; special efforts being made to obtain wide circulation for them in places where the petitioners had relatives living in America. Several hundred intellectuals at a press conference and in a published petition joined in declaring their solidarity with Soviet Jewry. This declaration subsequently was endorsed by more than 1300 leading faculty members in some 100 American colleges and universities.

An Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry, comprising 3200 faculty members of 180 North American institutions of higher education, with Professor Hans J. Morgenthau of New York City College as chairman, conducted a symposium on Soviet anti-Semitism at Harvard University. It was attended by 500 faculty members and students. The Committee also launched a new scholarly newsletter on Soviet Jewry, Review. (It also published the booklet, “A Hero for Our Time: The Trial and Fate of Boris Kochubiyevsky,” referred to below.)
Thousands of Americans cabled their revulsion against the oppressive campaign to the Soviet Embassy in Washington. During the period around Pesach, there were many “Exodus marches” and outdoor Sedarim for Soviet Jewry. In New York City over 25,000 people, in a record attendance, marched to the United Nations in a dramatic demonstration. Advertisements were published in the New York Times and other newspapers, “calling on the government of the Soviet Union in the name of humanity to cease their travesty on human rights.”

Over one million copies of a “Matzoh of Hope” plea, for incorporation in or use in conjunction with the Seder service, were circulated in English, Hebrew and Yiddish, and it was reprinted widely in newspapers and other publications. Thousands of copies of this statement were sent to organizations and groups outside the United States, and it achieved world-wide circulation.

The output of publications on Soviet Jewry was increased during this period. 150,000 copies of a new version of the “Fact Sheet on Soviet Jewry” were circulated; a montage of anti-Semitic cartoons appearing in the Soviet press was distributed on campuses and in communities in large numbers; the booklet “Redemption: Jewish Freedom Letters From Russia,” (published in conjunction with the non-sectarian Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews) was circulated widely to the non-Jewish and Jewish community. The Booklet “A Hero for Our Time: the Trial and Fate of Boris Kochubijevsky,” was also circulated in large numbers; posters were widely disseminated and their impact was increased greatly by reproduction in magazines, Jewish organizational publications, Jewish communal periodicals, and elsewhere.

All the 28 national member organizations of the AJCSJ stepped up the frequency of memoranda, programmatic recommendations and directives to their memberships to embrace Soviet Jewry activities locally and nationally. News and feature material was provided to editorial writers, TV and radio stations and other channels—depicting the worsening situation of Jews in the Soviet Union—on a larger scale. A number of regular, periodic radio programs on Soviet Jewry were initiated; and these continue to be sustained.

Regional Conferences

Four major regional conferences on Soviet Jewry were held during the first half of the year: in Cleveland, Ohio, for the midwestern states, on February 28; in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the mideastern states, on March 8; in San Francisco, California, for the western states, on May 16; and in Atlanta, Georgia, for the southern states, on June 6. More than 500 local Jewish community and student leaders attended these regional conferences, which sparked new programs in many areas where there previously had been no activity on behalf of Soviet Jewry, and resulted in the creation of new committees and other mechanisms to intensify such activity. The fruits were evident in the ensuing months as the intensity of the effort to arouse American opinion mounted in cities throughout the United States.

Revulsion at Hijacking Charges

The alleged hijacking charge against a group of Soviet Jews and the subsequent trial and convictions in Leningrad . . . gave great impetus to the activities of American Jewish organizations. Conferences were held with public officials at every level, national, state and local; a number of these were open press conferences, at which opportunity was seized to stress the imperiled state of Jewish life and the insecurity of Jews in the Soviet Union.

A number of Senators and Representatives publicly denounced the arrests and accompanying harassments of Soviet Jews.

Demonstrations were staged in larger cities.
Several cities sponsored "Freedom Fasts," coinciding with Tisha b'Av, and also utilized the August 12 anniversary of the execution of Jewish intellectuals and writers to focus on the Soviet official uses of anti-Semitism. Special materials for observing these two occasions were supplied to Jewish summer camps.

In conjunction with various Jewish communities around the world, large demonstrations were conducted in several cities on September 20, designated as World Day For Soviet Jewry, including one that drew some 10,000 people in New York City at the United Nations.

**Visiting Soviet Exhibits and Performances**

Visiting Soviet performing companies and a traveling Soviet photo exhibit provided opportunities for dramatic peaceful confrontations. Counter photo exhibits, portraying the anti-Semitic campaign in the Soviet Union, were mounted in a number of cities. Paid advertisements and tens of thousands of leaflets distributed at the sites of the photo exhibits drew public attention to the plight of Soviet Jewry.

In some 20 cities, peaceful demonstrations were mounted outside the halls in which the visiting Moiseyev Ballet was performing. The actual performances were not disturbed. Extensive publicity was obtained through distribution of materials and advertisements and through meetings with members of the ballet company. In New York Jewish young people performed dances in front of the theater as a means of directing attention to the suppression of Jewish cultural and artistic expression within the USSR. Similar activities were staged in several cities in connection with appearances by a company of Siberian dancers and singers and the Moscow Ice Circus.

**Communications to Soviet Jews**

To communicate solidarity directly with Soviet Jews, thousands of Rosh Hashanah greeting cards were sent to synagogues in the Soviet Union. Synagogue addresses and a format for greetings in Russian were supplied to over 200 Jewish communities and to student groups on some 200 campuses.

In a similar mail campaign, on a wider scale, tens of thousands of cards and letters were sent by individual Americans within a 90-day period to the families of those imprisoned in connection with the alleged hijacking, expressing support and sympathy. This campaign continues, and there is accumulating evidence from Russia of its effectiveness.

At the same time, thousands of individual cables were sent to the leadership of the Soviet Union in Moscow.

In a related campaign, packages were despatched to the prisoners and their families.

**Simchat Torah Demonstrations of Solidarity With Soviet Jewish Youth**

Since 1968, Simchat Torah rallies have been conducted in American communities in solidarity with the Soviet Jewish youth who gather annually in front of synagogues in the Soviet Union at that holiday time. In 1970, almost 100 communities conducted such celebrations around the dates of October 18-22; and there were an as yet untabulated number of similar observances on campuses all across the nation.

During the summer and autumn, scores of newspapers and magazines published articles about the state of Soviet Jewish life, featuring photographs of those arrested on the hijacking charge. Stickers, posters and, other publicity aids, designed to focus public attention on Soviet Jewry, were distributed in large quantities during this period.

A national youth mobilization—the first of its kind—was convened in Washington, D.C. the week prior to Simchat Torah. Under the auspices of the North American Jewish Youth Council—and with the cooperation of several national organizations and the local Jewish community—almost 3,000 Jewish high school and college student leaders from coast to coast conducted a two-day conference on how to augment work for Soviet Jewry.
in the United States. Delegations of young people met with officials of the State Department, and with Congressmen and Senators, seeking their public support. The Secretary of State sent a message of support to the participants. The gathering concluded with a massive demonstration in front of the Soviet Embassy.

**Leningrad Trial**

When it became apparent that Soviet anti-Semitic propaganda was preparing the world for the trial and conviction of those arrested in June, the American Jewish community . . . responded with renewed energy.

A massive advertising campaign in major newspapers across the country called attention to the real purpose of the trial—the repression of Jewish assertiveness and the frightening of Jews into ceasing to seek permission to emigrate.

Pictures of the imprisoned, whose number had risen to 36 since June, were again widely used.

“Spot” radio announcements were developed and supplied for placement with broadcasting facilities throughout the country. Such announcements by a number of well-known entertainment personalities were actually taped and supplied to 200 communities for use on local radio stations.

New automobile bumper stickers were created, carrying messages to “Free Russian Jews” and “Justice For Soviet Jews”.

A special background survey entitled “Soviet Jewish Political Prisoners” was circulated; almost 150,000 copies had been distributed by the date of this report.

Rabbinic, synagogal and Jewish community groups pressed the organization of meetings, locally and nationally, with Protestant church councils and Catholic diocesan bodies; and hundreds of statements of condemnation of the Soviet campaign of harassment and persecution of Jews were issued in the names of Christian ministers and church organizations.

On the eve of the first scheduled trial, over 2,000 people filled the Washington National Cathedral at an interfaith rally. In many Christian congregations, signatures on petitions were collected at Sunday services. Religious news and radio programs urged prayers.

In answer to the constantly growing concern of Jewish leadership to be kept informed of developments and plans, a “hot line” recorded telephone service was inaugurated in a number of cities; callers heard a recorded statement, which was revised as frequently as necessary to keep it current.

**National Emergency Leadership Conference—Washington, D. C., Dec. 30**

The announcement of the convictions and sentences in the Leningrad Trial set off a new and vigorous campaign, including a demand for commutation of the two death sentences . . . 500 Jewish leaders from 55 cities in 36 states were assembled in a National Emergency Leadership Conference in Washington, D.C. on 4 days notice. This conference was jointly sponsored by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations.

Concurrently—or within days—similar conferences and mass rallies were held in communities all over the country.

Outstanding Catholic and Protestant leadership, labor leadership, black leadership and others joined with these hundreds of Jewish delegates to the Washington Conference in denouncing the Soviet political use of judicial process and protesting the barbarity of the sentences. Delegations from the conference met with key American officials, including members of Congress. The delegation also called upon the Embassies of 13 foreign governments, requesting intervention on grounds of humaneness and justice. The climax of the conference were the meetings of Rabbi Herschel Schacter, Chairman of the
American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, Dr. William Wexler, Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations and Max Fisher, President of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, with the Secretary of State and later that same day with the President of the United States.

A special press conference of outstanding intellectuals was held during the Emergency Conference. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives adopted strong resolutions.

Government and U.N. Representations

On several occasions in 1970, delegations visited with the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., the American representative to the Human Rights Commission of the U.N., and the Director of the *Voice of America*. Meetings also were held with the Assistant Secretary of State for Europe and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Soviet Affairs and various officials of the USSR division. United States representatives pressed the question of Soviet treatment of Jews in United Nations forums.

During the year, the case of Leonid Rigerman, a young Jew whose persistence in seeking access to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow despite harassment by the Soviet police, gained wide publicity. His U.S. citizenship finally was certified by the U.S. State Department.

There was expanded reporting on Soviet Jewry by the *Voice of America*. The VOA has received with favor program and subject recommendations prepared by a special staff group.

Community and Campus Tours by Russian Emigres

In response to the desire of thousands of Americans to learn about the conditions of Soviet Jewry first hand from . . . Jews who have recently left the Soviet Union, the AJCSJ sponsored public appearances of such recent emigres throughout the months of November and December 1970 and January and February 1971.

Three signers of the famous letter of the 39 were among the four people who visited over 30 large cities and many university campuses, meeting with Jewish community leadership, government officials, the media, student groups and Christian clergy. Their poignant stories of the struggle for Jewish identity and the wish of thousands of Jews to leave the Soviet Union and live in Israel received wide publicity and implanted fresh insights into the plight of Soviet Jewry in the minds of many Americans. . . .

* * *