Trends and Developments in Jewish Education

In September 1969, the Department of Statistical Research and Information of the American Association for Jewish Education launched a number of surveys to identify some of the basic trends and developments in Jewish education. In each case, the sample was selected in accordance with the limited goals of the specific survey. Among the areas of concern were: total Jewish school enrollment; the all-day school, its enrollment, per-pupil costs, and subsidies by federations and welfare funds; salaries of full-time teachers; tuition-fee scales; and communal support of local Jewish education.

All the data presented below are based on figures reported in the respective survey samples. The various findings are subject to the usual liabilities associated with the use of the questionnaire as a research tool, e.g., dependence on the honesty of respondents, and the reliability of their interpretation of the questionnaire items.

Jewish School Enrollment

The population selected for the enrollment survey was limited to the communities having a central Jewish education agency. On the basis of earlier research and the estimated size of the Jewish population, it was assumed that information could thus be obtained about 90 to 95 per cent of the Jewish school population. In view of recent Jewish population shifts from urban to rural areas, this assumption may no longer be tenable.

Census survey forms were sent in 1969–70 and 1970–71 to 86 local central agencies for Jewish education: 43 bureaus or boards of Jewish education and central school systems, and 43 federation committees on Jewish education. While responses were received from a total of 54 agencies (63 per cent)—32 bureaus and central school systems (74 per cent), and 22 federation committees (51 per cent)—only 42 of them supplied usable data. Only 33 of the communities involved had provided comparable data for the 1966–67 census.

The 1969–70 survey sample comprised a total of 24 reporting communi-
ties believed to represent 74.9 per cent of the total estimated Jewish population of the United States. The sample was composed of:

- 5 cities with a Jewish population in excess of 150,000;
- 7 cities with a Jewish population of 40,000–149,999;
- 5 cities with a Jewish population of 15,000–39,999;
- 7 cities with a Jewish population of less than 15,000.

The 1970–71 survey sample included a total of 33 reporting communities believed to represent 76.8 per cent of the total estimated Jewish population of the United States. This sample was composed of:

- 5 cities with a Jewish population in excess of 150,000;
- 7 cities with a Jewish population of 40,000–149,999;
- 8 cities with a Jewish population of 15,000–39,999;
- 13 cities with a Jewish population of less than 15,000.

Forty-two communities, representing 78.1 per cent of the total estimated Jewish population, were used to arrive at the estimated total pupil enrollment for 1970–71. The sample included:

- 5 cities with Jewish populations in excess of 150,000;
- 8 cities with Jewish populations of 40,000–149,999;
- 15 cities with Jewish populations of 10,000–49,999;
- 14 cities with Jewish populations of less than 10,000.

In almost all instances, the reporting agencies specified that their data pertained only to schools affiliated with them. It must be assumed, therefore, that the true enrollment in most communities was higher than reported. Since the agencies reported only the over-all enrollment figures for their respective communities, and only relatively few listed the names of the affiliated schools or the number of schools included, it is not possible to estimate the number of unreported children attending unaffiliated Jewish schools in these communities.

**Summary of Findings**

While this survey included only a limited sampling of communities and schools, and the reported enrollment in many instances may have been incomplete, there nonetheless were sufficient data to warrant a number of limited conclusions (Table 1):

1. In 24 reporting cities, over-all Jewish school enrollment declined 8.7 per cent from 1966–67 to 1969–70 (a mean annual decline of 2.9 per cent), and 4.9 per cent from 1969–70 to 1970–71, representing a total decline of 13.1 per cent from 1966–67 to 1970–71 (a mean annual decline of 3.3 per cent).

2. In 33 reporting communities (including the above), over-all Jewish school enrollment declined 12.9 per cent from 1966–67 to 1970–71 (a mean annual drop of 3.3 per cent).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Reported Enrollment</th>
<th>Per Cent Change in Enrollment</th>
<th>Mean Annual Per Cent Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>9,573</td>
<td>8,121</td>
<td>7,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>14,556</td>
<td>13,278</td>
<td>12,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>26,659</td>
<td>23,437</td>
<td>22,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>9,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich. (Detroit, Mich.)</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>2,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County, N.J. (Newark)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>7,342</td>
<td>6,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>25,142</td>
<td>23,859</td>
<td>22,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Fla.</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>11,039</td>
<td>11,171</td>
<td>11,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>2,381,000</td>
<td>140,176</td>
<td>130,216</td>
<td>122,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>23,945</td>
<td>19,381</td>
<td>18,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>4,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, Calif.</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>5,498</td>
<td>4,799</td>
<td>4,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,318,500</td>
<td>284,478</td>
<td>258,874</td>
<td>245,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, N.Y.</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Mo.</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minn.</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, R.I.</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>2,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, N.Y.</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Reporting Cities</td>
<td>111,500</td>
<td>13,845</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>11,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Reporting Cities</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>22,792</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Jewish Population</td>
<td>Reported Enrollment</td>
<td>Per Cent Change in Enrollment</td>
<td>Mean Annual Per Cent Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn, Mass.</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>2,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, Calif.</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Minn.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah, Ga.</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady, N.Y.</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Mass.</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester, Mass.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reporting Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>102,775</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,494,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>265,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Reporting Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,607,275</td>
<td></td>
<td>278,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes only cities that reported parallel data for at least two of the sample school years.

* Includes data for United Hebrew Schools only.

* Does not include the Hebrew Institute.

* Estimated.
3. While the five intermediate-size Jewish communities manifested a decline of 9.7 per cent, and the 12 largest cities a decline of 9.0 per cent from 1966–67 to 1969–70, the 13 smaller communities showed an increase of 6.9 per cent during the same period. The data in Table 1, however, reveal that enrollment changes fluctuated widely within each group of cities.

4. From 1966–67 to 1970–71, all three population categories showed a decline in enrollment, with the greatest (13.5 per cent) in the 12 largest communities, followed by the eight intermediate-size communities (10.1 per cent). The smallest drop (3.7 per cent) occurred in the smaller communities. Again, it should be noted that enrollment changes varied widely within each group of cities, as illustrated by the decline of 14.4 per cent in five of the reporting medium-size cities and the increase of 5.5 per cent in seven of the smaller communities.

5. The decline in Jewish school enrollment in almost all reporting communities can be attributed to a combination of factors. Responses to a questionnaire addressed to the agencies reporting drastic declines in enrollment pointed to four major causal factors: fewer young couples in the community; reduced Jewish birth rate; lack of parental interest, and Jewish population movement to suburban areas. Of somewhat lesser importance are an increased pupil dropout rate and high congregational membership dues. Also, the growth of congregational schools brought a decrease in communal-school enrollment.

The likelihood is that the decline in Jewish school enrollment is related to all the suggested factors. Yet, additional exploration is required to ascertain whether all variables contributing to the enrollment problem have been identified. Furthermore, the currently available evidence is insufficient to fully verify or explain the respective roles of any of the factors already identified. At present, we can only cite the following examples:

a. According to U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare figures, the birthrate of the white population of the United States has declined 6.6 per cent between 1966–67 and 1970–71. In addition, Sidney Goldstein and others have suggested that the Jewish birthrate is generally lower, and the decline in the Jewish birthrate generally higher, than that of the over-all white population.1 While this factor is obviously of major importance, it does not account fully for the substantial reduction in the reported Jewish school enrollment.

b. Jewish population shifts have been widely documented, particularly in the larger cities.2 Yet, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York, among others, reported that Jewish school enrollment has diminished even in some of the newer Jewish enclaves, albeit the decline has been most dramatic in the older areas.

---

2 Ibid.
c. Data pertaining to congregational membership dues was culled from the survey of tuition-fee scales, summarized in a later section of this report. While there was strong indication that the financial policies of congregational schools may have an unfavorable effect on enrollment, further research is needed to determine a cause-and-effect relationship.

6. The few communities reporting increased enrollment attributed this growth to the affiliation of new communities and schools.

7. Contrary to the over-all trend in Jewish school enrollment, pupil enrollment in the all-day schools continued to increase throughout the country. (See section below.)

8. An attempt was made to estimate the total Jewish school enrollment on the basis of enrollment reported by 42 communities. As Table 2 indicates, these communities, with a total Jewish population of 4,686,285, reported a pupil enrollment of 294,282. Assuming that percentages of youngsters in Jewish schools in communities for which data were not available were comparable to those in communities for which data were available, an estimated 457,196 received some kind of Jewish education. It should be noted, however, that the larger the Jewish community, the smaller the percentage of the Jewish school population, a trend that was also discernible in the 1966-67 national census. In that census, the Jewish school population was estimated at 554,468. A comparison of the two estimates indicates a decline of 17.5 per cent in the Jewish school population between 1966-67 and 1970-71. However, since this decline has been computed on the basis of two estimates, it must be regarded with a great deal of caution.

The validity of the estimated current enrollment may also be questioned because it is based upon total population estimates which have not been revised for several years. If there has been an appreciable shift of the Jewish population from urban to suburban communities, as indicated by all recent reports, the over-all enrollment may well have been underestimated.

**All-Day School**

This report concerns itself only with several limited aspects of the Jewish all-day school: enrollment from nursery through Grade 12 (excluding nurseries and kindergartens that are not part of an elementary school), also comparing it with the total enrollment in Jewish schools; per-pupil cost of day-school education, and federation and welfare-fund subsidies to day schools.

Initial requests for pertinent data were addressed to the local central agencies for Jewish education and to the federations and welfare funds. Where complete information was not available from these agencies, the required data were obtained directly from the schools.

---

TABLE 2. ENROLLMENT ESTIMATE, 1970-71, BASED ON REPORTED ENROLLMENT FIGURES
AS PROPORTION OF TOTAL JEWISH POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Jewish School Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Reporting Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>939,770</td>
<td>76,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>629,230</td>
<td>278,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>740,000</td>
<td>640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3,691,000</td>
<td>3,691,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>4,686,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Population categories used:
1. Less than 10,000
2. 10,000 - 49,999
3. 50,000 - 149,999
4. More than 150,000

b Jewish population figures are based on the demographic data presented by Alvin Chenkin in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 71 (1970), pp. 344-53.

c Per cent of population was computed by dividing reported enrollment by population of reporting communities.

d Figures in parentheses denote the number of communities included in each population statistic. The total number of communities comprising Category I is unknown.
ENROLLMENT

The data were derived as follows:

1. The enrollment figures for 1966–67 were taken from the national census of Jewish schools. However, the New York enrollment total and, consequently, the total enrollment figure were revised in accordance with the updated information contained in the New York census report for 1967–68. The national census did not reveal the number of communities and schools included in the enrollment totals.

2. Enrollment data for 1969–70 were received for 282 schools in 66 communities. Data for another 18 schools (number of communities unknown) in New York State were derived from the study of the Fleischmann Commission. There were 334 day schools on record in 1969–70; enrollment figures were not available for 34 (10.2 per cent) of these, all located in cities with Jewish populations below 10,000.

3. For 1970–71, enrollment figures were received for 298 schools in 68 communities. Among these were 16 schools that had not reported previously. With 344 schools on record in 1970–71, data were not available for 46 (13.4 per cent), including 4 schools that had reported in the previous year. Again, all nonreporting schools appeared to be located in smaller cities.

Summary of Findings

Since the survey samples for 1969–70 and 1970–71 comprised almost 90 per cent of the total number of day schools on record, the available information appeared to support conclusions regarding the total day-school population.

The data presented in Table 3 indicate the following:

1. Enrollment in the all-day schools has consistently increased from 1966–67 to 1970–71, with the largest reported rate of growth (29.5 per cent) in the medium-size cities and the smallest (10.4 per cent) in Greater New York.

2. The rate of increase seemed to have slackened somewhat in the intermediate-size cities (6.0 per cent from 1969–70 to 1970–71), and to have almost halted in Greater New York (1.1 per cent from 1969–70 to 1970–71), but seemed to have accelerated in the remaining cities (5.6 per cent in the smaller and 10.0 per cent in the larger cities).

3. In the medium-size cities, where the number of schools appeared to have remained constant, the mean school size has grown. However, in com-

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Jewish Community*</th>
<th>Number of Communities</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Aggregate Enrollment</th>
<th>Mean Enrollment Per School</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase in Aggregate Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–49,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–599,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,949</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Greater New York)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>42,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>282</strong></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,990</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including New York)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Reportedc</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reported</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED TOTAL</strong>c</td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
<td><strong>344</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,478</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,195</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories were selected to correspond with those used in the 1966-67 national census of Jewish schools.

b Based on the national census of Jewish schools. The New York enrollment total and, consequently, the total enrollment figure were revised in accordance with the updated information contained in the New York census report for 1967-68.


d Estimate based on an increase of 8.3 per cent, the estimated mean increase for all communities except Greater New York.


f Only the enrollment figures and the data extrapolated from them were estimated.
communities where the number of schools has increased, there seemed to be a corresponding decline in the size of each school.

4. An attempt was made to estimate the total day-school enrollment for 1969–70 and 1970–71 on the basis of the known number of schools, the rate of increase in reported enrollment, and the mean number of pupils in the reporting schools.

a. In 1969–70 the 34 nonreporting schools appeared to have been located in the smaller cities. Therefore it was assumed that each of them would have a mean enrollment of 87 pupils, similar to that of the other schools located in cities of comparable size. The resulting addition of 2,958 pupils to the reported total enrollment of 69,520 makes an estimated total enrollment of 72,478 in day schools during the 1969–70 school year.

b. To arrive at the 1970–71 estimate, separate assumptions were made regarding two groups of nonreporting schools: (1) The 18 additional New York State schools derived from the Fleischmann study may have been located in communities of various sizes. It was assumed, therefore, that their reported enrollment for 1969–70 increased by 8.3 per cent (the estimated mean increase for all communities, except Greater New York), to an estimated total of 6,930. (2) Regarding the remaining 28 nonreporting schools, all located in the smaller communities, it was again assumed that each had a mean enrollment of 79, similar to that of the other schools located in cities of comparable size. The resulting addition of 2,212 pupils to the reported total of 65,053, plus the estimated 6,930 for the 18 Fleischmann schools, provided an estimated total of 74,195 pupils enrolled in day schools during the 1970–71 school year.

5. With day-school enrollment increasing, while total Jewish school enrollment appeared to be declining, it was to be expected that the day-school pupils would comprise a consistently larger proportion of the total number of pupils enrolled in Jewish schools. This is quite evident from the data presented in Table 4. The pattern is broken only in the smaller cities, where day-school enrollment represented 10.4 per cent of the total enrollment in 1969–70, but diminished to 9.4 per cent in 1970–71.

PER-PUPIL COSTS

Estimates of day-school costs were last reported in 1962. On the basis of usable information provided by a sample of 40 schools with combined budgets of $3,016,058, the mean annual per-pupil cost was estimated to be $540.

The current survey samples were appreciably larger. The 1969–70 sample included 87 schools located in 58 cities. It was comprised of an almost equal

---

# TABLE 4. DAY-SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AS PROPORTION OF TOTAL JEWISH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT IN REPORTING COMMUNITIES, 1966/67–1970/71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Jewish Community</th>
<th>Total Enrollmenta</th>
<th>Day-school Enrollmentb</th>
<th>Day-school Enrollment as Per Cent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15,000</td>
<td>9,490 (8)</td>
<td>6,231 (5)</td>
<td>17,245 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000–49,999</td>
<td>20,577 (7)</td>
<td>12,500 (7)</td>
<td>18,450 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–599,999</td>
<td>136,256 (9)</td>
<td>121,888 (9)</td>
<td>128,756 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000 and over</td>
<td>140,176 (11)</td>
<td>130,216 (11)</td>
<td>122,830 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306,499 (23)</td>
<td>270,835 (20)</td>
<td>287,281 (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This analysis includes only those communities for which total and day-school enrollment data were reported for the comparison census periods.

*a* Figures in parentheses denote the number of communities included in the total enrollment statistic.

*b* Figures in parentheses denote the number of schools included in the day-school enrollment statistic.
number of schools in the smaller (35) and larger cities (37), and an appreciably smaller number (15) in medium-size cities. The 1970–71 sample consisted of 90 schools, divided in a manner very similar to that of the 1969–70 sample. (See Table 5.)

**Summary of Findings**

Although the current survey sample is large compared to that of the 1962 study, it represents only about 25 per cent of the total number of schools, and approximately the same proportion of the total reported enrollment. In addition, both samples appear to consist of the larger schools in each population category and may, therefore, not be representative of the entire day-school population. Consequently, the tentative conclusions below should be interpreted with a great deal of caution.

1. Per-pupil costs appear to have risen from 1961–62 to 1969–70 at the approximate rate of 10 per cent per year. A similar rate of increase took place from 1969–70 to 1970–71 in all three population categories.

2. Per-pupil costs appear to have been equally high in the smaller and larger schools, and lower in the intermediate-size schools. Further exploration seems warranted to determine whether there is an optimum school size with regard to per-pupil cost.

3. An examination of the considerable range of per-pupil costs in all communities suggests that the lower and upper extremes may be due to unusual circumstances. For example, free housing of a school in a congregational or communal building could greatly reduce the school budget. The opposite may be true where a school is in the process of erecting or furnishing a building, or redeeming the mortgage on it. The responses obtained in a telephone sampling of several schools seem to support this conjecture.

4. A comparison of the mean tuition fees officially charged by day schools (reported below) with the estimated per-pupil costs indicates a 1 to 2 relationship. The 1962 survey found that actual income from tuition equaled about 40 per cent of the cost.

**FEDERATION AND WELFARE-FUND SUBSIDIES**

Allocations to local day schools were last examined in 1966–67. The findings regarding the schools outside New York City were based on two survey samples of 38 and 46 schools, respectively. The current survey produced data applicable to samples varying in size from 72 to 82 schools located in 49 to 56 communities outside New York City.

---

7 The comparable data are to be found in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Jewish Community</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Number of Communities</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Aggregate Enrollment</th>
<th>Mean No. Per School</th>
<th>Aggregate Budget</th>
<th>Per-Pupil Cost Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15,000</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$3,416,085</td>
<td>$966</td>
<td>$408–1,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$3,903,874</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>400–1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000–49,999</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$2,335,068</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>392–1,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>$2,422,722</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>478–1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more*</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9,272</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>$9,028,388</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>791–1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9,038</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>$9,549,157</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>780–1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15,532</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>$14,779,541</td>
<td>$952</td>
<td>$392–1,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15,217</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>$15,875,753</td>
<td>$1,043</td>
<td>$400–1,644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Greater New York.
Summary of Findings

1. The total reported data for 1969-70 indicate that 55 federations and welfare funds allocated a total of $1,549,611 to 74 all-day schools. In 1970-71, 56 federations and welfare funds reported subsidies totaling $1,884,924 to 82 schools. These figures indicate consistent increases in (a) the number of federations and welfare funds allocating subsidies to local day schools; (b) the number of day schools receiving subsidies, and (c) the over-all amount nationally allocated to day schools.

2. Increases were also evident in per-pupil subsidies. From the data presented in Table 6, it would appear that the mean per-pupil subsidy rose from $113.78 in 1966-67 to $129.62 in 1969-70, and to $139.03 in 1970-71. It should be noted that the data for 1966-67 were derived from a sample of only 38 schools in 28 communities, whereas those for 1969-70 applied to 74 schools in 51 communities, and those for 1970-71 to 77 schools in 52 communities.

3. A comparison of the data for the three population categories (Table 6), seems to indicate that the size of the per-pupil subsidy was generally related to the size of the Jewish community. Yet, there were many exceptions.

4. The range of per-pupil subsidies appears to be very broad. An examination of the total reported data for 1969-70 reveals the following distribution:

   a. Of the eight large communities, one allocated more than $300 per pupil, two between $200 and $250, one slightly less than $200, two between $50 and $100, and two less than $50 per pupil.

   b. Of the 11 intermediate-size communities, one allocated more than $500 per pupil, three between $200 and $250, one slightly less than $200, five between $50 and $100, and one less than $25 per pupil.

   c. Of the 32 small communities, two allocated between $300 and $400 per pupil, five between $200 and $300, seven between $100 and $200, 12 between $50 and $100, two between $25 and $50, and four less than $25 per pupil.

The 1970-71 data indicate the following distribution:

   a. Of the ten large communities, one allocated more than $400 per pupil, one slightly more than $200, five between $100 and $200, and three less than $50 per pupil.

   b. Of the 11 intermediate-size communities, one allocated more than $500 per pupil, three between $200 and $250, two between $100 and $200, four between $50 and $100, and one less than $25 per pupil.

   c. Of the 31 small communities, one allocated almost $800 per pupil, one close to $600, two slightly more than $300, three between $200 and $300, seven between $100 and $200, 12 between $50 and $100, two between $25 and $50, and three less than $25 per pupil.

5. A comparison of the mean per-pupil subsidies and the estimated per-pupil costs reported above indicate an approximate relationship of 1 to 7 for both 1969-70 and 1970-71.

6. These findings appear to reflect dramatic growth in over-all federation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Jewish Community</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Number of Communities</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Aggregate Enrollment</th>
<th>Aggregate Allocation</th>
<th>Per-Pupil Subsidy Mean</th>
<th>Per-Pupil Subsidy Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15,000</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>$341,600</td>
<td>$108.17</td>
<td>$5.29–400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>397,206</td>
<td>126.10</td>
<td>9.85–786.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>301,918</td>
<td>127.93</td>
<td>16.88–544.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>336,282</td>
<td>137.09</td>
<td>17.20–507.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 and over*</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,297</td>
<td>887,893</td>
<td>141.00</td>
<td>34.58–353.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7,589</td>
<td>1,100,636</td>
<td>145.03</td>
<td>10.71–403.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11,815</td>
<td>$1,531,411</td>
<td>$129.62</td>
<td>$5.29–544.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13,192</td>
<td>$1,834,124</td>
<td>$139.03</td>
<td>$9.85–786.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Greater New York.
support of day schools. Yet, an examination of the relationship between subsidies and school budgets suggests a far different conclusion. The data presented in Table 7 show that the proportion of the school budget subsidized by federations in the small communities increased only slightly from 1969–70 (11.4 per cent) to 1970–71 (11.6 per cent); even less in the intermediate-size communities (from 14.5 per cent to 14.6 per cent), and actually declined in the large communities (from 14.9 per cent to 13.7 per cent). On the whole, federations subsidized a smaller share of the school budgets in 1970–71 (13.3 per cent) than in 1969–70 (13.9 per cent). It would appear, therefore, that the increases in federation allocations to the day schools in the survey sample hardly kept pace with the increases in the day-school budgets.

7. The 1969–70 data for the three population categories show a direct relationship between the percentage of the school budgets subsidized by federations and the size of the Jewish community. In 1970–71, however, federations in the large communities subsidized a smaller proportion of the school budgets than did the federations in the intermediate-size cities.

8. The range in the percentages of school budgets subsidized by local federations and welfare funds is very broad. An examination of the total reported data for 1969–70 reveals the following distribution:

   a. In the eight large communities, one federation subsidized more than 40 per cent of the school budget; three between 20 and 30 per cent, and four subsidized 10 per cent or less of the school budget.
   b. In the 11 intermediate-size communities, one federation subsidized 54 per cent of the school budget, four between 20 and 30 per cent, two slightly more than 10 per cent, and four subsidized less than 10 per cent of the school budgets.
   c. In the 30 small communities, four federations subsidized between 20 and 30 per cent of the school budgets, eight between 10 and 20 per cent, 13 between 5 and 10 per cent, and five subsidized 5 per cent or less of the school budgets.

The 1970–71 data indicate the following distribution:

   a. In the ten large cities, one federation subsidized more than 40 per cent of the school budget, one about 35 per cent, five between 10 and 20 per cent, and three subsidized 5 per cent or less of the school budgets.
   b. In the nine medium-size communities, one federation subsidized 53 per cent of the school budget, two between 25 and 30 per cent, four between 10 and 20 per cent, and two subsidized 5 per cent or less of the school budgets.
   c. In the 30 small communities, one federation subsidized 42 per cent of the school budget, two about 35 per cent, three between 20 and 30 per cent, eight between 10 and 20 per cent, ten between 5 and 10 per cent, and six subsidized less than 5 per cent of the school budgets.

**Salaries of Full-Time Teachers**

Reports on teachers’ salaries in Jewish schools, published by the American Association for Jewish Education in 1960 and 1963, pertained only to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Jewish Community</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Number of Communities</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Aggregate Budget</th>
<th>Aggregate Allocation</th>
<th>Per Cent of Budget Subsidized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15,000</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$2,982,775</td>
<td>$339,175</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$3,387,674</td>
<td>$393,206</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2,083,068</td>
<td>$301,918</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$2,015,099</td>
<td>$293,894</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 and over*</td>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$5,947,831</td>
<td>$887,893</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$8,041,837</td>
<td>$1,100,636</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,013,674</td>
<td>$1,528,986</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$13,444,610</td>
<td>$1,787,736</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Greater New York.

Requests for information were mailed to the directors of local bureaus of Jewish education, federation executives, and school officials in 33 communities. Very sparse information was obtained regarding weekend schools and early childhood education. This report, therefore, deals primarily with full-time teachers in afternoon and all-day Jewish schools.\footnote{Full-time teaching in Jewish all-day schools means at least 20 hours per week; full-time teaching in Jewish afternoon schools, at least 12 hours per week; full-time teaching in public schools, at least 30 hours per week.} It briefly reviews the major findings of the recent study, with specific references to the tabulated data generated by the survey.\footnote{A detailed analysis of the findings, and the recommendations based on them, are to be found in Hillel Hochberg and Gerhard Lang, \textit{Salary Scales for Full-Time Teaching, 1969–1970} (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1972).}

For Jewish afternoon schools, the data reported apply to a minimum of 1,500 teachers, employed in 300 schools (representing more than 10 per cent of the known schools of this type), located in 26 cities with a total Jewish population of 2,294,900.\footnote{Alvin Chenkin, "Jewish Population in the United States," \textit{American Jewish Year Book}, Vol. 71 (1970), pp. 344–53.}

For Jewish all-day schools, the data reported apply to at least 500 teachers, employed in 50 schools (representing about 15 per cent of the known schools of this type), located in 15 of the 29 day-school cities with a total Jewish population of 1,850,000.\footnote{Ibid.}

Comparative data on public schools are reported for the schools located in the communities represented in both of the above samples.

\textit{Summary of Findings}

This study was based on a limited sampling of communities and schools, and describes the conditions applying only to their teaching staff. However, since the sample comprises a meaningful proportion of the known Jewish afternoon and all-day schools, some basic conclusions appear justified:

1. Salaries of full-time teachers in Jewish schools are generally lower than those of their colleagues in the public schools.
a. Whereas teachers in the public schools of the 26 sample cities received an annual median minimum salary of $6,925 and a median maximum salary of $11,455, in the Jewish afternoon schools the medians were $5,100 and $7,500, respectively (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8. COMPARATIVE SALARY SCALES FOR QUALIFIED FULL-TIME TEACHERS IN JEWISH AFTERNOON AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF 26 CITIES, 1969/70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Increments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. A comparison of salaries of public-school teachers with salaries of teachers in the Jewish all-day school in the 15 sample cities showed that the former earned a median annual minimum of $7,000 and a maximum of $11,850; the median minimum and maximum of the latter were $6,600 and $9,500, respectively (Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9. COMPARATIVE SALARY SCALES FOR QUALIFIED FULL-TIME TEACHERS IN JEWISH ALL-DAY AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF 15 CITIES, 1969/70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Increments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Based on earlier available data for afternoon schools in 12 communities, this discrepancy has substantially grown between 1961–62 and 1969–70 (Table 10).

3. Salary increases for the Jewish school teacher have lagged far behind the consumer price index, which rose by 22.6 per cent from December 1961 to December 1969. Although the teacher's annual salary has risen markedly (averaging slightly more than 20 per cent), its dollar value has decreased substantially.

4. Less financial inducement for advanced training was offered to the Jewish teacher, with many communities offering none whatsoever (Table 10).

5. Contrary to the prevailing practices in public education, Jewish schools generally failed to provide their teachers with adequate fringe benefits (Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Jewish Schools</th>
<th>Public Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median Salaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers without advanced degrees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$4,550</td>
<td>$5,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>8,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with advanced degrees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>6,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Columbus, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Haven, and Rochester.

b Chicago, Detroit, and New Haven.
### Table 11. Fringe Benefits of Qualified Full-Time Teachers in Jewish Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fringe Welfare Benefit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick leave pay</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross/Blue Shield</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major medical insurance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical leave</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower tuition fees for children attending school</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident and health insurance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower membership fees in congregation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition fees paid for college courses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced fee for children attending summer camp</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As specified in the Codes of Practice of 31 respondents.

6. Although one might expect to find better conditions of employment in communities with a local bureau of Jewish education, the survey results indicate a very inconsistent pattern in this respect.

7. There appears to be no relationship between Jewish school teachers’ conditions of employment and the size of the Jewish community or its geographic location.

### Additional Observations

1. In the 1963 study of teachers’ salaries, Chanover suggested that “the generally unfavorable comparison of the established scales in the 12 top-paying Jewish communities with wage schedules in public education should be cause for concern.”

14 The results of the current survey indicate that in most of the responding communities teaching in a Jewish school continued to compare unfavorably with teaching in a public school. Jewish school teachers generally received lower minimum salaries, lower maximum salaries, smaller increments, fewer welfare fringe benefits, and less inducement for advanced training. It therefore is quite understandable why many of the most skilled teachers in Jewish schools are enticed into other fields, particularly the public school system.

2. Although a strong effort has been made to create viable salary schedules and to improve the general economic standards for Jewish teachers, there continued to be a wide gap between these standards and those prevailing in public education.

14 Hyman Chanover, *Salary Scales for Full-time Teaching.*
3. With very few exceptions, Jewish communities made no provisions for advanced-degree standing of their teachers.

4. Supplementary data received from many respondents indicated:

a. A large proportion of teachers (and principals) maintained two positions to support their families adequately. (Since the afternoon school invariably is the second job of the day, it cannot receive the best services of the employees.)

b. Many afternoon schools allegedly paying full-time salaries discouraged dual employment, although salaries were far from adequate.

c. Some afternoon schools encouraged, and even arranged for, dual employment, since they could not provide a living wage.

d. Efforts to establish codes of practice for Jewish educators apparently have not been very successful. But even those communities that had official codes of practice did not necessarily maintain true salary scales. School personnel also continued to suffer from lack of security, since tenure provisions of the code usually guaranteed only severance pay and not continuity of employment.

e. Many communities providing fringe benefits, such as pensions, made these available only to administrative personnel, not to teachers.

**Tuition-Fee Scales**

The last report on tuition fees in Jewish schools, published by the American Association for Jewish Education in 1968, dealt only with weekend and afternoon schools, and was based on a very limited number of responses. Earlier AAJE studies were similarly limited in scope.

The present study was the first relatively successful effort to elicit meaningful tuition-fee information from a fairly wide spectrum of Jewish schools. It covered 3,025 schools of all types: 2,893 in the United States and 132 in Canada. Responses were received from 754 schools, of which 721 were located in the United States and 33 in Canada. The sample thus represented about 25 per cent of both the American and Canadian schools enrolling a total of 185,318 pupils (about 38 per cent of the estimated total 1969–70

---

15 *A Study of Tuition Fees and Related Matters Based on the Responses of 161 Congregational and 28 Communal Weekend and Afternoon Schools* (New York: Department of Statistical Research, American Association for Jewish Education, 1968).


17 A detailed analysis of the results, 28 supportive tables, and recommendations emanating from the data are to be found in: Hillel Hochberg and Gerhard Lang, *Tuition Fee Scales and Policies in Jewish Schools* (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1972) Information Bulletin No. 34.
Two questionnaires were used, one specifically designed for congregational schools, the other for communal and independent schools. Because the sample for this survey was very much larger than that obtained for any previous study of this subject, comprising a far greater number of schools and pupils, comparisons between the current findings and the earlier data must be regarded with some caution. The major findings on annual tuition fees are categorized according to the type of school and the type of school fee.

**CONGREGATIONAL WEEKEND AND AFTERNOON SCHOOLS**

1. Tuition fees in the "single pupil-member" category varied considerably in all departments of both types of schools (Table 12). For example:

   a. In the primary grades of the weekend school, the median tuition fee was $20, with a range of $5-$105.

   b. On the elementary level of the three-days-a-week school, the median fee was $85, with a range of $15-$165.

   c. In the two-day high school, the median tuition rate was $60, with a range of $15-$200.

2. As a rule, median tuition fees did not increase with the level of instruction. For instance, they were uniformly $85 per year in the primary, elementary, and high-school departments of responding congregational three-days-a-week schools.

3. Median tuition fees charged for pupils attending one-day-a-week (about two hours) classes in kindergarten, primary, elementary, and high-school departments of congregational afternoon schools, generally were higher than those in the comparable departments of congregational weekend schools. The differentials ranged from $5 (elementary) to $15 (primary).

4. Tuition fees were usually reduced for each additional child from the same family, when two or more attended the school simultaneously:

   a. In the elementary grades of the three-days-a-week school, the median tuition fee per pupil (member) was $85, and $150 for two, reducing the fee for the second child of the family by 24 per cent. The range in reduction for the second child was from 6 per cent (afternoon school/primary/1-day) to 40 per cent (week-end/kindergarten/1-day), with a median reduction of 24 per cent.

   b. In the primary grades of the weekend school, the median tuition fee per pupil (member) was $20, and the full fee of $40 was charged for two children of the same family. For three or more pupils, however, the median fee was $50, giving an allowance of $10, or a 50 per cent reduction for the third child. Generally, tuition fees charged to member families for three or more children ranged from 18 per cent (afternoon school/primary/3-day) to 75 per cent (week-end school/kindergarten/1-day) less than the single pupil rate, with a median reduction of 50 per cent.

5. Nonmembers paid 28 per cent (afternoon school/kindergarten/5 days)
### TABLE 12. ANNUAL TUITION FEES IN CONGREGATIONAL AND COMMUNAL AND INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Congregational Schools</th>
<th>Communal and Independent Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median Fee Per Pupil</td>
<td>Range of Fee Per Number of Pupils in Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Nonmembers)</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend/1-day</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>$20 $32 $45 (b)</td>
<td>$5-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>20 40 50</td>
<td>5-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>20 40 45</td>
<td>5-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-School</td>
<td>20 40 60</td>
<td>10-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon 1-day-a-week</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>31 50 75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>35 68 95</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>25 50 75</td>
<td>10-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-School</td>
<td>30 60 90</td>
<td>10-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-days-a-week</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>60 120 150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>55 100 140</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-School</td>
<td>60 100 150</td>
<td>15-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>85 160 240</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>85 150 220</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-School</td>
<td>85 150 225</td>
<td>30-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-days-a-week</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>90 160 220</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-days-a-week</td>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>295 590 885</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>250 500 750</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reductions, if any, for additional pupils in family ranged between 22 and 25 per cent.

* Dashes indicate no information available.
to 109 per cent (afternoon/kindergarten/1-day) more than members, with a median differential of 66 per cent. Tuition-fee charges to nonmembers for two pupils exceeded those to members by 28 per cent to 160 per cent (median=69 per cent); for three or more pupils, the differentials ranged from 36 per cent to 100 per cent (median=67 per cent).

6. Median tuition fee charges by responding Conservative schools were consistently higher than those of reporting Orthodox schools. The median charges of responding Reform schools were consistently the lowest of the three orientations represented. This applied to both weekend and afternoon schools. Comparison samples comprising at least 25 respondents were used in this analysis. (See Table 13.)

7. Median tuition fees levied by larger schools tended to be typically higher than those charged by smaller schools.

COMMUNAL AND INDEPENDENT AFTERNOON SCHOOLS

1. Tuition fees also varied widely in these types of schools. (See Table 12.)

2. Median tuition fees charged (single pupil) in three-days-a-week elementary ($125) and high-school ($120) departments of responding communal and independent schools fell midway between fees of congregational schools for their members (elementary and high school, $85) and fees for nonmembers (elementary, $150; high school, $125). However, in the two-days-a-week high-school department, communal and independent school median fees ($100) were higher than fees paid by nonmembers of congregational schools ($90).

3. Tuition-fee reductions offered by responding communal and independent schools for two, three, or more children per family were generally lower than those granted by congregational schools (elementary/3-day; high school/3-day). We find that responding communal and independent schools granted a 6 per cent reduction for the second child (elementary/3-day), compared to a 24 per cent reduction offered by reporting congregational schools. The reduction for three or more children per family was 12 per cent (communal and independent) and 41 per cent (congregational), respectively. Such reductions were apparently not available in the two-days-a-week high school.

NURSERY SCHOOLS

1. Tuition fees for nursery grades also showed wide variance. (See Table 12.)

2. Tuition-fee reductions for the second, third, or each additional child from the same family were either nonexistent or extremely low. In responding communal schools, for example, the reduction for the second child was only 2 per cent (three-days-a-week), the lowest observed in any department of congregational, communal, or independent schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School and Department</th>
<th>Median Fee Per Pupils in Family</th>
<th>Range of Fee Per Pupils in Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Orthodox</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conservative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Two Three</td>
<td>One Two Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Day-a-Week Kindergarten</td>
<td>$30  $50  $75</td>
<td>$31  $62  $92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>35  60  90</td>
<td>36  72  102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>— — —</td>
<td>30  60  79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-School</td>
<td>— — —</td>
<td>36  71  103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Days-a-Week Elementary</td>
<td>— — —</td>
<td>60  120  155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Days-a-Week Elementary</td>
<td>87  157  205</td>
<td>90  151  221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Tuition fees for nonmembers (single pupil) were 28 per cent higher than for members in congregational three-days-a-week nurseries, and 30 per cent higher in five-days-a-week nurseries. The differentials for two, three, or more pupils were smaller, ranging from 22 per cent to 25 per cent. Even though all departments of responding congregational schools charged higher tuition fees to nonmembers, the differential was smallest for the nursery department.

ALL-DAY SCHOOLS

1. As in other types of schools, tuition fees also varied greatly in the responding all-day schools. (See Table 14.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Median Fee Per Number of Pupils in Family</th>
<th>Range of Fee Per Number of Pupils Per Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-School</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. These figures indicate that tuition fees rose consistently with the level of instruction.

3. Tuition-fee reductions were comparable to those prevailing in the reporting communal and independent afternoon schools and considerably less than those granted by congregational weekend and afternoon schools. For example, the reduction for the second child was 24 per cent in responding congregational schools (afternoon/elementary/3-day), and 13 per cent in reporting all-day schools (elementary/5-day). The reduction for three or more children per family was 25 per cent, as compared to 41 per cent in congregational schools.

CHANGES IN TUITION FEES SINCE 1951/52

Comparative data for the school years since 1951/52 could be assembled only for tuition fees charged for one child by three-days-a-week elementary schools. In responding congregational schools, tuition fees appear to have
increased 70 per cent (about 4 per cent per year) for members, and 130 per cent (about 7 per cent per year) for nonmembers during the 18-year period, 1951/52 to 1969/70. (See Table 15.) Reporting communal schools showed an annual increase of approximately 8 per cent during the same period. Figures must be regarded with caution because of the disproportionately larger 1969–70 sample.

**TABLE 15. CHANGES IN ANNUAL TUITION FEES, 1951–1970, IN THREE-DAYS-A-WEEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Median Fees</th>
<th>Congregational</th>
<th>Communal and Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Nonmember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951/52</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961/62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966/67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other School Fees

Practices seem to vary greatly among the responding schools with regard to the educational services and materials provided for the pupils under a comprehensive tuition fee. Most often included in the over-all fee were registration (62.9 per cent of responding schools), books and supplies (46.0 per cent), and preparation for bar mitzvah (33.0 per cent). Among the items less commonly included were: use of facilities for bar mitzvah (21.3 per cent) and bat mitzvah (18.9 per cent), and transportation (7.3 per cent). The practice of including registration was more prevalent among conservative schools (70.3 per cent) than among Reform (61.0 per cent) and Orthodox schools (51.0 per cent). Day schools (mostly communal or independent) were less likely to forego this source of supplementary income. Communal and independent schools appeared to be generally more inclined to levy charges for various types of additional services and materials. Where special fees were imposed, they applied to a large variety of items and ranged broadly in amount. The lowest charges were usually for children's publications, registration, and books and supplies; higher fees were usually related to bar mitzvah and bat mitzvah celebrations. Generally, congregational schools did not differ significantly from communal and independent schools in the amounts charged for the various services and materials. However, small schools tended to charge less than medium and large schools. The highest fees were charged by Orthodox day schools for transportation.
Congregational-School Policies

Tuition Fees for Children of Members

Approximately two-thirds (67.7 per cent) of the reporting schools charged tuition fees for children of members, one fourth (25.4 per cent) did not. Fees were required by a larger proportion of Orthodox (73.3 per cent) and Conservative (76.6 per cent) than of Reform (51.7 per cent) schools. Since the majority of the Orthodox and Conservative sample schools were afternoon schools, a larger proportion of these (74.1 per cent) charged tuition fees than did weekend schools (42.4 per cent), which were predominantly Reform. Relatively few schools (5.3 per cent) required a tuition fee for some departments and not for others. No consistent relationship was found between school size and tuition fees for children of members.

Admission of Children of Nonmembers

Most of the responding schools (53.0 per cent) restricted enrollment to the children of congregation members; about 4 in 10 (43.6 per cent) indicated they also accepted others. Here, substantial differences were noted between schools of varying orientation and size. Nonaffiliated children tended to be admitted by a larger proportion of Orthodox (79.2 per cent) and Conservative (46.2 per cent) schools than Reform (19.0 per cent) schools. They were also more likely to be accepted by afternoon schools of all orientations that charge tuition fees for children of members; the opposite was true of Reform weekend schools. Also, nonaffiliated children were more readily admitted by small (57.9 per cent) and medium (40.3 per cent) schools, than by large (32.1 per cent) schools. It should be noted, however, that a sizeable number of congregations indicated that they generally made exceptions for children whose parents could not afford to pay membership dues.

Membership Dues

The range in congregational membership dues was found to be quite extensive. In congregations maintaining afternoon schools, dues ranged from $15 to $500 for a “family with children.” Dues for single individuals were lowest, those for families with children, highest; but families without children paid only slightly lower dues than did families with children.

Dues of responding Reform congregations were generally higher than those of Conservative, which, in turn, were generally higher than membership dues of Orthodox congregations. For example, in congregations having afternoon schools, average membership dues for a “family with children” were $216 (Reform), $182 (Conservative) and $109 (Orthodox). School size was positively related to congregational membership dues. In the
“family with children” category, the progression of average dues charged by Orthodox congregations with small, medium, and large schools was $95, $121, and $194; for Conservative congregations having schools the respective means were $157, $179, and $202, and for Reform congregations, they were $179, $198, and $241.

INCLUSION OF TUITION FEE IN MEMBERSHIP DUES

One-fifth (21.3 per cent) of the responding schools reported that congregational membership dues covered a portion of tuition fees, while 63.8 per cent responded that they did not. The rest (14.9 per cent) did not respond to this question. Reform schools in our sample were more likely to allocate a portion of the membership dues toward tuition (28.3 per cent) than were Orthodox (20.8 per cent) and Conservative (16.9 per cent) schools. There seemed to be no consistent relationship between this practice and school size.

FAIR SHARE PLAN

Slightly more than one-fourth (27.3 per cent) of the reporting schools indicated that their sponsoring congregations had adopted the Fair Share Plan, i.e. setting membership dues according to the annual incomes of individuals or families. This plan was more prevalent in Reform schools (43.9 per cent) than in Conservative (21.4 per cent) and Orthodox (10.9 per cent) schools. Reform and Conservative congregations with small schools were more likely to adhere to this plan than were those with large schools. This applied to 51 per cent of the small and 41 per cent of the large Reform schools; 26 per cent of the small and 15 per cent of the large Conservative schools. There was also some evidence that Fair-Share-Plan congregations were very likely to include some portion of the tuition fee for their schools in membership dues.

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS

1. The poor response (161 congregational and 28 communal week-end and afternoon schools) to the earlier AAJE study was ascribed to an apparent reluctance to divulge the diverse financial data solicited. This hypothesis appears to be confirmed by the relatively large sample of the current survey which requested only basic information. However, in the absence of all detailed financial data, it is impossible to evaluate the contributory role of tuition fees and membership dues in the over-all school costs and total congregational funding of school budgets.

2. In view of the very broad range of fees in all categories, the more nominal fees could hardly be related to the actual per-pupil cost of Jewish education, even in schools whose teachers received minimal salaries.

3. Distinct differences in school policy seemed to be somehow related to its religious orientation and the size of pupil enrollment:
a. Reform congregational schools were more likely than others to admit only children of members; to charge no tuition fee; to allocate part of membership dues for tuition; to adopt the Fair Share Plan in determining dues for members of the congregation; to levy typically higher membership dues, and to charge lower tuition fees, where such fees were imposed.

b. Large schools were more likely than others to levy higher fees for school-related items; to admit only children of members; to adopt the Fair Share Plan in determining congregation membership dues; to charge typically higher membership dues, and to charge higher tuition fees, where such fees were required of members.

4. These findings should be evaluated in the context of the findings of the 1968 AAJE study that: the larger the community, the smaller the congregational membership. Therefore, it seems likely that a large number of children are deprived of a Jewish education due to a combination of factors, such as school policy, parental insolvency, and parental reluctance to join a congregation.

Communal Support of Local Jewish Education

Allocations by federations and welfare funds to local Jewish education were last examined in 1966. That sample included 82 communities: 14 with a Jewish population of 40,000 or more; 13 with 15,000 to 40,000; 33 with 5,000 to 15,000; and 22 with a Jewish population of less than 5,000. The current survey sample numbered 87 communities: 14 with a Jewish population of 40,000 or more; 18 with 15,000 to 40,000; 32 with 5,000 to 15,000; and 23 with a Jewish population of less than 5,000. The sample consisted of communities that submitted complete reports for at least two of the years between 1966 and 1970, as well as of those that made their initial allocation to Jewish education in 1970.

The primary data were derived from the reports received by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. The detailed statistical analysis of these data is presented in Tables 16 through 19; Table 20 summarizes the findings (see pp. 226-35).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. The cities in the 1970 survey sample allocated a total of $9,707,881 to Jewish education, an increase of approximately 50 per cent over the total


19 The author is indebted to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, and particularly to Mr. Alvin Chenkin and Miss Mae Dauer, who made available the CJFWF file materials and also assisted in compiling some of the required information.
reported in 1966. The largest increase was reported by the cities in the
5,000 to 15,000 population category (69.4 per cent), the smallest by those
in the 15,000 to 40,000 category (37.7 per cent).

2. Of the aggregate federation and community-chest contributions to local
Jewish needs (total local allocation), 13.0 per cent were allocated for local
Jewish education, as compared to 11.0 per cent in 1966. Comparable in-
creases were noted for each of the population categories, indicating that
Jewish education was given somewhat higher priority.

3. The percentage of the total local allocation earmarked for Jewish
education appears to be in inverse relationship to the population category,
i.e., the smaller cities allocated a higher percentage of their funds to Jewish
education.

4. The allocations to Jewish education in the total sample rose at a far
higher rate (49.8 per cent) than have total local allocations (26.6 per cent).
Similar increases were noted in the various population categories, which,
again, indicate the increasing priority given to Jewish education. However,
only a relatively small proportion (20.7 per cent) of the increase in the
total local allocations was earmarked for Jewish education.

5. Allocations to Jewish education on a per-capita basis, too, showed an
inverse relationship with the population category. While in the smallest cities
it was $4 per person and in the intermediate-size cities about $3.50, alloca-
tion in the large cities (except New York) was less than $3 per person; in
New York it was only $0.44. This analysis may be open to question, since
it was based on population estimates that have not been verified for several
years, and should be regarded with great caution.

6. The communities within each population category varied widely with
regard to the amounts allocated and the priority given to Jewish education.

Hillel Hochberg
TABLE 16. ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL JEWISH EDUCATION IN FEDERATION AND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Federation Allocation to All Local Jewish Needs</th>
<th>Total Local Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown, Pa</td>
<td>42,200</td>
<td>58,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton, N.Y</td>
<td>21,605</td>
<td>41,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton, Ohio</td>
<td>67,790</td>
<td>28,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, S.C</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christie, Texas</td>
<td>1,251*</td>
<td>26,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>82,309</td>
<td>137,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, Pa</td>
<td>10,538*</td>
<td>15,109*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint, Mich.</td>
<td>22,650</td>
<td>45,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg, Pa</td>
<td>71,891</td>
<td>131,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford, Mass.</td>
<td>11,511*</td>
<td>29,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain, Conn.</td>
<td>11,047</td>
<td>21,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London, Conn.</td>
<td>3,350*</td>
<td>4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News, Va</td>
<td>26,421</td>
<td>39,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norristown, Pa</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph, Mo</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>23,600*</td>
<td>38,600*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah, Ga</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>40,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady, N.Y</td>
<td>23,455*</td>
<td>30,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon, Pa</td>
<td>5,172*</td>
<td>6,372*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux City, Iowa</td>
<td>38,168</td>
<td>44,465*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend, Ind.</td>
<td>23,263</td>
<td>32,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>42,253</td>
<td>51,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>3,705*</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>3,000*</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>500*</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,000e</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>20,397</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>2,459e</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>750*</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>500e</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,979</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes community-chest funds.
** Increases were not made by all cities during each of the intervening years.
* Per capita allocation was computed by dividing total allocation to Jewish education by Jewish population of the community.
* The figures given are for 1967, the year of the initial allocation to local Jewish education. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1967 and 1970.
* The first allocation to local Jewish education was made in 1970. There is no basis, therefore, for comparison with previous years.
* The figures given are for 1968 (the year of the initial allocation to local Jewish education) and for 1969 (1970 data were not available) respectively. Therefore, the indicated changes occurred from 1968 to 1969, and the per capita allocation is for 1969.
* The figures given are for 1969, the year of the initial allocation to local Jewish education. Therefore, the indicated changes occurred from 1969 to 1970.
* The figures given are for 1968, the year of the initial allocation to local Jewish education. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1968 and 1970.
* The figures given are for 1969, since later data were not available. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1966 and 1969, and the per capita allocation is for 1969.
* The figures given are for 1967, since later data were not available. Therefore, the indicated changes occurred from 1966 to 1967, and the per capita allocation is for 1967.
## TABLE 17. ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL JEWISH EDUCATION IN FEDERATION AND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Federation Allocation to All Local Jewish Needs</th>
<th>Total Local Allocation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>70,400</td>
<td>87,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City, N.J.</td>
<td>109,990</td>
<td>139,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, Conn.</td>
<td>56,200</td>
<td>94,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>173,333</td>
<td>238,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>45,628</td>
<td>85,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>127,418</td>
<td>170,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>95,948</td>
<td>168,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn, Mass.</td>
<td>99,648</td>
<td>159,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tenn.</td>
<td>26,065</td>
<td>81,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick, N.J.</td>
<td>43,750</td>
<td>80,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, La.</td>
<td>124,886</td>
<td>192,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk, Va.</td>
<td>63,664</td>
<td>116,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W. Indiana (Gary)</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>9,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk, Conn.</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic, N.J.</td>
<td>116,592</td>
<td>128,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Ariz.</td>
<td>129,700</td>
<td>129,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
<td>65,600</td>
<td>106,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Va.</td>
<td>91,900</td>
<td>91,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, Calif.</td>
<td>30,045</td>
<td>30,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Minn.</td>
<td>163,268</td>
<td>269,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, Calif.</td>
<td>89,933</td>
<td>154,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, Calif.</td>
<td>19,950</td>
<td>19,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton, Pa.</td>
<td>33,543</td>
<td>90,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, Wash.</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>149,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Mass.</td>
<td>109,013</td>
<td>187,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford, Conn.</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, N.Y.</td>
<td>38,267</td>
<td>65,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>143,940</td>
<td>196,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton, N.J.</td>
<td>84,106</td>
<td>149,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, Ariz.</td>
<td>43,585</td>
<td>67,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Del.</td>
<td>14,530</td>
<td>26,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester, Mass.</td>
<td>130,214</td>
<td>208,078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars

Change 1966–70b

Per Cent
### Allocation to Local Jewish Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</th>
<th>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</th>
<th>Change 1966-70a</th>
<th>Percentage of Change</th>
<th>Per Capita 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,000d</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>+ 4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>+ 8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>+ 8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>41,165</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>75,728</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>+ 34,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>29,360</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>62,983</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>+ 33,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>59,100</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>+ 14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>37,376</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>70,628</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>+ 33,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>40,240</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>53,600</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>+ 13,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>+ 4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>+ 6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>16,285</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>31,120</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>+14,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>+ 9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>+ 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2,400f</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>+ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,450</td>
<td>14,027</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>- 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>36,800</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+10,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>5,000h</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5,000h</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>58,531</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>+31,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,000a</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>40,646</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>+27,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>500h</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>15,443</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>19,420</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>+ 3,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>+32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>60,640</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>102,100</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>+41,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>1,000f</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>+ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>5,000f</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>31,818</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>+17,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>+20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,000h</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>+ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>3,900f</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>13,475</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>+ 9,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>49,254</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>77,408</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>+28,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Includes community-chest funds.

b The noted increase or decrease pertains to the overall period, and may not indicate the direction of the change during each of the intervening years.

c Per capita allocation was computed by dividing total allocation to Jewish education by Jewish population of the community.

d Despite these decreases, there was an increase in the allocation to local Jewish education.

e The figures given are for 1969, since 1970 data were not available. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1966 and 1969, and the per capita allocation is for 1969.

f The figures given are for 1969, the year of the initial allocation to local Jewish education. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1966 and 1970.

1 The figures given are for 1969, the year of the initial allocation to local Jewish education. Therefore, the indicated changes occurred from 1969 to 1970.
### TABLE 18. ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL JEWISH EDUCATION IN FEDERATION AND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Federation Allocation to All Local Jewish Needs</th>
<th>Total Local Allocation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>150,625</td>
<td>242,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, N.Y.</td>
<td>24,802</td>
<td>41,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden, N.J.</td>
<td>61,695</td>
<td>130,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>431,803</td>
<td>508,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>213,412</td>
<td>303,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Col.</td>
<td>254,228</td>
<td>285,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>227,983</td>
<td>391,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood, Fla.</td>
<td>30,575</td>
<td>44,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td>114,995</td>
<td>214,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Mo.</td>
<td>331,409</td>
<td>393,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, Calif.</td>
<td>71,341</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Wis.</td>
<td>413,548</td>
<td>482,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minn.</td>
<td>283,915</td>
<td>331,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>68,735</td>
<td>100,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, Calif.</td>
<td>155,335</td>
<td>363,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, N.J.</td>
<td>92,065</td>
<td>157,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, R.I.</td>
<td>134,513</td>
<td>230,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, N.Y.</td>
<td>128,791</td>
<td>165,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures include local allocations from Federation and other sources.

* Figures include local allocations from Federation and other sources.
### Allocation to Local Jewish Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>83,119</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>133,745</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>50,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>79,175</td>
<td>319.0</td>
<td>89,044</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>9,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,230</td>
<td>53,070</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>69,213</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>16,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>111,500</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>118,236</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>11,220</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>18,018</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>35,250</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>30,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>24,960</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>41,616</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>147,382</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>165,449</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>18,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>152,288</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>216,009</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>63,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,985</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>68,275</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>6,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>37,150</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>56,850</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17,725</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>66,159</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>114,108</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>47,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>61,747</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>83,349</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>21,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Includes community-chest funds.

b Increases were not made by all cities during each of the intervening years.

c Per capita allocation to Jewish education was computed by dividing total allocation to Jewish education by Jewish population of the community.

d The figures given are for 1968, the year of the initial allocation for local Jewish education. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1968 and 1970.

e The figures given are for 1967, the year of the initial allocation for local Jewish education. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1967 and 1970.

f The figures given are for 1969, since 1970 data were not available. Therefore, the indicated changes pertain to the period between 1966 and 1969, and the per capita allocation is for 1969.
TABLE 19. ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL JEWISH EDUCATION IN FEDERATION AND WEL-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Federation Allocation to All Local Jewish Needs</th>
<th>Total Local Allocationa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1,662,392</td>
<td>2,241,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>2,262,754</td>
<td>2,658,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>4,818,342</td>
<td>6,279,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>1,450,729</td>
<td>2,127,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1,444,835</td>
<td>1,858,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County, N.J. (Newark)</td>
<td>842,745</td>
<td>1,362,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>2,468,963</td>
<td>3,462,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Fla.</td>
<td>461,741</td>
<td>729,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>15,918,872</td>
<td>17,619,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>1,108,563</td>
<td>1,699,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>543,278</td>
<td>782,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>780,031</td>
<td>1,199,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, Calif.</td>
<td>623,350</td>
<td>770,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>342,170</td>
<td>634,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Allocation to Local Jewish Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>Increase 1966-70&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percentage of Change</th>
<th>Per Capita&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>215,406</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>282,210</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>66,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>373,993</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>574,906</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>200,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>648,700</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1,107,000</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>458,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>522,983</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>726,141</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>203,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>531,046</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>786,428</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>255,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>147,373</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>186,669</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>39,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>719,246</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>224,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>89,218</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>161,300</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>72,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,381,000</td>
<td>797,467</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,047,092</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>249,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>596,455</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>951,650</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>355,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>178,575</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>319,643</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>141,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>63,557</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>116,350</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>42,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>103,425</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>36,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Includes community-chest funds.

<sup>b</sup> Increases were not made by all cities during each of the intervening years.

<sup>c</sup> Per capita allocation to Jewish education was computed by dividing local allocation to Jewish education by Jewish population of the community.
### TABLE 20. ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL JEWISH EDUCATION BY 86 FEDERATIONS AND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Federation Allocation to All Local Jewish Needs</th>
<th>Total Local Allocation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>572,388</td>
<td>825,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>2,228,216</td>
<td>3,492,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>3,189,770</td>
<td>4,671,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 and over</td>
<td>34,728,765</td>
<td>43,437,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Excluding New York)</td>
<td>18,809,893</td>
<td>25,817,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,719,139</td>
<td>52,426,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Includes allocations for special programs.

<sup>b</sup> Excludes New York.

<sup>c</sup> Excluding New York.
### Allocation to Local Jewish Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Per Cent of Federation Allocation</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54,700 (19)</td>
<td>146,745</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>241,286</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>94,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,805 (23)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>250,786</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265,770 (28)</td>
<td>592,781</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>1,003,931</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>411,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301,145 (32)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,015,431</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383,630 (18)</td>
<td>926,755</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>1,276,604</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>349,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,476,000 (14)</td>
<td>4,800,273</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7,165,060</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2,364,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,095,000 (13)</td>
<td>4,002,806</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>6,117,968</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>2,115,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,180,000 (79)</td>
<td>6,466,554</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>9,686,881</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3,220,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,218,580 (87)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,707,881</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes community-chest funds.
* Figures in parentheses denote the number of reporting communities in the population category.
* Increases were not made by all cities during each of the intervening years.
* Per capita allocation to Jewish education was computed by dividing total allocation to Jewish education by Jewish population of the community.
* Figures do not include Norristown, since complete data were not available for 1970. See Table 16.
Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances

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 traditionally are 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 but also a major type of aid provided through contributions by Jews in the United States and in other countries.
- 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 relative difficulty of migration from specific stress areas, 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 care for the aged 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 Career Counseling 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 factors in planning and financing these services are provided mainly by 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.
The response to the Israel Emergency Fund of the UJA and the high proportion of service payments by hospitals brought this annual total to almost $1.5 billion in 1970. 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 since 1965. If data for 1970 and 1965 were compared, the following major changes are indicated:

- Federations raised $33 million more in 1970 for regular operating purposes; but the 1970 IEF experience resulted in an increase in total federation campaign results of about $157 million beyond the 1965 level.
- Grants by United Funds for local Jewish services rose by over $5 million.
- Hospital income rose by almost $400 million, care for the aged income by over $70 million, and center income by about $11 million (other than federation and United Fund allocations).
- While nonlocal agencies raised about $17 million more in 1970 than in 1965, most of this sum was earmarked for special and capital purposes (not included in federation annual campaigns). Noncontributed income, mainly government services, accounted for a rise of $70 million.¹

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 doubled since 1965, rising from about $0.7 billion to almost $1.5 billion in 1970.

Results of Jewish Federated Fund Raising

Over $4.5 billion was raised by the central Jewish community organizations of the United States in their annual campaigns in the 33-year period, 1939 through 1971, with almost $1.5 billion of this total raised in the five year period 1967–71. The 33-year period coincides with the organization of the UJA, which received almost $2.6 billion, mainly from welfare funds.

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

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

¹ This was centered in government research grants and municipal hospital contracts involving the Einstein College of Medicine.
creation of the State of Israel: 1946 results more than doubled and moved forward to the 1948 peak of over $200 million, exceeded only in 1967 and thereafter.

- 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 efforts to supplement regular campaigns.
- 1965 results of $131 million and 1966 results of $136 million were the highest since 1957.

Since the 1967 six-day war, Jews in the United States, Canada, and other countries have recognized that the welfare, health, education, and related needs of immigrants in Israel required 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 Emergency Fund of UJA in 1967 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 $318 million in 1967. This record was exceeded in 1971 and in 1972.

This campaign continued after 1967, in response to the continuing crisis faced by Israel. Campaign responses of about $80 million in 1968; $99 million for 1969, and $124 million for 1970 were second only to the 1967 results. However, this peak was exceeded in 1972.

With minor exceptions, federation campaigns include only maintenance and operating needs. They exclude totals for capital-fund or endowment drives conducted by federations alone, or together with local Jewish agencies, for local hospitals, homes for the aged, centers, and other structures.²

By contrast, the data for independent efforts of national and overseas agencies include major capital- and endowment-fund drives, mainly for educational and religious institutions and hospitals. Comparisons between

²A group of 25 larger cities reported endowment-fund assets of about $100 million in 1970. Their income and earnings in 1970 were $7.0 million, of which about one-third came from gifts and bequests, with most of the remainder derived from earnings and net gains on sales.
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 from 1961 through mid-1971 for its building fund about $168 million in pledges, as well as about $35 million in government grants, $51 million in loans (including $22 million in government loans), $20 million in endowment, investment, property sales, and other income.

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 conducted largely apart from federation annual campaigns. There appears to have been a diminution of such efforts during the emergency campaign period, which began in 1967.

JWB estimated that, in the 22-year period through 1969, capital investments for local centers reached $132 million. Building of centers was underway in 1970 and 1971 in six communities.3

The amounts raised by Federations are augmented by funds provided by non-sectarian United Funds for local Jewish services. These grants totaled $23.4 million in 1970, mainly to federated agencies. Outside New York City, United Funds provided $20.9 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.

A number of federations have developed policy statements regarding supplementary appeals, which stress the primacy, clearance procedures on approved appeals, and public reporting by these appeals.

The major independent fund-raising efforts for overseas programs in 1971

were: Hadassah, which raised $14.4 million, in addition to amounts secured from federations in half the communities; Hebrew University, Technion, and Weizmann Institute, which raised $16 million for capital and special funds; the America-Israel Cultural Foundation and National Committee for Labor Israel, which raised about $1.7 million and $2.6 million, respectively; the Jewish National Fund, ORT, and American Red Mogen Dovid, which did not appeal to welfare funds, but independently raised $3.6 million, $3.6 million, and $1.2 million, respectively.

The major independent efforts for national programs in 1971 were by Brandeis University, which raised $13 million without appealing to welfare funds; two hospitals, City of Hope and National Jewish Hospital, which raised $13.3 million with only nominal support from welfare funds; Yeshiva University, including Einstein Medical College, which raised $9.3 million; the Reform Jewish Appeal and the Jewish Theological Seminary-United Synagogue Appeal, which raised $10.0 million mainly from membership sources; B'nai B'rith Youth Service Appeal, which raised $4.9 million, also from membership sources; and the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League, which raised $4.6 million and $4.2 million, respectively, mainly from campaigns in New York City and Chicago.

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 on 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 $10 million in 1970 for operating purposes. These were supplementary contributions, with the major share of income derived from Jewish federations and United Funds. 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 33 per cent 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 14 per cent annually outside New York City for the regular campaign (exclusive of IEF). Inclusion of IEF would lower this figure to under 10 per cent.

These major elements explain the difference in the figures shown for amounts raised (Table 1) and the figures shown for amounts distributed (Table 3). Amounts distributed also include 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 and 1970 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) had leveled off at 56 to 60 per cent from 1958 to 1961. Since 1963, the UJA share has been from 53 to 56 per cent of regular funds.

Regular allocations to UJA by welfare funds rose by about $3 million (to $77 million) in 1970, with a higher rise indicated in the 1971 regular campaign. In 1970 UJA received about two-thirds of all funds raised (including IEF).

Overseas agencies other than UJA continued to receive 2.4 per cent of totals budgeted. Together with national agencies, all nonlocal non-UJA agencies continued to receive about 6.4 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 53 per cent of regular funds budgeted in 1970 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 over 80 per cent of their budgeted funds. Intermediate-size cities provided nonlocal agencies with about 67 per cent of budgeted funds.

Local services received, for operating purposes from Federation sources, about $55 million in 1970 compared with $53 million in 1969. Income for Jewish local services from United Funds rose by about five per cent in 1970. Jewish Federation allocations rose by almost ten per cent but this reflected mainly increased allocations for Jewish education, the need to provide total financing in cities where local Jewish services received no United Fund support and the need to supplement United Fund grants.

There was little change in allocations for local capital purposes in 1970.

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.
Such allocations did not exceed 1.4 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 United Fund support for Jewish education, local community relations, and local refugee aid programs.

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

Thus, from the total of about $44.5 million provided to fields eligible for United Fund support in 1970 in 112 cities outside New York City (hospitals, family, child care, centers, aged, vocational services, and administration), total United Fund support of about $21 million should be deducted. The difference ($23.5 million) represents federation support for these fields on a combined basis. In addition, federation support of $12.3 million was provided for services which receive no United Fund support (Jewish education, community relations, and refugee care).

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.

**OVERSEAS SERVICES**

*Aid to Israel and Other Overseas Areas*

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States is channeled through the United Jewish Appeal and other overseas agencies and through purchases of Israel Bonds. From 1948 through 1971, the UJA provided almost $1.654 million 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 (including mainly the JDC Malben program and aid to yeshivot) to the extent of over $200 million.\(^5\) Hadassah transmitted over $200 million in this period. Sales of Israel Bonds were $1,588 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-1971 was about $1,345 million, but this included $975 million in loans, of which $514 million was later repaid, and grants and technical aid of $370 million. This included grants and loans in local currency. Net aid stood at $832 million through mid-1971.\(^6\)

By the end of December 1971, foreign currency balances were reported at about $1,278 million.\(^7\) 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 over $750 million in 1968 through 1971. By June 1971, foreign currency debts were reported at about $3,430 million.\(^8\)

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 $720 million in 1970, and about 53 per cent of imports of $1,371 million.\(^9\) The 1970 deficit in commodity trade reached $551 million.

These figures deal with trade in commodities only. If services are included (tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $1,219 million in 1970, $869 million in 1969, $638 million in 1968, and $532 million in 1967. (Preliminary reports for 1971 include a narrowing of the trade deficit by about $90 million.) These deficits were partially offset in 1970 by $635 million in "unilateral transfers" consisting mainly of restitution and reparations, campaign proceeds in the U.S. and other countries, and personal transfers. In 1969 these transfers had reached $459 million.

The major changes in "trade deficits" since 1966 have included the rise of defense imports and income from campaign proceeds and restitution payments. Defense imports rose from $116 million in 1966 to $624 million in

---

\(^5\) This was included in total receipts of JDC of about $689 million received from 1948 through 1971. Total JDC receipts in the 57-year period, 1914 through 1971, from all sources was about $963 million.


\(^7\) This includes deposits in Israel, deposits abroad, and deposits with the International Monetary Fund. Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (Jerusalem), April 1972. Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (Jerusalem) Table G-4, April 1972.


**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 economy of the country.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF had available for overseas purposes about $281 million in 1971 and $238 million in 1970. Almost 90 per cent of these funds were available for Israel purposes in 1971. Campaigns in other overseas countries also provide funds for programs in Israel.

Keren Hayesod pledges were about $103 million for 1971, about $85 million for 1970, about $77 million for 1969, and about $55 million for 1968.

In addition, net receipts from the global sale of Israel Bonds in 1967 totalled $171 million, after redemptions and conversions, contrasted with net receipts in 1968 of $78 million, $63 million in 1969 and $136 million in 1970 after similar redemptions.11

Immigration since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948 through 1971 totalled about 1,410,00012 while almost 200,000 Jews migrated from Israel to other countries. Major migration took place from 1948 through 1951, when about 685,000 Jews entered Israel. About 90,000 Jews migrated in 1952 through 1955, but there was a surge forward in 1956 through 1957, when over 127,000 Jews migrated to Israel.

The immigration pace slackened in 1958 through 1960, when about 75,000 Jews went to Israel, but the tempo of movement was heightened again in the ensuing four years (1961–64) when almost 230,000 Jews migrated to Israel. In 1965 through 1968 the total movement exceeded 80,000, but rose to about 40,000 annually in 1969 through 1971.

The waves of immigration were related to opportunities which existed at particular times: the post-war migration of displaced persons; movements from Eastern Europe, when local conditions permitted and required this in Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; and movements from North Africa resulting mainly from political changes in Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Yemen, and

---


11 Ibid., Table III–24.

Egypt. There was a substantial rise in immigration from the Soviet Union in 1971, which was continuing in the first half of 1972.

**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. At September 1971, $392.6 million had been sold and $263.5 million were still outstanding.

Total Bonds issued for all issues were $1,891 million at the end of 1971, including $1,588 million sold in the United States.

At the end of September 1971 there were outstanding in the hands of the public $1,049 million, including $115.9 million Second Development Issue; $263.5 million Third Development Issue (floated March 1, 1964), $418.4 million Fourth Development Issue (floated September 15, 1967); $12.3 million Development Investment Issue (floated March 1, 1966); $130.7 million Second Development Investment Issue (floated August 1, 1968), and $58.9 million Fifth Development Issue and $49.4 Third Development Investment Issue (floated March 1, 1971).

From the inception of sale of Israel Bonds in May 1951 through 1971, about $134 million worth of State of Israel Bonds were received by the UJA in payment of allocations provided from the proceeds of individual pledges. In 1971, $17.8 million worth of bonds were reported to have been received by the United Jewish Appeal in payment of individual pledges to local welfare funds.

From 1963 through 1971, about $340 million in Bonds matured. Conversions for investment purposes in 1963–71 had totaled about $120.8 million, from inception through November 1971.

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 over $209 million in 1971, exceeding the 1967 peak of $190 million. These results reflected the response to the critical needs faced by the government of Israel since the six-day war.

Outside of the United States, 1971 sales amounted to $42.3 million, compared with $34.7 million the preceding year. Worldwide sales amounted to $251.4 million in 1971.
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: $1,683 million from 1955 through 1970. This included $138 million in 1969 and $201 million in 1970.

The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1964 with Claims Conference funds for the support of “Jewish history, religion, education, and traditions.” Operations began in 1965. Forty-two Jewish organizations joined the Foundation, including 11 from the United States. Allocations in 1970-71 of about $1,533,000 were granted to organizations in 16 countries and to individual scholars for activity in the areas of education, research, publication, and documentation of the Holocaust. Allocations are granted out of current income only. The restricted capital balances were $13.1 million by September 1971.

Overseas Agencies

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

The UJA share of all regular funds budgeted was about 53 per cent in 1970. The Israel Emergency Fund went entirely to the UJA and resulted in increasing the total share of UJA. In 1970 UJA received about two-thirds of total funds raised.

Total cash receipts in 1971 of all overseas agencies was about $281 million, with about $48 million raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities were the Israel Education Fund of UJA; Hadassah, which raised $14.4 million through activities of its members; the building and special fund drives of Hebrew University and Technion, which raised $13.2 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 $2.5 million; the Jewish National Fund campaign for “traditional income,” which raised $3.6 million; and Weizmann Institute, which raised $2.9 million.

United Jewish Appeal

The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) is a partnership of the United Israel Appeal (UIA) 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 the UJA or joint appeals, with UJA as the major beneficiary.

From its inception in 1939 through 1971, UJA received cash payments of about $2,576 million and distributed about $1,654 million to UIA (formerly United Palestine Appeal); $689 million to JDC, and about $93 million to USNA, NYANA, and UHS. In addition, there were pledges of about $135 million for prior years (mainly for 1971) most of which, judging from past experience, would be paid in 1972.

A 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 $76 million. In 1969 they rose to $74 million for the regular campaign and $93 million for the Israel Emergency Fund. In 1970, regular UJA allocations were $77 million and the Israel Emergency Fund totalled $120 million. In 1971, regular UJA allocations were $91 million and the Israel Emergency Fund totalled $162 million.

UJA provides general campaign services to communities (publicity, speakers, and the like) and seeks to secure from welfare funds a maximum share of funds collected. It does not directly operate any service programs. These are conducted through the agencies which share in the UJA proceeds: UIA (actually by the Jewish Agency in Israel), JDC, 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. This 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 beyond the formula and it was to receive up to $1,250,000 additional for 1970 if up to $10 million were raised beyond the $55 million level. Similarly, the JDC was to receive $1,250,000 if $70 million were raised, and 12.5 per cent if more then $74 million were raised. The formula was not applied to the proceeds of the Israel Emergency Funds of 1967, 1968 and 1969.

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

---

13 Exclusive of Israel Education Fund.
14 Estimated receipts from the Israel Emergency Fund are on a net basis, after deduction of expenses and shrinkage. Data in Table 1 are on gross basis.
equipment, and facilities. This effort is separate from the annual UJA campaign. A total of $36.3 million in pledges was received from 1965 until the end of 1971 of which $23.8 million had been received in cash.

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

JDC does not share in this fund. The funds are turned over to 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, exempts the institution from governmental tax, provides funds toward the cost of maintenance and agrees not to make similar arrangements with other similar efforts without prior consultation with the UJA and the UIA.

**UJA Regular and IEF Funds**

On a *pledge* basis, UJA regular income was $90 million in 1971, exclusive of the Israel Education Fund. This was about 17 per cent higher than the 1970 pledge total of $77 million. In addition, the pledges for the Israel Emergency Fund were about $162 million.

On a *cash* basis, UJA had receipts of $85.1 million in "regular" funds in 1971, compared with $80.6 million in 1970. These were the cash amounts received each year, regardless of years for which the pledges were made. In addition, $3.3 million was received annually in 1970 and 1971 for the Israel Education Fund.

Cash receipts for the 1967 Israel Emergency Fund rose to about $172.8 million by the end of 1971.

Cash receipts for the 1968 Israel Emergency Fund (of $76 million in estimated pledges, net of expenses and shrinkage) totaled $72.4 million by the end of 1971.

Cash receipts for the 1969 Israel Emergency Fund (of $93 million in estimated pledges, net of expenses and shrinkage) totaled $85.5 million by the end of 1971.

Cash receipts for the 1970 Israel Emergency Fund (of $115 million in estimated pledges, net of expenses and shrinkage) totaled $99.6 million by the end of that year.

Cash receipts for the 1971 Israel Emergency Fund (of $162 million in estimated pledges, net of expenses and shrinkage) totaled $90.2 million by the end of 1971, with major additional collections anticipated in 1972.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its percentage share of campaign proceeds. UJA regular allocation proceeds for 1971 of about $90 million compared with total *regular* campaign proceeds of about $197 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 1971 was $33.2 million. The terms of this loan also limited short-term debt (for 12 months) at any time to $10 million. The loan for $50 million was exclusive of financing by some of the insurance companies of capital requirements for housing in Israel.

An additional series of bank loans for $45 million were secured by UIA early in 1970. Unpaid balances of both the 1965 and 1970 loans were about $70.9 million at the end of 1971. Also, UIA (with UJA as guarantor) completed arrangements for lines of credit of $50 million for 1972.

Jewish National Fund

The Jewish National Fund, under the UJA agreement between UIA, JDC, and NYANA, is permitted to raise $1,800,000 annually from the “traditional collections” in the United States, after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Amounts raised beyond that level could result in an equivalent reduction in the UIA share of UJA funds. Total United States income of JNF, including traditional income, bequests, and other income, was about $3.6 million in 1970–71. 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. The board of trustees of the combined agency includes mainly members suggested for consideration by various communities and designees of the American Zionist organizations previously represented in the former UIA. Ten are elected at large.

The board of trustees elects two-thirds of the board of directors, with the remaining one-third designated by the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc. The operating agency for services to immigrant and other programs in Israel is the Jewish Agency for Israel, Jerusalem. These 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...
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Jewish Appeal, the latter being constituted by periodic agreements between 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 a program geared to stimulating interest in Israel through the use of motion pictures, literature, and direct contact with membership organizations and welfare funds.

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

Israel Emergency Fund

The response of the American Jewish community to the Israel crisis resulted in pledges of about $173 million for IEF of UJA in 1967; $76 million in 1968, $93 million in 1969, $120 million in 1970, and $162 million in 1971. This was in addition to the proceeds of the regular UJA campaign.

Preliminary estimates for the year ended March 31, 1972 indicate that UIA hoped to have available for allocation about $181 million in cash from both IEF and regular programs. On this basis, UIA approved allocations for 1971-72 for this sum, subject to revision on the basis of actual funds available.

Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem)

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

Before 1967, about 80 per cent of contribution income generally came from the United States, but the 1967 Israel crisis resulted in a rise of the share of contributions by overseas Jewry. By 1971 United States Jewry was providing about 70 per cent, and overseas Jewry about 30 per cent, of the total funds raised for Jewish Agency programs.

Receipts of UIA in 1967-68 from UJA were about $211 million. They were about $105 million in 1968-69; $125.5 million in 1969-70, and $145.1 million in 1970-71. Receipts in 1971-72 are estimated to be over $180 million. In addition, cash receipts for the Israel Education Fund were $3 million annually. Before 1967, the peak year of UJA fund raising was 1948, but the UIA received a lower share from UJA in that year ($37 million) than in more recent years when the JDC share of UJA funds had declined. The rise in 1967-68 receipts was due to the initiation of the
Israel Emergency Fund. These receipts decreased in 1968-69, and have risen since then.

UIA allocations for programs in Israel are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration &amp; absorption</td>
<td>$11.6</td>
<td>$18.8</td>
<td>$19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social welfare services</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural settlement</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>55.5b</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth care (including Youth Aliyah)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service (in U.S.)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and other</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$130.9b</td>
<td>$182.0b</td>
<td>$181.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional funds were provided by overseas Jewish communities for further requirements of the Jewish Agency for Israel in the categories specified above (for example, $63.6 million in 1970-71).

b Includes $45 million from proceeds of 1970 loans.

c Subject to adjustment.

**Immigration and absorption** allocations include activities outside Israel to help immigrants move to Israel: 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 the integration of immigrants.

**Health** allocations include 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 include 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, transporting of students, and related services.

**Higher education** allocations for 1970-71 included aid to seven institutions of higher learning for operations and for capital purposes: Hebrew University
($16.2 million), Technion ($10.3 million), Weizmann Institute ($5.0 million), Tel Aviv University ($5.8 million), Bar-Ilan University ($2.5 million), Haifa University ($3.1 million), and Beersheba University ($0.6 million). UIA allocations of $41.2 million were augmented by Jewish Agency allocations of $32.5 million.

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

**Reorganization of the Jewish Agency for Israel**

The Jewish Agency for Israel was reconstituted in 1970. The main governing body is the annual Assembly, consisting initially of up to 296 members, of which 50 per cent are designated by the World Zionist Organization, 30 per cent by UIA, and 20 per cent designated to represent Jewish communities in 25 other countries. The first Assembly met in June 1971 in Jerusalem.

The Assembly elected officers and the board of governors from among its members. The board has power to act between meetings of the Assembly. The board, in turn, elects members of the Executive. The board consists initially of 40 members, composed of the same 50-30-20 proportion used for the Assembly.

The program of the Jewish Agency continues to be only such as may be carried on by tax-exempt organizations. It is independent of the World Zionist Organization. UIA continues 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 Jewish 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 233,000 persons in 1971. Of these, 98,000 were in Israel (including about 30,000 receiving aid from Malben, 42,500 in ORT schools, and about 19,600 in *yeshivot*), 65,000 in Western Europe, 17,000 in Eastern Europe, 43,000 in Moslem areas, and about 10,000 in other areas. This was exclusive of 80,000 aided by "relief-in-transit" programs, which are less formally organized.

Disbursements were $23.3 million in 1971; receipts were $25.2 million. Regular income included about $0.2 million in overseas campaign income, $0.5 million in restitution funds, and about $1.0 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 its appropriations: $8.2 million, or one-third of the 1971 total. An additional
$914,000 was provided for aid to yeshivot and other traditional institutions in Israel. In 1971 Malben aided about 30,000 persons; services included care of the aged in institutions and in their own homes with medical and psychiatric services. Malben accounts for the greatest portion of the total of over $200 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1971.

The largest number of North African Jews receiving JDC aid was in Morocco, where over 15,500 were being assisted in 1971. About 23,000 Jews in Tunisia and Iran were also receiving JDC aid. JDC appropriated $3.7 million in 1971 for work in Moslem areas. JDC assistance is channeled through such agencies as OSE in the health field, the Alliance Israélite Universelle, Ozar Hatorah, and Lubavitcher schools in the educational fields; and ORT for vocational training.

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

ORT and Vocational Education

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

The global expenditures of the World ORT Union were at an annual level of about $24.0 million in 1971. Total ORT trainees in 1971 were 64,000, of whom 42,500 were in Israel, 5,700 in France, 3,100 in Italy, and 5,500 in Moslem countries.

American Jewish support of the ORT program is channeled in two ways: through the JDC grant to ORT ($2,600,000 for 1971 and $2,850,000 for 1972), derived from JDC participation in UJA and from ORT membership contributions in the United States. Women's American ORT provided about $3.6 million in 1971. The agreement between ORT and JDC permits ORT to recruit members at annual dues not exceeding $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. UHS assisted 3,170 Jewish immigrants to migrate in 1971 (including 955 to the United States), compared with 6,377 in 1970. 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 aiding their resettlement and absorption. Hence, the financing of NYANA's program is considered a national responsibility, as reflected in its inclusion as a direct beneficiary of National UJA.

Recent annual immigration to the United States is estimated at about 6,500, including persons aided by agencies and those arriving independently. Of those who settled in New York City, about 1,300 received aid from NYANA in 1971. The 1971 UJA grant to NYANA was $645,000.

**Hadassah**

The largest income of an overseas service agency, other than UJA, was that of Hadassah, which received $20.1 million in 1970–71. 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 $33.4 million. Medical services in Israel are also provided by the Kupat Holim of the Histadrut, by governmental departments, and by the Malben program of JDC.\(^\text{15}\)

The Youth Aliyah program for the maintenance and training of immigrant youth (in the earliest years orphaned, now mainly with families in Israel) and other youth activities are conducted by the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, at an annual cost of about $10 million. Hadassah transmitted to Youth Aliyah about $2.3 million in 1970–71. Hadassah reports that it has supplied about $63 million for Youth Aliyah since the program was begun 38 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 12,000.

**Higher Education in Israel**

Enrollment in 1971–72 at all of the institutions of higher education in Israel totaled over 53,000, compared with about 46,000 in 1970–71. Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University,\(^\text{16}\) Technion, and Tel Aviv University had receipts in America of about $20 million in 1970–71, mainly in contributions. In addition, these three institutions together with four others, received grants of about $41 million from the United Israel Appeal, a beneficiary of UJA funds.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^{15}\) Hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary, and private) totaled 23,758 and provided about 8.3 million days' care in 1970. Hadassah had about 700 beds and bassinets, and provided about 214,000 days' care.

\(^{16}\) Hebrew University reported a marked rise in receipts in 1971–72, after the prior suspension of capital fund-raising campaign was ended.

\(^{17}\) In 1970–71 United Israel Appeal granted to Weizmann Institute about $5.0 million; Hebrew University, $16.2 million, Technion $10.3 million, Bar-Ilan University $2.5 million; Tel Aviv University $5.8 million, Haifa University $0.8 million, and to Beersheba University, $0.6 million.
Hebrew University and Technion receive from federations about $800,000 annually for maintenance purposes. The building-fund and special-fund cash campaign proceeds of the two institutions were $11 million in 1971. Their maintenance appeals were combined; their capital fund drives were conducted separately.

Both institutions had marked enrollment increases in recent years. About 18,500 students were registered at Hebrew University (including a Tel Aviv branch) and 6,750 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, originally founded in 1955 with the support of the Mizrachi Organization of America, subsequently evolved as an independent institution. It had a student enrollment of about 5,500 in the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

Tel Aviv University, originally affiliated with the municipality, was reorganized as an independent institution and in 1964 began to seek public financial support for capital needs. Its 1971–72 student enrollment was about 14,000 in the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, law, and medicine.

Haifa University began its program in 1964–65 and had an enrollment of 5,000 students in 1971–72. Beersheba University opened in 1965; its student enrollment in 1971–72 was 3,200.

Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel

There were about 20,000 students in attendance in 1970 in some 300 yeshivot receiving support from the government of Israel. Students in some of the yeshivot received JDC support as well. Many of these yeshivot have no age limit, although most students are between 14 and 17 years old. They are called “traditional institutions” because of their roots in the traditional religious life of Eastern Europe.

Many of the yeshivot receive support from JDC (about $900,000 annually). Some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel institutions ($183,000 raised in 1971), but a great number also seek funds separately in the United States, through collectors (meshulokhim) and mail appeals. Altogether, annual expenditures were reported at $5 million in 1968–69.18

Cultural programs in Israel were supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation ($1.9 million in 1971), which included some 50 agencies in Israel in its appeal. These were mainly in the

---

18 Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1971, Table T-2.
fields of music, theater, dance, art, and literature. Building funds are sought by AICF in addition to funds for maintenance. The major recent capital project was for a new structure to house the Israel Museum.

**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 World Zionist Organization Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns under conditions regarding timing, goals, scope, 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 institutions of higher learning were suspended in 1971 to facilitate fund raising for the Israel Emergency Fund. These campaigns were later resumed, with emphasis on orderly scheduling in cooperation with specific communities. These agencies continue to receive a portion of IEF funds, as budgeted by the United Israel Appeal.

Thirteen overseas agencies, other than UJA agencies, had income of $47.9 million in 1971, compared with $43.1 million in 1970.

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, maga-
zines, 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 coordination 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 92 local and regional community-relations councils.

The National Conference on Soviet Jewry was reorganized in June 1971 as an autonomous body, consisting of national agencies and representatives of local welfare funds and community relations councils, to deal with programs affecting the status of Soviet Jewry. The Conference utilizes the resources of NJCRAC as the channel for local implementation of programs.

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 $16.8 million in 1971, compared with $15.8 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). An additional motivation was the theory that the climate of areas like Denver and Southern California was helpful in TB cases.

These institutions came into existence before many of the present local Jewish hospitals were organized. Improvement in the health conditions 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. In-
come 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 of New York City, began functioning in 1955. Its receipts in 1971 were $67.9 million, compared with $56.6 million in 1970. Its student enrollment in 1971–72 was 496. An agreement between Montefiore Hospital and the hospital of Yeshiva University involves operations of both facilities by Montefiore Hospital, and availability for teaching facilities of both hospitals to the Einstein Medical School.

Income of the other four agencies in 1971 was $27.7 million. Two of the agencies (City of Hope, near Los Angeles, and National Jewish Hospital, in Denver) accounted for about $24.1 million of the total for 1970.

Service Agencies

Basic services to individuals are provided by local agencies, financed in large measure by federation and (in some fields) by 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. It received $2.2 million in 1971, out of a total of $3.0 million 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 United Funds), 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, Con-
servative, 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.

The National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council also provides service to 92 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.

A Joint Culture Appeal was organized in 1972 for nine cultural agencies. Its initial budget was approved by the Large City Budgeting Conference. NFJC serves as the administrative arm of the JCA.

The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, financed from German reparations funds, allocated $321,788 for activities mainly in the United States in 1970–71. This included 57 scholarship and fellowship grants, aid to two yeshivot and grants to agencies mainly for research (American Association for Jewish Education, Conference for Jewish Culture, Dropsie University, Leo Baeck Institute, Yeshiva University, and YIVO).

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

Although seventeen agencies had income of $58.9 million in 1971, Brandeis University accounted for $33 million, B’nai B’rith National Youth Service Appeal for $7.2 million; Yeshiva University programs (other than medical and religious) for $13.4 million; and Zionist Organization of America for $1.8 million. The remaining 13 agencies received $3.4 million in 1971.

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. Local population studies are conducted mainly by local federations. CJFWF undertook a major national population study; initial results are to be released in late 1972.

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 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 Youth Service Appeal (Hillel Foundations, B'nai B'rith Organization, and B'nai B'rith Career and Counseling Service) and the Jewish Chautauqua Society emphasize youth activities. BBYSA 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.

Ten national religious agencies received $23.6 million in 1971, and $23.5 million in 1970.

LOCAL SERVICES

Central communal sources (Jewish federations and United Funds) provided about $80 million for local Jewish services in 1970, a rise of almost five per cent.

Jewish federations supplied about $56.2 million in 1970, compared with $53.7 million in 1969, 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 United Funds provided an additional estimated $24 million in 1970, in most cases through Jewish federations, but in some cases directly to Jewish service agencies. Of this sum, $16 million was received in the 14 largest cities, where over 75 per cent of the Jewish population reside.

United Funds generally restrict their support to agencies operating in the

---

20 Includes Greater New York Fund and NYC United Hospital Fund.
fields of health, family and child care, care of the aged, and Jewish centers. A substantial share of contributed communal income even in these fields comes from Jewish federations, particularly for health and care of the aged services; federations also have exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

Outside New York City, agencies eligible for United Fund support received $2.6 million more in 1970 than in 1969; but United Funds provided $1 million of this increase with the major portion ($1.6 million) provided by federations. Other services not supported by United Funds had increased allocations of 15 per cent ($1.6 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 United Funds. This is reflected below in data for 1970 (except for centers, vocational services, and some nonreporting agencies, 1969):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Service</th>
<th>Reported Receipts (in millions)</th>
<th>Provided by Jewish Federations and United Funds (in millions)</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>$666.9</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish education</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged care</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers (excl. camps)</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family service</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Available data for 112 communities for 1969 and 1970 show how central communal funds (federation and United Fund income) were distributed among various fields of local service (see Table 5). Federations provided roughly 63 per cent, and United Funds 37 per cent, of central communal funds received by local agencies in these communities; but the totals include many fields of service and agencies, which receive no United Fund support. Even in the fields where United Fund allocations are available, there was, for the first time in 1969, a shift to major federation support. This was accented in 1970, when federations provided $23 million, compared with $21 million, from United Funds. Federations also provided $12 million to services not eligible for United Fund support.

Rises from 5 to 7 per cent in 1970 in central community grants were experienced in the fields of Jewish education, recreation, care of the aged, community relations, and vocational services. Hospital grants fell by 5 per cent.

The major sources of funds for local service agencies, other than central
funds, are payments for service by users and public-tax funds. These sources of funds have risen more than community funds.

An analysis of allocations for local services by 93 communities over a five-year span (1966–1970) indicates significant changes: Both United Fund and federation grants rose, by 23 and 42 per cent, respectively. The federation share of allocations rose from about 60 to 63 per cent during this period. The sharpest rises in allocations since 1966 were for the care of the aged (60 per cent), Jewish education (55 per cent), centers and community-relations services (48 to 52 per cent), and family, child care, refugee care, and employment services (32 to 35 per cent). Hospital allocations fell by 13 per cent.

A similar analysis for a full decade indicates that, since 1961, United Fund grants rose by 46 per cent and federation grants by 70 per cent. The sharpest rises in the 1961–70 decade were for Jewish education and for the care of the aged, 101 per cent; local community relations, 92 per cent; centers, 86 per cent; refugee care, 68 per cent; family and child-care service, 65 per cent; and employment services, 56 per cent.

Health

Most local Jewish hospitals are in the largest centers of Jewish population. Fifteen of the 16 cities with more than 40,000 Jewish population in the United States and Canada have local Jewish Hospitals;20 in the 15,000 to 40,000 population group, eight out of 16 cities have local Jewish hospitals, with only three such hospitals in smaller cities. As a result of this concentration of health services in the largest centers of Jewish population, local health allocations averaged about 16 per cent of total combined allocations in 1970 (federations plus United Funds) in the group of cities with population over 40,000 (excluding New York City)—a decline from 24 per cent in 1966—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 1970 there were reports on 24,641 beds and bassinets in 63 general and special hospitals under Jewish sponsorship. Federations and United Funds provided $10.7 million for local Jewish hospitals in the United States, of which $8 million was identified as direct federation grants. This was 14 per cent of federation allocations for all local services. It was also 14 per cent of combined federation and United Fund grants. When compared with total regular federation fund-raising receipts in 1970, the share received by hospitals was 5 per cent; inclusive of IEF, it was less than 3 per cent.

A total of $6.7 million days' care was provided in 1970 by local (general and special) Jewish hospitals in the United States. There was an average
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20 The exception is Washington, D.C.
bed utilization rate of 88 per cent in 1970, compared with 84 per cent in 1960.

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. Together with United Fund grants, federation allocations accounted for 1.6 per cent of operating receipts in 1970. Payments for service for hospitals (individual patient fees and Blue Cross insurance) and tax support rose to $634 million in 1970 in 46 hospitals, or 94 per cent of operating receipts. Governmental payments (mainly for Medicare and public assistance programs) accounted for about $231 million of total service payments.

Family and Child Care

Family-service agencies provide personal and family counseling, family-life education, psychiatric services, and limited economic aid. An increasing number of agencies provide homemaker services in 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 with refugee services. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most 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 1970, 67 family agencies reported a total of about 86,800 open cases on their rolls, with about 63,000 cases closed during the year, and a monthly average active caseload of over 20,000 families (about 4,000 more than in 1960). About 31 per cent of cases involved persons aged 60 and over, a rise from 25 per cent in 1968.

A total of 6,866 children were under care during 1970 in 40 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 United Funds for family and child-care services rose by 6 per cent in 1970. Such central allocations accounted for about 73 per cent of total receipts for family agencies (including refugee service). Central allocations were 18 per cent of the receipts of child-care agencies, with over 63 per cent provided by public tax funds.

Refugees

Services in communities are financed locally, although they may be considered as extensions of an overseas problem. Post-war immigration to the United States began in volume late in 1946, reached its peak in 1949, and, 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 1.7 per cent in 1970.
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 is 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 1970 aid was provided to 908 refugee families by 48 family agencies (excluding aid by NYANA). While this was about 7 per cent of the active cases of these agencies, the financial aid given to refugees was 54 per cent of aid given by them to all families.

Centers, Camps, Youth Services

According to the National Jewish Welfare Board, there were, in 1971, over 300 Jewish community centers, with a membership of about 782,000. Some 30 per cent of members were under 14 years of age, 19 per cent were 14 through 24 years old, and over half were 25 or older.

Estimated total community-center expenditures in 1970 were about $53.8 million, compared with $48.9 million in 1969, exclusive of separate camping agencies. A decade earlier, in 1959, these expenditures had been $22.5 million. Since 1967, costs have been rising at an annual rate of 9 to 10 per cent. Average family-membership fees were about $80 in 1969. Federation and United Fund allocations to centers, camps, and other youth services rose by 11 per cent in 1970, and by 48 per cent in the five-year period 1966–70 (a rise of 86 per cent since 1961).

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 59 per cent of center receipts in 1959, to 64 per cent in 1969. Central community support from federations and United Funds provided the balance of finances.

Homes for the Aged

There were 76 homes for the aged, which reported 14,900 beds with 95 per cent bed utilization in 1970. They cared for 18,954 residents, who received 5.1 million days' care. Average per capita cost was $21.50. Federations and United Funds provided 5.5 per cent of receipts, with 88 per cent secured from payments for service, including public funds. Almost 64 per cent came from governmental sources, exclusive of OASDI funds paid by clients.

Aggregate federation and United Fund allocations to homes for the aged
rose by 5 per cent in 1970. They rose by about 60 per cent between 1966 and 1970 (and by 101 per cent since 1961), increasing as the proportion of aged in the population continued to grow.

About 65 per cent of the residents in homes for the aged were over 80 years old; more than 87 per cent were over 75. Median age of residents was 82.

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 $103.8 million were reported for 1970 by the homes. Payments for service accounted for $95 million, including public funds. Federation and United Fund support was reported at $6.1 million. There were 17 homes which received support from neither central communal source.

Jewish Education

There was an estimated enrollment of 555,000 students in 1966. Of these, 42 per cent were attending one-day-a-week schools, 44 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 7 per cent of enrollment.

An AAJE National Study of Jewish Education, issued in 1959, arrived at an estimate of a cost of “over $60 million” in 1958. Although the enrollment estimate for 1958 was higher than more recent estimates, this was offset by a subsequent decline of one-day-a-week schools and the growth of more costly and more intensive day-school programs.

The consumer price index rose by about 40 per cent from 1958 to the end of 1970. Hence, the cost of Jewish education since 1958 may have risen by as much as $25 million. Estimates of “about $85 million” for 1970, and “about $90 million” for 1971 are of the grossest type, and are advanced only in the absence of more reliable data.

The major sources of support of pre-bar mitzvah education are congre-

21 National Census of Jewish Schools conducted by American Association for Jewish Education, reported in World Census on Jewish Education, 1968.

22 There are major unresolved problems in financial reporting for Jewish education, including the need for uniform methods of distributing joint expenses between congregational and educational functions and between secular and religious components in day schools. National congregational associations do not report on the congregational share of the costs of Jewish education. In 1968 a study of Reform temple finance estimated that $52 million was being spent by congregations, with the average share of congregational budgets for Jewish education at about 20 per cent. A Conservative study for Metropolitan New York estimated that about 30 per cent of budgets were spent on Jewish education. There are no data for Orthodox school costs, but 20 per cent of congregational enrollment is under Orthodox auspices, half of it in the more costly day schools.
gational and parental. Financing of Jewish education is inseparable from congregational financing because of joint housing, joint staffing, and the pivotal role played by bar mitzvah preparation in Jewish education. Variations in scales of tuition fees are frequently related to variations in 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 heretofore restricted the availability of meaningful data on financing of Jewish education under congregational auspices.

Jewish federations provide almost $10 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 $8.7 million outside New York City in 1970, a rise of 12 per cent from the year before. A gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education has occurred each year; they were 55 per cent higher in 1970 than in 1966, and 101 per cent higher than they had been in 1961. Payments by parents, either directly or through membership fees to congregations, provided the major source of income for primary education.

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

Federation grants of $8.7 million in 1970 outside New York City for Jewish education were 25 per cent of total local allocations from federation sources. United Funds 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 large and intermediate communities. Local activities financed by federations received about $1.7 million in 1970, 17 per cent more than in 1969 (outside New York City, which is served mainly by national agencies), a rise of 52 per cent since the beginning of 1966 (a rise of 92 per cent since the beginning of 1961).

In some areas, local and regional community-relations programs are financed by national agencies (mainly B'nai B'riith 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 and United Funds provided about $2.9 million in 1970 (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 reported by the Jewish Occupational Council. A complementary program is provided by a network of vocational service bureaus financed by the B’nai B’rith Youth Service Appeal, at a cost of about $0.6 million in 1970.

Local allocations for vocational programs increased by 8 per cent in 1970 outside New York City. The gain since 1966 was 35 per cent; 56 per cent since 1961.

Changes in Financing Since 1961

The major changes in federation and United Fund support of local Jewish services in the ten-year period 1961–70 are briefly noted; only health costs fell, by $1 million. The major rises were for:

- Recreation services, about $7.3 million;
- Family and child care service, over $4.8 million;
- Jewish education, over $4.3 million;
- Care for the aged, about $3.1 million;
- Employment and vocational service, about $0.6 million;
- Local community relations, almost $0.7 million.

Of total rises of about $20.6 million since 1961, United Funds provided about $6.3 million; the balance of $14.3 million was provided by federations.

About two-thirds of the rises ($14.8 million) were in fields generally eligible for United Fund support. The rise in United Fund support ($6.3 million) in these fields was augmented by federations for the difference ($8.5 million); the balance of the federation rise in support ($5.8 million) went to fields which received federation support exclusively, mainly Jewish education, which received $4.3 million of the rise in the total $5.8 million federation support to fields of service receiving no United Fund support.

With a rise in the price level in this decade of about 30 per cent, the constant value of the dollar support provided to hospitals and refugee care decreased sharply, while the increases in the other fields of service would need to be deflated for change in the price level during 1961 through 1970. As a result, the rise in local allocations of 60 per cent during this decade would be closer to a rise of 30 per cent, after adjustment for changes in the price level.

S. P. Goldberg
TABLE 1. AMOUNTS RAISED IN CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS 1939–1971

(Estimates in Millions of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NYUJA</th>
<th>FJPNY</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>205.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 Regular</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 Emergency</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 Regular</td>
<td>152.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 Emergency</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 Regular</td>
<td>162.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 Emergency</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Regular</td>
<td>174.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 Emergency</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Regular</td>
<td>196.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Emergency</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1939–1971... $4,533.2 $1,019.3 $492.6 $1,511.9 $3,020.3

* Total regular pledges are shown at the end of each campaign year, prior to shrinkage and adjustments. IEF amounts were apportioned between New York City and other cities in relation to total pledges, exclusive of some expenses and shrinkage. 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. 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 $168 million in 1961–1971, 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 UJA, with pledges of about $318 million in 1967, $318 million in 1968, Total for both regular and IEF campaigns in 1967 was $318 million; $360 million in 1971. Data
### TABLE 1-A. ESTIMATED ANNUAL LEVEL OF INCOME IN 1970 OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES IN U.S.

*(In Millions of Dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds)</td>
<td>$174.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Israel Emergency Fund of UJA</td>
<td>$124.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grants by United Funds</td>
<td>$24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>$106.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including capital funds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>$120.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hospital Income including Research Funds (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$688.2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Family Service Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Child Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jewish Vocational Service (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Aged Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$103.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Center Income (excluding 1 and 2)c</td>
<td>$31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jewish Education Income (excluding 1)d</td>
<td>$75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,476.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

*a This sum includes operating funds, restricted funds, and capital funds.

*b Excludes some nonreporting hospitals.

c *JWB Year Book, Volume XX 1971.*

d Approximate; based on revision of estimate in National Study of Jewish Education, less welfare fund allocations. See text.
### TABLE 2. STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS, 1951–1971

*(In Thousands of Dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cash Sales&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</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>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>251,476</td>
<td>209,161</td>
<td>42,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total Sales** | $1,891,306<sup>b</sup> | $1,587,866 | $303,440

Less: Redemptions | 841,825 |

**Total Outstanding at September 30, 1971** | $1,049,481

---

<sup>a</sup> Excludes conversions of $24.8 million of earlier issues to Development Investment Issue.

<sup>b</sup> Data for 1968 excludes conversions of $37 million.

Redemption 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 1971 had been reduced to $1,049 million. Redemptions included about $134 million (including accrued interest) in payment of pledges and allocations, received by UJA from 1952 through 1971.
TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION TO BENEFICIARIES OF FUNDS RAISED (EXCLUDING ISRAEL EMERGENCY FUND*) BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS

(Estimates in Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENEFICIARIES*</td>
<td>$140,001</td>
<td>$133,765</td>
<td>$41,590 $40,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>77,414</td>
<td>73,756</td>
<td>23,050 21,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>55.4 52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>74,050</td>
<td>70,566</td>
<td>22,500 20,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>54.1 50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>3,364</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>550 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>5,569</td>
<td>5,267</td>
<td>570 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>570 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>54,003</td>
<td>52,336</td>
<td>17,970 19,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>43.2 46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care*</td>
<td>1,018f</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For gross estimated collections see Table 1. Net amounts comparable to data in this table become available after actual shrinkage and collections are determined by experience.

*Based upon communities which are currently CJFWF members and some smaller cities which are not CJFWF members, but which were 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. United Fund support excluded from this table, but included in Tables 5, 6.

*NYANA is included in UJA totals.

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.

†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 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 includes 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 1969 and 1970 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash is received.

‡Rise results from variations in reporting; on a comparable basis, refugee-care allocations were about $960,000 in 1970, and about $890,000 in 1969.

§Less than .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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount Budgeted</td>
<td>$584,113,378</td>
<td>$292,916,434</td>
<td>$11,593,958</td>
<td>$10,445,569</td>
<td>$14,318,818</td>
<td>$13,085,815</td>
<td>$15,426,768</td>
<td>$14,947,948</td>
<td>$57,071,834</td>
<td>$54,437,102</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>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>54,364,328</td>
<td>52,530,772</td>
<td>8,694,027</td>
<td>7,910,540</td>
<td>8,861,697</td>
<td>8,102,210</td>
<td>9,326,973</td>
<td>9,191,632</td>
<td>27,461,631</td>
<td>27,325,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>51,550,396</td>
<td>49,816,066</td>
<td>8,389,189</td>
<td>7,619,926</td>
<td>8,469,721</td>
<td>7,696,865</td>
<td>8,682,695</td>
<td>8,571,074</td>
<td>26,008,791</td>
<td>25,928,199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>2,813,932</td>
<td>2,714,706</td>
<td>304,838</td>
<td>291,012</td>
<td>411,976</td>
<td>405,345</td>
<td>644,278</td>
<td>620,558</td>
<td>1,452,840</td>
<td>1,397,791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,999,359</td>
<td>4,766,669</td>
<td>547,377</td>
<td>531,352</td>
<td>753,960</td>
<td>734,603</td>
<td>869,792</td>
<td>846,930</td>
<td>2,828,234</td>
<td>2,653,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,845,783</td>
<td>2,744,751</td>
<td>240,677</td>
<td>227,431</td>
<td>402,320</td>
<td>398,071</td>
<td>507,411</td>
<td>504,799</td>
<td>1,695,375</td>
<td>1,614,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>21,279</td>
<td>22,725</td>
<td>12,224</td>
<td>12,941</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>685,103</td>
<td>624,784</td>
<td>69,825</td>
<td>66,668</td>
<td>92,468</td>
<td>80,379</td>
<td>127,485</td>
<td>116,862</td>
<td>395,325</td>
<td>360,875</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>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>326,405</td>
<td>303,488</td>
<td>122,769</td>
<td>123,729</td>
<td>88,164</td>
<td>91,666</td>
<td>35,972</td>
<td>32,343</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>55,750</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>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,120,553</td>
<td>1,070,929</td>
<td>101,642</td>
<td>100,110</td>
<td>163,185</td>
<td>157,252</td>
<td>197,691</td>
<td>191,377</td>
<td>658,034</td>
<td>621,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>36,033,235</td>
<td>33,211,664</td>
<td>2,155,650</td>
<td>1,835,745</td>
<td>4,253,081</td>
<td>3,898,567</td>
<td>4,652,287</td>
<td>4,254,711</td>
<td>24,972,217</td>
<td>23,222,641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>1,018,375</td>
<td>706,882</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>46,330</td>
<td>40,665</td>
<td>137,202</td>
<td>126,684</td>
<td>834,819</td>
<td>539,593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,990,601</td>
<td>1,697,750</td>
<td>195,228</td>
<td>166,705</td>
<td>380,789</td>
<td>308,342</td>
<td>439,651</td>
<td>527,609</td>
<td>974,933</td>
<td>695,094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
* Rise results from variations in reporting: on a comparable basis, refugee care allocations were about $960,000 in 1970 and about $890,000 in 1969.
**TABLE 4. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND UNITED FUND ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1969 AND 1970**

*(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>Receiving Chest Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>$20.4</td>
<td>$22.3</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Provided by United Funds (exclusive of Administration)</td>
<td>$21.3</td>
<td>$22.5</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$19.2</td>
<td>$20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td>$36.5</td>
<td>$37.1</td>
<td>$16.2</td>
<td>$15.4</td>
<td>$20.3</td>
<td>$21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Funds to Federations for Local Administration</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Only Federation Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. Free Loans)</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Aid</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$76.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td><strong>$53.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by United Funds</td>
<td><strong>$22.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$76.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Hillel college youth programs.

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

c Provided mainly by national agencies.

d Most capital campaigns are excluded because they are conducted apart from annual campaigns; United Funds in nonfederated cities are also excluded.

e Includes in NYC grants by Greater New York Fund and United Hospital Fund to federated agencies. In addition, nonfederated agencies receive about $0.4 million annually.

f Data for other cities are understated by about $1 million in 1970 compared with total estimates in Table 3 because functional distributions are not available in all smaller cities.
## TABLE 4-A. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND UNITED FUND ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1965 AND 1970

*(In Millions of Dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total 1965</th>
<th>Total 1970</th>
<th>New York City 1965</th>
<th>New York City 1970</th>
<th>Other Cities 1965</th>
<th>Other Cities 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Chest Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>$14.3</td>
<td>$22.3</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>$10.5</td>
<td>$16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Provided by United Funds (exclusive of Administration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td>$28.6</td>
<td>$37.1</td>
<td>$13.7</td>
<td>$15.4</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Funds to Federation for Local Admin-</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Only Federation Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services (incl. Free Loans)</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Aid</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capitald</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td>$41.1</td>
<td>$56.2</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
<td>$18.1</td>
<td>$25.4</td>
<td>$38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by United Funds*</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Includes Hillel college youth programs.

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

*Provided mainly by national agencies.

d Most capital campaigns are excluded because they are conducted apart from annual campaigns; United Funds in nonfederated cities are also excluded.

*e* Includes in NYC grants by Greater New York Fund and United Hospital Fund to federated agencies. In addition, nonfederated agencies receive about $0.4 million annually.

f Data for other cities are understated by about $1 million in 1970 compared with total estimates in Table 3 because functional distributions are not available in all smaller cities.
TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS*, INCLUDING UNITED FUNDS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 112 COMMUNITIES, 1969, 1970

*Excludes New York City*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$6,949,941</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>$6,606,195</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service, Child Care</td>
<td>12,096,672</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>12,881,740</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>+6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>15,009,121</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>16,701,458</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>+11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>5,513,766</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5,774,341</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>+4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,833,048</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,987,821</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>+8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>7,792,229</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8,741,525</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>+12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>702,064</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,005,835</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>+43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,417,449</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,658,013</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>+17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>726,435</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>870,424</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>+19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Fund to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>576,170</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>605,100</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>+5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,624,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,832,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>+8.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

| Federations | $32,781,090 | 62.3 | $35,934,769 | 63.2 | +9.6 |
| United Funds | $19,843,880 | 37.7 | $20,897,683 | 36.8 | +5.3 |

*Includes Hillel college youth programs.

b Rise results from variations in reporting. On a comparable basis, refugee allocations were $959,835 in 1970 and $891,065 in 1969 (1.7 per cent in each year).

c Includes United Fund allocations for administration of local services which are part of total administrative and fund-raising costs ($16,418,340 in 1970 and $14,696,075 in 1969) reported for these 112 cities. Federation allocations for administration of local services are not shown in this table, except for income from United Funds.
### TABLE 5-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* INCLUDING UNITED FUNDS, FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 112 COMMUNITIES, 1969, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (112)</th>
<th>Under 5,000* (46)</th>
<th>5,000-15,000* (35)</th>
<th>15,000-40,000* (18)</th>
<th>40,000 and Over* (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$ 6,949,941</td>
<td>$ 6,606,195</td>
<td>$ 215</td>
<td>$ 342</td>
<td>$ 57,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service</td>
<td>12,096,672</td>
<td>12,881,740</td>
<td>216,942</td>
<td>235,841</td>
<td>1,588,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Servicesb</td>
<td>15,009,121</td>
<td>16,701,458</td>
<td>1,130,845</td>
<td>1,225,471</td>
<td>3,057,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>5,513,766</td>
<td>5,774,341</td>
<td>126,296</td>
<td>153,403</td>
<td>804,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,833,048</td>
<td>1,987,821</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>65,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>7,792,229</td>
<td>8,741,525</td>
<td>191,432</td>
<td>245,801</td>
<td>842,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>702,064</td>
<td>1,005,835</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>39,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,417,449</td>
<td>1,650,013</td>
<td>26,750</td>
<td>43,419</td>
<td>95,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>726,435</td>
<td>870,424</td>
<td>32,755</td>
<td>36,158</td>
<td>98,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Fund to Federations for Local Administration^d</td>
<td>576,170</td>
<td>605,100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>74,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,624,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,832,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,727,929</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,940,662</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,731,936</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>32,781,090</td>
<td>35,934,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Funds</td>
<td>19,843,880</td>
<td>20,897,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

* Jewish population.

b Includes Hillel college youth programs.

c Rise results from variations in reporting. On a comparable basis refugee allocations were $959,835 in 1970 and $89,1,065 in 1969 (1.7 per cent in each year).

d This table includes income from United Funds for administration of local services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Admin. and Fund Raising Costs</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>$14,696,075</td>
<td>$16,418,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-15,000</td>
<td>876,691</td>
<td>972,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-40,000</td>
<td>2,218,185</td>
<td>2,292,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 and Over</td>
<td>2,438,722</td>
<td>2,707,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,162,477</td>
<td>10,445,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5-B. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS*, INCLUDING UNITED FUNDS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 112 COMMUNITIES, 1969, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service, Child Care</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Servicesb</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Educationc</td>
<td>(23.8)</td>
<td>(24.3)</td>
<td>(17.2)</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td>(22.5)</td>
<td>(24.7)</td>
<td>(29.2)</td>
<td>(27.6)</td>
<td>(23.3)</td>
<td>(24.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Caree</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations..</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Fund to Federations for Local Administrations*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALSf</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

| Federations         | 62.3       | 63.2       | 64.6              | 68.4             | 55.7              | 56.7             | 53.1              | 55.2             | 65.4              | 65.9              |
| United Funds        | 37.7       | 36.8       | 35.4              | 31.6             | 44.3              | 43.3             | 46.9              | 44.8             | 34.6              | 34.1              |

* Jewish population.
* a See Table 5-A.
* b Less than 0.05 of one per cent.
* c Figures in parentheses are percentages of Jewish Education allocations to total federation allocations.
* d Slight difference due to rounding.
<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>$7,621</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>$7,131</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>$7,061</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>$6,940</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>$6,606</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Service Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>9,574</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>10,162</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11,054</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>11,957</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12,739</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>133.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>159.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Guidance</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>134.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5,585</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6,959</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7,715</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8,644</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>154.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>132.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>152.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>158.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Fund to Federation Local Adminis.</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>Total</td>
<td>$41,613</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$43,466</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$47,030</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$51,760</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$55,977</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>134.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income
- Federations: 24,831 59.7 25,631 59.0 28,393 60.4 32,248 62.3 35,408 63.3 142.6
- United Funds: 16,783 40.3 17,835 41.0 18,637 39.6 19,512 37.7 20,569 36.7 122.6

*a includes both Federations and United Funds; excludes New York City.
*b,c See Table 5-A.
>d During this period the United States consumer price index rose by about 20 per cent.
*e Total United Fund participation in these costs represents less than four per cent of total administrative and fund raising costs for these cities.
>f Slight differences due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (93) 1966</th>
<th>Total (93) 1970</th>
<th>Under 5,000b (31) 1966</th>
<th>Under 5,000b (31) 1970</th>
<th>5,000-15,000b (32) 1966</th>
<th>5,000-15,000b (32) 1970</th>
<th>15,000-40,000b (17) 1966</th>
<th>15,000-40,000b (17) 1970</th>
<th>40,000 and Overb (13) 1966</th>
<th>40,000 and Overb (13) 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,620,698</td>
<td>$6,605,980</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$86,385</td>
<td>$53,480</td>
<td>$494,676</td>
<td>$469,472</td>
<td>$7,039,137</td>
<td>$6,082,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>9,573,642</td>
<td>12,739,195</td>
<td>139,051</td>
<td>192,809</td>
<td>1,208,666</td>
<td>1,645,355</td>
<td>1,387,303</td>
<td>1,830,905</td>
<td>6,838,622</td>
<td>9,070,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>10,940,308</td>
<td>16,193,939</td>
<td>739,299</td>
<td>973,227</td>
<td>2,234,400</td>
<td>3,113,368</td>
<td>2,093,592</td>
<td>3,140,629</td>
<td>5,873,017</td>
<td>8,966,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,568,127</td>
<td>5,700,641</td>
<td>90,976</td>
<td>96,903</td>
<td>539,940</td>
<td>679,428</td>
<td>521,442</td>
<td>622,295</td>
<td>2,415,769</td>
<td>4,302,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,475,958</td>
<td>1,987,821</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45,202</td>
<td>66,080</td>
<td>216,397</td>
<td>287,239</td>
<td>1,213,909</td>
<td>1,634,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5,585,098</td>
<td>8,643,865</td>
<td>113,881</td>
<td>209,591</td>
<td>559,571</td>
<td>970,676</td>
<td>863,585</td>
<td>1,280,587</td>
<td>4,048,061</td>
<td>6,183,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>760,480</td>
<td>1,005,265</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>56,519</td>
<td>37,975</td>
<td>119,759</td>
<td>132,344</td>
<td>584,102</td>
<td>834,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1,084,537</td>
<td>1,648,613</td>
<td>15,116</td>
<td>38,869</td>
<td>78,165</td>
<td>143,303</td>
<td>237,441</td>
<td>289,708</td>
<td>753,815</td>
<td>1,176,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>535,002</td>
<td>846,889</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>30,483</td>
<td>67,943</td>
<td>102,948</td>
<td>29,425</td>
<td>104,915</td>
<td>422,134</td>
<td>608,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Fund for Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>469,505</td>
<td>605,111</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>68,358</td>
<td>68,985</td>
<td>155,333</td>
<td>244,167</td>
<td>245,814</td>
<td>291,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$41,613,355</td>
<td>$55,977,308</td>
<td>$1,114,873</td>
<td>$1,542,136</td>
<td>$4,945,149</td>
<td>$6,881,598</td>
<td>$6,118,953</td>
<td>$8,402,261</td>
<td>$29,434,380</td>
<td>$39,151,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of Income</strong></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>$24,830,618</td>
<td>$35,408,084</td>
<td>$687,240</td>
<td>$1,075,961</td>
<td>$2,382,494</td>
<td>$3,886,214</td>
<td>$2,950,991</td>
<td>$4,638,918</td>
<td>$18,809,893</td>
<td>$25,807,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Funds</td>
<td>16,782,737</td>
<td>20,569,224</td>
<td>427,633</td>
<td>466,220</td>
<td>2,562,655</td>
<td>2,995,384</td>
<td>3,167,962</td>
<td>3,763,343</td>
<td>10,624,487</td>
<td>13,344,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes both federations and United Funds; excludes New York City.

b Jewish population.

† Includes Hillel college youth programs.

‡ See similar footnote Table 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (93)</th>
<th>Under 5,000^a</th>
<th>5,000–15,000^b</th>
<th>15,000–40,000^b</th>
<th>40,000 and Over^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services^d</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camp, Youth Services</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Fund to Fed. for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Adm.^c</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

- Federations ............ 59.7 63.3 61.6 69.8 48.2 56.5 48.2 55.2 63.9 65.9
- United Funds ............ 40.3 36.7 38.4 30.2 51.8 43.5 51.8 44.8 36.1 34.1

^a See Table 6-A.
^b Jewish population.
^c Less than .05 of one per cent.
^d Includes Hillel college youth programs.
^e See similar footnote, Table 6.
^f Slight difference due to rounding.
TABLE 6-C. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND UNITED FUND ALLOCATIONS* FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 85 COMMUNITIES 1961, 1970

(Amounts in Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>Index of Change 1961 = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,556</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>$6,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>7,449</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>12,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services*</td>
<td>8,403</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>15,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Fund to Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,980</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,549</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>Index of Change 1961 = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$20,292</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>$34,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Funds</td>
<td>13,688</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>19,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Includes both federations and United Funds; excludes New York City.

*Includes Hillel college youth programs.

Figures in parentheses are percentages of Jewish Education allocations to total federation allocations.

Slight difference due to rounding.
| TABLE 7. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1971 AND 1970 |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **UJA & Beneficiary Agencies**                   | **Federations and Welfare Funds** | **Other Contributions** | **Other Income** | **Total**       |
| United Jewish Appeal**                           | $85,133,664     | $80,591,573     | $—              | $—              | $85,133,664     | $80,591,573     |
| Israel Education Fund                             | 127,455,540     | 97,957,492      | 3,245,834       | 3,251,779       | 127,455,540     | 97,957,492      |
| American Jewish JDC                               | —               | —               | 868,900         | 614,200         | 868,900         | 614,200         |
| United Israel Appeal                              | 1,356,000       | 451,350         | 1,139,988       | 572,214         | 1,139,988       | 572,214         |
| Jewish National Fundsc                            | 3,564,334       | 2,942,155       | 91,482          | 85,911          | 3,644,236       | 3,828,066       |
| ORT—Women's American ORTd                         | —               | —               | 791,628         | 777,152         | 791,628         | 777,152         |
| —American ORT Federationd                         | —               | —               | —               | —               | —               | —               |
| **TOTAL UJA AND BENEFICIARIES**                   | $212,589,204    | $178,549,065    | $10,418,942     | $9,331,106      | $226,484,993    | $190,427,796    |
| **Other Overseas Agencies**                      |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| American Committee for Weizmann Institute of     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Scienceb                                         | $—              | $—              | $—              | $—              | $—              | $—              |
| American Red Mogen David                         | 805,000(1)      | 777,851(1)      | 1,221,066       | 1,097,242       | 27,098          | 7,152           |
| University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal     | —               | —               | 10,434,000      | 6,607,591       | 5,176,000       | 1,579,555       |
| American Friends of Hebrew Universityc           | —               | —               | 2,782,790       | 4,853,104       | 1,453,107       | 1,119,497       |
| American Technion Society                        | —               | —               | 1,885,486       | 2,217,172       | 42,734          | 58,999          |
| America-Israel Cultural Foundation                | —               | —               | 469,019         | 401,429         | 10,685          | 9,301           |
| Ezras Torah Fundb                                | —               | —               | 74,236          | 73,954          | 182,558         | 177,697         |
| Federated Council of Israel Institutions          | —               | —               | 108,322         | 103,743         | 108,322         | 103,743         |
| Hadassahd                                        | 856,000         | 556,000         | 4,372,911       | 11,635,642      | 4,316,524       | 4,418,325       |
| Jewish Telegraphic Agency                        | 247,807         | 214,223         | 12,810          | 17,096          | 242,684         | 212,322         |
| National Committee for Labor Israelk             | 227,914         | 229,947         | 2,552,982       | 2,822,752       | 27,246          | 24,285          |
| National Council of Jewish Women                 | 20,000(1)       | 20,000(1)       | 760,815         | 753,494         | 383,548         | 380,259         |
| United Hias Serviceb                             | 1,411,871       | 1,360,539       | 245,539         | 248,383         | 472,062         | 770,890         |
| **TOTAL OTHER OVERSEAS AGENCIES**                 | $3,592,042       | $3,488,962       | $37,516,457     | $33,785,180     | $13,555,421     | $10,052,201     |
| **TOTAL OVERSEAS**                               | $216,181,246     | $182,038,027     | $47,935,399     | $43,116,286     | $17,032,268     | $12,599,826     |

* Including joint community appeals.
* Amounts raised for JNF are excluded. Hadassah "Other Income" includes membership dues, Shekels and Zionit Youth Funds.
* Includes income from UJA; also income from campaigns abroad, from intergovernmental agencies and from reparations income.
* Includes contributions and earnings of Investment Fund; other income includes research grants.
* Includes $4.3 million in 1971 bequest.
* Includes Swope Endowment Fund.
* Includes grants from other organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1971 AND 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federations and Welfare Funds</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relations Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Welfare Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Asthma Research Inst. and Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva U-Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Hospital¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Service Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Assn. for Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform Jewish Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC-JIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Synagogue of America¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telshe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 8. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1971 AND 1970 (Cont’d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America ........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah ...........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Madrash Govoha .....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva U., Religious Affiliates ......................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong> ...................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Agencies</strong> ......................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Reserve ...................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society ...................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitzaron .................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai Brith Youth Service Appeal ......................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University .......................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social Studies ..................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress for Jewish Culture ............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsie University ........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiasdrueth Ivrit ..........................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Bialik Institute ..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society ..............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Society .............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.I.S.P.U. and Herzliah ..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Baeck Institute .....................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture ................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva U. (Other than Medical, Religious) ........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO .................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionst Organization of America .......................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong> ...................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DOMESTIC</strong> ......................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OVERSEAS AND DOMESTIC</strong> ...................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including joint community appeals.
+ Including N.Y.C. and Chicago Campaigns.
\* Includes tour income.
\* Excludes overseas income.
\* Includes payments from national agencies.
\* Yeshiva University is reported in part under Health and Welfare Agencies and in part under Religious Agencies. In the Medical School "Other Income" includes substantial amounts in government funds and hospital service grants.
\* Income from centers included in federation income.
\* Including University of Judaism, California.
\* Excludes grants by other national agencies to avoid double counting.
\* In the absence of data for 1971, prior year data were utilized for 1971.
\* Includes building and endowment funds.
\* Excludes grants from Conference of Jewish Material Claims against Germany from National Foundation for Jewish Culture, and Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.
THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY RESPONDS TO
ISSUES OF THE DAY: A COMPILEDUM*

JEWS COMMUNITY

Institutional Concerns

American Jewish Committee launched major study (three task forces—on future of Jewish community in America, group life in America, and international affairs) to re-assess current problems and probable future of Jews and Judaism in the United States and around the world, with the participation of more than 100 well-known scholars and community leaders (February 6).

Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada launched campaign for strengthening observance of kashrut, calling upon organizations and individuals to stress observance (March 4).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy announced draft boards would give "favorable consideration" to requests of Jewish registrants for postponements of physical examination for induction into Armed Forces during Passover (March 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board announced $183,000 in grants to subsidize training of 72 graduate students for social work and health and physical education careers in Jewish community centers and Ys (August 27). JWB conducted national health and physical education institutes, with 150 health experts participating, to publicize potential of centers as force for preserving health and life (September 7-10).

Union of American Hebrew Congregations biennial assembly heard preliminary findings of first research study of attitudes of young and adult Reform Jews regarding future of synagogue, Jewish identity, and Jew in American life; members voted for programs designed to return synagogue to central place in Jewish communal life (November 4-9).

* Compiled mainly from press releases supplied by organizations.
Reference to items may be found in Index under the various agencies.
National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods demanded more participation by women in Reform Judaism decision-making, pointing to minimal representation of women on national, regional, and synagogue boards and committees (November 8).

Agudath Israel of America launched "crash program" for task forces of scholars to educate Jewish community throughout world about "true meaning of Jewish identification" and dangers of Israeli law regarding identity criteria (November 25).

National Jewish Welfare Board Year Book for 1971 reported peak Jewish community centers memberships of more than 782,000, and total of 34,506,000 participants in activities, reflecting expanding role of Ys and centers (December 10).

**Cultural Activities**

National Jewish Welfare Board established National Commission on Jewish Cultural Programming to ascertain community's needs in this area and determine role of Jewish organizations in meeting them (January 8).

National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council issued first of projected series of monthly film bulletins, featuring reviews of current commercial films in terms of Jewish interest (December 6).

Yeshiva University and Federation of Jewish Philanthropies announced establishment of joint master's program to train graduate students for leadership careers in Jewish community organizations (December 22).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, American Jewish Committee expressed regret at demise of Yiddish-language daily, *The Day—Jewish Morning Journal*, citing its educational, social and political role in development of American Jewish community (December 29).

National Jewish Welfare Board Jewish Book Council called on American Jewish community to participate in International Book Year, to be observed in 1972 under UNESCO sponsorship (December 31).

**Youth and Education**

National Jewish Welfare Board, in conjunction with Israel's Ministry of Education, announced it would send 100 American 15- to 17-year-olds to participate with Jewish youth from other countries in summer pilgrimage to Israel (January 15).

Yeshiva University sponsored Torah leadership seminar for high-school students from metropolitan New York yeshivot on such social issues as drug abuse, Vietnam War, ecology, and Jewish law (February 25–March 2).

American Zionist Youth Foundation, Inc., announced summer science and other educational programs in Israeli educational institutions for 4,200 U.S. high-school and college youths (June 13).

American Jewish Committee initiated radio series "Jewish Viewpoint" aimed at Jewish youth and campus groups, in which youths discuss drugs, violence, Israel, Vietnam, Soviet Jews, and other subjects (June 16).

American Zionist Youth Foundation, Inc.'s University Service Department conducted leadership training seminar in Jerusalem for 35 university students who are recognized leaders on American campuses (July 15–August 15).

Union of American Hebrew Congregations and affiliate National Federation of Temple Youth sponsored, in Washington, D.C., week-long study-program for teen-agers who discussed urban crisis, ecology, and world peace with government leaders, politicians, diplomats, and experts on religion (July 19).

Torah Umesorah administered special summer projects providing 415 Jewish teenagers from poverty families, counseling, remedial education, cultural enrichment, job development, recruitment and job supervision (July 29).

World Union of Jewish Students held five-day conference in Zieglerville, Pa., at which 280 students from U.S. and abroad discussed different life-styles and participated in workshops on arts, communications media, Yiddish culture (September 3–7).
Zeirei Agudath Israel of America, youth affiliate of Agudath Israel of America, charged conference "was a search for Jewishness without Torah which could only result in spiritual chaos" (September 15).

American Zionist Youth Foundations, Inc., instituted service department for Jewish high-school students to encourage and aid self-initiated activist groups in high schools (October 15).

**Jewish Education**

Union of American Hebrew Congregations announced expansion of its religious education program to provide a "generation bridge spanning all age levels" (January 4).

Torah Umesorah held Midwestern Regional Conference of Day School Principals and Administrators which discussed relationships with welfare federations and bureaus of Jewish education and stressed "ideological integrity of day schools" (February 2). Its Southern Regional Conference considered innovative teaching techniques, federal aid to education, and training for Jewish leadership (March 21).

United Synagogue of America, in cooperation with the Jewish Agency-American Section, established Solomon Schechter high school in Israel, where students from American Schechter schools would spend sophomore year (March 29).

American Jewish Congress Women's Division called for national voluntary tithe to create and support an independent agency devoted to Jewish education and culture (March 31).

Rabbinical Council of America convention considered crucial role of Jewish education in countering alienation of Jewish youth (May 8).

Torah Umesorah held conference of 300 administrators of Hebrew day schools in North America which considered innovative teaching techniques, upgrading profession of day-school educator, federations and welfare funds support for children of needy families (May 9).

American Jewish Committee announced recommendations of its cosponsored colloquium for Jewish education: clearly defined goals for Jewish education, innovative educational ideas involving camping and living experiences, increased Jewish studies on college campuses (May 17).

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America called on New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies to "establish a minimum of 10,000 scholarships for the New York Hebrew day schools" (May 23).

American Jewish Committee called on "every segment of the Jewish community" to support Jewish education, following U.S. Supreme Court decision holding public aid to parochial schools unconstitutional (June 28).

American Jewish Committee announced cosponsorship with Jerusalem Hebrew University Institute of Contemporary Jewry of America-Israel education program, a two-year course on the development of Jewish people and Jewish philosophical thoughts (September 11).

American Association for Jewish Education and World Zionist Organization department of education and culture agree to promote education programs related to Israel in American Jewish schools (November 7).

Torah Umesorah announced plan for establishing Hebrew day schools in communities with 7,500 or fewer Jews and plans for expanding scope of teacher training (November 14).

American Jewish Committee and American Association for Jewish Education conducted workshop on innovative education at which Jewish educators discussed new types of Jewish day schools, new approaches to teaching Bible and to supplementary-school curriculum and use of audiovisual materials (November 17).

Agudath Israel of America warned federations and welfare funds not to attempt to "purchase control over the education program of Jewish day schools" with any financial support it may give them (November 25). Synagogue Council of America called on Jewish community, particularly
federations and welfare funds, to increase financial aid to day schools (December 5).

**Employment Discrimination**

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith praised new federal law put into effect by Civil Service Commission May 24, requiring government agencies to accommodate to religious needs of "special Sabbath observers" (May 17).

Agudath Israel of America initiated bill banning discrimination against Sabbath-observing Jews by private employers signed into law by New York's Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller (June 25).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith charged public-utility companies with "widespread underutilization of Jews" in their employment practices citing that League survey of 1,119 top executives of 38 gas and electric companies in major urban centers revealed only 15 per cent Jews (November 15).

**Jewish Defense League**

American Jewish Congress condemned "reckless and irresponsible tactics of Rabbi Kahane and his small band of followers" as "anti-Jewish, anti-democratic and counter-productive" (January 19).

Hadassah mid-winter conference repudiated Jewish Defense League for "irresponsible" activities which "harm cause of Soviet Jewry" (February 4).

American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Workmen's Circle, and National Council of Jewish Women condemned invasion and vandalism of office of New York Board of Rabbis by JDL members and asked total Jewish community to repudiate them (April 29). Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, on record as opposed to JDL violence, denounced U.S. Attorney General's use of wiretaps on JDL leaders without first obtaining court order (June 23).

Jewish War Veterans, Anti-Defamation League (October 22), American Jewish Committee (October 30) condemned JDL for escalating violence and repeated harassments of Soviet Union's diplomatic personnel.

**INTERFAITH**

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in cooperation with United Methodist Board of Higher Education, sponsored three-day institute on contemporary Jewish and Christian thought at Emory University, Atlanta, Ga. (March 7-9).

American Jewish Committee, in cooperation with Socio-Religious Research Center, Louvain, Belgium, issued study findings indicating lessening in recent years of anti-semitic attitudes by Catholics exposed to Church teachings and upsurge in secular antisemitism, especially among young (April 7).

Synagogue Council of America and Secretariat for Catholic Jewish Relations of Miami Roman Catholic archdiocese jointly sponsored regional conference to examine such questions as abortion, population control, capital punishment, new genetics (May 3-4).

Jewish War Veteran leaders met with Pope Paul VI to discuss persecution of Soviet Jews and problem of peace in the Middle East (May 18).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith presented to U.S. ambassador to UN statement signed by 8,300 leading American Christian clergy and lay church officials, asking end to discriminatory treatment of Jews in U.S.S.R. (June 28).

American Jewish Committee and Southern Baptist Mission Board conducted four-day interfaith dialogue on application of religion to secular problems (June 13-16).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith hailed U.S. Catholic Conference appeal on behalf of Jews behind Iron Curtain as example of "best spirit of ecumenism" and symbol of closer relations between Catholics and Jews (August 7).
CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

Aid to Parochial Schools

American Jewish Congress, in collaboration with 28 other organizations known as Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty (PEARL), called on New York State legislature to defeat proposal to repeal Blaine amendment barring direct or indirect aid to religious schools (January 22).

Torah Umesorah urged New York State Commission on Education to consider feasible financial plans for helping nonpublic school students (January 22).

Agudath Israel of America launched political action campaign among Orthodox Jews to help assure passage of Parent-Aid (Speno-Lerner) bill in New York State legislature (January 27).

American Jewish Congress joined American Civil Liberties Union in sponsoring three cases of appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, asking it to rule federal grants to sectarian colleges unconstitutional under First Amendment (March 3).

American Jewish Congress urged House Committee on Education and Labor to bar Office of Economic Opportunity from supporting "any version of the voucher plan," alleging such a plan would impair separation of church and state (March 31).

American Jewish Congress warned President Richard M. Nixon's proposal to increase federal government financing of nonpublic schools would "further violate constitutional principle of separation of church and state and undermine our public schools system" (April 6).

Torah Umesorah congratulated President Nixon for recommending increased provisions to aid nonpublic school students (April 7).

Synagogue Council of America, at two-day conference on "Public Aid to Non-Public Schools," heard Conservative and Reform representatives maintain traditional opposition to support for religious schools but admit openness to formulas for aiding day schools, which would not compromise church-state separation (May 9-10).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, American Jewish Congress hailed U.S. Supreme Court decision striking down Pennsylvania and Rhode Island laws granting public funds to parochial and private schools (June 28).

American Jewish Congress, through PEARL, joined other groups in challenging as violation of First Amendment New York State's $33-million parochial law due to go into effect September (July 19).

American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A., National Council of Jewish Women, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and United Synagogue of America welcomed U.S. Supreme Court decision ruling state aid to parochial schools unconstitutional and stated Jewish community has sole responsibility for sponsoring "sound and effective system of Jewish education" (August 10).

American Jewish Congress criticized President Nixon's pledge of government support for parochial schools, declaring, "Government has no obligation to assist" parochial schools in propagating the faith (August 18). American Jewish Committee reacted to President's statement with proposal for "dual enrollment" programs permitting religious school pupils to attend nearby public schools for instruction in nonreligious subjects (August 20). Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America responded to Nixon's proposal with suggestion that "legal ways must be found to let parents determine" schools where their children should be educated, with the support of city, state, and federal governments (August 20).

Agudath Israel of America praised Governor Milton J. Shapp of Pennsylvania for signing nonpublic school-aid bill, immediately after Supreme Court ruled such aid unconstitutional (August 30), and President Nixon for "sensitivity" to needs of non-
public schools in his statement to U.S. Office of Education conference attended by superintendent of public schools (November 17).

Agudath Israel of America called on President Nixon to grant tax credit to parents of children attending nonpublic schools (November 28).

American Jewish Congress, together with 30 groups of PEARL, asked Governor Rockefeller to defer $61 million in 1972 state aid payments to nonpublic schools until two court challenges to constitutionality could be decided (December 27).

**Prayers in Public Schools**

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America recommended to New York State Governor Rockefeller that he sign bill permitting brief period of silent prayer or meditation by public school pupils at beginning of each school day (March 24). American Jewish Congress called on Governor to veto bill, stating “it is not the business of the state . . . to foster religion” (March 24).

American Jewish Congress warned that “integrity of the Bill of Rights” was threatened by a proposed constitutional amendment to permit prayers in public schools (September 28). Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Central Conference of American Rabbis (October 8), National Council of Jewish Women (October 20) deplored attempt by Congress to adopt amendment. American Jewish Congress hailed defeat of proposed prayer amendment as “affirmation of belief of American people that Bill of Rights may not be tampered with” (November 9).

**URBAN PROBLEMS**

**Group Tensions**

American Jewish Committee outlined plans to depolarize tensions in lower middle-class white ethnic communities as part of its National Project on Ethnic America (January 21).

American Jewish Congress called on suburban residents to press for massive financial aid to ease black-white tensions in Newark after teachers' strike (April 9).

**Forest Hills Housing Development**

American Jewish Committee called for calm and reasoned discussion by all groups in Forest Hills of issues involved in construction of controversial low-income housing in middle-class community (November 24). Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith expressed “overwhelming support” of Forest Hills project, urging construction of more such projects to achieve racially and ethnically balanced communities (November 24). American Jewish Congress urged New York City Mayor John V. Lindsay meet with Forest Hills residents to try to “work out changes in proposed project to bring an end to community turmoil” (December 12). Agudath Israel of America called on President Nixon to intervene in Forest Hills controversy to halt construction, declaring “Jewish minority rights cannot be flagrantly and arbitrarily violated in the process of helping other minorities” (December 30).

**Crime**

American Jewish Congress Commission on Jewish Affairs called on black and white groups to join hands in fighting crime and reforming nation's criminal justice system (April 5).

American Jewish Committee, in conjunction with National Alliance for Shaping Safer Cities, formed Alliance for a Safer New York to reduce crime and fear of crime in city and to work toward improvement of criminal justice system (May 14). Alliance held day-long consultation with 350 participants, including labor and ethnic leaders, law and prison officials, and representatives of civil-rights and community groups discussing ways to increase neighborhood safety, improve court and correction procedures, develop better relations between citizens and police, help drug
addicts and ex-prisoners, and deal with victimless crimes (November 9).

Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, a joint body of Union of American Hebrew Congregations and Central Conference of American Rabbis, called for interreligious inquiry into events at Attica and all-out drive by nation's religious groups for prison reforms in penal institutions (September 14).

**Poverty**

Hadassah supported President Nixon's welfare reform program to "overcome degradation and hopelessness of millions of poverty-stricken citizens" and urged Congress to allocate necessary funds (February 5).

American Jewish Committee endorsed changes in proposed welfare reform bill passed by House of Representatives, asserting bill would afford America's poor "greater measure of justice and dignity" (October 29).

American Jewish Congress called for 18 major changes in federal Economic Opportunity Act and New York City's antipoverty program, charging Jewish poor were in effect excluded from benefits under law (November 3).

American Jewish Committee sponsored two-day consultations on poverty in Jewish community which examined problems of nearly one million American Jews living below poverty level and considered means of assistance (December 14).

**Dissension in Hospitals**

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith warned "growing radical left movement parading under banner of community control threatens New York City hospitals with turmoil, disruption, instability, and lower professional standards" (January 24).

Synagogue Council of America revealed results of investigation of controversial dismissal of Jewish physician from New York City's Lincoln Hospital, which refuted impression that antisemitism played role in dismissal (June 7).

**Neighborhood Governments**

American Jewish Committee and its National Project on Ethnic America explored possibilities of "neighborhood governments" as means of administering affairs of huge metropolitan complexes (March 1).

**Ethnic Quotas**

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith protested a New York City's school district listing "prospective teaching personnel in terms of their racial or ethnic background" (August 2); called upon chancellor of city's schools not to appoint acting school supervisory personnel, pending determination of related litigation, to refute charges of "racial, ethnic, and religious discrimination" (September 15).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith expressed "serious concern" that findings of ethnic survey of municipal employees by New York City Commission on Human Rights might lead to reverse racism and undermine the merit system (October 21).

American Jewish Congress called for public hearing on ethnic survey (October 22).

American Jewish Committee demanded Human Rights Commission do a "comprehensive survey of the hiring policies of the city agencies instead of one limited to visible minorities" (October 26).

American Jewish Congress objected to quota system called for in City University of New York's "affirmative action" plan to increase employment of women and "other minorities" (October 28). Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith called plan "abhorrent" (November 1).

**Civil Liberties**

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith resolved to protest such infringements upon
civil liberties by agencies of federal government as preventive detention, police no-knock entry, and wiretapping (February 22).


American Jewish Congress and Synagogue Council of America called upon U.S. Supreme Court to uphold right of Amish parents to refuse because of religious conviction compulsory education for children beyond elementary-school age (September 24).

National Council of Jewish Women urged Economic Employment Opportunity Commission be granted necessary authority for effective enforcement of legislation (October 20).

**Housing**

Jewish War Veterans announced it will sponsor a number of housing communities for elderly as part of the 236 program of the Federal Housing Authority (February 24).

American Jewish Committee released suburban zoning regulations survey charging local zoning and building boards enact ordinances barring low-rent or subsidized housing, thus “locking out” workers in industrial plants located in suburbs (October 31).

Union of American Hebrew Congregations called for state legislation providing that suburban communities set aside percentage of land for low and middle-income housing for workers in growing industries outside metropolitan areas (November 8).

**Women’s Rights**

Jewish Labor Committee conducted workshops in women’s rights (March 15).

American Jewish Congress announced support of proposed Equal Rights Amendment barring discrimination based on sex; said it would undertake study of role of women in Jewish law and tradition (September 30).

**Supreme Court Appointments**

Jewish War Veterans urged President Nixon to appoint a Jew to one of two available seats on Supreme Court (October 18).

National Council of Jewish Women urged President Nixon to broaden his search for men and women qualified to serve on U.S. Supreme Court, with excellence as prime criterion (October 20).

Workmen’s Circle went on record as opposing nomination of William H. Rehnquist to Supreme Court (December 1).

**Drugs**

National Jewish Welfare Board heard 53 communal agency representatives at consultation on drug abuse discuss causal factors of drug involvement, its impact on Jewish community, and possible roles for community center in combating and preventing drug abuse (March 5).

Jewish War Veterans appealed for more adequate federal programs to rehabilitate returning drug-addicted Vietnam veterans (April 24).

**HUMANE CONCERNS**

**War and the Draft**

American Jewish Congress protested “military build-up on the Laos borders” and urged United States to “dissuade its allies from plunging into tragic and possible irretrievable course” (February 4).

Synagogue Council of America opposed elimination of divinity-student exemptions from military draft, as proposed by House Armed Services Committee (March 3).

National Council of Jewish Women urged withdrawal of American troops and immediate end of all U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia (April 13).
Synagogue Council of America called on Congress to extend concept of conscientious objection to individuals who object not to all wars, but to a particular war only (May 3).

American Jewish Committee deplored bloodshed and open conflict in East Pakistan and called on United Nations to guarantee principles of human rights (November 30).

Death Penalty

American Jewish Committee declared execution of political prisoners in Guinea was evidence of tendency to use death penalty as political weapon and urged United Nations to make statement against “use of capital punishment for political activity” (January 27).

Synagogue Council of America and American Jewish Congress asked Supreme Court to abolish death penalty as violation of Eighth Amendment, which prohibits “cruel and unusual punishment” (September 9).

Services to Community

Hadassah chapters set up program to guide local Job Corps centers in working with youth, based on experience with youth programs in Israel (February 5).

National Council of Jewish Women announced development of strengthened national programs and new services for senior citizens projects (June 3).

American Jewish Congress published Directory of Aids, Facilities, and Services available to the Jewish aged in the City of New York (December 1971).

Genocide

American Jewish Committee urged U.S. Senate to ratify Genocide Convention (May 16).

Political Reform

National Council of Jewish Women urged Congress to revise legislative procedures so that they can serve needs of people more effectively (January 22).

National Jewish Welfare Board conducted public affairs seminar for communal agencies professionals to help them relate workings of political system to their professional duties (October 22).

American Jewish Committee and Catholic University Law School conducted institute at which legal experts considered ways of dealing with political violence without resorting to repressive measures (October 21–23).

SOVIET JEWRY

Violation of Human Rights

American Jewish Congress urged Americans to refrain from travel in the U.S.S.R. following Kremlin warnings of reprisals against U.S. nationals for anti-Soviet demonstrations (January 6).

Jewish War Veterans declared “repression against Jews is new state policy of the Soviet Union,” asked President Nixon to register protest with Soviet officials (January 6); urged release of Soviet Jews wishing to go to Israel (January 19).

National Council of Jewish Women condemned escalation of Soviet antisemitic activities, citing Leningrad trials as example of “diabolic intentions” of state toward its Jewish citizens (January 22); urged U.S. government ask Soviet authorities to release all held in prison in violation of Universal Declaration of Human Rights (October 20).

American Jewish Congress called on Soviet officials to permit the 110 Jews, who had participated in sit-ins at Moscow offices of Supreme Soviet to emigrate to Israel (March 11).

Jewish Labor Committee joined New York Conference on Soviet Jewry rally to demonstrate American trade-union movement’s concern for plight of Soviet Jews (April 4).

American Jewish Committee condemned new trials of Jews in Soviet Russia and
called for exposure of violations of human rights (May 13).

American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry was reorganized as autonomous body, now called National Conference on Soviet Jewry, consisting of national agencies which were already part of Conference; member organizations of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations; Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, as well as representatives of local welfare funds and community relations councils (June).

Agudath Israel of America youth organization, Zeirei Agudath Israel, sent delegation to meet State Department officials to urge U.S. speak out for human rights of Soviet Jewry (June 11).

Hadassah resolved to take action urging Soviet Union to grant its Jewish citizens same religious and cultural rights accorded other Soviet nationalities and religious groups (August 25).

Leadership Conference of National Jewish Women's Organizations, representing nine groups with more than one million members, met with State Department officials to ask U.S. intercession with Soviet authorities on behalf of Jewish women prisoners in U.S.S.R. (September 19). Conference asked U.S. Ambassador to the UN George Bush to place issue of Soviet Jewry on agenda of current General Assembly session (September 28), and to seek relief for Jewish prisoners in Soviet Union (December 6).

American Jewish Committee analysis revealed at least 49 Russian Jews currently serving sentences in prisons and labor camps in Soviet Union because they sought to emigrate (October 1). Committee presented to Ambassador Bush more than 100,000 petitions urging Soviet government to allow Jews to emigrate (October 21).

American Jewish Congress said it was "shocked" by State Department testimony before House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee attempting to "diminish severity" of Soviet Jews' situation (November 12).

American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry announced inauguration of major nationwide campaign to mark first anniversary of Leningrad trial on December 15, 1970 (December 1).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith noted date with plea to U.S. officials to speak out against harassment of Soviet Jews (December 10).

Brussels Conference

World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry convened in Brussels to plan global strategy on behalf of 3.5 million Jews in Soviet Union (February 23–25; AJYB, 1971 [Vol. 72], pp. 265–69). It called on Soviet Union to recognize right of Jews who so desire to go to Israel; to enable Jews in the U.S.S.R. to exercise religious and cultural freedom; and to put an end to defamation of Jewish people and of Zionism (February 25).

American Jewish Congress saw Soviet Union concerned about Brussels conference's effect on world opinion (February 22). Hadassah, American Jewish Committee urged Soviet Union to heed Conference plea (February 23).

Voice of America Broadcasts

American Jewish Congress asked that Voice of America inaugurate Yiddish and Hebrew broadcasts to U.S.S.R. (June 18). Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith pressed for passage of two bills authorizing such broadcasts (June 24). American Jewish Congress announced meeting with State Department to discuss broadcasts in Yiddish to Soviet Jews (September 3). Agudath Israel youth organization met with State Department officials to discuss contents of proposed Yiddish broadcasts (October 19).

Attacks on Soviet Property

American Jewish Congress denounced bombing of Soviet cultural building in Washington, D.C., and called those re-
sponsible “enemies of the Jewish people” (January 8).

American Jewish Committee called on Congress and President Nixon to introduce legislation “making a federal crime of illegal actions against official property and personnel of foreign governments in the United States” (January 9).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations condemned wave of attacks against Soviet offices, calling them “strategy of terror” and “mindless violence” (January 11).

National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council condemned “outrageous” shouting into Soviet Mission building in New York City, but denounced Soviet and Arab anti-Jewish outbursts in UN against the shooting as “vicious” and “cynical” (October 25).

ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Support for Israel

National Council of Jewish Women lauded Israel’s decision to rejoin indirect negotiations under UN special envoy Gunnar V. Jarring (January 22).

American Jewish Congress called on President Nixon to reject pressures aimed at forcing Israel to rely for her security on international guarantees instead of defensible borders (March 18).

Jewish War Veterans accused Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, of wanting to "sacrifice the survival of Israel" for "peace at any price" (March 26).

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America designated an “Aliyah Sabbath” to stress centrality of Israel in Jewish life and importance of personal participation in state’s development (May 22).

American Zionist Federation adopted program to promote greater use of Israeli products in U.S. through sponsorship of Israeli fairs by communities, organizations, and congregations (June 21).

American Zionist Federation expressed hope for firm U.S. commitment to supply Phantom jets and other military equipment to Israel (July 22).

American Jewish Congress sponsored dialogue of American and Israeli intellectuals, public officials, and communal leaders on problems of integration of Arabs and Sephardim in Israel; ethnic consciousness of American Jews in a pluralistic society; responsibilities of Israeli government in occupied territories (August 1-4).

Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith hailed resolution introduced by 77 Senators urging United States to make Phantom jets available to Israel (October 15).

National Council of Jewish Women urged United States to renew delivery of Phantom jets to Israel and to advocate direct negotiations between Israel and Egypt (October 20).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called for “immediate resumption of shipment of Phantom jets and other essential equipment to Israel to restore military balance and assure Israel’s deterrent capability” (October 22).

American Jewish Committee called on U.S. government to “refrain from exertion of pressure upon Israel” for concessions to Egypt prior to negotiations by withholding Phantom jets (November 1).

Jewish Welfare Board urged United States to meet Israel’s need for adequate planes by resuming Phantom jet deliveries (November 16).

Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith charged reports of U.S. refusal to sell Phantom jets to Israel is “endangering peace in Middle East and playing into hands of Soviet Union” (November 16).

Jewish War Veterans alleged U.S. State Department “undermines Israel’s negotiating position” for peace by withholding Phantom jets (November 17).

Jerusalem

American Jewish Committee delegation requested clarification of Vatican position on status of Jerusalem, urging distinction
between safeguarding of Holy Places and status of city as whole (April 5). Committee warned against dangers of turning Jerusalem into international city (June 25); released survey of Christian public opinion favoring city to remain under Israeli jurisdiction (October 30).

American Jewish Congress called on United States to veto, if necessary, any UN action aimed at restricting Israel's right to develop Jerusalem (September 27).

Social Services

Joint Distribution Committee announced the launching of intensive effort to develop nationwide network of community services for Israel's aged population, with annual budget of $5,000,000 (January 21).

National Jewish Welfare Board conducted seminar for young professional center workers to increase their understanding of Israel's role in American Jewish life (September 1-22).

National Council of Jewish Women initiated educational program for speedy integration of the economically and culturally disadvantaged in Israel (October 18).

Arab Boycott

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith urged United States to implement its anti-Arab boycott policy by refusing to give tacit support to Japan Air Lines boycott of Israel (January 26).

Jewish War Veterans announced educational campaign to discourage purchase of Toyota and Datsun cars and patronage of Japan Air Lines, in retaliation against boycott of Israeli goods and service (February 18).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations announced Mobil Oil Corporation had rescinded all instructions to its tanker fleet suppliers which had effect of capitulating to Arab economic boycott of Israel (March 16).

Government and Orthodoxy

Agudath Israel of America asked Israel government to "halt its pressure tactics to attempt to coerce Israeli rabbinate to compromise Torah law on conversion and personal marital status" (April 15).

Anti-Israel Activities

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith warned against New York-based Communist-front group conducting anti-Israel advertising campaign which used Arab and Soviet propaganda (February 9).

American Jewish Congress and Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith published study charging American Friends Service Committee with distorting facts to bolster "preconceived" pro-Arab bias and making "recommendations detrimental to cause of peace in Middle East" (August 10).

Jews in Arab Lands

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith charged Amnesty International with "virtually ignoring" persecution of Jews in Arab lands and Soviet Union, while making unsubstantiated charges of mistreatment of Arab terrorists in Israeli prisons (February 1).

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations endorsed rally and demonstration of 4,000 persons at Dag Hammerskjold Plaza to protest imprisonment and torture of Syrian Jews (November 4).

Workmen's Circle appealed to Syrian Mission to UN to discontinue mistreatment of Jewish citizens and to give them "protection and privileges to which they are entitled" (November 5).

WORLD JEWRY

American ORT Federation announced 1971 budget and program for aid to more than 62,000 persons in 21 countries, with increased allocations to schools in Israel, France, Latin America, Iran, and India (January 24).

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith warned Argentina's 500,000 Jews are
threatened by proliferating, violent anti-semitism encouraged by indifferent governments (March 3). It also pointed to precarious state of Jews in Chile, where middle class seriously threatened by Marxist government changes (March 12).

American Jewish Committee released findings of opinion poll of attitudes toward Jews of France, indicating proportion of Frenchmen with antisemitic attitude has remained relatively static during past five years, despite anti-Jewish remarks of President de Gaulle (May 16).

American Jewish Committee reported over 1,000 members of Mexico City Jewish community participated in activities of Center for Jewish Contemporary Studies, joint venture of Committee and Bet-El Congregation of Mexico City (August 12).

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America called for world conference of affiliated synagogues and religious councils to examine means of strengthening Orthodoxy Judaism (August 19).

National Jewish Welfare Board arranged two-week fact-finding mission to Europe for North American center presidents to study problems of Jewish communities in large European cities (November 18).

GERALDINE ROSENFIELD
Confrontation and Reconstitution: Selections from the Literature of Jewish Public Affairs, 1969-1971

The years 1969–1971 were marked by an atmosphere of confrontation in which the Jewish People found itself arrayed against enemies and difficulties, old and new. In the aftermath of the six-day war, Jews in all parts of the world stood far more united than at any other time in the recent past, to actively confront the forces arrayed against them.

By 1969 it was apparent that an Israel-Arab peace settlement was not in the offing but rather that the condition of “no war—no peace” (non-war), which had become endemic to the Eastern Mediterranean area would continue indefinitely. Russian intervention on behalf of the Arab world, and most particularly Egypt, had restored to the Arabs a measure of military capacity that gave them certain maneuverability on the political front. Moreover, the Russians’ intransigence matched that of their Arab counterparts. Before the period under discussion in this article came to a close, the Russian presence had become more ominous with the actual commitment of Russian personnel to defend the Egyptian lines. At the same time, the United States, while continuing to back Israel in most ways, made it clear that the American-Israeli relationship would by no means be as simple as that linking the Arabs and the Russians. The United States made every effort to avoid open alliance with the Jewish state, preferring to pursue a policy that sought to balance power in the area rather than to favor one side. Before the end of 1970, this came to mean American pressure on Israel to be “flexible,” as well as unprecedented American military assistance. While the flow of weapons continued, with some exceptions through 1971, that year saw growing American pressures on Israel to make security concessions, pressures which Israel rejected. At the very end of the year, however, following a visit by Golda Meir to Washington, there was a dramatic reversal of the American position to Israel’s benefit.

Through all this, world Jewry came to recognize that the tension of May and June, 1967, while slightly reduced in some ways, would continue unabated for an indefinite time. “Normal crisis” became the order of the day, as Israel continued to be the focal point of world Jewish attention. At the beginning of 1969, Israel was faced with an upsurge in aggressive activity on the part of the Arabs, involving both terrorism along the borders and within the country where possible, as well as intensified military activities along all cease-fire lines. The years 1969 and 1970 saw Israel waging what was in fact a fourth round of open warfare, with casualties reaching a wartime level.
Matters came to a head in the first half of 1970, and the result was yet another Israeli victory, this time gained primarily through the judicious use of air power along the front lines and diligent patrolling and counterespionage in the interior. Tensions, which had reached a new peak in June 1970 were sufficiently relaxed by Rosh Ha-shanah to bring the period to a close with a moment of respite on all fronts. The cease-fire arranged by the Big Four, coupled with King Hussein's crackdown on the Palestinian terrorist organizations and the death of Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser, eased the crisis without resolving it. The cease-fire held through 1971, although it formally came to an end after a year. The terrorists were decisively defeated by Jordanian forces in July, some even fleeing to Israel to escape their Arab "brethren," and the Russian involvement grew.

The Israeli situation greatly influenced the position of the Jews throughout the rest of the world. Antisemitism had been more or less quiescent for a quarter century after the end of World War II, as the world recoiled in horror from Nazi genocide. It gained in respectability as the New Left and those who arrogated to themselves the appellation of "progressives" began to side with the Arabs and, adopting the Russian usage of the term, made "anti-Zionism" the epithetical euphemism of "antisemitism." What the New Left felt justified in doing by virtue of its claim to being progressive, the old right also felt justified in doing; so that old-line antisemites began to rear their heads again.

In the United States, New Left "anti-Zionism" was reinforced by that of militant blacks which, though repudiated by the responsible black leadership, was sufficiently boisterous to attract attention in many quarters.

Finally, the crisis of Soviet Jewry took on a new intensity. The six-day war galvanized thousands of Soviet Jews into becoming more militant in their demands for the right to live Jewish lives and to emigrate to Israel, where they could satisfy their national aspirations as Jews. Petitions, protests, and even sit-ins became the order of the day inside the Soviet Union. A clandestine Jewish life emerged, with a surface visibility greater than anything since the Russian Revolution. World Jewry responded in kind, with demonstrations of support for their Russian brethren. Led by Israel, the Jews mounted a propaganda offensive against the Soviet Union and its "anti-Zionist" policies, whose impact was probably more far-reaching than even they realized.

In sum, the Jewish people's feeling of aloneness in June 1967 was by no means dissipated. Quite to the contrary: while there was a continued relaxation of the atmosphere of those June days, the institutionalization of the crisis sharply limited the extent to which Jews have felt free to let down their guard. The feeling of community responsibility was renewed and strengthened in many ways, as the lesson of 1967 was repeatedly driven home—namely, that in the last analysis only Jews would be responsible for and concerned with the fate of other Jews.
The Jewish response to these multiple, yet interlinked crises was to further the reconstitution of the Jewish people, a process begun by the 1967 crisis. Israel seized the initiative to enhance its role as the center of world Jewry, convoking conferences of notables for variety of purposes, ranging from economics to medicine, in an attempt to give institutional substance to the renewed ties which bind Jews with one another emotionally.

Perhaps foremost among these efforts was the reconstitution of the Jewish Agency for Israel (p. 178), accomplished in the summer of 1970 and approved by the founding assembly in June 1971, to make the Agency broadly representative of virtually all segments of world Jewry. That reconstitution was coupled with the organization of the American Zionist Federation, envisaged as the umbrella organization uniting the various Zionist groups in the United States. Finally, capitalizing on the demands of the young Jewish radicals for the democratization of the Jewish "establishment," the World Zionist Organization made provision for the restoration of a more open electoral process for choosing its leadership. Other sectors of American Jewry attempted to respond to the demands of its young by reshaping some of its institutions to allow their voices to be better heard. And the Israeli political parties began an effort to satisfy demands for electoral reform within their existing structures, as an alternative to changing the system.

The three years under review here witnessed no more than the initiation of these processes; their outcome cannot yet be forecast. Nevertheless, they mark critical steps in the rebirth of the Jewish people in the postmodern world.

The literature of Jewish public affairs for 1969-1971* reflects all these trends. The continuing Israel crisis drew most attention; the emphasis was on the state's external relations, but its internal life was not ignored. Other major topics were black-Jewish confrontation; Jewish-Christian relations in the aftermath of the six-day war; relations between the Communist bloc and the Jews; the place of American Jews in the "ethnic revival" now taking place in the United States, and the problems of alienated and hostile Jewish youth on American campuses. Jewish political behavior, too, received attention in several analyses of Jewish voting patterns in American elections. There also have been some shifts within established categories of interest. Publications dealing with Jewish religious movements and public persuasions rested less on the conventional discussions of Orthodoxy, Conservatism, Reform, and Reconstructionism, and turned more to discussions of Zionism and secularist modes of Jewish self-perception.

* Full bibliographical notations of the books and articles mentioned here will be found in a separate section at the end of this essay.
FRAMEWORK FOR RECONSTITUTING THE JEWISH PEOPLE

It is significant that the year 1969 witnessed publication of Israel and the Diaspora, the first substantial work by Ben Zion Dinur to appear in any Western language, and a framework for approaching the problems of Jewish public affairs in our time. Dinur, one of the founders of what might be called the Israeli school of Jewish historiography, has been labeled as the dean of contemporary Jewish historians by no less a personage than Yitzhak Baer, his one peer. The school of historians, founded by him and Baer, has reflected their commitments to the Jewish national renascence. The Israeli school’s primary aim has been to demonstrate the persistence of the Jewish people as a self-governing community throughout its history, even in the Diaspora. The works of these scholars have been presented to the public primarily in Hebrew, and are only now being made available in English.

Israel and the Diaspora presents in under 200 pages the central thesis of the works of an author who, since his “retirement,” has been publishing at least one 500-page volume a year. Dinur states his thesis at the very beginning of the book:

The unique feature of “Israel in Diaspora” . . . is not to be found in the expulsion of Jews from their homeland to foreign countries, but in the continuation of collective Jewish life in the Dispersion and in spite of the Dispersion.

Dating the beginning of the era of Israel in Diaspora from the Arab conquest of Palestine, that is to say, nearly six centuries after the destruction of the Second Temple (the conventional starting point), he sees Diaspora as a reflection of two main factors:

(1) the gradual disappearance of the specifically Jewish character of Palestine and the emergence of a different national majority in the country; (2) the survival of the Jewish nation and the preservation of its national character outside its own land, in periods that had ceased to be Jewish.

It was not, Dinur stresses, “till the moment when Palestine ceased to be a Jewish country through being occupied and permanently settled by non-Jews . . . when the nation was deprived of the soil on which it had developed its own specifically national form of life” that the problem of preserving the national character of the individual Jews in the dispersion became “particularly acute.”

Here Dinur turns conventional history of the Jewish Diaspora on its head and develops a new thesis according to which the Jewish community in the land of Israel remains the constant counterpoint to the communities in the dispersion. His corollary thesis, that, “while Jews may be in Dispersion at any time and, indeed, have been throughout most of Jewish history, as
long as the land of Israel is in the hands of the people, Israel per se is not in Dispersion,” can serve as a viable hypothesis for the development of a new world Jewish community in our time.

Dinur points out that the bond between Israel in Diaspora and the land of Israel persisted, not only in spirit but also through successive waves of immigration coming after every crisis in the history of Diaspora Jewry. The strength of that bond he concludes can “serve us as a criterion for determining both the political condition of Palestine and the status of the Jews in the Diaspora,” for it “bears a direct relation to the former and is in inverse proportion to the latter.” It reflects the periods of stability and crisis in the Diaspora, which form the basis for Dinur’s periodization of Diaspora in Jewish history.

The rest of Dinur’s work is devoted to the clarification of five fundamental themes: 1) the unity of the nation during the period of its exile and dispersion; 2) the nature of Judaicity (his term for Jewish civilization as a whole); 3) the nation’s power of independent action in the Diaspora; 4) the reciprocal relations existing between the scattered diaspora communities, and 5) the place occupied by the land of Israel in the life of the exiled nation. After discussing the way in which the great Jewish historians of the 19th century dealt with these themes, Dinur formulates his own position, which may be summarized as follows:

1. “Even after the destruction of the Jewish state, . . . the unity of the Jewish people still remains complete and unbroken. . . . The fundamental nature of this organic entity is not only socio-psychological, but also socio-political.”

2. “Even in the days when they were an independent nation living in their own land . . . the Jewish people were given a special national character in their special religious mission. . . . This religious element in Jewish nationhood gave a special aura of sanctity to the whole Jewish way of life and was one of the causes of the peculiar blend of religion and nationalism in Judaism.”

3. The nation’s power of independent action in the Diaspora was conditioned by the different environments in which Jews found themselves and within which “the vital forces of the nation were given a chance to create and act, to organize themselves and come to terms with their environment.”

4. At any given time, those Jewish communities in the Diaspora “which were distinguished by the greater intensity of their inner life” dominated the others and may, within certain limitations, be called centers of Jewish life.

5. “The unity of the Jewish nation in exile was also the organized unity of a people living according to laws, customs and practices of its own which regulated every aspect of public and private life to an extent that can hardly be paralleled even in the most highly organized states. . . . Even during the period of the Diaspora, the Land of Israel and its Jewish population still
played a part of general importance in the history of the nation... as a consequence of the unique position, historically and territorially, occupied by the *yishuv* among the dispersed Jewish communities."

Dinur's elaboration of these points in the remainder of this brief volume can well serve as a starting point for a philosophy of Israel-Diaspora relations for our own time.

**JEWISH POLITICAL THOUGHT**

*Israel and the Diaspora* is the work of a historian committed to the rebuilding of the land of Israel. As such it is unabashedly political in orientation and stands in counterpoint to what fairly can still be called the political thought of diaspora Jewry (which is often masked by theological forms). Three theologically-oriented anthologies published in 1970 in the United States present us with materials illustrative of current trends in diaspora "political" thought.

*Arguments and Doctrines: A Reader of Jewish Thinking in the Aftermath of the Holocaust*, edited by Arthur A. Cohen, is an almost unwilling witness to the transformation that has taken place in the past generation in diaspora thinking about the Jews as a polity. The book is advertised as "a reader with a specific religious center," which is defined as "not Jewish life as such, not the Jewish community, not Zionism nor the State of Israel, but the nature and content of Jewish beliefs." This approach is consistent with Cohen's own, which he evolved in the course of two decades of Jewish intellectual activity. Nevertheless, because the anthology is a comprehensive one, the nature and content of Jewish beliefs center heavily on concern for Jewish life and Jewish community, Zionism and the State of Israel. They do so in a way that is uniquely the editor's and, consequently, all the more valuable in tracing the rediscovery of the Jewish polity.

As Cohen points out in his introduction, "The initial task of the prewar Jewish thinkers was to validate the Jewish enterprise, to make a denationalized, cosmopolitan, culturally productive elite into an authentic community... prewar European Jewish thinking recognized that religious Judaism, classical Judaism, the Judaism of Bible and tradition had to be smuggled back into the armamentarium of the Jew... The war and its aftermath, while augmenting certain confusions, dissolved others. Although individual Jews may now opt to disappear... the State of Israel has made it clear that Jews as a whole will not disappear... One consequence of this... is that Jewish religion has become inescapably personalist in character. The Jew is no longer held together in the Diaspora by the Law imposed or by the authoritarianism of the community, for the normative Jewish community—both secular and religious—is in Israel... The new Jewish religious community is resurgent because all the reasons for escape have disappeared. In place of anguish and embarrassment, there is a resnascent pride."
Cohen, following his very personalist inclinations, concluded that “instead of Judaism's being a principle of cohesion and communality, it is for those Jews come lately to learn in the Synagogue a source of meaning.” The anthology then goes on to demonstrate that, whatever reasons bring men to the synagogue, Judaism does become a principle of cohesion and communality.

The second collection of essays is *Tradition and Contemporary Experience: Essays on Jewish Thought and Life*, edited by Alfred Jospe. Addressed primarily to a college audience, it is less devoted than *Augments and Doctrines* to abstract theology, yet it reflects very much the same pattern of thought. Particularly important from the perspective of Jewish political theory are Jospe's own comments on the role of the covenant in Jewish life and thought.

The third anthology is *The Jewish Expression*, edited by Judah Goldin. Unlike the first two, which are explicitly contemporary in their orientation, Goldin's reader consists of twenty major essays of historical, theological, and philosophical interpretation by leading modern scholars, touching upon Jewish history from biblical times to the present era. Each one of the essays is of first importance in the field of modern Jewish scholarship, and each one contains matter relevant to Jewish political thought.

To mention only a few of the most important ones: Moshe Greenberg identifies some basic elements of biblical political thought in “Some Postulates of Biblical Criminal Law.” Shalom Spiegel uses a clever device to look at the Jewish concept of civil liberties in “Amos vs. Amaziah.” Elias Bickerman examines the Maccabean uprising as a struggle over constitutional reform, while H. L. Ginsberg explicitly treats Tannaitic Jewry from the perspective of what he calls the State of Israel of the years 132–135 C.E. The ambiguity of Jewish political thought during the exile is treated in “Jewish Thought as Reflected in the Halakah,” by Louis Ginzberg. Leo Strauss is represented with the preface to the English edition of his book, *Spinoza's Critique of Religion*.

Yitzhak F. Baer's “From the Ancient Faith to a New Historical Consciousness” wraps up the shift in Jewish historiography as the result of the repolitization of Jewish thought in the 20th century. Baer's article has the additional advantage of demonstrating how the modern history of the Jewish people really begins in the 17th century with the entrance of the upper strata of the Jewish populations in Western Europe, particularly in the Calvinist countries, into the lives of their respective communities. In doing so, they “gave up their political ties and their responsibility to the Jewish nation as a whole, and tried to make themselves as comfortable as possible in their 'homes' in the Golah ('Exile').” Baer's central thesis is that “the historical thought of modern Judaism still suffers from the effects of an improperly understood religious-political heritage.”

Besides these anthologies, a number of works dealing with classical expressions of Jewish political thought, both biblical and rabbinic were
Robert Gordis published a collection of his essays and biblical interpretations in *Poets, Prophets and Sages: Essays in Biblical Interpretation*, among them "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Israel," which is an attempt to understand the political institutions of ancient Israel from a modern democratic perspective. Other essays in the volume touching on biblical political thought are "Isaiah, Prophet, Thinker, and World Statesman" and "Micah's Vision of the End-Time." On a more popular level, Sheldon H. Blank's *Understanding the Prophets*, one of the "Issues of Faith" series, deals with prophetic concerns for social justice. *The Book of Joshua*, which can be understood as a biblical political utopia, was published under the editorship of Sidney B. Hoenig in a new translation of the text and a commentary digest. Eliezer Berkovits' article on "The Biblical Meaning of Justice" adds, at least indirectly, to our understanding of the political terminology of the Bible.

Turning to rabbinic literature, Steven S. Schwarzschild offers a very important study in Rabbinic political thinking in his article, "A Note on the Nature of Ideal Society—A Rabbinic Study." Utilizing the midrashic method, Schwarzschild explores Talmudic materials relating to a paragraph in Baba Batra, 122a. On the basis of exploration, he presents us with a portrait of the restored Israel of messianic times, which represents the ideal polity in rabbinic thought.

The polity will be organized as a territorially-based federation of the twelve tribes, with a thirteenth section of the land of Israel reserved for the people as a whole, perhaps even for the world as a whole. Economic abundance and equality will prevail. The directly operative authority in the messianic state will be God alone, with the Messiah functioning as a public servant, not as a ruler in the usual sense of the word: in essence, a theocratic democracy. Schwarzschild proceeds to discuss the place of non-Jews in the ideal messianic society to indicate the extent to which Jewish political thought has universalistic connotations.

Of interest in this connection is David Polish's discussion of "Pharisaism and Political Sovereignty." Two other articles bearing on the rabbinic understanding of community and polity in Israel appeared in the *CCAR Journal*; "Midrash Reshumim" by Morrison David Bial and "The Rabbinic Image of Man: Man and Mitzvah" by Leonard S. Kravitz.

The publication of the Samuel K. Mirsky memorial volume *Studies in Jewish Law, Philosophy and Literature*, edited by Gershon Appel, Morris Epstein, and Hayyim Leaf, brings us several essays of importance in the field of Jewish political thought, including Walter S. Wurzburger on "The Covenantal Imperative" and Jose Fauer on "Law and Justice in Rabbinical Jurisprudence."

Alvin J. Reines compares *Maimonides and Abrabanel on Prophecy* in a detailed treatment of Isaac Abrabanel's commentary on the theory of prophecy presented by Maimonides in the *Guide for the Perplexed*. The
prophet is the key figure in Maimonides's political thought, which is radically different in orientation from that of Abrabanel. Another medieval thinker who touches on political questions is Abraham Bar Haya, whose major work, *The Meditation of the Sad Soul*, is presented in translation with an introduction by Geoffrey Wigoder.

The very special constitutional view of Judaism of Moses Mendelssohn is made available to the English-speaking public through Alfred Jospe's translation of *Jerusalem and Other Jewish Writings*. This splendid volume presents the key ideas of the founder of the emancipationist movement in Germany. It is especially significant to Jewish thought because of Mendelssohn's description of the Torah as the Jewish constitution and his application of that concept to foster the breakdown of Jewish corporate communalism on behalf of the integration of individual Jews into Western society.

In a pioneering work of classic proportion, Moshe Greenberg presented his *Understanding Exodus* as Volume 2, Part 1, in the Melton Research Center Series, "The Heritage of Biblical Israel." Greenberg's detailed analysis of the text of the Book of Exodus through Chapter 11, Verse 10, with appropriate commentary of his own, represents the first major effort to understand the book as an integrated whole. Citing the many traditional and modern commentators to elucidate this particular work, Greenberg has achieved a tour de force, whose impact on biblical scholarship will no doubt be great. This first part of his work deals only with the events preceding the actual Exodus, not with the broad questions of law and political organization found later in the book. At the same time, Greenberg patiently delineates the great understanding of political psychology evidenced in the Bible's portrayal of the rise of Moses, his confrontations with Pharaoh, and the negotiations leading to the liberation of the Jewish people.

Emil Fackenheim's *God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmations and Philosophical Reflections* is a contemporary analysis of the fundamental premise of Jewish thought that God makes his presence manifest in history. Though Fackenheim is concerned with theological concepts, the volume must be considered in the context of Jewish political thought. It provides us, in a few pages, with important methodological understanding of midrashic thinking in the development and elucidation of Jewish ideas—the first requisite for dealing with any aspect of Jewish thought. Fackenheim also discusses Ernst Bloch, whose political thinking, emerging out of the ferment of 20th-century German Jewry, adds a useful dimension to the Jewish intellectual activity of the pre-holocaust period.

Two of the leading figures in contemporary Jewish thought turned their attention to explicitly political matters in the period under discussion here. Abraham Joshua Heschel, whose special brand of mysticism had rather assiduously avoided any direct confrontation with the political, was moved by the events of 1967 to write *Israel: An Echo of Eternity*. In it, Heschel
relates the Jewish attachment to the land of Israel and to the contemporary state, the third Jewish commonwealth, and places that attachment in the perspective of his over-all thought, thereby integrating that very concrete manifestation of Jewish nationhood into the far more transcendent vision of Jewish life which he has already given us.

Similarly, Mordecai M. Kaplan, the dean of contemporary Jewish thinkers and perhaps the most influential of any in America, presented us with The Religion of Ethical Nationhood: Judaism's Contribution to World Peace. Unlike Heschel, Kaplan has dealt with the national element in Jewish life from the first, popularizing, if not actually creating, the concept of peoplehood to accommodate the national elements in Jewish life in the United States which does not recognize separate national ties on the part of its member groups. His philosophy and his works have been permeated with the sense and importance of Jewish peoplehood, so that for him Jewish public affairs consistently have been a central aspect of Jewish religious existence. In his 90th year, Kaplan has given us a distillation of his theopolitical thought, which emphasizes his particular understanding of the religious underpinnings of politics; the relationship between the human and the political destiny of man, and the unfinished business of Israel and world Jewry, including the American Jewish community, as parts of the Jewish People as a whole.

A similar emphasis on the existence and unity of the Jewish people and its ties with the state of Israel has become a central theme in the work of the Jewish theologians of today. Eugene B. Borowitz points this out in "The Post-secular Situation of Jewish Theology."

In How Can a Jew Speak of Faith Today? Borowitz elaborates on his theological position, speaking of the life of Torah as the pivot of Jewish religion and the peoplehood of Israel as central to the life of Torah. Borowitz is among those who have renewed the emphasis on covenant as the basis of Jewish theology and theopolitical thought. As a Reform Jew, his emphasis is on the covenant-making rather than the giving of the Torah itself, and he celebrates the covenant as the establishment of peoplehood rather than of specific law. Emil Fackenheim similarly highlights this aspect of Judaism in his recent works.

Because the concern for matters political is so crucial to the Jewish world view, relevant discussion of Jewish political thought turn up in places which might otherwise seem unlikely. Phillip Goodman's A Rosh Hashanah Anthology is a case in point. He includes a selection from Philo, which compares the vanquishing of faction in cities with the taming of nature, as themes of Rosh Ha-shanah. The great Hellenistic Jewish philosopher recognized the meaning of Rosh Ha-shanah as the acknowledgment of God's sovereignty and constructed his own very reasonable interpretation of the implications of that sovereignty in nature and politics. Almost as a footnote, Goodman points out that the authorship of the Alenu prayer, which, in acknowledging God's sovereignty and drawing the proper im-
plications from it, stands as the keystone of the Jewish political worldview, was attributed by the sages to Joshua, the ideal political leader according to the Bible.

The attempt to revive Jewish political thought in our time was given impetus in the three years by those Jews who sought Jewish grounding for their reaction to the evils of our time. Steven S. Schwarzschild, while editor of Judaism, was particularly concerned with stimulating a radical understanding of the political implications of Jewish tradition. In the special section of the Winter, 1970 issue, entitled "The Jewish Tradition of Protest and Dissent," he published three articles on the subject. "The Prophets as Dissenters" by Rinah Lipis Shaskolsky is a conventional exposition of the prophetic tradition from a perspective that has been commonly accepted since the rise of the social gospel. Reuven Kimelman, writing on "The Rabbinic Ethics of Protest," advances the discussion in a sensible way into the talmudic epoch.

The third article in the group, "Rabbinic Reflections on Defying Illegal Orders: Amasa, Abner, and Joab," by Moshe Greenberg, is, in the Greenburg manner, a pioneering effort, important both for its substantive character and its methodological suggestiveness. Greenberg raises the question of obeying orders that, though given by lawful authority, are themselves morally repugnant and, consequently, unconstitutional in the Jewish sense, by treating the rabbinic understanding of a series of events in the days of Saul, David, and Solomon, the first three kings of Israel. In doing so, he covers the range of rabbinic literature on the subject; shows us how to penetrate that literature to seek out its political commentary; elucidates such points as the power of legitimate authority, the limits on that power, and the problem of warfare within Jewish tradition; and answers the original question posed. Greenberg's work stands as a model of what can be done to develop Jewish political thought in an honest and authentic way from its traditional roots.

Another Judaism symposium in the same vein focused on "Judaism and Revolution Today" and included articles by Arthur I. Waskow, "Malkhut Zodon M'herah T'aker"; Maurice Lamm, "After the War—Another Look at Pacifism and SCO"; Sol Roth, "The Morality of Revolution: A Jewish View," and Norman Levine, "The End of the Third World Revolution." Other expressions of this interest can be found in The New Jews, edited by James A. Sleeper and Alan L. Mintz, a collection of articles and essays dealing with the new activist Jewish youth. Bill Novak, one of the "new Jews" and editor of Response, their leading voice, summarized the new turn of all these discussions in the article "On Relevance and Beyond," pointing out that superficial discussions of the relevance of Judaism to any of the contemporary political concerns must give way to a search for what is authentic in Jewish tradition, whether or not its relevance is immediately apparent.

In "Civil Disobedience: The Jewish View," Leo Landman examines
traditional sources for evidence of a Jewish stand on civil disobedience. He concludes “in all the sources available, suggestions were made to disregard a civil law which could not be justified. However, never once can one find even the slightest hint at disobedience with the use of force or violence.” Landman shows that the moral lines were drawn clearly, with the individual empowered, indeed required, to make decisions of conscience on certain issues, but never to enforce those decisions through violence.

Concern with the land of Israel as a category in Jewish political thought was heightened in the aftermath of the six-day war. Two articles by Arthur Hertzberg treat the question in detail. “The Meaning of the Land of Israel to the Jewish Community” embodies the text of a study done for the National Council of Churches, while “Judaism and the Land of Israel” is addressed to Jews.

Other works touching upon elements of Jewish political thought include Judaism and Ethics, edited by Daniel Jeremy Silver; Gilbert S. Rosenthal, Generations in Crisis: Judaism’s Answer to the Dilemmas of Our Time; The Spirit of Jewish Thought, edited by Bernard Evslin; and Gershom Scholem, The Messianic Idea in Judaism.

The American Histadrut Cultural Exchange Institute published another in its series of symposia bringing together American and Israeli experts on problems of common political concern. This one, also edited by Judd L. Teller, is Government and the Democratic Process.

RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT AND PUBLIC PERSUASIONS

One of the most significant developments on the American Jewish scene in the past several years has been a breakdown of the seemingly crystallized division of Jewish public persuasions into Orthodox, Conservative, Reform and Reconstructionist segments. Even during the less than two decades when these institutionalized movements seemed to dominate the definition of Jewish ideologies in the United States, many of the most serious American Jews rejected the denominationalism implied in their definitions. If they were forced by circumstances to remain quiet, or at least unheeded, until the late 1960s, today they are shown to be more correct than those who cavalierly championed the redefinition of Jewishness along strictly religious and denominational lines. Indeed, as the literature of the past two years clearly reveals, the Jewish religious movements are on the defensive at a time when Jewish public persuasions of other kinds are being revived.

Two motifs dominated discussion in this field between 1969 and 1971. Among the religionists there was a great sense of crisis and failure, a feeling that the American embodiment of Jewish religious institutional life was ceasing to function as the guardian of Jewish survival and the promoter
of Jewish values. The synagogue, particularly the Conservative synagogue and the Reform temple, was viewed as being in crisis, and the rabbinate equally so.

At the same time, there was a resurgence in Zionist circles, a feeling that the hour of Zionism had returned. The creation of the new American Zionist Federation, linking the various Zionist organizations in the United States, and the restructuring of the Jewish Agency along a broader base seemed to mark a turning point at which Zionism once again was in a position to contest for leadership in the Jewish world.

Secularism, too, long dormant on the American Jewish scene, has acquired new adherents who seek in Jewish ethnicity a substitute for a religious identification, which they find unsatisfactory both in definition and lifestyle. Finally, hasidism, in its authentic and not-so-authentic forms, has emerged as a kind of public persuasion in its own right, and radicalism, both secular and religious, has become a posture, if not an ideology, for many serious Jews.

Part of the problem of American Jewish religious movements is revealed in Arnold A. Lasker's study of "Motivations for Attending High Holy Day Services." The study showed that only the authentically Orthodox Jews went to synagogue primarily to worship God; Conservative and Reform Jews went as a matter of ethnic solidarity, first and foremost.

Perhaps the most extensively examined institution of American Jewry in 1969-1971 was the synagogue, whose ostensible primacy in American Jewish life was undergoing substantial challenge. Mason M. Landman, in "Requiem for the American Synagogue" delineates the crisis and the problem in direct and precise terms. Two Reform rabbis wrote on the theme: Gerald B. Bubis, in "The Synagogue and the Seventies: What Will Its Leaders Need to Know?" and Balfour Brickner, in "The Synagogue: Reality or Relic?". All these pieces directly or indirectly make the point that the synagogue, if it is to survive, must adapt internally to changing conditions, and also strengthen its links with the Jewish community as a whole.

Looking ahead to the future, Samuel Z. Klausner writes about "Synagogues in Transition: A Planning Prospectus," which discusses the need to redesign synagogues for nonterritorial communities, as the Jewish neighborhood disappears and suburbanization, with its geographic and cultural manifestations, becomes the dominant mode of Jewish life in the United States. Klausner suggests that "the loss of a geographic base for the synagogue requires a supraorganizational response, a reorganization of the net of religious institutions serving a community or region."

With the crisis of the synagogue came that of the rabbinate, whose prominence in American Jewish life was being seriously challenged on several fronts. Charles Raddock discusses "The Rabbi's Changing Image" in a critical manner. Rabbi Simon Greenberg, one of the leaders of the Conservative movement during its rise to prominence, writes about "The Rabbinate and
the Jewish Community Structure,” an analysis which he defines as “a search for a viable definition of the rabbinate, and of ourselves as rabbis.” His paper, the subject of a symposium, brought responses by Rabbis Irving Greenberg, Sidney Greenberg and Daniel Merritt. Rabbi Greenberg’s stance that rabbis must change their role to accommodate new trends is endorsed by the younger respondents. Continuing this discussion in an even more critical tone is Allen S. Maller’s “Rabbi Power,” which takes rabbis to task for their failure to take concerted action to influence even the Jewish community, much less the larger one.

Looking at a more technical aspect of the rabbi’s work in “The Counseling and Pastoral Role of the Rabbi in the American Community,” Martin A. Hoenig and Stuart H. Gilbreath assess the changes in the attitude of the American rabbi toward this role since 1950.

Rabbinical training also received much attention in the period under discussion, most of it stimulated by Charles S. Liebman’s exciting article “The Training of American Rabbis.” A symposium sponsored by Judaism to discuss the subject was published as “The Future of Rabbinic Training in America: A Symposium.” Unfortunately, the published version was severely edited, and did not adequately reflect the whole range of opinions and discussion of the conferees.


In “Jewish Theological Education in a Secular Academic Setting,” Arthur Gilbert discusses one of the latest experiments in rabbinical education, the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College and its connections with the religious studies program at Temple University. According to Gilbert, the program of the seminary emphasizes the Reconstructionist movement’s concern with the “totality of the Jewish scene,” with “Jewish self-identification and involvement in the world.”

A rarely examined facet of American Jewish communal life was exposed to public view in The Book of Kashruth—A Treasury of Kosher Facts and Frauds by Seymour E. Friedman. The author, a well known kashrut supervisor, gives us an insider’s view of the kosher food services in the United States and their control (or lack of same) in a compendium of information on all aspects of kashrut.

Orthodoxy

The most comprehensive statement of a coherent Orthodox world view to appear in the period under discussion was Emanuel Rackman’s One
Man’s Judaism. This collection of articles and essays by one of the leading spokesmen for modern Orthodoxy offers a summation of his position on the major questions confronting contemporary Jewry. Defining himself as a traditionalist, Rabbi Rackman discusses what he describes as the God-centered humanism of his Judaism. Of particular value in the realm of Jewish public affairs are his essays in the second section, on the scope of Jewish law, and in the fourth, on halakhic methodology. In a related article, “A Challenge to Orthodoxy,” Rabbi Rackman further pursues the theme of his book; he raises questions about the closed minds of those claiming authority in matters of Jewish law and asks that they reexamine fundamentals in order to increase the flexibility and widen the range of their interpretive role.

*Tradition* continued to be the prime English-language forum for American Orthodox thought. In a most interesting article, Steven Shaw explores the “Orthodox Reactions to the Challenge of Biblical Criticism.” In something of a paradigm of the development of Orthodox ideology in modern times, Shaw reviews Orthodox scholars’ efforts to come to grips with the problem of modern Bible criticism in light of the demands of tradition, with emphasis on the works of Israeli and American scholars. One possible solution to the Orthodox dilemma regarding modern Bible study is offered by Isaac Boaz Gottlieb in “Scientific Method and Biblical Study.” He suggests the possibility of using methods other than the so-called “higher criticism,” that are equally scientific for penetrating the biblical text in other than traditional ways.

In its Spring 1970 issue, *Tradition* reintroduced its quarterly survey of recent halakhic periodical literature by J. David Bleich, which appears in every issue and is a most valuable source for maintaining contact with contemporary halakhic thinking.

*Tradition* also reflects the efforts of at least one wing of Orthodoxy to come to grips with the problems of contemporary life. Among the articles dealing with such questions are Joseph Grunblatt, “Jewish Perspectives on Campus Unrest”; Melvin Granatstein, “The Dyonisian Revolt and Halakhic Man”; Fred Rosner, “Suicide in Biblical, Talmudic and Rabbinic Writings”; Shubert Spero, “Is Religion a Separate Language Game?”; Abraham Amsel, “Judaism and Psychology”; a review article by Gerald J. Blidstein, “Jews and the Ecumenical Dialogue”; and “The Sport of Hunting: A Humane Game?” by Sidney B. Hoenig. The question of “relevancy” itself is challenged by David Singer in “The Case for an ‘Irrelevant’ Orthodoxy: An Open Letter to Yitzchak Greenberg.”

The new American Jewish interest in the campus is also reflected in Orthodox circles. Aside from Grunblatt’s article in *Tradition*, Menachem B. Greenberg writes on “College and the Orthodox Student” in *Jewish Life*, and the *Jewish Observer* includes a symposium on the Orthodox student on the college campus. Participants are yeshivah and teacher-seminary students
attending City College in New York on a part-time basis who discuss their reactions to college.

One ultra-Orthodox group was also explored in Norman Lamm's "The Ideology of the Naturei Karta, According to the Satmarer Version."

**Conservatism**

*Conservative Judaism* is the Conservative movement's counterpart to *Tradition*. Their similarities and differences are instructive. Both have the same general format and deal with the same general subject matter. However, whereas *Tradition* relies for articles about equally on members of the Orthodox rabbinate and on nonrabbinical intellectuals within Orthodoxy, *Conservative Judaism* is actually, as well as officially, the journal of the Rabbinical Assembly and overwhelmingly draws on articles written by rabbis. *Tradition*, too, tends to emphasize matters of Jewish law and discussions of the ideas of traditional Jewish thinkers of the past, while *Conservative Judaism* tends to emphasize contemporary issues of relevance to the American rabbinate.

The differences are quite understandable when placed in the context of the two religious movements. Orthodoxy has produced a small but significant Jewishly literate public, which not only can respond to the intellectual efforts of its rabbinical leaders but can match them. The Conservative movement, on the other hand, tends to serve a Jewish public that is largely illiterate from a Jewish point of view, with such intellectual talent as has come its way very heavily concentrated in the rabbinate. Moreover, the concerns of the two movements are fundamentally different. Orthodoxy is concerned, first and foremost, with normative Judaism in terms of both law and tradition and, insofar as it seeks "relevancy," it does so firmly anchored in what it understands to be the law and the authoritative tradition. Conservative Judaism, on the other hand, though sharing a commitment to normative Judaism, is far more concerned with its adaptation to the contemporary scene.

Three articles appearing in *Conservative Judaism* in 1969 illustrate this difference well. In the Spring 1969 issue, David Lieber, president of the University of Judaism, reviews the Bible study materials of the Melton Center in an essay "The Melton Materials," that parallels Steven Shaw's article in *Tradition*. Both the subject and its presentation in the Lieber article reaffirm Conservatism's commitment to a new understanding of the Bible within a context respectful of tradition, yet modern in its willingness to use critical materials. It points to the difficulties and the achievements of the Melton materials in their effort to combine both. Gilbert Kollin's article, "In Search of a Balance," in the same issue of *Conservative Judaism*, deals with the problem of Jewish education in the Conservative school. It is a good statement of the mainstream Conservative rabbinical position on the educational goals in the Conservative congregational school today. "A Modern
Approach to Shabbat,” by Max Weine is another example of the Conservative movement’s central effort at adaptation to the mainstream of American Jewry. All three articles reflect the problematics of that effort.

On the other hand, W. Zev Bairey’s “Takkanot: A Layman’s Call for Active Legislation” is a serious effort to come to grips with the need to change Jewish law in a way that could revive its role in the lives of everyday Jews. The author’s concrete suggestions, all based on traditional Jewish legal categories, deal with problems ranging from truth in commerce to limitations on smoking for reasons of health. He recommends that they be adopted as takkanot, or ordinances, by “the juridical authority of the Conservative movement,” thereby restoring to life Jewish public law in the Diaspora.

Gilbert Kollin’s “Reflections on the Quest for Relevance” discusses the meaning of the decision to “demote yom tov sheni to an optional observance,” taken at the 1969 convention of the Rabbinical Assembly of America. Kollin, a strong advocate of denominationalism, is generally pleased with the action because it represents “an open break with Orthodox understanding” of Jewish law. More significant, Kollin’s approach differs from Bairey’s in that he advocates halakhic activism only in the area of Jewish ritual concerns, beyond which, he feels, the competency of Conservative rabbis does not extend.

Responsa to the question of yom tov sheni occupy the major part of the Winter 1970 issue, with five views for or against the retention of the second day. The heart of the symposium is the responsum by Philip Sigal and Abraham J. Ehrlich, making it optional.

The crisis of the synagogue was treated by two rabbinical leaders of the Conservative movement: Wolfe Kelman, executive director of the Rabbinical Assembly, takes an optimistic view of the synagogue in “The American Synagogue: Present and Prospects.” Less optimistic is the view of Abraham J. Karp in “Rabbi, Congregation, and the World They Live In.”

Reform

The CCAR Journal continues to be the major source of discussions on the character and direction of Reform Judaism, though the revamped Dimensions in American Judaism, the Reform movement’s “general” magazine, has begun to assume more of that burden. Reform movement concerns in the three years of the CCAR Journal under review here focused on three subjects: the character of the Reform synagogue and its worship, the relationships between Reform and Conservative Judaism, and the reconsiderations of Reform rabbis regarding the nature of their rabbinate.

Examples of the first include Jakob J. Petuchowski’s review article, “New Directions in Reform Liturgy.” Contributing to the controversy over the observance of the second day of festivals, the Journal reprinted Solomon Zeitlin’s two articles, “The Second Day of the Holidays in the Diaspora”
and “The Second Day of Rosh Ha-shanah in Israel.” A touching article by Benjamin Friedman, “From Reform to Conservative to Reform,” describes his conclusions about the possibilities of linkage between the two movements, based on his temporary service in a Conservative pulpit.


The sense of crisis and failure, which seems to be permeating the leadership of Conservative and Reform Judaism, was also echoed by Richard N. Levy in “The Reform Synagogue: Plight and Possibility.” It critically examines “the areas in which the synagogue has failed—as a house of prayer, of study, of meeting, and of social action.” In this connection, the Dimensions in American Judaism symposium “The Future of the Reform Synagogue,” is most useful. An Orthodox view of Reform efforts at self-examination was provided in Gerald Blidstein’s review essay, “Early Reform and its Approach.”

William B. Silverman authored Basic Reform Judaism as an introduction to the Reform movement, and Solomon B. Freehof completed Current Reform Responsa, another volume in his continuing series of works that attempt to build a body of Reform Jewish law. Richard G. Hirsch, one of the leaders of the “social action” wing of Reform Judaism who decided to settle in Israel in 1971, summarized “Social Values in Judaism and Their Realization in the Reform Movement” in what originally was a lecture for Israeli kibbutz leaders.

Reconstructionism

The Reconstructionist movement was the subject of a most authoritative article by Charles S. Liebman (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], pp. 3–99). Though it spoke to the over-all situation of American Jewry and was widely noticed, it provoked a response only in Reconstructionist circles. Alan W. Miller’s The God of Daniel S.: In Search of the American Jew dealt with Reconstructionist theological principles as understood by one adherent of the movement. The leaders of the Reconstructionist movement, themselves, provided us with a contemporary restatement of their views in Common Faith, Uncommon People: Essays in Reconstructionist Judaism, edited by Meir Ben-Horin. A critique of Reconstructionism by Marc A. Triebwasser, a young Jewish radical, entitled “But, Rabbi Kaplan: The Evolution Isn’t Over,” was published in the Reconstructionist with a reply by Kaplan. Triebwasser
argued that Reconstructionism has become stagnant though it first taught the importance of evolutionary dynamics. Kaplan's restatement of his position in *The Religion of Ethical Nationhood* has already been mentioned.

**Zionism**

Indicative of the resurgence of Zionism were two articles by Jacob Neusner, "Zionism and the Jewish Problem" and "Judaism and the Zionist Problem." In the first, Neusner, who in the past had not been overly sympathetic to Zionism, acknowledges and traces the role of Zionism in giving Jewish life in the 20th century a political and intellectual coherence that no other ideology or movement could give. In the second, Neusner further affirms the importance of Zionism:

Zionism has had a uniformly beneficial effect upon Jewry. It achieves the reconstruction of Jewish identity by its reaffirmation of the nationhood of Israel in the face of the disintegration of the religious foundations of Jewish peoplehood.

It is precisely for this reason that Zionism is resurgent at the present time, when synagogues are in crisis.

Robert Alter, in his essay "Zionism for the 70's," also looks at the contemporary relationship between Zionism and Judaism. The essay, which attracted much comment, is more ambiguous than Neusner's, since Alter, himself a Zionist since his youth, is less certain than Neusner appears to be of the undiluted benefits of Zionism. Alter looks at the irony of Israel creating new threats to the security of the Jews even while eliminating old ones. He is skeptical of the ultimate values of sovereignty even while endorsing the proximate ones, and raises questions about the future of Judaism in Israel, looking to Zionism to—hopefully—supply the answers.

The second edition of Ben Halpern's *The Idea of the Jewish State* provides us with an updated view of Zionist political theory. Similarly, an exchange in *Tradition* between Sidney B. Hoenig ("The Sicarii in Masada—Glory or Infamy?")], Shubert Spero ("In Defense of the Defenders of Masada"), and Louis I. Rabinowitz ("The Masada Martyrs According to the Halakah"), regarding the fall of Masada and the suicide of its defenders, in light of Jewish law, in fact deals with the question of Zionism and *halakhic* requirements to preserve life. The articles also raise questions about the character of Jewish political ideas at the time of the destruction of the Second Temple.

A special issue of the *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* was devoted to Zionism in America, including four articles on various aspects of American Zionist history. Ktav reissued two classics, Nahum Sokolow's *History of Zionism*, first published in 1919, and *The Jewish National Home in Palestine*, the record of the 1944 Congressional hearings on the Palestine question, which is a primer of Zionist ideas and polemics.
Radicalism and Secularism

A phenomenon of the period under review was the resurgence of Jewish secularism as an ideology among young radicals and the development of a religious radicalism outside of the Orthodox-Conservative-Reform-Reconstructionist “mainstream.” In two short years, a large literature has developed discussing these new forms. Here we will only deal with exemplary manifestations of that literature.

The new secularism shows itself as authentically Jewish in its attempt to express its secularistic aspirations through what are normally considered Jewish religious forms. Arthur I. Waskow's *The Freedom Seder; a New Haggadah for Passover,* first published in *Ramparts* and then as a book, is a characteristic, if highly controversial, example of that trend. The Haggadah, which attempts to introduce entirely non-Jewish, even anti-Jewish, categories of thought, conditions, and personalities into a Jewish framework, stirred a strong emotional response in the Jewish community. It remains notable for the effort that it is—to bridge the gap between secularist radicalism and Jewish tradition in the United States. David Singer offers a good review of Waskow's Haggadah in “Passed-Over Jewishness in the Radical Haggadah.” A sharper attack was made by Robert Alter in his *Commentary* article “Revolutionism & The Jews: Appropriating the Religious Tradition.”

What is notable about these new Jewish secularists is that many, if not most of them, come from old Jewish secularist backgrounds, often reflecting the influences of Bundist grandfathers, to add support for Hanson's law in an unexpected way.

Far more significant are the more religious manifestations of Jewish radicalism that have emerged in the past few years, particularly the havurot. Stephen C. Lerner gives us a good description of “The Havurot,” while the rationale behind their efforts and those of related groups is well presented by Bill Novak in “The Making of a Jewish Counter Culture.” The success of these radical Jews is marked by the fact that they, too, have now acquired a journal of considerable stature in *Response,* edited by Novak and published quarterly. The Fall 1970 issue is particularly important because of its symposium on the havurot and Waskow's article “A Radical Position on Israel.” A *Response* symposium, sparked off by the 1966 *Commentary* symposium of the condition of Jewish belief, discussed not only the participants' beliefs, but also how they affected the way they live.

If Jewish mysticism has not yet become a separate public persuasion, it has become a phenomenon to be reckoned with among serious figures in the major religious movements and most of the other public persuasions to which Jews are becoming committed. Courses in Jewish mysticism are becoming an integral part of the various Jewish free universities, or their equivalent, springing up around the country. The great heroes of seeking young Jews run heavily in favor of those committed in some way to the
Jewish mystical tradition. In all this, American Jews are paralleling the increased interest in mysticism (usually of the ersatz variety) in American society as a whole. Capitalizing on this, publishers have issued a number of volumes on hasidism, including Milton Aron's *Ideas and Ideals of Hasidism*.

One respected figure whose concern has been moving in this direction is Herbert Weiner, who describes authentic Jewish mysticism on the present scene in *91/2 Mystics: The Kabbala Today*. From all appearances Weiner is the half mystic in the title. Appropriately enough, his book was one of the most widely reviewed in the period under discussion. In it, he describes the current major Ashkenazi mystical movements in terms of beliefs and practices, particularly the hassidic groups.

**Defining the Boundaries of Jewish Society**

The problem of defining the boundaries of Jewish society became a matter of public policy in Israel as a result of a series of Supreme Court decisions attempting to define who was to be registered as a Jew for purposes of Israeli law. Consequently, perhaps the single most popular title in the Jewish periodical literature in 1969–1971 was “Who is a Jew?”. Articles so entitled, by David Ben Gurion, Samuel Burstein, Ira Eisenstein, Benjamin Z. Kreitman, Norman Lamm, Misha Louvish, and Moshe Rosetti, ran the gamut of opinions on the subject. Sholom J. Kahn made an unsuccessful attempt to resolve the problem in a different way, as the title of his article, “Israeli, Hebrew, Jew: The Semantic Problem,” indicates. Benjamin Akzin took a scholarly look at the issue in “Who is a Jew? A Hard Case.” The Anti-Defamation League published a reader entitled *Who is a Jew?*, edited by Solomon S. Bernards. The Shalit case, which triggered the bulk of the discussions, was thoroughly and penetratingly analyzed by Robert Alter in an article with that title. Further elaboration of the case was provided in a *Conservative Judaism* symposium, “Who Is a Jew: A Symposium” featuring Benjamin Z. Kreitman, Jack Stern, Jr., Edward Gershfield and Martin Rozenberg. Mordecai Roshwald summarized the issue in a scholarly fashion in “Who is a Jew in Israel?”.

Intervention of the Israeli Supreme Court marks a new turn of events in the whole discussion, which has had some interesting by-products. First of all, it has made the discussion in Israel central to the discussion in the rest of the Jewish world, just as Israel has become central to the rest of the Jewish world in so many other ways. Moreover, as Charles S. Liebman pointed out in his article, “Who is Jewish in Israel?”, now that a sovereign Jewish state exists, the Jewish people can once again make decisive decisions regarding the question of who is Jewish rather than simply debating the matter, as is done in the Diaspora. Moreover, these decisive decisions will
necessarily be political because, in a Jewish state, many religious questions are, of necessity, also political ones. Thus the sheer existence of Israel heightens the polity-like qualities of the Jewish people in this situation, as in others.

Even where the question of one's Jewish birth is not in dispute, the question of Jewish identity remains for both American and Israeli Jews alike, indeed for Jews the world over. The question has assumed a new character, as committed Jews take the offensive instead of simply lamenting the existence of the problem. This new turn was well-defined in two pieces. Nathan Glazer's "The Crisis in American Jewry" looks at the American Jewish scene at the point where the character of communal identity seems to be changing from religious to ethnic in its basis. M. Jay Rosenberg, a new voice, responding to this new ethnic thrust from a radical perspective, forcefully attacked those who deny their Jewishness or, at the very least, its relevance, in "To Uncle Tom and Other Such Jews." Rosenberg's piece has been reprinted often and has become somewhat of a clarion for those who approach Jewish life from a positive, if radical, stance.

Among a number of notable studies of identity, the two foremost were by Simon N. Herman. American Students in Israel examines the ways in which Israel affects, or fails to affect, the attitudes of young American Jews towards their Jewishness; Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity takes a penetrating look at the way Israeli youth of approximately the same age view their Jewishness. Both volumes are products of years of careful research of the highest order and mark a new step forward in the literature on the subject. Their generally hopeful conclusions thus are to be particularly welcomed.

Herman sees a growth in positive Jewish identity in both groups. His data also convincingly demonstrate a high correlation between the extent of one's religious commitment and the degree to which one is positively oriented towards the Jewish people and Israel. Both books are landmarks in the field, and no subsequent discussions of Jewish identity will be able to avoid dealing with them.

A more limited study by John E. Hofman and Itai Zak, "Interpersonal Contact and Attitude Change in a Cross-cultural Situation," examined another group of American Jewish youths exposed to Israel and Israelis, and came up with similar conclusions. John Hofman also published "The Meaning of Being a Jew in Israel: An Analysis of Ethnic Identity," which confirmed Herman's study of Jewish high-school students.

On the other hand, Asher Arian, utilizing data based on a sample of the entire Jewish population of Israel, drew the somewhat different conclusion that as one's sense of Israeli identity increases, one's sense of Jewish identity diminishes. In light of subsequent events, the timing of his study, "Consensus and Community in Israel," may well mean that his conclusions need to be modified.
A problem related to identification, that of affiliation, was discussed in several papers presented at a session on “Patterns of Jewish Affiliation and Nonaffiliation,” sponsored by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies and the Theodor Herzl Institute in 1968. Among the papers published were “Some Historical Facets of Jewish Affiliation,” by Joseph L. Blau, tracing the American Jewish experience from the colonial period; “The Economics of Belonging,” by Eli Ginzberg; “Expression Through Philanthropy,” by Walter A. Lurie; “Identification Through Secular Affiliation,” by C. Bezalel Sherman, and “Jewish Identification After the Six-Day War,” by Arthur Hertzberg. Though essentially transcripts of oral presentations, the papers do develop some interesting insights into the problem of Jewish affiliation in America today.

Gilbert S. Rosenthal has provided us with a compendium of articles on The Jewish Family in a Changing World, which places the American Jewish family within the context of contemporary Jewish social and communal life. It covers subjects ranging from the demography of American Jewry to a profile of Jewish education in the United States, to discussions of intermarriage, drug addiction, and alcoholism.

The family is becoming a major area of concern in the Jewish community, in recognition of its role in providing the basic cement that holds the Jewish People together. Typical of this new concern were Gisela Konopka’s “The Family in Our Time” and Gerald B. Bubis’s “The Modern Jewish Family” originally presented at the annual meeting of the Jewish Family Service, and the symposium on “The Jewish Family in a Changing Society,” with Saul Hofstein, Manheim S. Shapiro, and Louis A. Berman participating.

Intermarriage remains one of the crucial problems to be considered in the question of defining the boundaries of Jewish society. Israel Ellman’s “Jewish Intermarriage in the United States of America” is a synthesis of the empirical studies of intermarriage conducted in the 1950s and 1960s. Eugen Schoenfeld’s case study of “Intermarriage and the Small Town: The Jewish Case” examines the feelings of Jewish identity of Jews who married within the community and those who married outside it, to show that, on the emotional level at least, differences between the two groups are insignificant. Paul H. Besanceney dealt with Interfaith Marriages: Who and Why. Ruth Shonle Cavan examined “Jewish Student Attitudes Toward Interreligious and Intra-Jewish Marriage.” Benjamin Shlesinger reviewed and analyzed the literature of intermarriage since 1921 in “Intermarriage: An Old Problem and a Modern Dilemma” to extract some general principles concerning who intermarries and why, and how those principles have changed over the last 50 years.

Norman Mirsky looked at “Mixed Marriage and the Reform Rabbinate” examining the Reform rabbi’s perennial problem of whether or not to officiate at marriages between a Jew and a non-Jew. The Reform mode of conversion
was challenged by Herbert Weiner, a Reform rabbi, in “Conversion: Is Reform Judaism So Right?”. He argues that, apparently conducting conversions in a non-halakhic manner is not of very great import to the Reform movement, while for Orthodox and Conservative Jews the difference really counts. He suggests that Reform might be wise to restore the requirements of circumcision and mikvah in order to enhance its position in other fields where it seeks recognition from the Orthodox rabbinate. The issue was further examined by Burt A. Siegel in “Officiating at Mixed Marriages” and Allan S. Maller and Marc Lee Raphael in “The ‘Cost’ of Mixed Marriages.”

Everett Gendler, a radical universalist with a rabbinical degree, makes an astonishing proposal from the perspective of Jewish survival in “Identity, Invisible Religion and Intermarriage,” which appeared in Response. He suggests that intermarriage must be redefined in terms of belief systems rather than traditional ethnoreligious groupings, so that if people share the same opinions they will be defined as marrying endogamously, regardless of their respective religious or ethnic backgrounds. Subsequent issues of Response contained rebuttals of the Gendler thesis from various sources.

Erich Rosenthal, continuing his studies on intermarriage, wrote on “Divorce and Religious Intermarriage: The Effect of Previous Marital Status Upon Subsequent Marital Behavior.” Rosenthal’s Iowa and Indiana data indicate that “the proportion of religious intermarriages is considerably higher among remarriages than among both first marriages.”

Published comparative research studies on group identification of interest to Jews included Edward O. Laumann’s “The Social Structure of Religious and Ethnoreligious Groups in a Metropolitan Community,” which examines the formation of friendship among various religious and ethnoreligious groups. Bernard Lazerwitz contributed “Contrasting the Effects of Generation, Class, Sex, and Age on Group Identification in the Jewish and Protestant Communities” where he applies eight religio-ethnic identification dimensions to the Jewish and Protestant communities and finds that they apply equally in both.

Andrew M. Greeley, the Catholic sociologist, writing about “Religious Intermarriage in a Denominational Society” presents evidence showing that “denominational homogeneity in marriage exists for at least three-quarters” of the adherents of the major religious denominations, making the United States still very much a society divided along the lines of the major religions. Similarly, Jon P. Alston discovered in “Religious Mobility and Socioeconomic Status” that, as of 1955, only 15 per cent of adult white Americans had changed their religious affiliation, with Catholic, Jewish, and Baptist groups the most stable. Equally interesting, though more limited, is Norman L. Friedman’s study of “Jewish or Professional Identity? The Prioritization Process in Academic Situations,” an examination of the choice of priorities of 42 Jewish professors.
POLITICAL CULTURE

Several explorations of Jewish political culture were published in the 1969–1971 period. Two studies by Daniel J. Elazar deal explicitly with the subject. *Cities of the Prairie* includes a look at the political-cultural orientation of American Jews in the over-all context of American political sub-cultures. The second, *Israel: From Ideological to Territorial Democracy*, attempts to delineate the basic elements in Jewish political culture as part of the political cultural synthesis now developing in Israel.

Bearing on this theme, though less directly, is Charles S. Liebman's "Dimensions of Authority in the Contemporary Jewish Community." He looks at the ways in which Jews have internalized respect for certain kinds of authority figures at a time when traditional sources of authority in Jewish life no longer are operative for most of them. His conclusions show that charismatic leadership, traditionally a strong source of authority in Jewish life, survives by drawing on different sources of charisma.

"The Ethical Impact of Jewish Identification" by Bernard Lazerwitz deals with the body of knowledge that is beginning to emerge from Jewish identity studies to show the connections between rootedness in Jewish life and authenticity of Jewish culture.

On a somewhat different theme is Howard Singer's *Bring Forth the Mighty Men: On Violence and the Jewish Character* which attempts an exploration of that facet of Jewish political culture, without using that terminology. Similarly, but on a more popular and often superficial level, Ernest van den Haag looks at what he calls *The Jewish Mystique*. His amateurish, if sometimes insightful, effort to see what makes the Jews "tick" is full of strange errors and unexpected combinations of information and misinformation, like so many books about Jews written for popular consumption in the last few years.

There were also numerous attempts to explore the political attitudes of Jewish students. Fundamental questions were raised by Nathan Glazer in "The Jewish Role in Student Activism." He traces the usual assumptions about Jewish commitment to liberalism and the left, and then tries to spell out their contemporary implications. The attitudes of Jewish students toward race emerge from a comparative study "Religious Affiliation, Church Attendance, Religious Education and Student Attitudes Towards Race," by Kenneth E. Burnham, John F. Connors III, and Richard C. Leonard.

Joshua S. Geller is even more ambitious, though he confines his study to Jews, in "Adolescent Ethnic and Democratic Attitudes as Related to Attendance in Communal, Congregational, Day and Public Schools." Perhaps Geller tackled too much, for his study is weak, if only because he has difficulty defining democratic attitudes in a way that would be useful for his survey.
A number of scholarly publications dealt with the problem of Jewish political organization and institutions in the past. *New Directions in Biblical Archeology*, edited by David Noel Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield, includes articles dealing with the Biblical period. The reissuance of *Rabbi Meir of Rothenberg: His Life & Works as Sources for the Religious, Legal & Social History of the Jews of Germany in the Thirteenth Century* by Irving A. Agus, again makes available a landmark work on the community organization and government of medieval German Jewry. This work, which passed unnoticed outside a select scholarly circle when first issued, is already attaining the status of a classic in the study of Jewish political life. Agus's most recent book, *The Heroic Age of Franco-German Jewry*, is another in his series of studies of community building in the formative years of Ashkenazi Jewry. Israel M. Goldman's *The Life and Times of Rabbi David Ibn Abi Zimra*, also reissued at this time, examines the life of one of the scholars exiled from Spain in 1492, who became a communal leader in the Turkish-dominated world of the Near East. Goldman's discussion of Jewish life in Rabbi David's era, as well as the rabbi's juridical work, provides us with significant information on the political organization and institutions of the Jews in the emerging Ottoman Empire.

Turning to the modern scene, "The Reconstitution of Jewish Communities in the Post-War Period," by Daniel J. Elazar—the first product of a major worldwide study of Jewish community organization being undertaken by the author—surveys Jewish community organization in 82 countries since the end of World War II. It sets forth several typologies of organization and influence in an effort to develop a systematic basis for the analysis of Jewish community life. Also part of that study are Liebman's study of authority (p. 325) and Ernest Stock's "In the Absence of Hierarchy: Notes on the Organization of the American Jewish Community," in which the author applies some of the typologies developed by Elazar to a preliminary discussion of the character of Jewish community organization in the United States.

In a more critical vein, and far more impressionistic, is Efraim Shmueli's "Observations on Leadership," specifically "the conditions and modes of operation of Jewish leadership in the United States."

Looking at the central institutions of the American Jewish community, Donald B. Hurwitz, executive vice president of the Federation of Jewish Agencies of Philadelphia, gave us a neat and concise description of the changes in the Federation-related agencies' role in Jewish community organization in "Jewish Traditions and Social Trends." It was published in *Relationships Between Jewish Tradition and Contemporary Social Issues*, a collection of essays delivered at Yeshiva University.

Another article based on the Philadelphia experience is Howard Adelstein's and Charles Miller's "The Communalization of Jewish Center Serv-
ices," which explores "the emerging role of the Jewish community center as a significant agency in dealing with major Jewish communal problems." Reinforcing this theme of the expanding role of Jewish community agencies in the realm of Jewish public affairs is Morris Levin’s "Establishing Priorities for Jewish Communal Service." In the same vein is Rhoda Kopstein's "Relating to College Youth—Rethinking Federation Planning Approach," which examines the way the Boston Federation as an institution has attempted to relate to the college youth in the Boston area.

Bernard Postal looks at a very important Jewish institution that has been given too little attention: "The English-Jewish Press." Here, Postal discerns the same gloomy prospects for the future that face so many other Jewish institutions; he bases his prognosis on a lack of "Jewishly dedicated young writers and editors" to staff the Jewish weeklies which perform so vital a function in the American Jewish community.

The Jewish civil service, too, was examined in light of new conditions in 1969-1970. Jerry Hochbaum discusses "The Federation Executive and Our Contemporary Crises: Resistances, Rationalizations and Professional Responsibilities." Hal Mintz looks at "The Center Executive and the Problems of Leadership in a Society in Transition." In a more humorous vein, Albert Vorspan speaks of career opportunities and problems in So the Kids are Revolting...? He speaks, with tongue in cheek, of the way to maneuver toward success in the rabbinate and the Jewish bureaucracy of contemporary America. Judah J. Shapiro seeks to push these changes even further in "Jewish Continuity: A Function of Jewish Communal Service," suggesting that a reform of the Jewish communal service, to make it more Jewish and also better attuned to the need for "political modernization" of contemporary Jewish communal institutions, is an immediate practical necessity for meaningful Jewish continuity. Shapiro spells out in some detail the need for new measures of achievement and a new relationship with world Jewry.

**POLITICAL BEHAVIOR**

Writing on Jewish political behavior means dealing with the two faces of the phenomenon: the political behavior of Jews within their community and that of Jews as a group in relation to the larger community. As in the past, the emphasis in 1969-1971 publications was on the latter face.

One of the most important works of the period on political behavior within the Jewish community was Kenneth C. Roseman's "Power in a Midwestern Jewish Community." Rabbi Roseman applied the community power study technique, developed by sociologists and political scientists for the study of American local communities generally, to an unnamed midwestern Jewish community and came up with a thorough, though not completely systematic, study of the way in which the community functions: who its leaders are, how they get there, what different roles they play, and how
their actions shape community decision-making. Gilbert Kollin discusses a perennial country-wide problem—the struggle between “New York” and the rest of American Jewry—in “East Is East and West Is Different.” Within the institutions of Jewish life, the relationship between professional and voluntary leadership is an important aspect of their continuous operations. One facet of that relationship is discussed in “Staff Roles in a Jewish Community Relations Agency” by William Katz, a professional and participant-observer.

In *The Pledge*, a book that attracted a great deal of attention in 1970, Leonard Slater presents a historical case study of both faces of Jewish political behavior. Although he emphasizes the sensational over the successful in many cases, Slater’s inside look at the way American Jewry in the late 1940s rose to the support of *yishuv* in its efforts to establish the state of Israel offers a classic confirmation that the Jewish community is at least a latent polity, one that is capable of resurrecting its political character when the need arises. The inescapable conclusion readers must draw from *The Pledge* led many Jews to wonder whether the book should have been published at all.

The revival of interest in ethnic pluralism in the United States in the past several years has led to renewed interest in the political behavior of the Jews as a group within the American political system. This interest reflects the new ethnic consciousness which led the Jews to discard the self-conscious attempt to deny the existence of explicitly Jewish political behavior, or even of a “Jewish vote.” There is a growing willingness to recognize that Jews, like every other group, have generalized behavior patterns that carry over into politics, and more attempts are being made to analyze those patterns.

Lawrence Fuchs, perhaps the first political scientist to attempt a systematic study of the subject, wrote about “American Jews and the Presidential Vote,” which was incorporated in *Ethnic Group Politics*, edited by Harry A. Bailey, Jr. and Ellis Katz. An *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* special issue dealing with ethnic influences on American foreign policy published articles on several ethnic groups. Daniel N. Gordon looks at “Immigrants and Municipal Voting Turnout: Implications for the Changing Ethnic Impact on Urban Politics,” in which he examines the relationship between the size of immigrant populations and voting turnout data in 198 American cities between 1934 and 1960.

Analyzing the 1969 mayoralty election in New York, Milton Himmelfarb points to “Jewish Class Conflict?” suggesting that the wealthier half of the New York Jewish community voted for Lindsay and the poorer half for Procaccino, putting the division on the basis of what were in effect class interests. Arthur Klebanoff’s “Is There a Jewish Vote?” essentially reaffirms Himmelfarb’s understanding of that election. Another article on the subject, Murray Schumach’s “Yarmulkes, Blintzes and Ballots,” reflects the transition
from the old school of Jewish voting analysis to the new one. Beginning
with a denial of the existence of a Jewish vote he then points out that the
Jews are the only ethnic group to have split the way they did, thereby point-
ing to a certain pattern of Jewish voting, which differs markedly from that
of other ethnic groups but still exists as a separate pattern. The American
Jewish Committee provided some background data to the entire question in
a paper *Jewish Voting in Recent Elections*, prepared by Arnold Schwartz.

Allen S. Mailer's "Notes on California Jews' Political Attitudes—1968" extended the scope of Jewish voting patterns analysis to the second largest
concentration of Jews in the country. Harold Applebaum links Jewish iden-
tity and political behavior in "What Does Jewish Identity Really Mean?", a
discussion of the ability to motivate ascending levels of identity from asso-
ciation to participation, and even to leadership.

A revised edition of Nathan Glazer and Daniel B. Moynihan's *Beyond the
Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New
York City* was issued in 1970.

The number of historical studies of Jewish political behavior is increasing.
Walter J. Fischel's *Jews in the Economic and Political Life of Medieval Islam*
was reissued with a new introduction by the author on the court Jew in the
Islamic world. Ezra Mendelsohn authored a study of *Class Struggle in the
Pale: The Formative Years of the Jewish Workers' Movement in Tsarist
Russia*. Isaiah Berlin elucidates a very important aspect of Jewish political
consciousness brought down to the individual level in "Benjamin Disraeli,
Karl Marx, and the Search for Identity," which traces the impact of Jewish-
ness in the political behavior of these two giant figures of the nineteenth
century.

**PUBLIC LAW**

As works discussed earlier in this article have indicated, a few more halting
steps were taken in the three years toward the development of a Jewish
public law for the Diaspora. An unsigned article in the *Columbia Journal of
Law and Social Problems* on "Rabbinical Courts: Modern Day Solomons"
discusses the status of rabbinical courts in the contemporary United States
and the advantages of utilizing them in the settlement of disputes. It suggests
ways in which they can be expanded to be "of even more benefit to society
as a whole." Richard J. Israel, too, deals with the revival of *halakhic* concern
in contemporary American Jewish life in "The Elusive Appeal to Authority
in Rabbinic Counselling and Casework." He suggests ways in which *halakhic*
authority can be brought to bear in rabbinical counseling efforts. Finally,
Emanuel Rackman devotes two sections of *One Man's Judaism* to *halakhic*
problems, with the contemporary situation in mind.

In a very long article entitled "And He Writes Her a Bill of Divorcement,"
Simon Greenberg attempts to come to grips with one of the great problems of personal status in Jewish law. While his discussion is not related to public law per se, his approach to the problem of adapting Jewish law to new conditions is useful for all those concerned with the problem of maintaining a viable halakhah in our times.

Milton R. Konvitz discusses in “Law and Morals: In the Hebrew Scriptures, Plato and Aristotle,” the differences in philosophies of law underlying biblical and Greek thought, including that of the Hebrew Bible. “The law embraces the whole life of man and of the community; but there is room left for the good which exceeds the measure commanded by the law. Yet the law itself commands its own transcendence. . . .”

Aaron Kirschenbaum gave us a detailed study of Self-Incrimination in Jewish Law, tracing the development of the strong prohibition against self-incrimination.

SOCIAL SERVICE INSTITUTIONS

Jewish social service institutions were also concerned with problems of crisis and reform in 1969–1971. In that connection and others, The Journal of Jewish Communal Service continued to be the principal organ for the expression of the views of professionals in the communal services field. Paul Weinberger discussed the matter explicitly in “Jewish Health and Welfare Reform: The Next Steps.” His thesis is that “the present system of Jewish community services does not lend itself well to deal with current social issues because it was put together to serve the needs of an earlier era.” Sanford Solender dealt with “Contemporary Issues Affecting Future Jewish Community Center Planning” in much the same way.


The problem of maintaining Jewish community control of its social service institutions, even when they serve non-Jewish populations, has come to a head in recent years with the demands of blacks and, to a lesser extent, Puerto Ricans, for representation on the boards of all agencies which serve them and with the increase in the level of their support from non-Jewish sources. A limited literature dealing with this question has developed among Jewish communal professionals, including several articles published in the
period under discussion here. Donald B. Hurwitz set forth a framework for maintaining the Jewish identity of such agencies in his article, "Sectarian Services in the Crossfire of Current Problems." David Zeff applied a similar framework to Jewish family agencies in "The Jewish Family Agency, the Jewish Federation and the United Fund: Problems, Omens, and Opportunities." Jerry Grossfeld looked at the particular situation in Seattle, and drew larger applications from it, in "Future Jewish Family Agency Board—Sectarian or Non-sectarian?". Felice Perlmutter's "The Effect of Public Funds on Voluntary Sectarian Services" examines the impact of federal support on the "Jewishness" of the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service of Philadelphia, indicating ways in which control over the policy-making and staffing of an agency can continue maximum Jewish connections even with government support, given the nature of the American political system.

Characteristic of all these discussions is the renewed emphasis on the part of Jewish communal leaders and the Jewish civil service to maintain Jewish community agencies as Jewish ones, even when they also serve the non-Jewish community. This sense of Jewish institutional self-preservation has not always existed in American Jewish life. Today, it is increasingly the dominant view, as Irwin H. Gold expressed it in "Sectarian Services in a Time of Crisis": "the instrument [the sectarian agency] is a Jewish one, played by a Jewish musician and hopefully for a predominantly Jewish audience."

Within the framework of Jewish community services, the perennial question of priorities received its share of attention. Martin Greenberg suggested ways to deal with the question on a practical level in "Planning for the Jewish Community—The Process of Establishing Priorities and Goals"; Paul Weinberger reported on a study of priority demands in the growing Jewish community of San Diego in "An Empirical Assessment of Priorities in Jewish Community Services." Walter A. Lurie examined "Allocating to National Agencies—Priorities and Processes" and Sidney Z. Vincent, "Priorities and Planning for Jewish Education."

The role of the Jewish family service in meeting continuing Jewish needs is discussed in "Refugee Resettlement in the American Community," by Benjamin R. Sprafkin. The article is limited to the Philadelphia agency. Kurt G. Herz provides us with an overview of "Services to the Jewish Aged in North America."

CIVIC EDUCATION

Jewish education received its share of attention in the crisis-oriented approach of the past three years. Indeed, the crisis in Jewish education was looked upon as greater than perhaps any other, since it was tied in so intimately
with the problem of maintaining a Jewish identity and attachments among the young. It became commonplace to blame the failures of Jewish education on the Jewish schools, perhaps as a convenient "out" for those Jewish families, whose own ambivalent attitude towards being Jewish has eliminated the home as a positive element in the educational process. Essentially, the Jewish educators accepted at face value the critique of the Jewish schools, and the pages of *Jewish Education* and the *Pedagogic Reporter*, the two major professional journals in the field reflect their continuing concern. By and large, however, discussions of the problem in those forms tended to focus on single experiments or on hortatory generalizations.

Abraham G. Duker set forth the basic truths underlying Jewish education in the United States in "Changing Values in American Jewish Life: A Challenge to Jewish Education" pointing to the hard choices to be made by the American Jewish community, which must insist on pluralism even in the face of assimilationist drives from other segments of society. Eliezer Berkovits provided an Orthodox critique of the problems of Jewish education in "Jewish Education in a World Adrift."

Among the more interesting critiques were "Of Jewish Education, etc.," by Shlomo Katz; "Are Our Religious Schools Obsolete?", by Jack D. Spiro; Howard Sticklor's "Education and Self-Deception," and Shloime Wiseman's "Relevance of Jewish Education to Present-Day Life." Alvin I. Shiff's article, "Religion in Education: A Jewish Perspective," attempts to apply the broader Jewish definition of religion to the whole question of religious education in the Jewish schools.

Daniel J. Elazar discusses the history of this problem and its consequences in "Jewish Education and American Jewry: What the Community Studies Tell Us." He traces the development of Jewish educational curricula from the national-cultural approach of the 1920s and 1930s to the synagogue-skills approach of the 1940s to 1960s, and into the new emphasis on Israel and Jewish community now beginning to make its way into Jewish educational circles. The strong belief prevalent before 1967 that only by converting Judaism to a Protestant-like religion do we assure ourselves of its survival in the United States is precisely what has been rejected by the youth, while Israel, the most political expression of Jewish solidarity, is the one element in the Jewish constellation which is exciting and attractive to them. He suggests that Jewish education will have to come to grips with this new situation. This theme is emphasized and developed by Moshe Davis in "The Eretz Yisrael Dimension of Contemporary Jewish Life," a broad-based discussion of the Israel phenomenon and how it must be integrated into diaspora Jewish life, with particular emphasis on the educational component. In a companion article, Isaac Toubin, in "A Shift in Educational Focus," applies Davis' thesis directly to the American Jewish school. Concrete suggestions for the implementation of the educational aspects of Davis's article were presented by Albert Elazar in "Israel and Jewish Education in the Diaspora."
All this has stimulated a renewed concern with the teaching of Jewish civics or, more appropriately, a sense of involvement in the world Jewish community and the understanding of its workings. While material reflecting this new approach remains sparse, the literature on Jewish education is beginning to include more of it and, with new task forces at work on the problem, there should be even more in future years.

Concern with the substance and orientation of Jewish education has been coupled with a renewal of discussions about proper form. Attention has focused particularly on the place of the day school. In "Whither the Hebrew Day School?", Eugene Rothman reports that day-school enrollment rose 19 per cent between 1962 and 1967, going counter to the trend which saw over-all enrollment in Jewish schools declining by 5 per cent. At that, only one-third of children between the ages of 3 and 17 were receiving any Jewish education. While racial problems in the public schools have undoubtedly helped increase the popularity of day schools among some Jewish parents, an increasing desire to give children an intensive Jewish education is a more important factor in their growth. Amy Malzberg brings the data on Jewish day schools up to date in *Jewish Day Schools in the United States*. An insider's view of the day-school movement from the perspective of the largest network of day schools in the United States, the Torah Umesorah schools, was provided in *Hebrew Day School Education: An Overview*, edited by Joseph Kaminetsky and Murray I. Friedman.

A very limited discussion of the future of Jewish education based on a study conducted at Temple Israel of Greater Miami was published as *Judaism of the Next Generation* by the noted sociologist Morris Janowitz, with the assistance of Roberta Ash.

Lloyd P. Gartner edited *Jewish Education in the United States: A Documentary History*, the first volume of its kind. In it, Gartner brought together documents reflecting development from the colonial period to the present. The work will undoubtedly become a source book for Jewish teachers colleges and all students of American Jewish life. Jay B. Stern looks at the critical shortage of teachers in Jewish schools in "Losing One's Faculties in Jewish Education." In "Trends and Currents in Curriculum Development, 1930-1970," an historical survey of the debate over the proper curriculum for the Jewish school, as reflected in the pages of the first 40 years of *Jewish Education*, the leading journal in the field, Leon H. Spotts inevitably delineates the importance of peoplehood and community. The relationship between the religious and ethnic-national motives is an important and continuing element in the discussion. Abraham P. Gannes provides a very positive stance in "Reflections on the Community Idea in Jewish Education."

An institutional phenomenon in Jewish education is the proliferation of Jewish studies at American universities. In part a response to the demands for Black studies and other minority studies programs, the Jews have seized upon the opportunities provided by others to build even more sys-
tematically and, perhaps, with greater long-range success. An assessment of the status of Jewish studies programs and Jewish scholarship on the eve of the "boom" is provided in *Colloquium on the Teaching of Judaica in American Universities*, edited by Leon A. Jick. An outgrowth of a colloquium held at Brandeis University in 1969—which also led to the formation of the Association for Jewish Studies as the professional body of teachers of Judaica at American universities—this volume takes an in-depth look at the major fields of Jewish studies and their present status on the American campus.

PUBLIC PERSONALITIES

The writing of biography flourished between 1969–1971, producing a number of important works about American Jews. A segment of Abraham Cahan's autobiography appeared in English translation as *The Education of Abraham Cahan* (translated by Leon Stein, Abraham P. Conan and Lynn Davison from the Yiddish *Bleter fun mayn lebn*) to provide us with a rich picture of immigrant Jewish life in the early 20th century. Liva Baker authored the biography of Felix Frankfurter, another Jewish immigrant who reached eminence in his adopted land, while Frankfurter's successor on the Supreme Court was the subject of a political study by Victor Lasky, entitled *Arthur J. Goldberg: The Old and the New*. The role of Louis D. Brandeis in the Progressive movement was analyzed by Melvin I. Urofsky in *A Mind of One Piece: Brandeis and American Reform*.

Stanley F. Chyet gave us the first scholarly biography of Aaron Lopez, the most famous of the colonial Jewish merchants, in *Lopez of Newport: Colonial American Merchant Prince*. Another fine scholarly biography was Naomi W. Cohen's *A Dual Heritage: The Public Career of Oscar S. Straus*. Straus, a major Jewish public figure in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, was one of the leading representatives of American Jewry to the United States government and heavily involved in Jewish communal affairs here and abroad. His biography adds considerably to our understanding of Jewish public affairs of that period.


Alexander M. Dushkin, one of the pioneer Jewish educators in the United States, contributed an autobiographical note in "Antaeus—Autobiographical Reflections." Some insight into the ways of local Jewish public affairs during the days of the immigration is provided in a short autobiographical sketch by Nathan Platnick, "From Kielem to Bluefield," in which he reminisces on his role in the development of Jewish communal life in West Virginia.
The usual spate of biographies of Israeli leaders also appeared in 1969–1971. *Ben Gurion Looks Back*, by David Ben Gurion and Moshe Pearlman, represents a kind of memoir by the first prime minister of Israel, in the form of conversations with his co-author. Another book, *David Ben Gurion: Memoirs*, compiled by Thomas R. Barnstein as an autobiography, actually consists of materials written by Ben Gurion at various times and compiled without his authorization. Naphtali Lau-Lavie wrote *Moshe Dayan: A Biography*. Levi Eshkol, the late Israeli prime minister who died in 1969, was the subject of a biography by Terence Prittie, *Eshkol: The Man and the Nation*. A brief selection of Eshkol's state papers was published as *The State Papers of Levi Eshkol*, edited with an introduction by Henry H. Christman. Simcha Kling provides a biography of Joseph Klausner, one of the great leaders of the early Zionist movement and, for many years, the intellectual backbone of the Revisionist movement. Golda Meir was the subject of a pictorial biography entitled *Golda Meir: Portrait of a Prime Minister*, with text by Eliyahu Agress. There was also the publication of a revised edition of Marie Syrkin's *Golda Meir: Israel's Leader*.

Two major figures of European Jewish origin who helped shape the modern Jewish world as leaders in Jewish public affairs, were the subjects of books. Nahum Goldmann, the most international of the international Jewish leaders of our times, wrote of his experiences at the center of most public issues confronting world Jewry since World War I in *The Autobiography of Nahum Goldmann: Sixty Years of Jewish Life*. However, while providing great insight into the man himself, the book reveals little about issues which have engaged him.

The Territorialists had their day in the period under discussion. Samuel J. Lee wrote of Baron de Hirsch in *Moses of the New World: The Work of Baron de Hirsch*, describing his role in the development of Jewish agricultural colonies in the Western hemisphere. Elsie Bonita Adams portrayed Israel Zangwill.

In a biographical note, Henry J. Cohn discussed "Theodor Herzl's Conversion to Zionism" tracing Herzl's movement away from assimilation and toward an active role in Jewish life. Aubrey Hodes turned his attention to *Martin Buber: An Intimate Portrait*.

Mordecai and Miriam Roshwald attempted a biography of *Moses: Leader, Prophet, Man*, and Joseph I. Schneersohn's *The Tzemach Tzedek in the Haskalah Movement* was published in an English translation prepared by Zalman I. Posner.

**SUBDIVISIONS OF JEWISH SOCIETY**

The revival of interest in the Sephardi segment of world Jewry accelerated to become a major "item" of Jewish interest. It was accompanied by a renewed search for identity on the part of growing numbers of Sephardi intellectuals.
Their writings, influenced in part by the new ethnicity in the United States and the "Black Panther" movement in Israel, were at times relatively militant in tone. In some respects, this represented a salutory response to the still-condescending tone of Ashkenazi views on the subject.

Dvora and Menahem Hacohen authored *One People: The Story of the Eastern Jews* dealing with twenty centuries of Jewish life in North Africa, Asia, and Southeastern Europe, perhaps the first major effort to present their story to a general reading public. Moshe Lazar's collection, *The Sephardic Tradition: Ladino and Spanish-Jewish Literature* was meant to be a favorable treatment but, in fact, subtly reflects all the by-now-usual Ashkenazi condescension toward the Sephardim. Stephen Birmingham, on the other hand, prints a glowing picture of the American Sephardi aristocracy in *The Grandees: America's Sephardic Elite*. His book not only suffers from inaccuracies stemming from a mixture of firm fact, gossip, and hearsay; it also was challenged (by Edouard Roditi in "The Real Grandees") for Birmingham's choice of which Sephardim really were the aristocrats; those who went to the New World and assimilated or those who perpetuated Jewish cultural life in the Eastern Mediterranean region. The Foundation for the Advancement of Sephardic Studies and Culture issued a collection of four other reviews of *The Grandees* by Sephardim.

David N. Barocas edited two volumes of shorter works: *In Search Of Our Sephardic Roots* and *The Sephardic Storm Lamp*. Volumes 3 and 4 of the *American Sephardi*, the journal of the Sephardi studies program of Yeshiva University in New York, appeared as double issues, the first in September 1969 and the second in the autumn of 1970. In both, the expanded format permitted the publication of numerous scholarly articles focusing on Sephardi life and culture throughout the world. An interesting study by Morris Gross on "Learning Readiness in Two Jewish Groups: A Study in 'Cultural Deprivation'" raised the question "Do American-born Sephardic youngsters display educational, intellectual and verbal handicaps as compared with American born Ashkenazic youngsters?"

**ISRAEL**

The monumental outpouring of literature on Israel, which continued unabated in 1969–1971, concerned itself with examinations of the Arab-Israeli situation and discussions of the internal problems of the Jewish state. Space limitations require this article to confine itself to the latter.

The period under discussion here may indeed have witnessed a significant step forward in the study of Israeli civil society. Several works by social scientists broke some new ground, at least in the questions asked if not always in the answers provided. Dan Avni-Segre, writing on "Israel: A Society in Transition," attempted to look at the political consequences of industrialization in Israel in relation to the original agrarianism of the
Zionist founders of the state. Daniel J. Elazar, in *Israel: From Ideological to Territorial Democracy*, took a broad look at the transition now taking place in Israeli society from its earlier pioneering stage to a more rooted one, and compared Israel with other “new societies” that have emerged in the modern era. Amos Perlmutter probed the *Anatomy of Political Institution-alization: The Case of Israel and Some Comparative Analyses*.

Two of the more popular books to appear during this period were Morris Mandel's and Leo Gartenberg's *Israel: The Story of a Miracle* and Nathan Shaham's *This Land We Love: An Affectionate Look at Israel*. In a far more conventional work, Edwin Samuel sketched *The Structure of Society in Israel* with a few swift strokes. Misha Louvish discussed *The Challenge of Israel*. In *Israel: The Sword and the Harp*, a strange work that combines social scientific observation with a proto-Christian outlook, Ferdynand Zweig tried to assess Israel society, oscillating between penetrating examination and sheer silliness.

A number of works attempted to look more closely at Israeli attitudes and values. The most influential by far was *The Israelis: Founders and Sons* by Amos Elon, a sensitive and penetrating account of generational change in Israel. Of great importance was *The Seventh Day: Soldiers' Talk About the Six-Day War*, a self-edited record of the thoughts of groups of young *kibbutzniks*, who had seen combat and sought to understand their own reactions to war, Israel, Zionism, and Jewish values. A beautiful book, it stands as heartening testimony to the high worth of the best that Israel has to offer. Two more popular books on the Israelis were Ruth Bondy's *The Israelis, Profile of a People*, an attempt to delineate "the character, personality and way of life of the citizens of Israel," and Herbert Russcol's and Margalit Banai's *The First Million Sabras: A Portrait of the Native-Born Israelis*.

Ilana Preale, Yehuda Amir, and Shlomo Sharan discussed "Perceptual Articulation and Task Effectiveness in Several Israel Subcultures" in an effort to learn more about task achievement differences among Israeli subgroups. Asher Arian, writing on "Consensus and Community in Israel" suggested that the thrust of the Israeli experience since 1948 has been to strengthen the sense of nationality rather than Jewish community among the state's Jews. However, his data are based on a pre-1967 study and have been superseded to some extent by evidence of latent feelings of Jewishness that emerged in the crisis of that year. Arian partially updated his findings in "Stability and Change in Israeli Public Opinions and Politics." Simon N. Herman's already cited *Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity* offers a more articulated penetration into the problem of Israeli and Jewish identity.

Several landmark decisions by the Israeli Supreme Court and the general situation of a nation living under siege aroused American interest in questions of constitutional law in Israel. Jeffrey M. Albert wrote on "Constitutional Adjudication Without a Constitution: The Case of Israel." Ammon Rubenstein analyzed Israel's equivalent of *Marbury vs. Madison*, in which the court held a law of the Keneset effectively unconstitutional, in "Supreme Court
vs. the Knesset.” Other constitutional discussions were treated in the articles dealing with the question of who is a Jew. Finally, Allan M. Dershowitz, looking at “Terrorism & Preventive Detention: The Case of Israel,” concluded that the Israelis are handling the problem of preventive detention in as constitutional a manner as possible under what, in effect, are extra-constitutional circumstances.

In the fall of 1969, after a rather lackluster campaign, Israel held elections, whose outcome seemed to hold no surprises in any respect. They received no extensive or serious treatment in the press beyond the usual quotient of journalistic discussions of the political scene. A summary of the results is available in Herbert Smith, *Preview to Israel Elections, 1969*.

Not surprisingly, in the aftermath of the six-day war, Israel’s army has come in for a great deal of attention as a phenomenon in its own right. Because of Zahal’s particular character, the more analytical studies of necessity also shed considerable light on the character of Israeli society.

Three books by “insiders” appeared during the period under discussion. Samuel Rolbant’s *The Israeli Soldier: Profile of an Army* is a serious, detailed description of the army in all its aspects, from military doctrine to sociological structure. While the book suffers slightly from a time lag between writing and publication, it offers, in this writer’s view, the best account to appear in English. Yigal Allon, Israel’s deputy prime minister and former commander of the Palmach, provided us with *The Making of Israel’s Army*, a short essay with a collection of documents describing the various pre-state and current military experiences of Israel. As might be expected, it provides an adequate survey without analysis in depth. Shimon Peres, another cabinet minister and deputy minister of defense in the Ben Gurion government described the building of Israel’s military capacity during the 1950s in *David’s Sling*, a fascinating account, but basically one of his own role in the effort.

A Frenchman, Jean Lartéguy, presented a European’s view of the Israeli army in *The Walls of Israel*. On another plane, Ted Berkman’s *Sabra: The Story of the Men and Women Behind the Guns of Israel* is a popular history of the army as seen through the six-day war experiences of the people interviewed. It has all the advantages and disadvantages typical of this kind of material. Equally popular, but more sophisticated in approach, is William Stevenson’s *Zanek: A Chronicle of the Israeli Air Force*.

The problem of religion and state continues to be central to Israeli experience and, as we have already seen in the connection with the “Who is a Jew” controversy, has provoked a great deal of commentary. The six-day war continued to call forth considerations of the new meaning of the Jewish experience for Orthodox and non-Orthodox Jews. Harold Fisch wrote on “Faith in Israel” from that perspective, while Isaiah Leibowitz and Michael Rosenak further discussed the meaning of the war in “The Spiritual and Religious Meaning of Victory and Might” and “The Mitzvot, the Messiah and the Territories,” respectively.
The argument over the character of the relationship between religion and state in Israel and the problem of “religious freedom” was also widely featured. Ervin Birnbaum’s *The Politics of Compromise: State and Religion in Israel* gives an extensive description of the political and constitutional aspects of the problem. Emile Marmorstein’s *Heaven at Bay: The Jewish Kulturkampf in the Holy Land* provides a thorough treatment of the issue, in the context of Israel’s social and political development and of Jewish history as a whole. His discussion of rule in Jewish tradition is a significant contribution to the field of Jewish political studies. Another discussion of the subject is Samuel Clement Leslie’s *The Rift in Israel: Religious Authority and Secular Democracy*.

The position of Reform Judaism, which underwent considerable stress in Israel in the past two years, was restated by Maurice N. Eisendrath in *Israel: Freedom for All*. A compromise which would leave Orthodoxy in “its primary position and status as the established State synagogue,” but would provide for the recognition of the Reform movement was suggested by Sholom A. Singer in “Orthodoxy and Non-Orthodoxy in Israel as Seen Through the Sorokin Thesis.” *Judaism* carried a symposium on “Religion and the State of Israel: Three Points of View.”

A different approach to the Orthodox establishment in Israel was Louis I. Rabinowitz’s “*Dat is Not Religion*,” which chides Israeli Orthodoxy for concentrating on the maintenance of established ritual canons rather than concerning itself with larger ritual or ethical problems. Pinhas H. Peli looks at the situation in just the reverse way in “Israel’s Religious Component.” He tries to examine the extent to which a religious spirit animates non-Orthodox Israelis and sees great hope in their intrinsic religious attitudes. Abraham Goldberg responded to Rabinowitz in “Jewish Law and Religious Values in the Secular State.”

The great rise in Western immigration to Israel after the six-day war has led to a spate of studies on the subject. Fred S. Sherrow and Paul Ritterband did “An Analysis of Migration to Israel” and discovered that the standard explanations of why young Americans and Canadians move to Israel still hold. Aaron Antonovsky and David Katz explored “Factors in the Adjustment to Israeli Life of American and Canadian Immigrants” to learn about the problems and processes of adjustment of over 1,600 Jews from those countries. A lighthearted account of just that kind of adjustment was Arnold Sherman’s *Impaled on a Cactus Bush: An American Family in Israel*. Fernando Peñalosa discussed the adjustment of Jews from Latin America in “Post-Migration Experiences and Assimilation of Latin American Immigrants in Israel.”

Chaim Adler looked at “Education and the Integration of Immigrants in Israel,” while Shulamith Har‘even described “Meetings With New Immigrants,” from the Communist countries of Eastern Europe. The prolific Arie L. Eliav wrote *No Time for History: A Factual Story of Immigrant*
Absorption and Integration in Israel, an examination of the resettlement of one particular region of Israel, of which he was director. Yochanan Peres examined “Ethnic Relations in Israel” by analyzing studies of intergroup relations conducted between 1966 and 1968.

Interest in the kibbutz remains high in the United States, particularly now that communes (of a very different sort) have become popular in certain quarters in this country. Perhaps the most widely read book on the kibbutz to appear in the period under discussion here was Bruno Bettelheim’s The Children of the Dream. This highly favorable account of child-rearing in the kibbutz is impaired by the author’s willingness to generalize from a single case study. Erik Cohen and Menachem Rosner discussed “Relations Between Generations in the Israeli Kibbutz.”

Menachem Rosner wrote “Communitarian Experiment, Self-Management Experience in the Kibbutz,” a general article about the kibbutz movement and its role in Israeli society. Melford Spiro’s Kibbutz: Venture in Utopia was reissued in an expanded version.

D. Weintraub and others looked at Moshava, Kibbutz and Moshav: Patterns of Jewish Rural Settlement and Development in Palestine, an overview of the agricultural colonization movement. Another aspect of Israeli agriculture was discussed by Arthur H. Doerr, Jerome F. Coling, and William S. Kerr III in “Agricultural Evolution in Israel in the Two Decades Since Independence,” a glowing account of how agriculture has developed extraordinarily high productivity in a difficult environment.

Meir Heth wrote about The Flow of Funds in Israel, a technical study published in cooperation with the Bank of Israel. Planning and the Private Sector: The Experience in Developing Countries by John C. Honey is a comparative study of twelve countries including Israel.

Aharon F. Kleinberger looked at Society, School and Progress in Israel. Rina Shapira and Eva Etzioni discussed “‘Individual’ and ‘Collective’ Values of Israeli Students: The Impact of Youth Movements.” This intensive study reaffirms the continued importance of the youth movements “as a framework for the crystallization of values, albeit mainly in the collective, public, and not so much in the individual, private area.” A revised edition of Raphael Patai’s Israel Between East and West: A Study in Human Relations was issued in 1970.

Michael Avi-Yonah, an Israeli scholar noted for books of this type, edited A History of the Holy Land an attractive pictorial history of the land of Israel that emphasizes the role played by the Jews when they were a majority and when they were not. In another history of the land of Israel, James W. Parkes answers the question Whose Land? A History of the Peoples of Palestine. Parkes, a Christian scholar noted for his studies of Palestinography, looks at the respective roles of Jews, Christians, and Muslims over the centuries, and demonstrates that the Jewish presence in the land never ceased and, indeed, was almost invariably the most important one whenever the land, itself, had any importance on the world scene.
War and Hope: A History of the Jewish Legion, by Elias Gilner, a Legion veteran, is an absorbing account of the first substantial Jewish fighting force in the modern era. The book is oriented towards the Jabotinsky view of the Legion's role and problems, and honestly portrays the heartbreaking problems, which ultimately frustrated the hopes of the Legion's founders and leaders. Israel Eldad discussed The Jewish Revolution: Jewish Statehood.

Among the published materials dealing with the emergence of the State of Israel was Yehuda Bauer's From Diplomacy to Resistance, a fine study of Jewish Palestine during World War II, showing how the Jews prepared for the post-war struggle that was to lead to statehood. Nana Sagi relates "The Epic of Aliyah Bet ('Illegal' Immigration) to Palestine." Leonard Slater's The Pledge is an account of the American Jewish contribution to the effort in Palestine; Jacob Rubin recorded the story of the over-all American Jewish role in the development and rise of the State of Israel in Partners in State Building: American Jewry & Israel. Herbert Feis wrote on The Birth of Israel, a history of diplomacy in the creation of the state. In West German Reparations to Israel, Nicholas Balabkins presents a panorama of that important ingredient for Israel in its early years of statehood.

Chasya Pincus describes the youth immigration in Come From the Four Winds: The Story of Youth 'Aliya.

Iva Cohen compiled Israel: A Bibliography which, as its subtitle indicates, is "a selected, annotated listing of works on Israel's past history and present structure and culture."

AREA STUDIES

United States

NATIONAL STUDIES

Several important anthologies dealing with the history of the Jews in America were published between 1969 and 1971. The most monumental was the five-volume set of reprints of selected studies from the Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society (later called American Jewish Historical Quarterly), titled The Jewish Experience in America. Its editor, Abraham J. Karp, wrote an introduction for each of the volumes, which set the scene for the selections included. Undoubtedly the most compendious work on American Jewish history yet published, it brings together most of what we know about the history of American Jewry, and will stand as the basic source book for that history, until the history itself is written. Its 88 selections cover the period from 1654 to World War II. The third edition of Morris U. Schappes, Documentary History of the Jews in the United States, 1654–1875, appeared in 1971. Irving J. Sloan completed The Jews in America, 1621–1970: A Chronology & Fact Book.
Jacob R. Marcus, dean of American Jewish historians, completed *Studies in American Jewish History*, a massive collection dealing with all stages of colonial Jewish history. One section, "The Colonial and Early National Period," was reprinted in the *American Jewish Historical Quarterly*.

An admiring Christian view of American Jewish history was provided by Robert St. John, in *Jews, Justice and Judaism: A Narrative of the Role Played by the Bible People in Shaping American History*. This glowing account of the Jewish contribution to America presents the Jews' very best side to the larger world. Equally popular is Tina N. Levitan's volume, *Jews in American Life*, which, in the author's words, covers the period "from 1492 to the space age." Anita Libman Lebeson's *Recall to Life: The Jewish Woman in America* is a collection of sketches of Jewish women who were influential in American life, whether as Jews or not.

A collection of Salo W. Baron's essays on American Jewish life was published under the title, *Steeled by Adversity: Essays and Addresses on American Jewish Life*. Several of the pieces included in the collection stand as monographs in and of themselves. Three serious works by Rudolf Glanz add to our knowledge of the details of American Jewish history. His *Studies in Judaica Americana* deals basically with German Jews in America, but also touches on a whole range of ethnic comparisons and intercommunal relations within the Jewish community. "The German Jewish Mass Emigration: 1820-1880" looks at that immigration as paradigmatic not only for Jews, but for migrants to America in general. Glanz also gave us *The German Jew in America: An Annotated Bibliography*.


Of interest to students of the deviations in American Jewish history is Howard B. Radest's history of the Ethical Culture Society, *Toward Common Ground: The Story of the Ethical Societies in the United States*, an example of a Jewish "heresy" developed during the salad days of Reform universalism in the United States.

The September 1970 issue of the *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* is devoted to Zionism in America. It includes studies by Isaac M. Fein, George L. Berlin, Herbert Parzen, and Doreen Bierbrier. The March 1969 issue of the *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* included the proceedings of the 1968 joint session of the American Jewish Historical Society and the American Historical Association, featuring articles on the relationship of Jews to the currents of social ferment in the United States at the turn of the century. The December 1969 issue includes three articles on the role of Hebrew and Yiddish in American Jewish life, as well as an article by S. Joshua Kohn, "New Light on Mordecai Manuel Noah's Ararat Project."
The revival of interest in Yiddish in some quarters of American Jewry is reflected in Milton Doroshkin's *Yiddish in America: Social and Cultural Foundations*.

Peter I. Rose edited a collection of essays focusing on the contemporary Jewish scene, under the title *The Ghetto and Beyond*. The 26 essays in the volume show American Jewry, "warts and all." They meet the highest canons of scholarship.

Bernard Lazerwitz compared "The Association Between Religio-Ethnic Identification and Fertility Among Contemporary Protestants and Jews" to see whether there are fertility differences among Jews and Protestants who are more religiously or ethnically identified as distinct from those who are less so. Ronald M. Goldstein, in "American Jewish Population Studies Since World War II," examined local Jewish community surveys, conducted between 1948 and 1956, from which he extracted some basic sociodemographic data.

**STATE, LOCAL, AND REGIONAL STUDIES**

The South and the West remained the two regions having coherent identity in American Jewish life. Two useful articles on the Jews in the South appeared during the period reviewed here: Leonard Dinnerstein carried on his work on that theme in "A Note on Southern Attitudes Towards Jews." Allen Krause discussed "The Rabbis of the Deep South," specifically their role in relation to the fight for the rights of blacks. According to Krause, they have tried to steer a middle course, but have shown greater willingness than the larger community to be counted among civil-rights advocates.

The primary expression of Western Jewish identity remains the *Western States Jewish Historical Quarterly*, in essence a California publication. The bulk of articles in its 1969-1971 issues were biographical descriptions and resurrected travelers' reports, all useful contributions to the development of a body of literature on the Jews of California and the West. Most important was a five-part series on the history of Montana Jews, from the 1860s to 1950.

The volume of material on Jewish communities in the various states and localities continued to grow in quality as well as quantity. This was particularly because the development of state and local Jewish historical societies has led to more systematic research into local Jewish history.

**Alabama:** Bertram W. Korn drew a picture of "The Jews of Mobile, Alabama, Prior to the Organization of the First Congregation in 1841."

**California:** The major work on the California community was *The History of the Jews of Los Angeles* by Max Vorspan and Lloyd P. Gartner, another in the Jewish Community Histories series, edited by Moshe Davis and the late Allan Nevins. Though a pioneering effort, which will remain a basic source for some time to come, it was viewed in many quarters as not living up to its promise. For a thorough analysis of the work, see William M.
Kramer and Norton B. Stern, "The Study of Los Angeles Jewish History: An Analytical Consideration of a Major Work."

I. Harold Sharfman’s Nothing Left to Commemorate: The Story of the Pioneer Jews of Jackson, Amador County, California calls attention to the Jews of the Gold Rush country. Unfortunately, it is so replete with errors that its usefulness for serious historians is questionable. Far more carefully documented is “The Early Sacramento Jewish Community,” by Marlene S. Gaines, which looks at the institutional development of the community rather than at the individual Jewish settlers alone.

California Family Newmark, a family history by Leo Newmark, augments our knowledge of the development of Jewish life in California. It supplements Sixty Years in Southern California, 1853–1913, the work of the author’s uncle, Harris Newmark, in that it portrays another generation of one of the important Jewish families in the West.

An article of particular interest, because it attempts a social analysis of Jewish life in America, is Norman L. Friedman’s “Hollywood, the Jewish Experience, and Popular Culture.” It examines the implicit or explicit ethnic Jewishness of Jewish Hollywood in the 1930s, a kind of a caricature of the development of Jewish life in America.


Delaware: Harry Bluestone has contributed An Historical Review of the Jewish Family Service of Delaware, an institutional survey of one of the state’s Jewish communal agencies.


The November 1969 issue of the journal was devoted to the history of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, written by Bernard I. Nordlinger.

Florida: Mel Ziegler, discussing “Jewish Poverty Amid Jewish Affluence: Journey’s End in Miami Beach,” pointed out that “Half the permanent residents of Miami Beach live unnoticed in what may be the world’s most invisible slum. . . . Of the more than 40,000 persons clustered there, 80 per cent are 65 or over, most of them in their seventies. Eighty-five per cent are Jewish.”

Georgia: The impact of the synagogue bombings of the late 1950s on Atlanta Jewry was described by Arnold Shankman in “A Temple is Bombed—Atlanta, 1958.”

Illinois: Thomas B. Littlewood wrote Horner of Illinois, a biography of Governor Henry Horner, the only Jewish governor in the history of that state.
In this moderately satisfactory work, Littlewood discussed Horner’s Jewish background and attachments, as well as his life and career.


*Iowa*: *A History of the Sioux City Jewish Community, 1869–1969*, by Bernard Shuman, is another example of an amateur historian’s account that gives us some basics with which to understand the local variations of the Jewish experience in America.

*Kansas*: Kansas Jewish history seems to be confined only to studies of the Jewish colonization attempt at Beersheba. The latest contribution was Lipman Goldman Feld’s article, “New Light on the Lost Jewish Colony of Beersheba, Kansas, 1882–1886.”

*Louisiana*: In a far more analytical study of local history, *The Early Jews of New Orleans*, Bertram W. Korn, seeks to determine why the Jews who came to New Orleans early in its history did not develop a Jewish community but assimilated into the general community. Examining the case histories of exemplary families, he points to the consequences for Jewish communal life when the first Jewish settlers in an area are thoroughly apathetic or antagonistic to Jewish survival. Korn’s work is an important contribution to the understanding of a very special local variation in American Jewish life. It also throws light on some of the leading “names” in American Jewish history.

*Maryland*: Isaac Fein’s study, *The Making of an American Jewish Community: The History of Baltimore Jewry From 1773 to 1920*, provides us with the first solid history of that major Jewish community.

Naomi Fellman is the author of a brief pamphlet *On the Beginnings of Jewish Charities in Baltimore*, a useful survey.

*Massachusetts*: In a very useful work, a group of Jewish college students in the Boston area prepared *Jewish Boston: A Guide for Student and Newcomers*, designated as Volume 1, Number 1, 1969–1970. While designed as a guidebook, this slender volume also gives us a better insight than any other readily available source into the ways of Jewish communal life in the Boston area and, indeed, provides a model that deserves to be emulated in other Jewish communities. The students promised to make the guide an annual, and in fact issued Volume 2, Number 1, 1970–1971, as *Jewish Boston and New England Jewry Supplements: A Guide*.

*Michigan*: Historical and demographic material about the Michigan Jewish community continues to expand. *Michigan Jewish History*, the journal of the Jewish Historical Society of Michigan, is published regularly. Its focus, as that of most local Jewish historical journals, tends to be on individuals and their biographies, or personal memoirs. The January 1970 issue is of particular interest because it deals more generally with Jewish settlement in the state, with articles on Jews in Kalamazoo and in the northern part of the state.

Robert Rockaway’s “Ethnic Conflict in an Urban Environment: The
German and Russian Jew in Detroit, 1881–1914” is taken from his doctoral dissertation on the history of Detroit Jewry. Albert J. Mayer, the leading Jewish demographer of Michigan, wrote The Flint Jewish Population Study: 1967. It is more than the title indicates, for it includes data on the religious observance of the city’s Jews, and their affiliation with the Jewish community.

An unusual work to be included in any bibliographic listing of American Jewish life is Thomas V. LoCicero’s Murder in the Synagogue, a detailed study of the assassination of Rabbi Morris Adler of Detroit.


**Mississippi:** Perry E. Nussbaum wrote “Mississippi Rabbi Under Fire,” an account of the experiences of one rabbi in that troubled state in the midst of the desegregation struggle.

**Missouri:** Avram B. Bender prepared a “History of the Beth Hamedrosh Hagodol Congregation of St. Louis, 1879 to 1969,” the city’s oldest Orthodox synagogue.

**Montana:** Reference has already been made to the five-part history of the Jews in Montana in The Western States Jewish Historical Quarterly.

**Nevada:** “Raw Ore From Nevada Diggings—Some Notes on the Jews of Nevada,” by Samuel Sokobin, brings together a number of quotations from an 1881 history of Nevada dealing with various aspects of Jewish life in the state.

**New Jersey:** Joseph Brandes authored a major history of Jewish agricultural colonization in the state, Immigrants to Freedom: Jewish Communities in Rural New Jersey Since 1882, one of the new breed of serious studies of local Jewish communities to appear in recent years.

**New York:** By far the best Jewish community study to be published in the period under consideration and one of the very best available anywhere is Arthur A. Goren’s New York Jews and the Quest for Community: The Kehillah Experiment, 1908–1922. It examines the social and political background and the political dynamics of the most notable experiment in centralized Jewish community organization in the United States. Based on thorough, meticulous research, Goren’s work not only adds to our understanding of American Jewry in the World War I period; it also shatters several myths about the problem of Jewish community organization in this country. The book is required reading for any student of American Jewish public affairs.

New York was also fortunate in being the subject of several neighborhood histories that appeared in 1969, reflecting the reality of Jewish life in that
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city which is really a region or congeries of communities, rather than a single one. Alter F. Landesman, one of the leaders of the Brownsville Jewish community, wrote *Brownsville: The Birth, Development and Passing of a Jewish Community in New York*, a portrayal of Jewish life in a classic Jewish neighborhood of New York between 1881 and 1924, using both autobiographical, nonfictional, and fictional materials. Ronald Sanders pursued the same theme in *The Downtown Jews: Portraits of an Immigrant Generation*, which also concentrates on the Lower East Side. *A Photographic Study of the Lower East Side of New York City: A Project of the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, 1931–1933* was rediscovered by the American Jewish Historical Society. The original study, an invaluable documentary record of that community in its later stages, included 300 pictures of Jewish life during the Depression on the Lower East Side, most of them accompanied by transcribed interviews and interviewers' comments. The current entry in the Society's quarterly consists of a sampling of previously unpublished photographs, with an acquisition note by Robert S. Goldman.

B. G. Rudolph's *From a Minyan to a Community: A History of the Jews of Syracuse* is a history of one of the smaller Jewish communities in the state of New York. It is a collection of the raw materials of local history, organized into a useful framework. Another kind of “community” was presented in a popular manner by Joel Pomerantz in *Jennie and the Story of Grossinger's*, a portrait of the most famous of the Jewish Catskill resorts and of its founder.

*New Mexico*: One of the true stories of a Jewish family in the “Wild West” is retold with great care and in considerable detail by Floyd S. Fierman in “The Impact of the Frontier on a Jewish Family: The Bibos.” This family established itself in New Mexico immediately after the Civil War and went through the varied pioneering experiences on the far frontier, in part assimilating among Indians, Spanish, and Anglos and in part retaining its Jewish connections. A portrait of contemporary Jewish life in New Mexico, with its own particular set of ambivalences, is provided by Maurice M. Rosenthal in “Yiddish—The Sweet Stuff of Life.” It is the account of how one Jew found his way back to participation in Jewish life through a discovery of Yiddish language and literature.

*North Carolina*: Ira Rosenswaike throws “Further Light on Jacob Henry,” the 19th-century Jew who fought to retain his seat in the state legislature of North Carolina, which barred non-Christians from serving on that body.

*North Dakota*: “Jewish Communal Life in Fargo, North Dakota: The Formative Years,” by Robert J. Lazar, examines early organized activity in the major Jewish community of that state.

*Pennsylvania*: Norristown Jewish Community Diamond Jubilee provides a brief history of it. Gaeton Fonzi's study, *Annenberg: A Biography of Power* is a look at the life and career of Walter Annenberg, perhaps the most prominent “Jew” in Philadelphia and a classic example of a Jew who seeks to shed his Jewishness but cannot. Some useful records for the study of the

**Rhode Island:** The Rhode Island Jewish Historical Society remained active, particularly through its publication, *Rhode Island Jewish Historical Notes*. That journal is exceptional in that it features as many studies of Jewish institutions and agencies as of individual Jews. For example, the November 1970 issue contains an article by Malcolm H. Stern, “Newport Jewry—Whence and Whither?”; another by Bessie Edith Bloom, “Jewish Life in Providence”; a study of the “Hebrew Free Loan Association of Providence,” by Beryl Segal; and an account of “Temple Beth-Israel Finds a Spiritual Leader,” by Benton Rosen.

**Vermont:** Lottie P. Strogaff described her life as a member of an immigrant family in Vermont in *The Other America: A Story of Life in Vermont at the Turn of the Century*.

**Virginia:** Lewis Ginsberg wrote *Chapters on the Jews of Virginia, 1658–1900*.


**Other Countries**

The first comprehensive survey of diaspora Jewry that utilized the results of recent social and historical research is Raphael Patai’s *The Tents of Jacob: The Diaspora, Yesterday and Today*. Unfortunately the book is pitched to a general audience, and suffers in consequence. Barnet Litvinoff provided us with an even more popular survey of Jewish life around the world today in *A Peculiar People*. Another journalistic, but less successful, account of a portion of world Jewry can be found in *Jews in Latin America*, by Jacob Beller, a very superficial description based primarily on anecdotes of Jewish life in that part of the world, country by country.

**ARGENTINA**

Most studies of Argentinian Jewry tend to focus on Jewish colonization efforts. “Discord Among Western and Eastern European Jews in Argentina,” by Bernard D. Ansel, is a welcome exception, for it looks at the hostility between the old-established West European Jewish community and the new wave of Russian Jewish immigrants of the late 19th century. Haim Avni’s two-part article, “Argentine Jewry: Its Socio-Political Status and Organizational Patterns,” is by far the best and most comprehensive study of that community ever published, and by an acknowledged expert in the field.
AUSTRALIA

Walter M. Lippmann’s “Australian Jewry in 1966” supplements his earlier work, “The Demography of Australian Jewry,” with data from the 1966 census. Lippmann’s continuing efforts have succeeded in giving us an outstanding demographic portrait of Australian Jewry. “Jewish Education and Ethnic Identification: A Study of Jewish Adolescence in Australia,” by John Goldlust, sought to isolate intensity of Jewish education as an independent variable and examine its relationship to various measures of religious and social identification among a group of Melbourne Jewish adolescents. His findings indicate that without favorable home environment, formal Jewish education appears to have a minimal influence on religious and social group values.

BOLIVIA

Jerry W. Knudson explored “The Bolivian Immigration Bill of 1942: A Case Study in Latin American Anti-Semitism.” Among advocates of the measure, which discriminated against Jews, Negroes, and Orientals, were significant Bolivian leaders.

CANADA

One of the most attractively produced Jewish books to be published anywhere in recent years is Stuart E. Rosenberg’s The Jewish Community in Canada: A History. Unfortunately, the quality of the historical writing does not measure up to the attractiveness of the format. An excerpt from the book was published as “Canada’s Jews: The Sacred and the Secular.” David Millett attempted to develop “A Typology of Religious Organizations Suggested by the Canadian Census.” Larry H. Long looked at “Fertility Patterns Among Religious Groups in Canada.”

CHINA

Emmanuel Pratt describes the mass migration, after the creation of the State of Israel, of the tens of thousands of Jews who had settled in China between the first and second World Wars in “Exodus From China.”

CUBA

Everett Gendler drew a very sympathetic portrait of the surviving Jewish community in Cuba in “Holy Days in Habana.”
CZECHOSLOVAKIA

H. J. Polak's "Conversations in Prague, Summer 1970" gives us the mood of the remnant of that Jewish community left in that unhappy country.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Netam Lat wrote about the abortive settlements of Jews in the Dominican Republic in "From Sosua to Azua."

EGYPT

Jews in Nineteenth Century Egypt, a most impressive and scholarly study of what was once a great Jewish community, by Jacob M. Landau, has been translated into English.

ETHIOPIA

The Falashas have once again come to public attention. Meyer Levin, who supervised the production of a documentary film about them, also wrote of their life in "The Falashas." Both he and Jack Leshinsky, writing on "The Falashas," too, concluded that the group is losing its struggle for survival in modern Ethiopia.

FRANCE

Curiously enough, French Jewry is another community "rediscovered" by American Jews after long neglect. Zosa Szajkowski published a detailed demographic study of Jews and the French Revolutions of 1789, 1830 and 1848. It provides lists of Jews who were involved in the major internal and external conflicts of France and the internal conflicts of the French Jewish community for nearly a century, from 1789 to 1880. Michael Robert Marrus completed a study of The Politics of Assimilation: A Study of the French Jewish Community at the Time of the Dreyfus Affair.

Turning to the contemporary scene, Albert Memmi, W. Ackerman, and N. and S. Zoberman examined "Differences and Perception of Differences Among Jews in France." The article reviews "the criteria used by Gentiles in their typing of Jews, and the manner in which the Jews feel they are perceived by Gentiles." Renee Weingarten's "Jews in the Mind of France" focused on the same theme. She examined the recrudescence of the problem of dual loyalty in what seems to be a rapidly assimilating Jewish community. An Orthodox view of the French Jewish scene was provided by Elkanah Schwartz in "Mission to France."
GERMANY

H. G. Adler looked at The Jews in Germany: From the Enlightenment to National Socialism. The Jubilee Volume Dedicated to Curt C. Silberman contains several valuable short studies of German Jewish history from the Middle Ages to the Nazi era.

INDIA

Schifra Strizower gives us a penetrating anthropological study of The Bene Israel of Bombay: A Study of a Jewish Community, based on close personal observation.

ITALY

In "By the Waters of the Arno: Florentine Jewry" Roberta Levine describes an aging community, which is held together by Italian law, but is crumbling around the edges.

MEXICO

The long awaited study by Seymour B. Liebman, The Jews in New Spain, appeared in 1970. Liebman's work examines the Jewish community that flourished underground from 1521 until the eve of Mexican independence. It is a major addition to our understanding of the Sephardi diaspora and its role in the worldwide Jewish polity of the 16th and 17th centuries.

PORTUGAL

In one of the series of short articles on Jewish communities around the world to appear in Hadassah Magazine, was Sidney DuBroff's "Jews in Portugal."

SOUTH AFRICA


SPAIN

Shirley and Sol Kolack wrote about "The Jewish Revival in Iberia: A Letter From Spain," a chronicle of the sudden spurt of organized Jewish community life in that country, now that curbs on communal organization
have been substantially removed. After visiting the Jewish historical sites, Don A. Halperin attempted in *The Ancient Synagogues of the Iberian Peninsula* to define the architectural forms used before 1497, the year of the exile of the Jews from Portugal.

**SWEDEN**

Liva Herz supplied us with "A Note on Identification and Assimilation Among Forty Jews in Malmö" the findings of a study which indicate that the older Jewish natives of Sweden were generally more assimilated than the older Jewish immigrants. However, among the younger respondents both native-born and immigrants are very conscious of their Jewishness.

**UNITED KINGDOM**

Identity and demography were the foci of most of the published material dealing with the United Kingdom in 1969 and 1970. Ernest Krausz continued his publication of the data in "The Edgware Survey: Occupation and Social Class" and "The Edgware Survey: Factors in Jewish Identification." S. J. Prais and Marlena Schmool examined "Statistics of Milah and the Jewish Birth-Rate in Britain."

Hanoch Bartov gave his impressions of the British Jewish community in "For Queen and Country and Ardent Zionism." Chaim Pearl contrasted the American and English Jewish communities in "A Tale of Two Communities." He discussed, among other things, organizational differences and communal homogeneity, synagogue organization, ritual practices, and rabbinical roles.

**INTERCOMMUNITY RELATIONS**

One of the major features of the past two years has been the intensification of the ties between the various Jewish communities in the world. The concept of world Jewry has emerged with far greater force than at any time since the Emancipation. Institutionally, a number of steps have been taken, generally stimulated by Israel, to forge concrete ties that will reflect this attitude. While the new concern has been reflected in the literature, serious discussions of the institutional arrangements are notably lacking. Aside from the already discussed books about the relationship between Israel and American Jewry (p. 322), Robert Silverberg published *If I Forget Thee, O Jerusalem: American Jews and the State of Israel.*

Moshe Davis' article, "The Eretz Israel Dimension of Contemporary Jewish Life" is more than a discussion of Jewish education (p. 332). It deals with Jewish identity in the Diaspora, and the impact of the state of Israel on it. The ideal, he says, must be "cultivation of the ideology of mutual
dependence of Jews qua Jews, *Judaism, not Israel is at stake.*” David Polish looked at “The Tasks of Israel and Galut,” and C. Bezalel Sherman tried to define the role of “America in the Structure of Jewish Peoplehood.” All three look beyond the America-Israel relationship to take in the whole Jewish world.

**EXTERNAL RELATIONS**

In recent years the Jews have discovered that marginality really means interstitiality; that is to say that, as a group, Jews have fitted in between major groups of the societies in which they have lived, subject to all the strains as well as opportunities that come from being “in-between.” It is indeed possible that the secret of Jewish success and failure comes from the fact that the Jews, wherever they are, naturally gravitate toward the center of the communications network which enables them to achieve positions that carry far more weight than their sheer numbers would normally allow. At the same time, it also exposes them to all the stresses that arise when the communications network, itself, comes under assault. Robert J. Marx applies this view in a classic Zionist analysis of the Jewish situation in “The People in Between.” In doing so, he focuses on what are now the key problems of Jewish external relations.

Uriel Tal, perhaps the foremost student of the causes of antisemitism, lectured on “Religious and Anti-Religious Roots of Modern Anti-Semitism” for the Leo Baeck Institute. The published version of his talk is a valuable introduction to the subject. Leonard Dinnerstein edited *Antisemitism in the United States,* a collection of scholarly studies probing the causes of outbursts of antisemitism: religious teaching, psychological frustration, and economic insecurity.

Continuing the Anti-Defamation League’s series on antisemitism, Charles Y. Glock and Ellen Siegelman edited *Prejudice, U.S.A.,* a generalized study of the American scene. Gertrude J. Selznick and Steven Steinberg co-authored a volume on *The Tenacity of Prejudice: Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America.* Lucy S. Dawidowicz provided a detailed and reasoned critique of the Glock studies in “Can Anti-Semitism Be Measured?”, an essay review of the four books in the series thus far published.

A case study of subtle antisemitism is provided by Albert I. Goldberg in “Jews in the Legal Profession: A Case of Adjustment to Discrimination,” an examination of the situation in a professions where entrance is easy for Jews, but advancement to elite positions is very difficult. Michael B. Kane’s volume, *Minorities in Textbooks: A Study of Their Treatment in Social Studies Texts,* was published in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League.

External relations in America took a new turn in 1969–1971, as the Jews began subtly to redefine themselves as an ethnic group and not simply as a
religion. Ethnic pluralism and ethnicity are the two new themes of the avant-garde in American life, and the Jews have moved quickly to relate to them. The *International Migration Review* has become a significant outlet for this kind of material, and particularly for Jewish-funded or -sponsored research on ethnicity. No less a person than Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., has put his stamp on this new trend in “Nationalism and History,” which discusses the quasi-nationalistic reaction of non-WASP groups who feel that they have been ignored in the national historical canon. He suggested that, “as history has reinforced a sense of identity for nations, so it could also reinforce the sense of identity of national groups within a multi-national state."

Another major problem of Jewish external relations has been the rise of the New Left, with its attacks on Zionism, which often are nothing more than a veiled substitute for direct attacks on Jews. The New Left has made antisemitism once again respectable, provided it is cloaked in this “genteel” manner, and has even encouraged the radical right. Many articles have been written on this subject in the past few years. Perhaps the best is “The Left, the Jews and Israel: ‘The Socialism of Fools’,” by Seymour Martin Lipset, which traces antisemitism in Socialist ranks in the past and its relationship to the New Left today. Also interesting in this connection, though in a somewhat different way, is *De Gaulle, Israel and the Jews*, by Raymond Aron.

Jewish community-relations groups have had to adapt themselves to these new assaults and to the new recognition of Jewish peoplehood. Jerry Hochbaum provides a good overview of the situation in “Change and Challenge in Jewish Community Relations in the United States.” Walter Lurie describes the present situation in “Jewish Community Relations—A Profile Today.” Published comments on the article both amplified and took issue with his report. On the same theme, but attempting to address the problem of what is to be done, is “A Search for Principles in Jewish Community Relations for the Embattled World of Today,” by Alan D. Kandel.

**Black-Jewish Confrontation**

No subject has attracted more attention in the past three years than the confrontation between militant blacks and the Jewish community. Once the issue had taken form in the streets, it acquired a literature of its own, exceeded in volume only by that dealing with Israel and the Arabs. No Jewish periodical was without its article on the subject, and such non-Jewish periodicals as *Commonweal* and *Phylon* also found space for it. Here we can only discuss a handful of the more significant pieces written in the brief space of two years.

Three types of writing appeared: the self-flagellating works of those Jews who could not understand the new turn of events; a few historical and
sociological, or sociologically-based, works attempting to understand the phenomenon; and what might be called the Jewish nationalist response. In addition, material appeared on the black Jews that was clearly related to the issue and, perhaps, achieved publication because of it.

Typical of the first genre was *Black Anti-Semitism and Jewish Racism*, edited by Nat Hentoff. While Hentoff made some effort at balance in his book, the title itself indicates his attempt to share the blame equally. Lenora E. Berson pursues a similar course in *The Negroes and the Jews*. Somewhat along the same lines, but more “Jewish,” was the revised edition of *Justice, Justice: A Jewish View of the Negro Revolt* by Henry Cohen. It actually reflects an earlier stage of the civil rights struggle, rather than a response to the confrontation. Max Geltman tackled the issues directly in *The Confrontation: Black Power, Anti-Semitism, and the Myth of Integration*, while Robert G. Weisbord and Arthur Stein looked at the perspective more historically in *Bittersweet Encounter: The Afro-American and the American Jew*. The best of all works on the subject is Ben Halpern’s *Jews and Blacks: The Classic American Minorities*, a penetrating analysis from an authentically Jewish perspective.

*Commentary* published three very significant articles on the subject at the very beginning of 1969. Earl Raab wrote on “The Black Revolution & the Jewish Question,” in which he saw the confrontation as an inducement to a renewed consideration of pluralism in American society. Milton Himmelfarb caused a major sensation with his “Is American Jewry in Crisis?”. He saw the black revolution as the beginning of a new and far less pleasant turn in the relationship between American Jewry and the American people. Nathan Glazer looked at “Blacks, Jews & the Intellectuals.”


Ben Halpern provided an ironic analysis of “The Jewish Liberal” caught in a dilemma of confrontation after renouncing his own religious and ethnic self-interest. Murray Friedman suggested that a recognition of pluralism may indeed be the way to get at this problem, in “Is White Racism the Problem?” Essential agreement with that solution was expressed by Bernard Weinberger, president of the Orthodox Rabbinical Alliance of America. He suggested in “The Interracial Crisis: How Should Jews Respond?” that disengagement is the way Jews can best serve the black community. Also supporting pluralism was Donald L. Kaufmann’s “Soul Pass Over: Jews, Blacks and Beyond.”
A "hard-nosed" assessment of the present situation and future prospects for a black-Jewish rapprochement was made by Jack Nusan Porter in "Black-Jewish Relations: Some Notes on Cross-Cultural Research." Porter rejects sentimental perceptions of "a common history of past oppression" as the likely basis for good relations in the future, and suggests that only common political interests, broadly defined, can serve as a basis for such relations.

Howard Brotz's *The Black Jews of Harlem*, the first comprehensive study of Negro Jews, first published in 1964, was reissued by Schocken Books in 1970 as part of a series of paperback source books on Negro history. Rudolph R. Windsor, one of the leaders of the black Jewish community in the United States, presented his own view of its history in *From Babylon to Timbuktu: A History of the Ancient Black Races, Including the Black Hebrews*.

**Jewish-Christian Relations**

Jewish-Christian relations were also a matter of continuing concern, with discussion centering on the Christian response to Israel and the problem of latent Christian prejudices. Confining ourselves to the books published on the subject in 1969-1971, we found an interesting cross-section of works. Fred Gladstone Bratton examined *The Crime of Christendom: The Theological Sources of Christian Anti-Semitism*. Friedrich Heer considered the problem in *God's First Love: Christians and Jews Over Two Thousand Years*, a volume translated from the German. Heer dealt specifically with the contemporary scene in "The Catholic Church and the Jews Today." James W. Parkes gave another view of those relationships in *Prelude to Dialogue: Jewish-Christian Relationships*. John M. Oesterreicher continued his series of publications on Christian-Jewish relations in volume 5 of *The Bridge*, entitled *Brothers in Hope*.


**Communist Bloc and the Jews**

The revival of active concern for Soviet Jewry was also reflected in the publications of 1969-1971, with a number of serious books and many more articles on the problem of Soviet Jewry and relations between the Communist bloc and the Jews. The latest analytical review of the present situation in the entire Communist world was provided by Paul Lendvai in "Jews
Under Communism." Perhaps the most thorough was The Jews in Soviet Russia Since 1917, edited by Lionel Kochan, whose 15 chapters, introduction and epilogue bring together the works of the leading students of Russian Jewry in a comprehensive portrait of the community and its relations with the Soviet government. It is an excellent overview of the tragedy of Russian Jewry since 1917, beginning with the condition of Russia's Jews from the eve of the revolution and continuing through the six-day war. The unrelieved blackness of the Soviet record is documented dispassionately and unmistakably. Maurice Friedberg, one of the contributors to the Kochan volume, wrote on "Soviet Jewry Today," in which he effectively brings the Kochan volume up-to-date. Among other academically-oriented works was Jacob G. Frumkin, et al, Russian Jewry, 1917—1967. Paul Lendvai looked at the whole Communist bloc, in Anti-Semitism Without Jews.

A more popular work was Gunther Lawrence's Three Million More?, a strong attack on the neglect of Russian Jewish interests in the West and a plea that Russian Jewry not be abandoned to die spiritually and ethnically, if not physically, as the six million were abandoned in World War II. Richard Cohen edited Let My People Go! Today's Documentary Story of Soviet Jewry's Struggle to Be Free, a useful compendium of materials documenting recent events for the widest possible public attention. Boris Smolar's Soviet Jewry Today and Tomorrow is a solid account of the situation. Joel Cang's The Silent Millions offers a concise picture of Russian Jewry since 1900. Moshe Decter, one of the most outspoken voices on behalf of Russian Jewry and one of the serious experts in the field, published two pamphlets on the contemporary situation: Redemption! Jewish Freedom Letters From Russia and A Hero for our Time: The Trial and Faith of Boris Kochubiyevsky.

A close analysis of "Russia's Anti-Zionist Campaign: Jews vs. Zionists" was provided by S. L. Shneiderman, who traced the ways in which Jews are both linked to Zionism and separated from it. The late Joseph B. Schechtman examined the "New Stirrings in Soviet Jewry," an overview of the exciting and startling revival of the sense of Jewish nationalism among large numbers of Russian Jews.

Among the short studies of Soviet Jewry to appear in the past three years was "The Jewish Antifascist Committee in the Soviet Union," by Shimon Redlich, essentially a discussion of Soviet wartime policies toward the Jewish minority. Joshua Rothenberg supplied "A Note on the Natural Increase of the Jewish Population in the Soviet Union," in which he criticized the American Jewish Year Book estimate calculating the number of Jews in Russia. Jews in the Soviet Union: An Annotated Bibliography 1967—1971 was compiled by Louise Renée Rosenberg.

The period reviewed here witnessed the virtual end of organized Jewish life in Poland in 1969 and 1970. Celia Stopnicka Heller's "Anti-Zionism' and the Political Struggle Within the Elite of Poland" and Gabriel Temkin's "Flight From Poland—1968" examine the reasons and the exodus of the
country's Jews. An overview of the situation was provided in The End of a Thousand Years: The Recent Exodus of Jews From Poland, edited by Itche Goldberg and Yuri Suhl.

THE COURSE OF JEWISH PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Publications in this area in 1969–1971 included works of established “greats,” reprints of classics or semiclassics, and the continuation of established series. In subject matter the revived concern with the Holocaust, stimulated in no small way by the six-day war and the revival of Soviet Jewry as a force on the world Jewish scene, led to a heavy concentration of writings on the Nazi period. Finally, a number of books dealing with the immediate post-Holocaust years and leading up to the establishment of the State of Israel made their appearance.

Salo W. Baron continued his monumental A Social and Religious History of the Jews with the publication of volumes 13 and 14, dealing with the Renaissance and the Reformation periods. Volume 5 in Jacob Neusner’s A History of the Jews in Babylonia, which appeared in 1970, concluded that important series. Ellis Rivkin continues the iconclastic tradition of Solomon Zeitlin, his teacher, in The Shaping of Jewish History: A Radical New Interpretation, reviving theories of economic determinism which had been very popular among students of Jewish history in the 1920s and 1930s.

Far different from those major scholarly efforts was Werner Keller’s Diaspora: The Post-Biblical History of the Jews, a popular history of the Jews after their dispersion from the land of Israel, written by a man who has established himself as a very successful popularizer of Jewish history and thought. Max I. Dimont reached thousands of people with more of his interpretation of Jewish history in The Indestructible Jews: Is There a Manifest Destiny in Jewish History?. As in the case of his previous effort, Jews, God and History, the book combines a striking thesis strongly backed up with amateurish scholarship.

George C. Brower focuses on the beginnings of that dispersion in Judea Weeping: The Jewish Struggle Against Rome From Pompey to Masada, 63 B.C. to 73 A.D. Joshua Starr’s classic study The Jews in the Byzantine Empire was reissued. His examination of communal affairs in the Jewish communities of the Byzantine Empire remains one of the major contributions to our knowledge of that subject. Andrew Sharf’s Byzantine Jewry From Justinian to the Fourth Crusade adds to our knowledge of that important Jewish community. The reissue of Jacob J. Mann’s The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine Under the Fatimid Caliphs: A Contribution to Their Political and Communal History, Based Chiefly on Genizah Material Hitherto Unpublished, with an interpretive introduction by S. D. Goitein, the leading Genizah scholar of our time, made available a work published
half a century ago that still stands the test of time. Mann’s focus on the internal organizational structure of the Jewish communities of Egypt, Israel, and Syria, and the relationship of those communities to the Exilarch between 969 and 1204 adds an important piece to our emerging understanding of Jewish self-government in the Diaspora.


Perhaps the best place to begin the survey of the new literature of the Holocaust is with George L. Mosse’s Germans and Jews: The Right, the Left, and the Search for a “Third Force” in Pre-Nazi Germany, which deals with the place and position of the Jews as the Weimar Republic degenerated into Nazism. Michael A. Ledeen described the experience of another Jewry which confronted the antisemitism of the Holocaust before the war in “Italian Jews and Fascism.” In that connection, Carlo Falconi examined The Silence of Pius XII, and Alfred Häsler dealt with the Swiss reaction in The Lifeboat is Full: Switzerland and the Refugees, 1933—1945.

Turning to the war itself, the emphasis in the three years was on Jewish resistance. Joseph Ariel looked at “French-Jewish Resistance to the Nazis.” Isaac Kowalski revealed the story of A Secret Press in Nazi Europe: The Story of a Jewish United Partisan Organization. The Bunker is Charles Goldstein’s personal account of the role played by one group of Jews in the great Warsaw Rebellion of 1944, when the Poles rose up against the Nazi occupiers of the city just before its liberation by the Russians.

Incredible Mission, by Fernande Leboucher, and The Silent Warriors, by Joshua Tazmor, examine other aspects of this resistance. Philip Bernstein’s account of Rabbis at War: The CANRA Story added an American dimension to this through his description of the Jewish segment of the American military chaplaincy.

Contrasting responses of non-Jewish governments toward the Jewish plight are presented in Leni Yahil’s The Rescue of Danish Jewry: Test of a Democracy and Henry L. Feingold’s The Politics of Rescue: The Roosevelt Administration and the Holocaust, 1938—1945 Dr. Yahil’s book not only describes the valiant successful Danish effort to save the Jews of that country but also discusses the public policy background of the rescue, thus making the work a sophisticated examination of Jewish-Gentile relations that goes far beyond conventional history. Feingold, on the other hand, demonstrates how the Roosevelt administration failed to move the United States in any useful way to alleviate the desperate situation of European Jewry.

We are now beginning to develop a picture of the continuing effect of the Holocaust on those who managed to survive it. Some sense of this was
provided by Ruth Jaffe in "A Sense of Guilt Within Holocaust Survivors."

Among the new collections of literature on the Holocaust is Anthology of Holocaust Literature, edited by the late Jacob Glatstein together with Israel Knox, and Samuel Margoshes, and Messenger From the Dead: Literature of the Holocaust, by Irving Halperin. Randolph L. Braham provided The Eichmann Case: A Source Book. Raul Hilberg edited Documents of Destruction: Germany and Jewry, 1933–1945. Lucy S. Dawidowicz provided us with a penetrating review of the publications of Yad Vashem, the Martyrs and Heroes Remembrance Authority in Jerusalem, in "Toward a History of the Holocaust." Rather critical of the publications of that important institution, she suggests the lines along which a true history of the Holocaust should be written. Mrs. Dawidowicz also compiled A Basic Library on the Holocaust, which should serve those interested in further readings on the subject as an important reference guide.

Flight and Rescue by Yehuda Bauer picks up the story at the war's end and shows how the surviving European Jews, with the assistance of the Palestinian Jewish community and the organizations of American Jewry, were able to organize themselves for their evacuation of the European continent, from all its corners, to the land of Israel. The magnificent effort, which Dr. Bauer portrays so well, must go down in history as one of the great political experiences: a virtually destroyed and seemingly demoralized population was able to pull itself together not only to seek a new life, but to do so in a way that the very institutions of the community were reestablished.

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

The great questions confronting the American Jewish community as contemporary issues in 1969–1971 had to do with a new feeling that it was in crisis. Whether or not this feeling was justified was weighed in discussions of such topics as the Jewish student revolt against the established community; the Jews' anomalous position in the confrontation between "blacks" and "ethnics"; the continuing problems of dissent generated by the war in Vietnam; the new antisemitism of the Left; the breakdown in traditional categories of separation of Church and State, and even the supposed responsibility of the Bible for ecological disasters.

Perhaps the most provocative article of the period was Milton Himmelfarb's "Is American Jewry in Crisis?". Himmelfarb answers in the affirmative, seeing the Jews caught between opposing forces of historic proportions, that are likely to end, or at least drastically lessen, the security of American Jewry, just as similar forces did in the case of other Jewries in the past. Nathan Glazer speaks to much the same point in "The Crisis in American Jewry," though he takes a more optimistic view. Looking at the crisis within
the Jewish community, Robert Alter wrote on "The Jewish Community & the Jewish Condition" which is as pessimistic an appraisal of the internal situation as Himmelfarb's is of the external one.

Among the better articles on Jewish student activism and dissatisfaction were "The Student Revolt and the Jewish Student," by Jonathan Braun; "A New Jewish Voice on Campus," by Sara Feinstein; "Jewish Students and the Jewish Community: The Hillel Conference of Jewish Students," by Richard J. Israel, and "Activists and a New Judaism," by James A. Sleeper. All these pieces examine the distinction between Jewish radicals and radical Jews, that is to say, radicals who happen to be Jewish and Jews whose radicalism is directed in positive Jewish ways as well.

In an effort to present a program, the radical Jews began making suggestions of their own. The most comprehensive statement was that of Bill Novak in "The Making of a Jewish Counter Culture." In the same vein was Howard Sticklor's "Education and Self-Deception," a sharp attack on the underlying problems faced by those interested in promoting Jewish education, given the character of the American Jewish community.

Despite the discovery that not all Jewish radicals were alienated Jews, the Jewish community continued to worry about the New Left and the Jews. The important difference was that now they more frequently took the offensive rather than being on the defensive, as in the past. Seymour Martin Lipset led the offensive with "The Left, the Jews and Israel: 'The Socialism of Fools.'" Allen Weinstein provided an example of the silliness of left-leaning Jews, which Lipset describes in more general terms in "Agit-Prop and the Rosenbergs," a stinging essay review of the theatrical fiasco that attempted to rehabilitate Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. A more dispassionate look at "The New Left and the Jews" was provided by Nathan Glazer. Mordecai S. Chertoff edited a book with the same title, which includes papers by 16 experts on such topics as anti-Zionism within the New Left, antisemitism among black and white radicals, and others. Richard L. Rubenstein looked at Israel, Zionism and the New Left.

Jewish concern over the Vietnam war did not diminish. Seymour Siegel took a hawkish position in "Vietnam Journal," though he expressed dissatisfaction with the present administration's policy. Irving Howe examined "Vietnam and Israel," attacking the policy of United States involvement in Southeast Asia, permitting the Russians to make great gains in the Middle East. Berel Wein took a hard line on "Jewish Conscientious Objectors and the Vietnamese War."

The rediscovery of ethnicity ranked high on the agenda of contemporary issues of American Jewry in 1969 and 1970. Leonard Dinnerstein and Frederic Cople Jaher edited The Aliens: A History of Ethnic Minorities in America, a compendium of articles describing minority group experiences, emphasizing struggle and ordeal and showing past and present group conflict in America. The American Jewish Committee figured prominently in
the revival of ethnic concerns. It sponsored the publication of Father Andrew M. Greeley's *Why Can't They be Like Us? Facts and Fallacies About Ethnic Differences and Group Conflicts in America*. In an article, “Is White Racism the Problem?”, Murray Friedman of the Committee staff effectively argued the pro “ethnic” position. Allan Mazur made an effort to examine scientifically “The Accuracy of Classic Types of Ethnic Personalities,” in which he focused extensively on Jewish social scientists.

Giving the lie to the argument propagated in some quarters that biblical tradition was responsible for the ecological crisis were several articles appearing in the Jewish periodical literature in 1969–1971. Eric G. Freudenstein’s “Ecology and the Jewish Tradition,” alone, should lay to rest the absurdity of that claim. *The Jewish Spectator* editorial “Ecology is the Will of God” stated the Jewish position forcefully, if not fully.

The Jewish Defense League, which emerged in 1969 as a new force on the American Jewish scene, received its share of attention in the Jewish periodical literature. Perhaps the most balanced article pro and con was “The Jewish Defense League: Vigilantism: Is It Needed?” by Morris Laub. Meir Kahane, founder and leader of the JDL presented his program and its rationale in *Never Again! A Program for Survival*.

**Research Approaches, Methods, and Resources**

The most valuable single new tool for the study of Jewish public affairs to become available in 1969–1971 was undoubtedly Martin Gilbert's *Jewish History Atlas*, a simple yet thorough collection of maps on the course of Jewish life from its earliest beginnings to the present. *The Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel* edited by Raphael Patai, is the most comprehensive reference work on the subject in English.

A host of directories appeared which also make the task of the student and practitioner of Jewish public affairs easier. Iva Cohen compiled *Jewish Organizations: A Worldwide Directory*, the most comprehensive guide made available thus far. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds continued to issue its directories: *Annual Compilation of Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances* by S. P. Goldberg, *Annual Yearbook of Jewish Social Service* and *Annual Directory of Jewish Federations, Welfare Funds and Community Councils*.


**CONCLUSION**

The three-year period, 1969–1971, witnessed an enormous rise in the volume of written material dealing with Jewish public affairs in its broadest sense, and even an increase, though a modest one, in writings explicitly directed to the subject. In part, this reflects the revival or emergence of very concrete issues affecting the Jewish community, as such, ranging from the problems of communal institutions that seem to have lost their drawing power, to the confrontation of the Jews as a body politic with such diverse entities as the black community, the church, and the Communist bloc, not to speak of the Arab world. In part, it reflects the present expanding interest in Jewish scholarship in the United States.

There is reason to think that the dramatic emergence of Jewish “textual” scholarship of the 1960s may be paralleled by a flowering of Jewish social science scholarship in the 1970s. This would be a natural response to the rise of the kind of “interesting” issues which stimulate social scientific inquiry. Some evidence of this flowering has been given in the preceding pages. Another sign is the publication of Erich Rosenthal’s article deploring “The Current Status of Jewish Social Research” in a nonacademic journal like *Midstream*. Rosenthal properly criticizes the tendency to restrict such research to population studies. Unfortunately, he ignored the entire field of Jewish political studies and the research that has been going on in recent years. An even better sense of it is conveyed by the roster of new authors and researchers on topics of Jewish concern. With the rise of black studies, an analogous trend has developed among social scientists with Jewish attachments, who are beginning to organize themselves into groups or associations for the purpose of planning joint enterprises or simply for encouraging one another to work within the confines of the Jewish community, or on matters relating to Jewish public affairs. The Association for the Sociological Study
of Jews and the Jewish Community Studies Group represent two such new groups of Jewish social scientists that were established in the period under discussion here. That Jewish questions are emerging (or reemerging) in the realm of public affairs as being of interest argues well for the important place of specifically Jewish concerns in the over-all concerns of our time. Certainly, the major issue areas discussed here are almost daily front-page matter in the world press. If this means that too much will be written on those issues out of ignorance and much of what will be written will be dross, the problem of abundance is still a pleasant alternative to contemplate after the long dearth of widespread interest in such matters. For out of the abundance there are bound to be some worthwhile contributions that may succeed in further illuminating the content and course of Jewish public affairs.

Daniel J. Elazar
Annual Yearbook of Jewish Social Service (Council of Jewish Fed. and Welfare Funds).
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