Communal Affairs

RELIGION

The increase in the numbers of religious bodies and in religious affiliation of individuals had been one of the most striking developments in the United States during the period from 1940 to 1954. In 1930, 47 per cent of the American people had been reported to be religiously affiliated; by 1950, the figure had risen to 57 per cent, and the proportion was estimated by the *Yearbook of American Churches* for 1956 as 60.3 per cent in 1954 (or 97,000,000 individuals). There were no comparable figures applying specifically to American Jews, but all evidence tended to show a movement of Jews into the synagogue parallel to that of other Americans to the church.

The results of several sample polls published during the period under review (July 1, 1954, through June 30, 1955) tended to substantiate these conclusions. Thus, on July 20, 1954, George Gallup of the American Institute of Public Opinion reported that 79 per cent of the adults polled had indicated that they were members of a church. The results of another Gallup poll published in March 1955 projected some 3,000,000 of 96,000,000 civilian adults giving their church preference as Jewish. In still another sample poll of adults conducted by Gallup early in 1954, 47 per cent of the interviewees stated that they had attended church (or synagogue) during the week preceding the interview. Four years earlier, a similar poll by the same organization had yielded the figure of 39 per cent. Of the church members, more than half of all the adults (55 per cent) had attended church; of non-church members, 11 per cent. Of the Jews reached in the survey, 31 per cent had attended synagogue.

The annual value of the new religious building construction had grown from $26,000,000 in 1945, as reported in the May 1953 *Statistical Supplement of Construction and Building Materials* published by the United States Department of Commerce, to an estimated $700,000,000 for 1955, according to the Religious News Service. It was impossible to secure accurate information relevant to Jewish religious building construction, as there was no central agency to gather or record such information.

Religious Identification

Interesting insight into the religious attitudes of American Jews was gained from a series of interviews conducted by the Scientific Research Department of the American Jewish Committee during the early months of

---

1 The 1936 decennial Census of Religious Bodies of the United States Census Bureau had yielded a church membership of about 56,000,000. There was no religious census in 1946. Tentative plans for the 1956 Census of Religious Bodies were announced by the Census Bureau in May 1955, but the first session of the eighty-fourth Congress did not pass the necessary budgetary appropriation.
1952. The first findings of the Riverton study, conducted in a medium-sized Northeastern Jewish community, revealed that 80 per cent of the parents interviewed conceived religion to be one of the principal attributes of the Jew, as did a full 97 per cent of the adolescents. (For a summary of these, and other data from the Riverton study, see *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. XVII, No. 3, p. 205-18.)

Though 81 per cent of the grandparents were described as Orthodox, only 16 per cent of the parents felt themselves to be Orthodox. While 30 per cent of the parents described themselves as Reform, only 5 per cent described their grandparents as such. Forty-three per cent of the parents felt that they were Conservative Jews, though only 11 per cent described the grandparents as having been such. The Orthodox adults were primarily immigrants, the Reform and Conservative overwhelmingly native-born. The Orthodox group was generally less educated than the other two groups, and also lower both as to income and as to occupational status. Four per cent of the parents claimed that they were religious Jews but not classifiable as Reform, Conservative, or Orthodox. More significant was the fact that very few stated that they were nonreligious. The dominant pattern was that of an adult group coming originally from an Orthodox background which now considered itself largely Conservative or Reform.

As for the adolescents, the bulk of the young people who came from Reform or Conservative homes stated that they expected to remain Reform or Conservative—62 per cent of the Conservative families, and 60 per cent of the Reform. On the other hand, only one out of every five of the children from Orthodox homes intended to remain Orthodox; most of the adolescents in Orthodox homes indicated their intention to become Conservative. However, there was evidence that the rate of defection from Orthodoxy was slowing down.

Of the adolescents who attended synagogue services at one time or another (over 90 per cent of the total teen-age group), the majority felt that they went because of their own desires rather than because of the urgings of their parents. However, only 61 per cent stated that they enjoyed the experience, 11 per cent were negative, and others were mixed or indifferent. Whatever the level of religiosity, it appeared to represent, if only on a verbal or institutional level, a very important form of Jewish identification.

**Bible Reading**

Another possible index of an increased interest in religion or of religious identification in the Jewish community was the substantial increase in sales of the Jewish Bible reported by the Jewish Publication Society (JPS) at its annual meeting on May 1, 1955. The JPS reported a total of 35,421 Bibles sold in 1954, as compared with 26,430 in 1953, and 25,536 in 1952.

**Conversion**

Some 2,000 non-Jews were being converted annually to Judaism in the United States, according to a survey conducted by Rabbi David Max Eichhorn whose findings were published in *Jewish Social Studies* in October 1954.
At least 1,000 of the conversions were reported by Reform rabbis, at least 500 by Conservative rabbis, with the remainder estimated by the Orthodox. Most of the converts were women. The proportion of male to female converts was one to four among the Reform group, one to six among the Conservative group. One out of twenty was converted out of conviction, rather than for the purpose of marriage. However, these figures were admittedly incomplete.

Lay Organizations

Some indication of the affiliation of Jews with the three branches of the American synagogue (Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform) may be obtained from the figures provided by synagogue organizations to the American Jewish Year Book in response to a questionnaire circulated during the spring and summer of 1955.

Of the Orthodox groups, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (UOJC) reported more than 700 member congregations in the United States and Canada; the UOJC's Women's Branch had 450 affiliated sisterhoods in twenty-one chapters. The National Council of Young Israel reported a membership of 20,000 families in 72 chapters, its Women's League a membership of 2,000 women in 60 chapters.

The (Conservative) United Synagogue of America reported 508 congregations, representing over 200,000 families. Its National Women's League reported a membership of 160,000 women in 615 sisterhoods; some 30,000-31,000 members of the National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs were affiliated to 210 clubs; the Young People's League had 6,000 members in 70 branches, and the United Synagogue Youth 16,000 members in 240 chapters.

The (Reform) Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) reported 520 member congregations, with which 255,000 families were affiliated. The UAHC's National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods claimed a membership of 100,000 in 517 chapters; the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, a membership of 55,000 in 320 chapters; the National Federation of Temple Youth, approximately 14,000 members of 380 youth groups; and the National Association of Temple Secretaries, a membership of 132.

The Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation launched a new Reconstructionist Fellowship of Congregations with four congregations in three states on May 22, 1955. The Union of Sephardic Congregations reported approximately fifty congregations, with congregational membership of from 20 to 500 families. It was difficult to properly evaluate this information in view of the various criteria used to judge membership in a congregation; the overlapping among these congregational organizations; and the failure of many congregational bodies to keep adequate membership records.

Regional Lay Organizations

There was a continuing trend for each of the congregational branches of Judaism in the United States to organize regional councils. During 1954 the

2 The Year Book has also received a report from the Union of Ethiopian Hebrew Congregations and Rabbis, claiming a membership of 14,000 "Falasha Jews" in thirty-seven congregations.
Orthodox UOJC established such organizations in California, Midwest, and the Great Lakes area. Five other similar councils were being formed. The Conservative United Synagogue of America's National Federation of Jewish Men's Clubs had nine regional bodies, its National Women's League twenty-one such bodies in the United States and Canada; the Reform UAHC had eleven regional councils and five metropolitan councils; its National Federation of Temple Youth reported seventeen regional federations.

Suburban Developments

With the growth in suburban Jewish communities, the various congregational bodies attempted to attract the potential new membership into the synagogue. Thus, in January 1955 the UOJC initiated a $300,000 campaign to finance a program to establish new Orthodox congregations in suburban areas, as well as to strengthen existing synagogues and expand youth and education activities. In July 1955, Rabbi Israel Klavan, executive secretary of the Rabbinical Council of America (RCA), announced that a revolving fund had been established out of which loans could be made to newly formed communities for the construction of Orthodox synagogues.

An indication of substantial Conservative growth in the suburbs came from the estimate by Irving Lurie, architectural consultant for the United Synagogue of America, that some thousand new Conservative religious buildings had been planned or constructed during the period from 1940 to 1955, approximately 150 during 1954–55.

Evidence of the trend toward the establishment of new Reform congregations in the suburbs was afforded by an advertisement printed in the New York World-Telegram on September 8, 1955, listing the member congregations of the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues in the metropolitan area. Significantly, the largest number of Reform congregations was to be found in the suburban areas, which had relatively smaller numbers of Jewish residents. Thus, Nassau County, with fewer than 150,000 Jewish residents, had twenty-two Reform congregations listed, and Westchester, with fewer than 50,000 Jews, had eleven Reform congregations, while in the metropolitan areas of The Bronx and Brooklyn, with estimated Jewish populations of 475,000 and 870,000, respectively, there was a total of only fourteen Reform congregations.

A radical departure in synagogue architecture was approved in November 1954 when, despite objections by a number of residents, the Cheltenham township zoning Board of Adjustment permitted Beth Sholom Congregation to erect the Frank Lloyd Wright-designed synagogue in Elkins Park, a suburb of Philadelphia. The residents had objected to the construction of the proposed synagogue, largely because of its height and novel design.

Rabbinical Organizations

It was estimated that there were some 3,000 rabbis serving 5,000,000 American Jews, compared to 10,000 ministers serving 2,500,000 Presbyterians, 26,000 ministers serving 9,000,000 Methodists, and approximately 47,000 or-
dained persons serving 31,500,000 Catholics. Of the Orthodox organizations, the Rabbinical Council of America (RCA) reported 608 members, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada 650, the Rabbinical Alliance of America 400. In addition some 2,000 Orthodox rabbinical students were enrolled in the P'Eylim—American Yeshiva Student Union. The Conservative rabbis were organized in the Rabbinical Assembly of America with a reported membership of 600, the Reform rabbis in the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) with a reported membership of 700. The New York Board of Rabbis (NYBR) also claimed a membership of more than 700 for 1954–55, representing the three wings of Judaism. In addition, the military chaplains were organized in the Association of Jewish Chaplains of the Armed Forces, with a reported membership of 525, of whom approximately 40 per cent were Reform, 30 per cent Conservative, and 30 per cent Orthodox. The National Council of Jewish Prison Chaplains, Inc., had a membership of about 35. Another group of religious functionaries were the cantors, whose Cantors' Assembly of America reported 191 members as of June 1955, constituting an increase of 27 members over 1954.

INTERNATIONAL RABBINICAL ACTIVITY

In an attempt to unify Orthodox authority throughout the world the RCA on July 13, 1955, adopted a resolution to establish a world confederation of Orthodox rabbis whose headquarters would be in Jerusalem. This world confederation would be empowered to deal with and resolve Jewish religious and social problems in various countries. In another move toward Orthodox unity, delegates to the Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi conference held in Jerusalem on August 9, 1955, voted to reunite the two movements after thirty years of separation into a new Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi organization world center. It was expected that the national convention of the Mizrachi Organization of America, which would be held November 2-6, 1955, would take the first steps toward the consummation of the merger in the United States.

Reform groups were also active in attempts to further their cause among the Jews of the world. The World Union for Progressive Judaism held a conference from June 30 to July 6, 1955, in Paris which considered plans to help the cause of Liberal Judaism in the State of Israel, and to create greater cooperation among all liberal Jewries. Reform groups affiliated with the Union in the United States were the UAHC, the CCAR, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, and the National Federation of Temple Youth.

The NYBR had in previous years developed contact with Jewry throughout Europe and North Africa. In July and August 1954 its general secretary flew around the world and surveyed the religious conditions in the Far East. He established contact with the religious Jewish communities in Pakistan, India, Burma, Hong Kong, Singapore, the Philippines, and Hawaii.

*The membership of the NYBR duplicated that of the other rabbinical bodies.*
Religious Practices

The Riverton study mentioned above shed some light on the ceremonial practices of American Jews, and their attitude toward them.

Nine out of every ten respondents stated that they observed one or another Jewish custom. Only one per cent of the parents interviewed observed no customs at all. On the other hand, a relatively small minority, about 10 per cent, claimed to observe all the rituals. The rituals which had special appeal were those which were joyous, which involved the young, which marked the transition from one stage of life to another, which did not require a high degree of isolation from non-Jews, which did not demand rigorous devotion and daily attention, and which were acceptable to the larger community as appropriate symbols of the sacred order.

Eighty-three per cent of the adolescents felt positively about the customs which their parents observed. Only about 14 per cent could be classified as having indifferent, mixed, or negative attitudes. Seventy-two per cent of the adolescents stated that they intended to observe about the same regimen which they experienced in the parental home. Boys intended to be about as observant as girls, but the intentions of the oldest group (ages eighteen to twenty) differed somewhat from those of the youngest (ages thirteen to fifteen). While only 5 per cent of the latter intended to be less observant than their parents, 25 per cent of the former intended to be less observant.

Of those who came from Reform homes, 15 per cent would observe more than their parents, and only 3 per cent less—among the Orthodox, 2 per cent planned to be more observant, and 18 per cent less. There was thus some evidence among adolescents for the "drift toward the middle" in Jewish life. Ritual observance appeared to remain a major component of Jewish identification.

Domestic Relations

In June 1954 the Rabbinical Assembly had passed a resolution calling for a new marriage contract for Conservative congregations (see American Jewish Year Book, 1955 [Vol. 56] p. 234-35). On November 12, 1954, the faculty of the JTSA and the Rabbinical Assembly announced the establishment of a joint conference on Jewish law, and of a Beth Din or court. The joint conference was to serve as the official instrument within the Conservative movement for all matters governing the Jewish laws of marriage and family welfare. One of the first assignments of the joint conference was the adoption of a takkanah (amendment) for the ketubah, or marriage contract, worked out by Prof. Saul Lieberman, dean of the Rabbinical School of the JTSA and professor of Talmud. Members of the Beth Din were: Dr. Ben Zion Bokser, Dr. Boaz Cohen, Rabbi Theodore Friedman, and Rabbi Isaac Klein; Dr. Judah Goldin was chairman.

The Orthodox rabbinate continued to object to the proposed Conservative ketubah. Rabbi Emanuel Rackman in a symposium published in Congress Weekly on February 28, 1955, explained this objection as due principally to the establishment by the Conservative rabbinate of a Beth Din. The Ortho-
dox had "no confidence in ... the Halachic integrity of a group that flouts Halachic norms and methodology." Rabbi Rackman's further suggestion that the devotees of the Halachah (Jewish law) constitute a national Beth Din was reflected in Rabbi Israel Klavan's annual report to the (Orthodox) Rabbinical Council in which he outlined the RCA's program for the coming year as featuring the establishment of a national Beth Din of Orthodox scholars. The Reform rabbinate, for its part, while not objecting to the Conservative revision of the ketubah, did not, in the words of Rabbi Solomon Freehof writing in the same issue of Congress Weekly, "share the principle upon which the [ketubah] is based, namely, the validity of the Halachah in total."

Writing in the Hadoar of April 25, 1955, Rabbi Aaron Ha-Cohen (the pseudonym of an Orthodox rabbi) suggested a possible compromise in this conflict between the Conservative and the Orthodox rabbinate. A change in the wording of the takkanah might permit both Conservative and Orthodox Beth Dins to decide in various cases, depending on which Beth Din the bridal pair undertook to accept as its authority. As an alternative compromise, the author suggested that a supreme Beth Din be constituted that would be representative of the three religious trends in American Jewish life.

The Family and Marriage Commission of the RCA reported in May 1955 that it was actively at work preparing a program of registering all marriages and divorces by RCA members; it was also continuing to concentrate on the problem of finding suitable foster homes for Orthodox children in the New York City area.

Kashrut

In cooperation with the Rabbinical Council, the UOJC provided kashrut (dietary) supervision on a fee basis to food processors and distributors, assisted in the establishment of local kashrut laws, and promoted kashrut observance. In 1954, twenty additional business firms made use of the UOJC kashrut supervision service. During the same period 139 rabbis supervised 405 products in 181 plants of 129 firms.

Calendar Reform

In the summer of 1954 a proposal put forth by the World Calendar Association for reforming the world calendar through "a blank day device" was under discussion at the Geneva session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The reform project under consideration would establish for each quarter of the year two thirty-day months and one month of thirty-one days, with an extra "blank" day at the end of the year belonging to no month, and, in leap years, another monthless day between June and July. By this device the same date would fall on the same day of the week each year. On July 1, 1954, the League for Safeguarding the Fixity of the Sabbath submitted a memorandum opposing the proposed plan on behalf of sixty-four American Jewish organizations. Jews opposed the project because, with one day out of sequence every year, and two in leap years, this would mean a shifting Sabbath. On July 8, 1954, five nongovernmental agencies spoke on the subject of calendar reform before ECOSOC. Two, the World
Calendar Association and the Indian Council for World Affairs, spoke in favor; two Jewish agencies, Agudath Israel and the World Jewish Congress, were opposed; Pax Romana, expressly stating that it was not speaking for the Vatican, held that the time was not ripe for such a change and that in any event it was a religious problem, not a purely mechanical or astronomical one. The entire project was sent to member governments for study.

On December 3, 1954, the chief rabbis of ten countries issued a statement appealing to the governments concerned to reject the calendar reform proposal. Involved were the chief rabbis of Israel, Great Britain, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Eire, Italy, Luxembourg, and Sweden. A representative of the RCA also signed this appeal.

On March 22, 1955, the United States government strongly opposed the calendar reform project, recommending that no further study of this subject be undertaken.

On May 16, 1955, ECOSOC deferred the calendar reform proposal for a year. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold revealed that twenty-three nations had opposed revision of the calendar, nine had favored further study, and two (Thailand and Monaco) had been in favor.

**Shechita Ban**

A request that a study be made of the prohibition in several countries against the religious slaughtering of animals for food was brought before the United Nations subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination in January 1955 by the Orthodox Agudath Israel organization.

**Role of Women in Synagogue Life**

On June 20, 1955, Dr. Barnett R. Brickner in his presidential address to the Central Conference of American Rabbis asked the CCAR to authorize the appointment of a special committee to “revaluate” the ordination of women. Dr. Brickner’s proposal was in line with a clearly defined religious trend in the United States. In May 1955 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the U.S. of America had approved the ordination of women as full ministers. Final ratification awaited approval of the Church’s 256 local presbyteries. Similarly, in June 1955 the New York East Conference of the Methodist Church had agreed to endorse efforts to put women in the pulpit. However, early in May 1955 the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York had refused to permit women to serve on parish vestries or to attend yearly diocesan conventions.

At the May 1955 convention of the Rabbinical Assembly women had been authorized to take part in leading the ritual, long a practice in Reform temples.

On June 23 the CCAR agreed to make a one-year study of the advisability of ordaining women to the rabbinate, in line with the Brickner proposal.

**Mixed Pews**

In December 1954 private court litigation brought a ruling supporting mixed or family seating in a Conservative Cincinnati synagogue. For nine
months Adath Israel Congregation had been the scene of a controversy over a change in its tradition of separate seating for men and women. Hamilton County Probate Court Judge Chase M. Davies, a non-Jew, had been called to chair a three-man board of arbitration after a congregational vote taken on March 3, 1954, had revealed that 74.3 per cent of the congregation favored the change.

In his opinion Judge Davies emphasized that “we are not attempting to make a decision which will affect under any circumstances seating in any other synagogue. To hold otherwise would be an assumption of this court to regulate the religious faith of members of this congregation. Under the federal and state constitutions there can be no disturbance of or limitation to the power and the right of the congregation to exercise that freedom of conscience which is the basis of our liberty.”

Representing ultra-Orthodoxy, on July 28, 1955, Rabbi Jacob Ruderman, dean of Ner Israel Rabbinical College, urged the Rabbinical Alliance of America (Igud Ha-Rabbonim) to preserve the traditional seating arrangement in the synagogue, on the ground that mixed pews directly contravened “the explicit law as well as the spirit of the Torah.”

“Universal Judaism”

During 1952–53 the American Council for Judaism (ACJ) had opened religious Sunday schools based on a program of “universal Judaism.” These schools for Judaism had been hailed by ACJ leaders as an approach to Jewish living which was attracting Jews otherwise indifferent to Jewish religious identification. In an address to the first Teachers’ Institute for the Schools of Judaism, on March 26, 1955, Rabbi Elmer Berger, executive director of the ACJ, offered a Council approach to the problems of Jewish customs and ceremonial as a guide for that aspect of the Schools of Judaism program. This approach was based on four principles: that customs and ceremonies were “changing and secondary to the basic moral truths and spiritual values of Judaism”; that therefore the ACJ was opposed to making such observances mandatory or obligatory; that “we feel obligated to eliminate those practices which bear no organic relationship to the spiritual truth of Judaism... or to the free and open character of American society”; and that for ACJ members “to whom custom and ceremony are important... dramatizations and emotionalizations of our faith where none existed to our liking” would be created.

In accordance with these principles, Rabbi Berger suggested three innovations: that American Jews observe Saturday as a day of play and Sunday as a day of worship; that a new type of menorah be created “whose design would reflect the appreciation of American Jews of the freedom of life in the United States”; and “an interpretation of a manner of observing Succot in which a holiday originally designed as a thanksgiving festival of an agricultural economy could be broadened to take on meaning to the citizens of an industrial society.”

Rabbi Berger’s proposals were attacked by Rabbi Norman Salit, president of the Synagogue Council of America, in May 1955. Declaring that Rabbi Berger’s proposals were “impelled by the inner compulsion of his group...
their great dread of being different," Rabbi Salit asserted that Rabbi Berger
did not understand "that religions have, and require, fixed and specific points
of observance," and that his proposals were "only the first steps to complete
assimilation."

Seminaries and Higher Education

Each of the three religious groupings continued to maintain institutions
of higher education, with the aim of training rabbis, cantors, and an in-
formed laity.

ORTHODOX

The largest of the Orthodox educational institutions was Yeshiva Univer-
sity, which reported a total unduplicated enrollment of 2,672 in all of its divi-

During the period under review the course of study leading to rabbinical
ordination was revised and set up as a three-year program for college gradu-
ates. The new system was designed to integrate training in rabbinics with
instruction in Halachah.

The Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute offered training leading to rabbinical
ordination and post-graduate work in Talmudic research to students from
the United States, South America, and North Africa. A unique feature of the
Mirrer Yeshiva organization was its Sephardic division, which provided
special classes conducted in Hebrew for a group of Sephardic students res-
cued from Morocco and other Arab-dominated areas. Upon graduation some
of the Sephardic students returned home; others served in the Sephardic
communities in the United States and Israel.

A major part of the Mirrer Yeshiva’s effort was expended in rescuing im-
migrant students; during 1954–55 more than 140 persons were aided by this
special department of the Institute. During 1954–55 the Mirrer Yeshiva en-
gaged in over 200 interventions in behalf of Orthodox Jewish scholars in
distress abroad, especially in the Middle East.

The Mirrer Yeshiva’s Munich Committee had printed more than 165,000
Bibles and prayer books for distribution in the Middle East.

CONSERVATIVE

The Jewish Theological Seminary of America educated religious function-
aries and an informed laity for the Conservative movement.

In February 1955 the National Planning Committee of the JTSA adopted
a ten-year program to raise $60,000,000 for the “indispensable minimum
needs” of the Seminary. A $10,000,000 building fund campaign, to house ex-
panded school needs, and a drive to obtain $17,000,000 in endowments for
maintenance of the new buildings and the expanded program were to be
included in the $60,000,000 efforts.

An increased ten-year budget of $6,000,000 for training rabbis and teachers
and $4,000,000 for television constituted a major part of the program. An
additional $1,000,000 had been allocated for the University of Judaism in
Los Angeles.
Reform

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) trained students for the Reform rabbinate. During the summer of 1954 an eight-week program of intensive instruction was offered candidates for admission. Students engaged in a comprehensive program of student training in religious education and rabbinical duties both in Cincinnati and New York. All students were required to have experience in serving congregations on a bimonthly basis, and many were engaged as religious school instructors under supervision both in Cincinnati and New York. Both the College of Jewish Studies in Los Angeles and the Hebrew Union School of Religious Education conducted courses for adults. During 1954-55 a special weekend Founders Day program was devoted to a re-analysis of the Reform position vis-à-vis Jewish education, the role of Jewry in the general American environment, and the history of the American Jew. A similar program had been designed for the coming year.

Present plans called for the introduction of a full graduate degree program in the New York school; the establishment of a Jerusalem School for Graduate Research; and the introduction of a program for the training of directors of religious education in New York leading to the degree of master of Jewish religious education.

Adult and Youth Education

During the years, the major branches of American Judaism had developed special programs for the education of adults and youths. In addition to the schools and institutes mentioned above as part of the structure and activity of Yeshiva University, the JTSA, and HUC-JIR, mention may be made of the (Orthodox) Young Israel Institute for Jewish Studies, with a student body of 700 in four branches, and of the Youth Bureau and Adult Education Department of the Community Service Division of Yeshiva University. The Youth Bureau held Youth Leaders Institutes for training of synagogue youth group personnel in several sections of the country and issued a series of publications on various phases of youth work. It also held, and was holding, seminars and conclaves for the young people themselves, dealing with fundamentals of Judaism and group leadership and skills. The Department of Adult Education devised curricula, syllabi, and teaching materials for individual Synagogue Adult Institutes, and assisted in setting up such programs in congregations and communities throughout the country.

In 1954, the National Conference of Synagogue Youth was organized to serve the youth of Orthodox synagogues throughout the country.

The (Conservative) National Academy of Adult Jewish Studies assisted congregations in establishing adult education courses.

The Leaders Training Fellowship of the JTSA, which aimed to prepare youth for various fields of Jewish service, was a summer camp and summer school program serving about 1,000 students (650 from outside New York City).

In June 1955 a nation-wide attack on "adult Jewish illiteracy" was planned
TABLE 1
ENROLLMENT AT AND GRADUATION FROM JEWISH RELIGIOUS
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING, 1954–55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and School</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORTHODOX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminary</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva College</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Institute</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Institute for Women</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern College for Women</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantorial Training Institute</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ner Israel Rabbinical College</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Theological College of Chicago</td>
<td>569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Department</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Department</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Institute for Women</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Academy</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division, Los Angeles</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Division, Los Angeles</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Torah Vodaath, N. Y. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Rabbinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Advanced Studies and Research</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSERVATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical School</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Department</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-theological Department</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Department</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Institute</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Division</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Department</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary College of Jewish Studies</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary School of Jewish Studies</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Institute</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Religious and Social Studies</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantors Inst.-Sem. Col. of Jewish Music</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Judaism in Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFORM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College—Jewish Inst. of Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical School</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Religious Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Sacred Music</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Jewish Studies, Los Angeles</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total unduplicated enrollment.
† Opened in September 1954.
‡ Opened in October 1954.
§ This figure includes enrollment in the Yeshiva Torah Vodaath elementary school, preparatory academy, high school, as well.
* All figures for the HUC-JIR are approximate.
† Newly opened.
by the National Women's League of the United Synagogue of America. A six-point program outline included the addition of "a word of Torah," even if only in a ten-minute presentation, at every meeting of each affiliated group; familiarity with the psalms and appropriate liturgic portions through their use at meetings and functions; a standard, rabbinically accepted short form of grace after meals to be utilized at all functions at which a meal was served; and the encouragement of its use in the home.

Zionism and Pro-Israel Activity

A clue to the attitudes of American rabbis on Zionism and Israel was obtained from a poll of a cross section of the rabbinate taken by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation and published by Eliezer Whartman in *Jewish Social Studies*, April 1955.

Questionnaires were mailed to 300 rabbis whose names were selected at random from the lists of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis.

By and large, the Conservative and the Reform rabbis held the same views, which were often in direct opposition to those held by the Orthodox.

Of the three groups, the Orthodox proved to be most optimistic about prospects of rapprochement of the two Jewries. The Conservative rabbis were less convinced that prospects were good for the improvement of relationships between Israel and the American Diaspora. A considerable minority of them predicted that the two Jewries would drift apart.

The Reform group included the greatest number of pessimists regarding future relations between Israel and the Diaspora. One-third thought that the American scene was being neglected as a result of the activity on behalf of Israel. Forty-five per cent were of the opinion that the Zionist movement no longer had a *raison d'être*. While favorably disposed toward the Jewish state as a group, the Reform rabbinate included the largest minority opposed to cardinal Zionist beliefs.

On at least one important point opinion cut across denominational lines: all but two of the 108 rabbis rejected the possibility of large-scale immigration to Israel by American Jews if the present political and social situation remained unchanged. Over one-third of the rabbis were either opposed or indifferent to Zionism.

The rabbis' outlook on the Israel scene sharply reflected their denominational affiliation. Reform and Conservative groups aligned themselves against the Orthodox on questions of religious practice in Israel. Thus, on the issue of rabbinical courts and religious parties, a majority opposed current trends in Israel. All groups were agreed on two points: that the present status of religion in the Holy Land was unsatisfactory, but that prospects were good for the future.

The primary purpose of Jewish activity, all agreed, should be to secure the survival of the Diaspora, although some took a dim view of its prospects.

Israel and the Middle East

Religious groups continued to express themselves on the political problems in the Middle East as they affected the interests of Israel. Thus, the
Rabbinical Assembly (May 1955), the CCAR (June 1955), Young Israel (June 1955), and the UOJC (October 1954), all urged the United States government to review its policy on the Middle East and defend the security and sovereignty of Israel within the context of a general and lasting settlement for the entire region.

Orthodox bodies were especially concerned about the implications of the religious developments in Israel. In June 1955 Young Israel protested "the religious coercion practiced by the Jewish Agency" in assigning 80 per cent of the Orthodox North African immigrants to nonreligious settlements, the allegedly inadequate support given by the Israel government to the independent religious school system in Israel, and Israel's failure to prohibit all missionary activity within its borders.

Other Orthodox groups in the United States reacted sharply to religious conflicts in Israel. On February 7, 1955, the United Orthodox Jewish Congregations and Organization of America held a meeting in New York City, at Manhattan Center, attended by 3,500 persons, to protest against "the continuous persecution of religion and religious Jewry in Israel, and particularly in Jerusalem." This demonstration was criticized sharply on the same day by the Hapoel Hamizrachi of America, the religious-labor Zionist group, which asserted that the sponsors of the demonstration did not represent any recognized religious groups in the United States. The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America also issued a statement, declaring that, though it took "a very serious view concerning the occurrences in the Mea Shearim section in Jerusalem and the harm that has befallen the religious Jews in that area . . ., mass demonstrations such as the one held at the Manhattan Center are contrary to the policy of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America."

Social Action On Civil Rights Issues

As in past years, during 1954–55 Jewish religious organizations engaged in the area of social action.

Of special concern was the administration of the Federal loyalty-security program, which called forth the condemnation of the religious bodies. Thus, the Rabbinical Assembly in May 1955 called for the adoption by Congress of an adequate code of fair procedures for Congressional investigating committees; and the CCAR, in June 1955, reiterated its opposition to the use of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. The NYBR in April 1955 joined fifteen Jewish and Protestant religious leaders in petitioning the Senate Judiciary Committee for an investigation of "informers" whose testimony before Congressional committees "tended to besmirch the reputation of ministers and rabbis."

Another subject of concern was religious education in the public schools. In June 1955 the Commission on Church and State of the CCAR cautioned its colleagues against participating in projects and experiments involving the introduction of religious education into the public schools.

All of these organizations, as well as the UOJC, also condemned the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and urged the revision of its discrim-
inatory provisions. In particular, the NYBR and the Rabbinical Assembly called for the replacement of this act by the Lehman-Celler Bill.

The Supreme Court decision of May 1954 banning segregation in the public schools was widely hailed by the synagogue groups. In May 1955 the Rabbinical Assembly, in urging speedy implementation of the decision, also recommended that Federal funds that might be made available for public school construction be withheld from those states practicing segregation.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES

Juvenile delinquency, divorce, social security, and automation in industry were other issues that were the subjects of religious pronouncements during the year.

Between 1948 and 1953 juvenile delinquency in the United States had reached such proportions that the United States Senate authorized its Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a "full and complete" study of the problem. The committee appointed a subcommittee of four which, after sixteen months of activity, on March 14, 1955, brought in findings reflecting the urgency of the problem. "The stream of children through the nation's juvenile courts grew from 300,000 in 1948 to 435,000 in 1953, and only 10 per cent of this increase can possibly be attributed to the enlarged juvenile population."

Jewish religious bodies, which had for some time been concerned with the implications of juvenile delinquency for the family and the church, reacted to these findings by stressing, as did Harold Boxer, chairman of the National Conference of Synagogue Youth, affiliated with UOJC, that juvenile delinquents were the products of an upbringing lacking in religious training, and that churches and synagogues should actively participate in recreational, social, and sports activities for youth. Delegates to a Young Israel convention passed a resolution on June 26, 1955, endorsing the proposal made by Abe Stark, president of the City Council of New York, to the effect that $3,000,000 be allocated in the city budget to organizations engaged in youth work. On June 23, 1955, the CCAR requested its Committee on Marriage, Family and Home to study the problem of juvenile delinquency.

On February 24, 1954, the NYBR joined the Protestant Council, the City Bar Association, the State Federation of Women's Clubs, the State Council of Churches, the Board of Justices of the Domestic Relations Court, and many other groups in endorsing the Gordon-Peterson Bill to set up a temporary state commission to study family problems and related matrimonial matters in an attempt to liberalize the divorce law in New York State. The principal opposition to this bill came from the Catholic Welfare Committee, the Knights of Columbus, and the Catholic War Veterans.

On March 4, 1955, the NYBR directed a plea to the New York State Assembly's Ways and Means Committee. The Rules Committee acted favorably on the Gordon-Peterson Bill; but on March 29, 1955, the Assembly voted it down by a vote of 85-61.

On January 26, 1955, the NYBR reaffirmed its conviction that ministers of religion should be included within the framework of the Social Security
System. Convinced that such legislation would in no way impair the principle of the separation of church and state, the NYBR urged that Congress take speedy action on this subject.

On June 23, 1955, the CCAR passed a resolution asking that a study be made of automation and technological unemployment "in the light of our religious ideals and ethical principles." The study would try to determine moral standards for employers forced to discharge employees whose services were rendered unnecessary by automation and to encourage the putting to spiritual uses of the new leisure for employees envisaged as a consequence of automation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS ISSUES

Synagogue bodies as usual maintained an active interest in the United States role in world affairs. Thus, in June 1955, the Commission on Justice and Peace of the CCAR endorsed "the willingness of our government to participate in a Four Power Conference with the Soviet Union and our Western Allies, and to sit in conference with Chou En Lai in the hope of achieving a peaceful settlement of our Far Eastern problems." Also the Rabbinical Council of America, on July 12, 1955, made formal application to the Soviet embassy in Washington to allow a delegation of rabbis to visit Jews in the Soviet Union, "in order to re-establish our spiritual ties . . . foster the growing spirit of understanding between the East and West . . . and enhance and strengthen the bond between our peoples."

Chaplaincy

The Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy, on which were represented the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox), the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative), and the CCAR (Reform), was the agency through which the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) was authorized by the United States Department of Defense to recruit and ecclesiastically endorse rabbis for service as chaplains in the various branches of the armed forces. In 1954, the Commission recruited and processed 32 full-time chaplains. There was a total of 95 full-time Jewish chaplains in the armed services and in other Federal governmental services at the end of 1954. In addition, 249 part-time chaplains served military installations and veterans' facilities. The Commission conducted Torah Convocations in the Azores, Europe, Far East, and Iceland. It also sponsored religious retreats. The Commission supplied prayer books, scriptural readings, holiday pamphlets, and other religious materials to service personnel. The Responsa Committee of the Commission dealt with problems of Jewish religious law confronting service personnel and their families.

The Armed Forces Division of the UOJC supplemented the work of the JWB. The Union felt that while the JWB met minimal observance needs of all Jewish servicemen, there were observant and Orthodox Jewish soldiers and sailors who required particular attention. The Union cooperated with the JWB, and funds for this function were raised through membership chan-
nels only. During 1954, 2,300 service personnel were listed in the Union's Servicemen's Registry. The Union attempted to provide them with literature, food, and supplies directly. The Union also assisted JWB in recruiting Orthodox chaplains for the Armed Forces.

On February 14, 1955, Rabbi David B. Hollander, president of the Rabbinical Council of America, called upon the armed forces to make provisions for kosher kitchens in installations which maintained Jewish chaplains. Rabbi Hollander commended the Army for cooperating in testing the feasibility of the plan providing facilities for observant Jewish servicemen at Fort Devens, Mass.

On January 13, 1955, the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy of the National Jewish Welfare Board announced publication of the first standardized religious school curriculum for Jews in the armed forces and their families.

Civilian Chaplaincy

Through its corps of ninety-one chaplains—an increase of fifteen over 1953–54—the NYBR supervised and directed chaplaincy activities in 160 institutions. This included voluntary hospitals, municipal hospitals, city prisons, homes for the aged, convalescent homes, and youth shelters. The institutions under the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, Correction, Health and Welfare were also served through the NYBR. It was estimated that the NYBR served approximately 250,000 men, women and children annually in these institutions.

Chaplains' activities included, besides visiting, the distributing of religious and inspirational literature, the conducting of religious services on Sabbaths and High Holy Days, and the observance of festivals.

The NYBR assisted the New York Department of Mental Hygiene in its first chaplaincy institute held at the Brooklyn State Hospital February 1–March 17, 1955, for the purpose of orienting chaplains of all faiths in institutional activities in mental hospitals.

Research and Scholarship

In addition to the ongoing program of research and scholarship, several institutions inaugurated new projects. On September 16, 1954, Abraham A. Neuman, president of the Dropsie College, reported that arrangements had been concluded with representative scholars of the Hebrew University for the joint production of a history of the Jewish people by the scholars of Israel and the United States, including also a number of European scholars. The final work would appear in twenty volumes in two editions: an English and a Hebrew version, published simultaneously. Two laymen were credited with the financing of the history project: Alexander Gurewitch of Jerusalem and Theodore Sondov of the United States. Sondov was president of the recently formed New York corporation, Jewish History Publications, which was established for the purpose of publishing this twenty-volume history of the Jews.

On June 24, 1955, the JTSA, with the aid of the Jacob Ziskind Trust for Charitable Purposes, launched an Institute for Ethical Studies in the Atomic
Age. The institute was inaugurated on the premise that “the most perplexing and urgent problems of our time lie in the neglected domains of ethics and theology.” It would grant fellowships to exceptional students who would be enabled to devote all of their time to the study of ethics, theology, and philosophy. The institute would also publish and give widespread circulation to the works of present and future scholars.

Through the grant of a subvention from Louis M. Rabinowitz, the NYBR announced on March 21, 1955, the establishment of the Rabinowitz Lecture Series. Its aim was to bring to the rabbinate and laity some of the outstanding scholars in the field of history, theology, literature, and archaeology.

Public Information

For the third year in succession the NYBR and the New York Chapter of the American Jewish Committee sponsored a TV Workshop in which the rabbinate of the eastern seaboard participated on June 7 and 8, 1955. The workshop stressed television as the new medium for the dissemination of religion and also emphasized some of the techniques in modern telecasting, such as interviewing, moderating, panel discussion, and religious services.

Anniversaries

An important event during the period under review was the anniversary of the three hundred years of Jewish settlement in the United States. Jewish religious institutions played a major role in the celebration of this tercentenary. It was also the occasion for a tercentenary celebration by Congregation Shearith Israel in New York City. (For a full account, see p. 101.)

Jacob Sloan

JEWISH EDUCATION

In the spring of 1954, 399,818 children attended Jewish schools in the United States, according to a Jewish school census carried out by the Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the United States. The study was based on reported actual enrollment from 197 communities which included New York City (the five boroughs) and the counties of Westchester, Suffolk, and Nassau; the other four major metropolitan centers having each a Jewish population of more than 100,000 (Chicago, Boston, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia); four of the six large urban centers having each a Jewish population of between 50,000 and 100,000 (Newark, N.J., Essex County, N.J., Cleveland, Ohio, Baltimore, Md., and San Francisco, Cal.); and 170 intermediate and small communities. These 197 reporting communities were distributed over 40 states and the District of Columbia and comprised an estimated Jewish population of four and one-quarter million, or over 80 per cent of all Jews in the United States.

More than half of the total enrollment (208,057 or 52.0 per cent) were
attending one-day-a-week schools, usually referred to as Sunday schools, and 191,761, or 48.0 per cent, attended weekday schools: weekday afternoon Hebrew schools, all-day schools, and Yiddish schools.

The increase in Jewish school enrollment during the period 1948–54 was not confined to any one geographic area, or to any one type of city. It manifested itself in all parts of the country and in cities of all sizes.

Large Jewish Communities

For all of the five cities having each a Jewish population of over 100,000, enrollment data were available for this period. These five urban centers—New York, Chicago, Ill., Los Angeles, Cal., Philadelphia, Pa., and Boston, Mass.—comprised a Jewish population of about 3,350,000, and constituted close to two-thirds of all the Jews in the United States. In the spring of 1948 these cities had recorded a Jewish school enrollment of 103,196 children; in the spring of 1954, the enrollment was 151,065—a relative increase of 46.3 per cent for the six-year period. The proportionate increases in the Jewish school enrollment in individual cities in this group ranged from 23.1 per cent in New York City to 132.1 per cent in Los Angeles.

Intermediate Jewish Communities

Of the seven cities having communities of 50,000 to 100,000 Jews, Jewish school enrollment data for 1948–54 was available for only four: Baltimore, Md., Cleveland, Ohio, Miami, Fla., and Newark, N. J. (Essex County).

The total number of children attending any type of Jewish school in these four cities had grown from 16,000 in 1948, to 21,622 in 1951, and 28,425 in 1954. The relative increase for the six years in these cities was 77.6 per cent.

Small Jewish Communities

Of the twelve cities with Jewish populations of 20,000 to 50,000, Jewish school enrollment data for the years 1948–54 were available for five: New Haven, Conn., Cincinnati, Ohio, Rochester and Buffalo, N. Y., and Milwaukee, Wis. In these communities Jewish school enrollment had grown during the years 1948–54 from 8,263 to 11,990, or 45.1 per cent.

Significant proportionate increases in the Jewish school enrollment were also recorded for the sixty-three cities with Jewish population of from 5,000 to 20,000 each. For only eleven cities in this category were enrollment data for 1948–54 available. The data indicated an aggregate increase in Jewish school enrollment in these cities of 73.3 per cent. Each of the eleven cities recorded a proportionate increase of over 50 per cent. One may assume that the other cities in this group also experienced increases in their enrollment.

Available data also indicated that a number of lesser Jewish communities, those having fewer than 1,000 Jewish residents, recorded proportional increases in their Jewish school enrollment.

---

2 Atlanta, Ga.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Camden, N. J.; Dallas and San Antonio, Tex.; Memphis, Tenn.; St Paul, Minn.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Columbus and Dayton, Ohio; Tucson, Ariz.
### TABLE 1

**Jewish School Enrollment, Jewish Communities of Over 100,000, 1948–54**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase, 1948–54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>8,507</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>11,846</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7,553</td>
<td>12,052</td>
<td>17,535</td>
<td>132.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>12,055</td>
<td>14,352</td>
<td>18,322</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>62,939</td>
<td>65,846</td>
<td>77,516</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>12,592</td>
<td>21,086</td>
<td>25,846</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,986</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**Jewish School Enrollment, Jewish Communities of 50,000–100,000, 1948–54**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase, 1948–54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>7,039</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>9,654</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>5,442</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, N. J. (Essex County)</td>
<td>3,196</td>
<td>4,986</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>100.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,662</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,425</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

**Jewish School Enrollment, Jewish Communities of 20,000–50,000, 1948–54**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase, 1948–54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>114.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,137</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,990</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For 1949.*
National Study of Jewish Education

During 1953–54 Cleveland, Ohio, and Savannah, Ga., served as pilot cities for the National Study of Jewish Education, which was based on a 10 per cent random sample of the Jewish communities in the United States, stratified by major geographic zones and categories of Jewish population. The field work in Cleveland and Savannah was done by Uriah Z. Engelman, who also prepared the Savannah report. The voluminous Cleveland report was written jointly by Professor Oscar I. Janowsky and Dr. Engelman, who submitted an agenda of twenty-four recommendations along with their findings.

Commission for the Study of Jewish Education

The National Study was being conducted under the auspices of the Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the United States. The Commission was composed of an independent body of 100 persons drawn from various walks of life and representing diverse points of view on American Jewish education, as well as other aspects of American Jewish communal work.

The Commission had its origin in a resolution adopted at the First National Conference on Jewish Education held in New York City on January 4, 1953, and convened by the American Association for Jewish Education. Professor Janowsky was the chairman of the Commission, and Dr. Engelman director of the National Study.

In addition to the lay members of the Commission, thirty-five specialists in Jewish education served as study associates, and twenty-one leaders in the field of general education and experts in the specialized field of surveying were available for consultation as consultant specialists. An executive committee functioned between sessions of the Commission.

Cleveland and Savannah Findings

The two articles that follow record the efforts made by responsible community committees in Cleveland and Savannah to implement the recommendations of the National Study surveyors. The findings were carefully studied by the community leaders, as were the recommendations. Though in some instances modified, in substance the recommendations were approved, and a number of far-reaching proposals had been or were being implemented.

It is noteworthy that only a portion of the materials amassed in the field work had been collated, interpreted, and included in the community reports. It was expected that a large number of findings, notably those revealing attitudes of children, teachers, parents, community leaders, etc., would be utilized along with similar findings in other communities when the National Study was completed, and the final synthesis prepared.
THE SELF-STUDY OF JEWISH EDUCATION IN SAVANNAH, GA.\(^1\)

The self-study of Jewish education in Savannah, Ga., conducted from January 1953 to April 1954, had its roots in a self-study of the Jewish Educational Alliance (Savannah's Jewish community center) in 1951. In the course of the latter study, a group of subcommittees concerned with programming facilities for children and youth had recommended that a Hebrew school under community auspices be established in the projected new building of the Jewish Educational Alliance, so that programming for children and youth could be coordinated with the formal Jewish educational program.

In view of the community planning aspects of this proposal, the recommendation was submitted to the Savannah Jewish Council, the central organization of the Jewish community, for its consideration. Deliberation of the proposal by the council resulted in the organization in 1952 of a steering committee, composed of five representatives each from the Orthodox and Conservative congregations, and the Savannah Jewish Council, plus two representatives from the Reform congregation, which conducted a Sunday religious school. The lesser representation from the Reform congregation was based on the latter's request. The steering committee had the responsibility for supervising a self-study of Jewish education.

The purpose of the study was stated as:

To gather facts about the current status of Jewish education in Savannah, as a basis for evaluation of the effectiveness of such education, in relationship to the objectives of Jewish education; and to make recommendations for the improvement of the program of Jewish education—for all age levels, but with special emphasis on Jewish education for our youth. The question of the desirability of establishing a community Hebrew School will be one of the subjects considered in the study.

**Organization**

The gathering of the factual information, the evaluation of the information gathered, and the drawing up of the recommendations were done by committees of laymen. The American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE) was engaged to provide the professional supervision and direction of the self-study. The desirability of having the religious education departments of the various denominational religious bodies, nationally, supervise the study—individually or in combination—was considered, but was dropped in favor of the AAJE, largely because of the fact that the approach to the study of Jewish education was basically communal, rather than denominational.

The role of the professional director of the self-study (Uriah Z. Engelman, director of research for the AAJE) was to give overall supervision to the study; to prepare the various schedules and questionnaires; to familiarize the committees with the methods to be used in gathering the data; to analyze

\(^1\) The Jewish population of Savannah was reliably estimated at 3,100, distributed among approximately 1,000 families.
the information gathered; and to interpret the meaning of the data to the committees.

The executive director of the Savannah Jewish Council had the responsibility of supervising and coordinating the numerous details involved in the operation of the various committees, between visits of the director; to work with the planning committee, which drew up the recommendations; and to act as the executive secretary for the project. Suggestions for persons who might be interested in serving on one of the subcommittees were drawn from these sources: presidents of Jewish organizations and congregations; members of the steering committee; interest blanks printed in the Savannah Jewish News; boards of education of all congregations.

A total of 135 men and women were recommended or volunteered for service on the self-study committees. However, only 72 ultimately expressed a desire to serve and were appointed to a committee.

Five subcommittees were constituted to gather the facts. These committees, which began their work in January 1953, and their responsibilities were as follows:

Administration: to gather data about the personnel, the buildings, equipment, finances, and other matters dealing with the administration of the various schools.

Attitudes: to gather data about attitudes and objectives of parents and pupils on the Jewish education of the children.

Community Educational Systems: to study those community systems of Jewish education in which Jewish communities had taken an active role in formulating the plans for administering and giving financial support to community programs of Jewish education.

Program: to gather data about the objectives, courses of study, and the curricula of all the local schools.

Statistics: to gather data about the enrollment, attendance, age range, size of classes, length of stay of pupils, reasons for dropping out, etc.

The committees on administration, program, and statistics helped to formulate the questionnaires. The data were submitted by the heads of the schools.

The data on attitudes of the parents were secured through the use of twenty-six volunteer interviewers, carefully selected and trained for their objectivity. The data on attitudes of the children were secured by questionnaires administered by Dr. Engelman and the heads of the schools. The data on community educational systems were secured through study and analysis at committee meetings.

A technical advisory committee, composed of all local rabbis, the principal of the Savannah Hebrew School, the executive director of the Jewish Educational Alliance, and the executive director of the Savannah Jewish Council, studied and analyzed all of the questionnaires and schedules drawn up by the committees and revised them to fit in with local needs.

Method of Procedure

In the study of the attitudes of the parents to the Jewish education of their children, 182 parents were interviewed. The interviewers filled out a
total of 213 questionnaires from the 132 sets of parents (both mothers and fathers were interviewed). Where a child attended more than one school, separate questionnaires were filled out for each school. The interviewed parents constituted 50.7 per cent of all parents having children in the Jewish schools.

Information, in the various categories outlined, was secured from all of the media of formal Jewish education in Savannah—from (Conservative) Congregation Agudath Achim (two-day-a-week Hebrew school and Sunday school); from (Orthodox) Congregation B. B. Jacob (four-day-a-week Hebrew school, Sunday school, and kindergarten); (Reform) Congregation Mickve Israel; and the Hebrew Academy (all-day school with two grades).

Although not originally included in the purview of the self-study, an additional element was added, that of securing data concerning the attitudes of the adult leadership group in the community toward formal Jewish education and probing their knowledge of Jewish life. This was initiated to fit in with the national study of Jewish education being undertaken by the AAJE, and was carried out in a limited fashion, due to lack of time.

First, all the data were gathered, collated, analyzed by Dr. Engelman, and the findings presented in a preliminary report, to a meeting of all members of the study committee and the steering committee, in January 1954; then a local planning committee was appointed to draw up a set of recommendations for improvements in the system of Jewish education in Savannah. Seven meetings of this committee were held, during which formal consultation was held with the presidents, chairmen of the finance committees, chairmen of the boards of education of all groups, sponsoring schools, as well as with all of the rabbis. Out of these meetings grew a set of recommendations dealing with the establishment of a community system of Jewish education in Savannah. After minor modifications recommended by the two synagogues participating in the new plan, these recommendations were adopted by the two synagogues and the Savannah Jewish Council in June 1954. The new plan was built around the establishment of a community-wide bureau of Jewish education. The details of the plan will be dealt with later in this article.

Findings

A summary of the significant findings of the self-study covering the school year 1952-53 follows:

Enrollment

The Jewish child population of Savannah in the age group four through fifteen comprised 549 children: 278, or 50.6 per cent, were boys; and 271, or 49.4 per cent, were girls. The seven Jewish schools of Savannah had a combined enrollment of 494 pupils. The unduplicated enrollment was 373 children, and constituted 67.9 per cent of all Jewish children in the age group of four through fifteen. Of these 373 children, 118, or 30 per cent of all of the children in this age group, attended more than one school (see Tables 1 and 2).
The proportion of boys and girls who attended the Jewish schools was about the same. Of all the boys in the Jewish population of Savannah aged four through fifteen, 68.7 per cent were enrolled in the Jewish school system; of the girls of this age group, 67.2 per cent were receiving a Jewish education.

A considerably larger proportion of boys and girls attended the more intensive type of schools. Of 132 girls aged six through thirteen enrolled in the Savannah Jewish schools, 47, or 36 per cent, attended the Hebrew elementary weekday schools. Of 145 boys aged six through thirteen, 88, or 60 per cent, were attending such schools.

More than one-fifth (21.5 per cent) of all children four through fifteen attending Jewish schools were four and five years of age; 30 per cent were either six, seven, or eight years old, and 21 per cent were nine or ten years old. In other words, 72 per cent of the total Jewish school enrollment of Savannah were children ten years of age or younger.

### TABLE 1

**Jewish School Enrollment of Savannah, Ga. by Congregational Orientation and Type of School, 1952-53**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congregational Orientation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. of Days Per Week</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Weekday afternoon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Weekday afternoon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Sunday school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>All-Day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Orthodox</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Weekday afternoon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Sunday school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Conservative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Sunday school elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reform</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**Distribution of Children by Age, Sex, and Jewish Schooling, Savannah, Ga., 1952-53**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Attending a Jewish School</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>373 68%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is an unduplicated count of individual children—where a child attends more than one school, he or she is counted only once.

**AGE DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE WEEKDAY HEBREW SCHOOL GRADES**

The age distribution of the children within the grades showed that children of widely disparate ages were grouped together. Especially was this the case in the first and third grades.

In the first grade, children of six, seven, eight, nine, and ten years of age studied together. The same was the case in the third grade, in which children of eight, nine, ten, eleven and twelve years of age were kept together. In the second grade, the age range of the children was from eight through eleven. In the other grades, the age range was somewhat narrower.

**TEACHERS**

The combined staffs of the Savannah Jewish schools consisted of thirty teachers; twenty-two taught in the Sunday schools and eight in the weekday schools. Four of the teachers taught both in the Sunday and in the weekday schools.

Eighteen of the Sunday school teachers had received their Jewish edu-
cation in a local Hebrew or Sunday School. Eleven of them were teenagers. Ten of them were attending or had been graduated from an American college; two had studied abroad; eight had been graduated from a public high school; and two failed to report.

Of the six teachers in the afternoon Hebrew schools and in the Hebrew Academy, only four were professional Jewish teachers. All of the Hebrew teachers had a good Jewish background and training.

The two teachers of the B’nai B’rith Jacob Kindergarten were professional kindergarten teachers.

Although the general education of the Sunday school teachers was considered satisfactory, the majority lacked professional teacher training.

Cost of School Operation and Sources of Income

The cost of operating the Jewish educational system of Savannah amounted in 1952-53 to $33,039.63; in 1951-52 the cost was $27,367.70, an increase of 19.3 per cent during the year (partially accounted for by the addition of a second grade to the Hebrew Academy). These amounts did not include the cost of maintaining the quarters and running the offices of the three Sunday schools.

Teachers' and principals' salaries amounted to 78 per cent of the cost of maintaining all local schools in 1952-53. School building maintenance accounted for 7.6 per cent of all expenditures. (This percentage was understated, since it did not include the cost of running several of the school buildings.) Instructional supplies accounted for 6 per cent, and transportation for 5.2 per cent of costs.

The schools derived in 1952-53, from tuition, special fees, and nonsynagogue contributions, the sum of $15,461, approximately 47 per cent of all income. In 1951-52 the aggregate income of the schools was $13,839, or 50.5 per cent. The balance of the cost was absorbed each year by the congregations sponsoring the schools.

It cost the Savannah Jewish community, in 1952-53, on the average, $65.68 to maintain a child in the local Jewish educational system; this sum varied according to the type of school the child attended.

Per pupil instructional cost ranged from $2.52 in one of the Sunday schools to $347.30 in the Hebrew Academy. The per pupil instructional cost in the two weekday Hebrew schools also differed widely. The per pupil cost of one school was $33.60 and the other school $113.

These per pupil average costs were not entirely comparable: the average per pupil cost in the one school covered only two sessions per week, while the average per pupil cost in the other school covered four sessions.

Attitudes of Parents Toward Jewish Education

Three out of every four answers given by parents in reply to the question “Do you like the Jewish education your child is receiving?” were affirmative.

Savannah Jewish parents did not regard attendance at a Jewish school as

1. Exclusive of the proportionate share of the rabbi’s and the cantor’s salary allocated to the Hebrew school; also exclusive of any office, clerical, or maintenance costs.
a factor which significantly interfered with their children's post-public school activities, such as music, sports, etc.

Most Savannah Jewish parents would not want to eliminate any of the subjects currently being taught in the Hebrew and Sunday schools. Of 155 parental responses, 96.1 per cent expressed the desire that all the subjects taught in the schools their children attended should be continued.

Of forty-three comments by parents on the need for intensifying the studies, twenty-seven related to the Sunday school, and fifteen to the Hebrew school. Sixteen felt that the study of history should be intensified; fourteen suggested the need for studying customs and ceremonies more intensively; four desired more emphasis upon conversational Hebrew, and three on prayers.

Forty-two comments were made by parents on the need of adding new subjects to the curriculum of the schools. The majority, twenty-nine, or 69.0 per cent, suggested introducing the study of Yiddish.

Over 80 per cent of the parental comments indicated that their children liked the Jewish schools they attended, 16.5 per cent of the comments were unfavorable, 1.1 per cent doubtful, and 1.5 per cent could not express an opinion.

The interviewed parents made 496 comments about the education their children were receiving in the Jewish schools: 333 comments, or 67.1 per cent, were favorable, and 163, or 32.9 per cent were unfavorable. Of the favorable comments, 85, or 25.5 per cent, dealt with the teaching of customs and observances and with teaching the children to practice them; 68, or 20.4 per cent, were concerned with teachers and teaching methods; 68 or 20.4 per cent dealt with developing a sense of identification with the Jewish group and acquiring a Jewish background.

Planned Community System of Jewish Education

It is of interest to consider the important elements of the plan for a community system against the backdrop of the study and planning which led up to its adoption. The core of the plan was the establishment of a bureau of Jewish education, jointly sponsored and financed by the Orthodox and Conservative synagogues and the Savannah Jewish Council. (The Reform congregation elected not to become a formal partner in the sponsorship of the plan, although the services of the bureau were available to the congregation, its members, and its children.)

The basic principles on which the plan was based included this significant statement: "The viewpoints and practices of all synagogues in the community are to be respected, in all elements of the plan. The subject matter and the spirit of instruction should stress the common religious, historical, and cultural heritage of the Jewish people." Related to this objective was the practice of providing for the specific religious indoctrination and orientation of the children of members of the two congregations in the specifics of ritual and philosophy of each denomination, through the junior congregations of each synagogue and whatever other devices each rabbi wished to use to achieve this end. Although it was not stated in the plan, the prevailing practice, sub-
ject to the adoption of the plan, was that no denominational orientation was to be provided on the premises of the Hebrew Community School, the name given to the school sponsored by the bureau. However, the school was traditional in its orientation to subject content.

Departments of Hebrew Community School

The departments of the new Hebrew Community School were:

A. A kindergarten, for four- and five-year-olds, with content of program adjusted to serve as the foundation of a six-year elementary school program, on the assumption that the children enrolled in kindergarten would move into the first year of the six-year program at the age of six. The kindergarten was to operate five days a week on a half-day basis.

B. A weekday elementary school, with two departments: a primary department (Mechina) in session two days a week, for six- and seven-year-olds, and an elementary department based on a six-year curriculum to be in session four days a week. In order to work progressively toward the objective of making eight the maximum age at which a child would be admitted to the elementary weekday school, beginning with the 1954–55 school year the maximum age of admission was set at ten; in 1955–56, the maximum age was to be nine; in 1956–57 and thereafter, eight.

C. A junior and senior high school to operate on a three-year basis, the first two years to be known as the junior high school and the third year as the senior high school. At the outset, provision was made only for the first year of the junior high school, meeting on a two-day-a-week basis. The high school classes were divided into two sections: one, for children who had not completed Hebrew elementary school, the other for children who had done so. All the above departments met during the week; there were no classes on Sunday.

D. A Sunday school. At the outset of the plan, Sunday school instruction in one over-all school was to be offered primarily for children under eight and for the children who had been attending Sunday school only at the time of the adoption of the community plan. However, the number of children enrolled in Sunday school was to be cut down through the operation of an emphasis on the weekday school; there was to be no Sunday school for children enrolled in the weekday school. The objective was to eliminate Sunday school for children above the age of eight, with the exception of the Sunday school of the Reform congregation, which would operate on its current basis. All of the teachers in the Hebrew Community School were to teach in the Sunday school, plus two other teachers, carefully selected from the best trained and experienced teachers in the Sunday schools previously sponsored by the two congregations. (Striking evidence of how the de-emphasis on Sunday school as the medium of Jewish education had affected the enrollment in the Sunday school of the bureau was revealed in these statistics: in 1952–53, the year in which the self-study was made, 226 children were enrolled in the Sunday schools of the two congregations; in 1954–55, the first year of operation of the bureau, only 71 children were enrolled in the Sunday school of the bureau.)
Adult Education

In addition, the bureau was to offer a program of adult education, through formal courses, in cooperation with the Jewish Educational Alliance. The bureau was also to serve as the resource agency in all aspects of Jewish educational content incorporated in the varied program of the Alliance, for all age levels.

(The Hebrew Academy, the all-day school, continued to operate as a separate entity outside the framework of the bureau, liaison between the bureau and the academy being continued on a consultative basis, in the interests of community planning. Both the bureau and the academy were housed in the Jewish Educational Alliance building, thus providing for an integration in content and scheduling of activities for the children served by all three agencies.)

Board of Directors

The board of directors of the bureau was to be composed of twenty-one persons—six each from the two synagogues and the Savannah Jewish Council, and the presidents of the three organizations. The rabbis of the three local congregations and the executive directors of the council and the alliance were to be ex-officio members of the board.

Relationship to Savannah Jewish Council

The plan called for the bureau to function as a department of the Savannah Jewish Council, with the board of directors of the bureau having complete autonomy with reference to program, personnel, and broad educational policy.

Staff

The plan called for the staff to be "well trained and experienced in working with the various age levels." (It had been found that this objective, as regards kindergarten and primary grade teachers, was governed by the practical consideration of the limited availability of highly trained and experienced teachers in the local community. However, the standards for teachers in the elementary and high school departments had been set up so as to provide that all such teachers must be licensed by one of the accredited licensing agencies in Jewish education. This requirement had been adhered to (with one exception, growing out of local factors). The plan stated that for the elementary and high school teachers, it was highly desirable that "personnel have some group work and adult education experience," so as to make it possible to "utilize teachers in the program of the Jewish Educational Alliance, as supervisors of clubs, in the day camp, and in adult classes." (Because of the exigencies involved in the short time gap between the organization of the bureau and the hiring of teachers, it had not been possible to achieve this objective immediately.)
CURRICULUM

The responsibility for drawing up the curriculum—a key problem, which occupied considerable attention by the planning committee—for all phases of the system was to be placed in the hands of a curriculum committee composed of six members of the board of directors of the bureau: two each from the two sponsoring congregations and the Savannah Jewish Council.

BAR MITZVAH AND BAS MITZVAH

Although each congregation was autonomous in its power to prescribe its own religious practices, the congregations had accepted the plan's recommendations in regard to bar mitzvah and bas mitzvah. They agreed that boys and girls would be required to have completed the same minimum number of years of education to become bar mitzvah or bas mitzvah. Utilizing the formula of gradual progress towards the ultimate objective, the policy of the two congregations regarding the above rites was that, beginning with the 1958-59 school year, all candidates for bar mitzvah and bas mitzvah would have to have completed at least five years of education in the weekday Hebrew school.

FINANCING

The plan called for the bureau to be financed from three sources: tuition; contributions from the two sponsoring synagogues; and the Savannah Jewish Council, with the council making up the deficit between the actual cost of operation and the income from the other two sources. Although a budget of $37,500 was projected in the plan, the actual budget for the first year of operation came to $43,000. This sum is to be compared with the gross cost of operating the schools of the two synagogues in 1952-53, which came to $24,254. (However, it must be pointed out that the 1952-53 figure did not include any charge for the salary of the rabbi as supervisor, the cantor as teacher, or any office or maintenance cost in the Conservative synagogue; nor any charge for bus depreciation [charged in the current budget of the bureau] or office expenses for the Sunday school and kindergarten of the Orthodox synagogue. Furthermore, the present plan called for a full-time executive director of the bureau, whose teaching responsibilities were limited to one high school class.)

The plan, it was agreed, was to be in effect and binding on the board of directors of the Bureau of Jewish Education for two years from the inception of the bureau.

The actual experience, in terms of increased enrollment in the weekday elements of the system was quite striking (see Table 3). The first year of operation of the weekday Hebrew Community School sponsored by the bureau, in 1954-55, reveals these increases, compared with the enrollment in the previous year of 1953-54: 41 per cent in the kindergarten; 20 per cent in the primary and elementary departments; and a 27 per cent over-all increase in all phases of the weekday operation.


---

**TABLE 3**

**ENROLLMENT FIGURES, SAVANNAH, GA., 1953-54, 1954-55**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Actual 1953-54</th>
<th>Estimated 1954-55</th>
<th>Actual 1954-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Elementary</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>176</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School 1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Each broken down into two classes.

^b Mechina, two days a week for six- and seven-year olds; all other grades, four days a week.
was also essential, since the committee found that a school with a low per-child hour cost might nevertheless constitute no educational bargain if the classroom standards were low. Conversely, a school whose comparative costs might seem high could possibly claim with justice that the community was receiving ample return on its investment because of the high level of its accomplishment.

The committee therefore recommended in 1952 an extension of its mandate to provide for a qualitative evaluation of the schools as well as the original fiscal review. The approval of this extension of mandate happily coincided with the launching of the national survey of Jewish education by the commission sponsored by the American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE). The Education Study Committee, feeling that experts from outside the city could most objectively study Cleveland's schools, requested the AAJE to undertake the survey, and quickly accepted the resulting invitation from the AAJE to serve as the pilot city for the first year of the national survey.

Certain mutually approved agreements were made. The Education Study Committee undertook to secure the complete cooperation of all Jewish schools in Cleveland, congregational as well as communal, including unrestricted access to all data. Congregational schools were added because the vast majority of Jewish children received their education there; and no valid assessment of either Bureau of Jewish Education operation or educational effectiveness in the community could be made without their cooperation. In addition, the Jewish Community Federation agreed to enlist community support for the survey and to supply local staff help, to serve as liaison to the national surveyors and to aid in making available the considerable manpower (actually womanpower) needed for so ambitious an undertaking.

On the other hand, the commission undertook to provide the general evaluation requested by Cleveland, and in addition, to suggest answers to some of the specific questions that had been raised: Was there any further need for the community to support a Sunday school system? What should be the extent of community support for the all-day school? Was the continuing existence of two afternoon Hebrew schools—one Orthodox and one general—justified? How could the relation of the Bureau of Jewish Education with the congregational schools be strengthened?

Upon the completion of all necessary arrangements, the intensive period of the study began in March 1953, when the surveyors established quarters in Cleveland for a three-month study of the entire school scene.

**Study Process**

It is difficult to overstate the extent of the study that followed. All school records—fiscal, enrollment, minutes—were made completely available to the surveyors. Detailed interviews were held with all rabbis, most of the educational directors, and a significant sampling of community leaders. Class observations were held, although it was subsequently agreed that it had been impossible to devote enough time to this aspect of the study.

Questionnaires on their attitudes toward many aspects of school work were given to all students in the sixth, seventh, eighth, and confirmation
grades of every Sunday school (1446 in all) and in the top two grades of the Hebrew schools (328). Ninety-five Hebrew high school children and 300 parents were interviewed on a stratified random sampling basis in order to provide deeper insight into attitudes than can be secured from a written questionnaire. More than 1,200 questionnaires were given to leaders from every section of the community inquiring in detail into their ideas on what contributed to effective Jewish living and what role the school could play in achieving this goal. More than a thousand tests of Jewish information and practices were given to adults, and an equal number of achievement tests in history and Hebrew were administered to students.

So widespread an examination demanded—and received—the full support of the community. Under the direction of the national surveyors, twenty-two trained social workers from various Jewish agencies were pressed into service to conduct the student interviews, and a corps of seventy women volunteers, carefully selected, were trained over the course of a month to prepare them for interviewing parents. The faculties of the various schools were used with a good deal of resourcefulness to insure that questionnaires were not administered by those already known to the student, thus helping to secure frank reactions.

The results of these extensive investigations were compiled on IBM machines, wherever the data made such treatment possible, and the entire corpus of findings was studied by the national surveyors. They then presented their findings and recommendations in two stages—a report on the communal schools in January 1954, and a study of attitudes toward education in January 1955.

To study the surveyors' findings and to formulate appropriate recommendations, a fifty-man Jewish Education Study Committee was appointed, broadly representative of the entire community—Orthodox, Conservative, Reform; lay and professional; rabbis and education directors. The committee began its work on receipt of the first half of the study in January 1954, and completed its work sixteen months and thirty-three meetings later. Meeting at times as a committee of the whole and at times through two subcommittees, it studied each school in turn, in accordance with this procedure: Each school was given full opportunity to react to the surveyors' findings, and the resulting comments were submitted to the surveyors for their further study and reaction. The appropriate subcommittee thereupon formulated tentative recommendations after exhaustive (and sometimes exhausting) discussion, and once more the school being studied was invited to formulate its positions in the light of committee thinking. The subcommittee then presented its final recommendations to the full committee which again reviewed all material on the given school. Only then was the final report submitted for action to the Social Agency Committee and the Board of Trustees of the Jewish Community Federation. It was felt by many that this process of review, which also involved reports to the community Delegate Assembly and to the Parent-Teachers Associations (PTA's) of many schools, was perhaps as important as specific committee recommendations. Certainly every school was given an unusual opportunity to study its own operation, and many of them made significant improvements during the course of the study.
Findings on the Communal Schools

The remainder of this report will not attempt a complete summary of the Cleveland study, much of which has meaning locally only, but will be limited to findings that have more general meaning. These findings fall into two sections—those relating to the communal schools, and those concerned with attitudes and generalized data concerning Cleveland's Jewish educational system.

Communal Sunday School System

For more than half a century, the Council of Jewish Women and, more recently, the community as a whole, had supported a communal Sunday school system attended by some 800 children. Sharp questions were raised as to the validity of continuing support of a school providing not much more than an hour a week of instruction. Did so minimal a program warrant community support? Should not the parents be urged to undertake full congregational responsibility, thus eliminating the need for a communal school? Was there any expanded role the school system could fulfill?

The committee made a study of parents' reasons for choosing the communal school, and found them a rather formless mixture of motivations. In some cases, the children came from mixed marriages, broken homes, or homes where the hold on Jewish life was tenuous. Certainly, inability to pay congregational membership fees was a factor (it was impossible to determine precisely how great), as was an unwillingness to affiliate formally with congregational life.

After much discussion, the committee felt that total suspension of the school system would undoubtedly deprive a significant number of Jewish children of any kind of Jewish education and, moreover, loyalties to the Sunday school were so strong as to indicate a continuing vigorous function for the agency. On the other hand, it was recognized that the school had to be greatly strengthened to justify continuing existence; certainly Hebrew had to be included in the curriculum for the first time. It was moreover felt that each child in the community should be provided with a living contact with a congregation to avoid any feeling that they were unprivileged or "second class" children.

Accordingly, a compromise was worked out providing for absorption of the children of the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades into the congregational Sunday schools, and the doubling of class time and expanding of the curriculum for the remainder of the school. This plan was put into effect in September 1955, and it is as yet too early to assess its effectiveness.

The All-Day School

Community support for the all-day Orthodox school of more than 300 students was greater in Cleveland than any other city in the United States. Although, after considerable controversy, the validity of subsidy for this type of education had been accepted almost a decade before, questions had con-
continuously been raised as to whether, in view of the rapid growth of the school, limitations should be placed on the degree of community support. In addition, the committee was asked to determine whether only the Jewish function of the school should be supported or the total operation.

After thorough debate the committee concluded that only the normal budgetary limitations applying to every institution should apply to the all-day school, and no arbitrary limit should be imposed beyond which community support should be suspended. It was also recommended that the entire school program should be supported, and not the Jewish studies alone. Difficulties in disentangling costs of the two intertwined functions partly explained the reason for this decision, but more compelling was committee feeling that once committed to support of the all-day school, the community must be interested in high standards for the entire operation, since neither the Jewish nor the general education could exist in isolation.

**Afternoon Hebrew Schools**

The community supported two afternoon Hebrew school systems, one of them specifically dedicated to Orthodoxy. In line with the surveyors' report that "fragmentation lies like a blight over Jewish education," considerable thought was given to consolidating the two systems. Numerous reasons were advanced for the merger—more efficient use of teachers, creating branches large enough to facilitate sounder educational procedures, overall community planning, standardizing practices and community subsidy, various fiscal benefits, etc.

Intense opposition was encountered from the Orthodox community, which insisted that any merger would threaten its ideological integrity. In an attempt to accommodate this objection, a complicated formula was worked out, guaranteeing that at least one branch with a specifically Orthodox orientation would be retained, granting the Orthodox community complete authority over the curriculum for any Orthodox-oriented branches, and providing for equal representation on the board of trustees of the new school. Although this compromise had been officially accepted by the federation, Orthodox resistance persisted and the question remained open as to whether the plan would be implemented.

**Bureau of Jewish Education**

Sixteen recommendations, many of them in considerable detail, were made as to the function of the proposed Bureau of Jewish Education. Together they formed a committee blueprint for an ideal bureau operation. The plan called for a board of trustees representative of all community viewpoints relying heavily on two supporting arms—an educational directors' council to act as an educational committee and a coordinating committee, including the chairman of affiliated school committees, to consider administrative questions.

The bureau was asked to set minimum school standards for all aspects of school functioning, to be responsible for programs of experimentation (including development of curriculum centers), to establish a program of standardized testing, to conduct regular class observations, to provide central teach-
ing aids of all kinds, to aid schools in defining sharply their programs and curricula, to inaugurate a standard system of record keeping, and to work out close relationships with group work agencies.

Teacher recruitment and training were considered so crucial that a separate memorandum was written incorporating more than a dozen suggestions in this vital field. These included a system of cadet training, starting with the confirmation class level, cooperating with the Jewish Vocational Service and Hillel Foundation, interesting former public school teachers, and establishing a system of community scholarships.

But more basic to improved functioning of a bureau than any particular recommendation, it was agreed, was the establishing of a feeling of confidence and shared objectives with the various schools, particularly the congregations, that sometimes lived in isolation from the total community. The committee report stated:

The Bureau should not be thought of as an outside supervisory body apart from the various schools, but can work together cooperatively for the purpose of furthering Jewish education. The Bureau should impose or favor no single philosophy of Jewish life, but should serve equally all types of positive education. Its function is to work for the goals mutually desired by the schools and the community, to serve as a channel for disseminating information, encouraging more effective teaching methods, improving teaching standards, and stimulating, guiding, and encouraging cooperative efforts for the betterment of Jewish education.

**Tuition Procedures**

Much thought was given during the committee process to respective responsibilities of parents and community in underwriting school costs. All agreed that the community should provide an education for children whose parents were financially distressed; but beyond such cases, should parents be asked to bear full per capita costs? This should be the objective, urged some, in line with the growing tendency in all communal services to ask the recipient to pay for what he received. Others stressed in opposition that the community had a unique stake in Jewish education through which it passed on Jewish values to the next generation. Some argued for a completely free Jewish education for all children, comparable to the American public school practice, with the expenses borne totally by the community.

The final resolution again represented a compromise, and was stated in generalized terms since no specific formula for distributing costs could be agreed on:

Parents ought to bear a reasonable share of the cost of Jewish education. Assessing the full per capita cost would make it difficult and in some cases prohibitive for parents to provide a Jewish education for their children. Since the community has a vital stake in keeping as large a number of children within the school as possible, it is suggested that the parents and the community be considered partners in sharing the cost of Jewish education. The schools should realize in fees from parents as much of their costs as possible without depriving any child of the right to a Jewish education.
Community Data and Attitudes

Space permits mention of only the high lights of the vast information revealed in the surveyors' report concerning the total educational undertaking in Cleveland.

In 1953 over 9,000 children (the 1955 estimate was 10,500) were enrolled in all the various schools, congregational and communal. Making allowance for dropouts, notably after confirmation, it seems clear that the overwhelming majority of Jewish children in Cleveland—perhaps in excess of 90 per cent—received some kind of Jewish education. However, the greater majority of these, probably as much as 70 per cent, received only a Sunday school education.

There was a strong tendency, despite some modification in the past decade, for boys to receive the more intensive Jewish education. Three quarters of the students of the three most intensive Jewish schools were boys, whereas girls were slightly in the majority at all levels of the Sunday school system.

Inverse correlations could also be worked out between the degree of intensity of the education and the economic achievements and length of residence in America of the parents. This same tendency for the intensity of Jewish education to lessen with increasing assimilation into American life was reflected in the fact that 87 per cent of the Sunday school teachers, but only 47 per cent of the Hebrew school teachers, were born in the United States. Seriously adding to the teacher shortage problem, commented on above, was this indication that Jewish intensive education seemed still to rest on the momentum of European Jewish life. A further difficulty was revealed in data showing that half the Sunday school teachers had taught for fewer than five years, indicating a rapid rate of turnover and perhaps a lowered degree of professionalization.

A study of the members of the various school boards indicated a high level of attainment in general education (almost all were college graduates, and a high percentage were professional people of high economic standing), but a low level of Jewish educational achievement (two-thirds had only Sunday school education).

Physical facilities rated extremely well; almost all of the children received Jewish education in modern physical plants that challenged favorable comparison with the public schools.

The extensive survey of children's attitudes revealed that 65 per cent of Sunday school students and 77 per cent of Hebrew school students “liked” their Jewish schools. This somewhat surprising showing, however, must be measured against a control question revealing that 95 per cent “liked” their public schools. Sixty per cent of both groups stated that they would continue to attend their Jewish school if they had their own free choice, and only 40 per cent of the Hebrew school students, and 33 per cent of the Sunday school students expressed an intention to continue their schooling on the high school level. Almost all students (94 per cent), however, accepted the need for a Jewish education, although 87 per cent of the Hebrew school students, and 65 per cent of the Sunday school students, claimed it “interfered” with
other things they would like to do. These figures lent themselves to many and varying interpretations.

A significant difference appeared in the attitude of the two groups toward study of Hebrew. One day a week students placed Hebrew at the bottom, and intensive school children at the top of the subjects they liked, thus raising again the question of the role of Hebrew in Sunday schools.

A survey of parental attitudes indicated that the overwhelming majority (87 per cent) express themselves as being generally satisfied with the schools their children attend. However, it was not clear that this satisfaction rested on a real knowledge of their children’s schooling, since a significant number had difficulty naming any subject their child studied. In addition, most detailed comments tended to come from those most critical—particularly from those complaining of inadequate teacher training, repetitious material, and poor teaching methods. Seventy per cent wanted their children to experience a different type of Jewish education from what they had received, of whom 55 per cent wished a more intensive education. None at all desired a less intensive education for their children.

An extremely interesting questionnaire on attitudes of Jewish community leaders revealed a vast gap between what was considered important for adult effective Jewish living and what were considered important school objectives. The schools were overwhelmingly expected to supply learning (Bible study, history study, language study, prayer study), even though relatively low priorities were given to these same pursuits in establishing an effective Jewish living pattern. Conversely, high priority was given by adults to being free of feelings of inferiority or superiority, wholesome attitudes toward Jewishness (and relationships of all kinds), but far less importance was attached to the schools stressing this type of objective.

While giving full weight to the school as a specialized community agency, charged with special responsibilities for Jewish literacy, the question nevertheless forcefully raised itself as to whether an unhealthy gap did not exist between what was valued in Jewish living and what was expected from Jewish schools. General education had certainly closed this gap considerably in recent years—at least in theory—with the growing acceptance of the thesis that schools were both a preparation for life and a living experience in itself. Perhaps Jewish education, and the Jewish community, still had this adjustment to make.

In retrospect, one overwhelming generalization seemed justified from the bewildering amassing of facts. The day of revolt from Jewish education—and Jewish life—was clearly over. Jewish parents seemed ready and in large part eager for increasing commitment to Jewish schooling, if that schooling was keyed to modern pedagogical understanding. The problem was to translate this readiness into specific educational patterns.

Sidney Z. Vincent
THE PURPOSE of this article is to review the major developments in the field of Jewish communal service during the period under review (July 1, 1954, through June 30, 1955), or for the most recent period for which data were available. Information has been drawn largely from studies conducted by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) as part of its program of service to member federations and welfare funds. These organizations had a variety of functions, structures, scopes of activity, and names. The element which they had in common was that they organized the Jewish population of a given area for combined fund raising, evaluated the needs for causes at home and abroad, and planned local services—particularly in the areas of local health, welfare, recreation, Jewish education, aged care, and group relations. The federations and welfare funds associated in the CJFWF conducted their activities in communities inhabited by 95 per cent of the total Jewish population. They reached an estimated total of over 1,000,000 contributors. They provided financial support to about 150 overseas and national agencies and to over 800 local agencies. In the larger and intermediate-sized communities, networks of local agencies provided service on the operating level, while in the smaller communities the Jewish federation frequently provided more limited services directly.

An agency budget is a financial expression of programs designed to meet human needs. Consequently, program and finances form an integrated whole as a vital area of concern to federations. This integration is reflected in the discussion of developments in Jewish communal service in the summary which follows. However, no attempt has been made to treat exhaustively the manifold activities of local service agencies. (For summaries of trends in some of these fields, see p. 252.) Rather, those elements of program change have been selected which cast light on financial change.

Central Jewish Community Fund Raising

Results of campaigns conducted by Jewish federations and welfare funds in the spring of 1955 indicated that the downward trend in evidence since the peak year of 1948 had been halted. Estimates for ninety-eight spring campaigns in 1955 which had raised 92 per cent of the total raised in 1954 outside of New York City indicated an increase in pledges of almost one per cent. Later returns might indicate greater variation. It was estimated that 1955 results would approximate $108 million, assuming that fall 1955 campaigns and the New York City campaign followed the spring trend.

Campaigns conducted in the fall of 1954 raised 3 per cent less than they had raised in the fall of 1953. This was a less negative experience than the results of spring 1954 campaigns, which had fallen almost 9 per cent below the spring 1953 level. For the entire year 1954 there was a decline of 8 per cent.

The decline in results in 1954 was greater than the decline in 1953, which
had been 3 per cent. As a consequence, a more systematic self-analysis was initiated in 1955 by communities where campaign weaknesses were evident; the results were reflected in improved totals for 1955 in fifty-seven out of ninety-eight cities reporting.

Over $1.3 billion was raised by central Jewish community organizations in the decade which ended in 1954. A new level of fund raising was attained which reached a peak of over $200 million in 1948. Campaign levels in the years immediately following World War II were related to the unprecedented needs of Jewish displaced persons. Results in the peak year 1948 also reflected response to the needs of the newly proclaimed State of Israel, and the opportunity the new state created for large-scale immigration. The number of immigrants to Israel fell off after 1951 and did not again rise significantly until the North African immigration of 1954.

Successive annual declines in campaign results brought the 1954 campaign total to $107.5 million. Because of the rise in the price level of about 50 per cent since 1945, the purchasing power of pledges in 1954 was approximately equal to that of 1945, the last year prior to the postwar emergency period.

Giving and Givers

Reports filed with CJFWF by seventy-two welfare funds outside of New York City indicated that, on the average, 26 per cent of the Jewish population contributed to welfare fund campaigns in 1954.

However, 89 per cent of the amounts raised was provided by 17 per cent of the contributors. The average per capita gift for the total Jewish population covered by these seventy-two campaigns in 1954 was $29.70. (By contrast, the average per capita gift to community chests and united funds in 1954 for 1955 needs was $4.37, although the degree of coverage, 25 per cent, was about the same.)

Independent Campaigns

Each federation and welfare fund was autonomous and determined for itself the scope of services which it would finance through allocations from central funds. There were ten non-local agencies which were included almost universally by welfare funds. Twenty other agencies were included by half or more of all welfare funds, with other agencies receiving less extensive inclusion.

Agencies conducted independent fund-raising campaigns in specific cities where they were not included in welfare funds. The general rule was that a beneficiary agency had to waive independent fund raising in localities where it received an allocation from the welfare fund, unless specific arrangements to the contrary with the welfare fund were made.

Extensive independent fund raising continued in many communities. In 1954, some sixty-five agencies raised $35.1 million independently, compared with $33.2 million raised in 1953.

1 United Jewish Appeal, Joint Defense Appeal, Jewish Welfare Board, Hebrew University in Jerusalem, American Fund for Israel Institutions, B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, United HIAS Service, American Jewish Congress, and American Association for Jewish Education.
Eighteen of the agencies raised seven-eighths of the total; each of the remaining agencies raised less than $500,000 independently.

Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies (generally arranged by agreement with federations) raised smaller sums for operating purposes—178 local hospitals, family agencies, child care agencies, and homes for the aged raised a total of $3.9 million independently. Contribution income of local centers was probably an additional $150,000.

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

**DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS**

Federations and welfare funds continued to allocate the major portion of their funds to the United Jewish Appeal (UJA). After deductions for administrative and campaign expenses and allowances for possible losses in collections, the UJA received 58 per cent of the totals budgeted in 1954, compared with 60 per cent in 1953 (see Table 3). The total budgeted by these communities declined in 1954, and the UJA share was reduced from $58.2 million to $52.5 million, or almost 10 per cent. There was a greater decline in funds provided for local refugee care, which fell by 20 per cent in 1954. This drop reflected the reduction in opportunities to migrate to the United States, and the lesser needs of immigrants already here.

Other overseas agencies received 7 per cent less from welfare funds in 1954 than in 1953. These agencies raised the greater part of their income through independent campaigns. Most of the agencies seeking funds for Israel were authorized to campaign by the Jewish Agency Committee on Control and Authorization. Fourteen of the overseas agencies raised about $20 million in contributions in 1954, or almost 30 per cent of the total funds contributed to overseas agencies including UJA in 1954.

National domestic agencies secured an estimated $4.5 million from welfare funds in 1954. This was about 4 per cent less than they had received in 1953. Although the major agencies in the community relations and national service fields received most of their funds from federations, there was extensive and growing independent fund raising by national Jewish hospitals, cultural agencies (mainly Brandeis University), and by national religious agencies. Including allocations by welfare funds, national agencies secured $24 million in contributions in 1954, compared with $22.4 million in 1953 (see Table 8).

Local services received, for operating purposes, about $28 million in 1954 from funds raised by federations, or about 2 per cent more than in 1953. In addition, community chests were providing at least $12 million for local Jewish services for family and child care, health and recreational aid, and service to the aged. Reports from thirty-six communities indicated that chest grants to local Jewish services rose by 8 per cent in thirty-three cities between 1952 and 1954.

Allocations for local capital purposes were reduced to $1.6 million in 1954. Most local capital fund campaigns were conducted separately, rather than
as part of the central annual drive conducted by federations and welfare funds, and were, therefore, not reflected in Table 8.

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

Table 4 indicates the pattern of distribution of funds by federations in 1954, and that of independent fund raising, by fields of service. It indicates that the UJA and national service agencies secured a greater share of their funds from federations, while overseas campaigns other than UJA, and those for health, cultural, and religious agencies, relied more heavily on independent campaigns.

Local programs were most highly developed in the larger centers of Jewish population. As a result, the share of funds for local services was higher in the larger cities than in the smaller ones. Cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over allocated 59 per cent of their budgeted funds to UJA and other overseas and refugee needs and 36 per cent to local operating and capital needs in 1954; smaller communities (under 5,000 Jewish population) allocated 75 per cent to overseas needs and 17 per cent to local needs. However, in the smaller communities the trend toward growing local programs continued.

Aid to Israel

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States was channeled through the UJA and other overseas agencies and through the Israel Bond Drive. United States governmental assistance and reparations from Germany were the other external sources of aid. These “fundamental four” sources of foreign currency supplemented Israel’s own earnings abroad. American sources provided 40 per cent of Israel total foreign currency income of $398 million for the fiscal year ending March 30, 1955.

Philanthropic Programs

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

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF had available for Israel purposes some $54 million in 1954 (exclusive of $63 million in special bank loans), compared with $67 million in 1953. This decline reflected primarily the drop in UJA income in 1954, which, in part, resulted from delays in transmission of funds from welfare funds. These delays in turn were related to efforts by welfare funds to obtain special bank loans for needs in Israel. This was a temporary dislocation offset by the large
loans negotiated by the philanthropic agencies, and was not expected to recur in 1955.

A major development in the Israel programs supported by philanthropic funds was the resumption of large-scale immigration in 1954. The Israel authorities decided to make arrangements for the admission of 30,000 immigrants from North Africa during the year ending September 30, 1955, and there was every indication that this goal would be reached. Pressure for emigration, especially in Morocco, had risen as a result of political developments, and it was reported that some 80,000 Jews had registered their desire to emigrate. The Jewish Agency for Palestine, which was the major philanthropic organization operating in Israel and the major beneficiary of the UJA, had instituted a new system of reception for immigrants upon their arrival. Those suitable for agricultural work were sent directly “from ship to farm” and the intermediary stage of the maabarot (transient camps) was eliminated for the new immigrants. About two-thirds of the newcomers were involved in this program, and the Jewish Agency continued to spend the largest part of its budget on the development and expansion of agricultural settlement.

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

A special five-year loan project for the UJA was undertaken by welfare funds just prior to their annual campaigns in 1954. Under the plan, the sum borrowed for a five-year period ($63 million, of which $50 million remained to be repaid at the end of 1954) was transmitted through the UJA and the UIA to the Jewish Agency, which exchanged the dollars for pounds and drew upon the pound balances to carry out its welfare activities in Israel (immigration, absorption, and land settlement). The dollars received by the Israel government were available to it as a foreign currency pool to meet its then-current dollar shortage, thus changing short-term debts to medium- or long-term debts.

By September 30, 1954, the Jewish Agency had drawn the equivalent of $19 million for use in its program. By June 30, 1955, preliminary reports indicated that a total of $35 million had been drawn and utilized. The withdrawal rate was higher than the repayment rate in the United States, and concern was expressed by the Jewish Agency treasurer that the borrowed funds might be exhausted prior to the five-year period of the loan.

The effect of the loan had been to reduce by $39,000,000 the short-term debt of the Israel government between December 31, 1953, and December 31, 1954. This was generally credited as an important factor in the economic improvement that had taken place in Israel since 1953.

**Bond Sales**

The three-year flotation period of the Israel Independence Bond Issue of the Israel government ended in May 1954 with reported sales of $145.5 million, of which $3.6 million in bonds was converted within the ensuing year into the Israel Development Issue, which was floated in May 1954. During the
three calendar years 1952, 1953, and 1954, a total of $8.3 million in bonds was transmitted to the UJA in payment of pledges. By the end of 1954, outstanding bonds of the first issue totaled $130.5 million.

The Israel Bond Issue's sales objective was $350 million, of which $75 million was to be sold in each of the first two years. Sales totaled $41.4 million by April 1, 1955, including $3.6 million worth of bonds converted from the first issue. In the first four years of the bond issue, bond revenue was utilized in Israel's development budget, as follows: agriculture, 45 per cent; industry, 30 per cent; housing, 15 per cent; and transportation 10 per cent.

The State of Israel designated the Development Corporation of America to replace the American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel as sole underwriter of Israel bonds effective May 16, 1955. Following the resignation of Henry Montor, Joseph J. Schwartz was appointed vice president and chief executive officer of the new sales organization, and a new governing board was established. (Schwartz had previously directed the UJA, where he was succeeded by Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman of Milwaukee.)

The change in administration of the bond sales organization followed a dispute, early in 1955, between leaders of the bond organization in Detroit and the national bond organization leadership over the question of timing of bond campaigns. The Detroit leadership felt that a conflict in timing between the bond drive and the annual welfare fund campaign would impair both efforts. The then national bond leadership felt that it could not achieve maximum bond sales if it had to accommodate itself to the campaign calendar of welfare funds in all instances. The change in administration followed an exploration of the problem by the Finance Minister of Israel, Levi Eshkol. The change in leadership held out promise that the efforts of the bond drive and the welfare fund campaigns for UJA would be coordinated closely.

Reparations Funds

Payments from Germany under the reparations agreement constituted the largest single source of foreign currency for Israel during 1954-55. Subsequent orders in Germany brought the total funds committed by Israel as of July 1955 to DM 1,370 million ($340 million), or about 40 per cent of Germany's total obligation. This included funds from allocations for the next several years. Goods worth DM 1,000 million ($250 million) had reached Israel by July 1955.

In February 1955 the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (CJMCAG) made the second yearly allocation of funds put at its disposal by Israel from reparations payments. Of $10,000,000 allocated for relief of Nazi victims outside of Israel, $6.88 million was granted to the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) for relief and rehabilitation, including allocations to communal and social welfare agencies in twelve countries of Europe. There was also a number of grants for cultural and educational reconstruction in Europe and the United States, totaling about $12 million. About $12 million went to relief programs in Israel, with the Jewish Agency as the major beneficiary.

The CJMCAG received requests for $45,000,000 from some 300 organiza-
tions in twenty-nine countries, about five times greater than the amount available outside of Israel. Welfare funds in the United States did not apply for funds for local refugee programs.

**Overseas Agencies**

The United Jewish Appeal (UJA) was the major channel for American Jewish philanthropy to Israel and to other overseas areas where assistance was required. The UJA raised funds, mainly through allocations by Jewish welfare funds, for the United Israel Appeal (UIA), the JDC, and the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA). Prior to the merger which resulted in the creation of the United HIAS Service in August 1954, the UJA also provided funds for the United Service for New Americans (USNA).

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

UJA was the largest beneficiary of funds raised by welfare funds. In small nonfederated communities, the UJA dealt with local leaders, who took responsibility for conducting local campaigns for the UJA.

UJA estimated its total pledges for 1954 at $60 million, compared with $65 million in 1953. Cash received in 1954, regardless of campaign year, totaled $48.6 million. In addition, the special loan project of the UJA raised $62.8 million. After repayment of principal and interest of $14.2 million, which fell due in the first year of the loan period, the UJA had succeeded in providing $78.5 million in 1954 from allocations and from loans for transmission to Israel, $18.6 million for the JDC Malben program in Israel, North Africa, and other overseas areas, and $1.5 million for NYANA-USNA.

**United Israel Appeal**

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

Before 1952, the Keren Kayemeth (Jewish National Fund-JNF) had been part of the UIA structure and had shared funds equally with the Keren Hayesod. Since 1952, the JNF had been receiving annual allocations in Israel directly from the Jewish Agency ($3,253,000 in 1953–54). Under the UJA agreement, the JNF was permitted to raise $1,800,000 annually from "traditional collections," after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Excess collections beyond this limit were considered to be equivalent to UJA
income, with UIA responsibility fixed for turning over the excess funds to UJA.

Receipts of the UIA in 1954 were $30 million, compared with $40.8 million in 1953. Two factors accounted for the decrease: 1. a decline of about 10 per cent in welfare fund allocations to the UJA in 1954, which affected the UIA share; and 2. delays in securing short-term bank loans by communities on current pledges, related to the efforts to secure five-year loans for the special loan project of the UJA. The unpaid balance of $49.8 million of the special loan as of December 31, 1954, was to be deducted by UIA from income allocable to the Jewish Agency over the next four years.

On behalf of the Jewish Agency, the UIA allocated $2,100,000 in 1954 to the Mizrahi Palestine Fund, Agudath and Poale Agudath Israel, the World Confederation of General Zionists, and the United Zionist Revisionists. The funds were earmarked for "constructive enterprises," and each of the groups waived its rights to independent fund raising in the United States for these Israel projects. This arrangement eliminated a substantial number of campaigns which had previously been conducted.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE

The Jewish Agency spent £94.2 million in the fiscal year ending September 30, 1954 compared with £69.8 million in the previous year. In the six-month period October 1954 through March 1955 expenditures were £54.6 million. In 1953-54 the largest single amount was spent on agricultural settlement (66 per cent). Expenses for immigration, absorption, and Youth Aliyah made up 18 per cent of the total. The Hadassah Women's Zionist Organization of America and other organizations continued to supply about 40 per cent of the cost of Youth Aliyah, with the Jewish Agency supplying the balance.

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

Receipts of the Jewish Agency in 1953-54 were £90.7 million, compared with £58.5 million in 1952-53. However, the institutional rate of exchange was twice altered in the two-year period, and the total of £58.5 million was roughly equivalent to £86.8 million on the basis of the later rate of exchange.

Contributions (85 per cent from the United States, 15 per cent from overseas drive) fell from 77 per cent of receipts in 1952-53 to 58 per cent in 1953-54, while income from reparations rose from 12 per cent in 1952-53 to 33 per cent in 1953-54.

JDC

JDC spent $20.6 million in 1954, compared with $22.1 million in 1953. Appropriations were voted by JDC of $25.7 million for 1954 and $22.3 million for 1953. Unexpended appropriations were adjusted in subsequent periods when final accountings for actual expenditures were made. Because of its world-
wide operation, there was a time-lag in receipt of records of actual expenditures for some overseas areas.

The JDC Malben program of service to sick, aged, and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to absorb the largest single share of appropriations—over 45 percent in 1954. Together with its program of aid to about eighty-four yeshivot in Israel, JDC had obligated itself to spend about $12.5 million in Israel in 1954, a slight rise over the 1953 total. Malben assisted 25,750 persons in 1954, including 5,081 institutionalized patients. Facilities for additional beds for the aged were planned in 1955 and 1956.

Relief, health, and educational programs in Moslem countries, mainly North Africa, expanded in 1954 and 1955 as a result of unsettled conditions affecting the status of the local Jewish populations. JDC appropriated $3.1 million in 1954, compared with $2.2 million in 1953, for work in Moslem areas.

JDC appropriations for Europe in 1954 rose for the first time since 1950. They were $4.4 million in 1954, compared with $2.5 million in 1953, exclusive of relief in transit and reconstruction of community institutions. The rise was related to the availability to the JDC for the first time in 1954 of $6.7 million in funds from the CJMCAG for aid to victims of Nazism.

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

Cash receipts of JDC in 1954 were $20.6 million, compared with $21.3 million in 1953. The drop in UJA receipts in 1954 was largely offset by the receipt of $6.7 million from reparations funds in 1954.

ORT

Since 1947, the JDC had had an agreement with the American Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training—ORT Federation and the World ORT Union, under which ORT's vocational training activities overseas were subventioned by the JDC. This agreement was renewed in January 1955. It guaranteed a minimum of $1,890,000 from JDC for ORT's activities in Western Europe, Israel, North Africa, and Iran in 1955, compared with $1,250,000 in 1954 and $1,100,000 in 1953. (The total ORT budget for 1955 provided for expenditures of $3,600,000. Actual expenditures in 1954 were $3,202,000.) As under previous agreements, the American branches of ORT were permitted to continue to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25, which would be used to supplement other ORT resources.

In 1954, a total of 16,376 trainees attended ORT courses and other programs financed by JDC, including 7,620 in Western Europe, 4,397 in Moslem countries, and the rest in Israel. ORT in Israel received an allocation of £185,000 from the CJMCAG in 1954.

OSE

The Oeuvre pour Secours des Enfants Israelites (OSE), established in 1912 in Eastern Europe, was an organization devoted to protecting the health of
Jews. Its operations, which stressed preventive, curative, and convalescent services for children, were now concentrated in France, North Africa, and Israel. In France and North Africa the work of the local OSE branches was subsidized by JDC, with funds made available from JDC appropriations to the particular country. In October 1954 JDC and the World-OSE Union agreed to set up a joint survey group to examine the current structure and function of OSE-Union and to submit appropriate recommendations. A report was submitted in January 1955 which recommended a reorganization of the OSE-Union's structure.

NYANA

NYANA continued to be a direct beneficiary of UJA as heretofore, and was not affected by the merger which resulted in United HIAS Service. UJA allocations to NYANA decreased from $1,228,000 in 1953 to $1,004,000 in 1954. While Jewish immigration to the United States increased from 4,900 in 1953 to 5,500 in 1954, the number of displaced persons in the total and the active caseload of NYANA decreased in 1954. Arrivals under the Refugee Relief Act were small in number during the first half of 1955, with prospects for an upturn dependent on the effectiveness of changes in the administration of the act.

OTHER OVERSEAS AGENCIES

Overseas agencies other than the UJA reported total income of $18.3 million in 1954, compared with $18.0 million in 1953. Although there was little change in financial support for six of the agencies in this group, there were significant increases for the three institutions of higher education in Israel and significant reductions in the income of Hadassah, United HIAS Service (UHS), the Federated Council of Israel Institutions (FCII), and the National Committee for Labor Israel (NCLI).

UHS voluntarily submitted its first budget for cooperative review with the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC), an informal grouping of welfare funds in eighteen large cities. The LCBC recommended that welfare funds consider, for allocation purposes, a UHS budget of $2,400,000 for 1955.

UHS completed its first year of operation in August 1955 with expenditures of about $2,340,000. It was attempting to secure increased allocations from welfare funds in order to meet its expenses without resort to JDC underwriting of its deficit of up to $1,000,000 annually in 1955 and 1956. The extent of UHS's initial results would be evident in 1956, after welfare funds had completed allocating the proceeds of their 1955 campaigns. In the first half of 1955, UHS had drawn $500,000 from the JDC.

UHS assisted 3,933 Jewish immigrants to migrate from Europe in 1954. It expected to assist a total of 6,000 migrants in 1955. Arrivals in the first half of 1955 totaled 1,208, with a monthly arrival rate in August 1955 of almost 300. Assisted arrivals in the United States were 57 per cent of the total.

Maintenance appeals of the American Friends of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the American Technion Society were merged for 1955 as
the result of an agreement reached in Jerusalem in November 1954 with the participation of officials of the institutions, the UJA, the Jewish Agency, the government of Israel, and the CJFWF Committee on National-Local Relations. Agreement was also reached on a formula for division of 1954 maintenance funds provided by welfare funds. A merger of capital fund drives had not been effected by the time of writing (October 1955).

The American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science entered into an agreement with the government of Israel and the Jewish Agency for Palestine whereby it ceased all appeals to welfare funds for a share of the proceeds of 1955 campaigns. Weizmann Institute funds were to be derived from Jewish Agency and government grants, from an annual fund-raising dinner, and from an investment program.

Hadassah continued to raise the largest sum among non-UJA overseas agencies ($8,557,582 in 1954), mainly through membership activities. Its major projects were for medical services and Youth Aliyah. The National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, raised funds for activities of the Histadrut in Israel in the areas of education, vocational training, health, and immigrant welfare.

The American Fund for Israel Institutions (AFII) raised funds on behalf of sixty-two cultural, social, and educational agencies in Israel. The Federated Council of Israel Institutions (FCII) sought funds for seventy-eight Orthodox institutions—yeshivot, as well as orphanages, homes for the aged, hospitals, and the like. Many FCII beneficiaries also sought funds separately in the United States.

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

Community Relations

Programs designed to improve group relations were primary functions of five major national agencies. More limited activities in this area were also conducted by other agencies whose major activities were centered in other areas. The major agencies in the national community relations field also conducted activities in other fields (cultural and educational, overseas affairs, and service to membership). On the local scene, many areas were served by local community relations councils or committees. Regional offices were also maintained by the national agencies.

3 Authorized agencies for 1955 were: American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund-raising dinner only); American Friends of the Hebrew University; American Fund for Israel Institutions; American Red Mogen David for Israel, Inc. (membership campaign only; no application to welfare funds); American Technion Society; Federated Council of Israel Institutions; Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish National Fund (traditional collections only; no application to welfare funds); Mizrachi Women's Organization of America (no application to welfare funds); National Committee for Labor Israel (Histadrut Campaign); Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women's League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).
The American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith raised most of their funds through the Joint Defense Appeal (JDA) and shared equally in the proceeds. The JDA agreement also provided for a grant by ADL to B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal. Separate fund raising by ADL from B'nai B'rith lodges and by the American Jewish Committee from “special contributions” were limited to $250,000 annually for each agency.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), serving as a coordinating and clearance agency for projects and policies, consisted of six national agencies, twenty-eight local community relations councils, one regional, and four state-wide organizations, including three agencies which joined in 1954. During 1954, the NCRAC developed a second Joint Program Plan for recommendation to all of its national and local member agencies. The JDA agencies had withdrawn from the NCRAC in 1952 (see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1953 [Vol. 54], p. 162-77).

National community relations agencies had receipts of $5,685,000 in 1954, compared with $5,700,000 in 1953. Increased income was attained in 1954 by the JDA, the Jewish War Veterans (JWV), and the NCRAC. There was a large reduction in income for the Jewish Labor Committee (JLC), and a more moderate decline for the American Jewish Congress.

The NCRAC, American Jewish Congress, JLC, and JWV again participated in 1954 and 1955 in the cooperative budget review process of the LCBC. Recommendations for approved budget levels for these agencies were among the elements considered by each community in arriving at local decisions regarding distributions of funds.

National Health Agencies

Six national health agencies raised $6,688,000 in 1954, compared with $6,032,000 in 1953, with over 70 per cent raised by the two largest hospitals: the City of Hope and the National Jewish Hospital. Four of the agencies had originally been devoted exclusively to tubercular care. With improved methods of treating tuberculosis, there had been a shift in emphasis to include heart, cancer research, and treatment of asthma in adults. The percentage of service to Jewish patients continued to decline in 1954. It ranged from 13 per cent for the National Jewish Hospital to 58 per cent for the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital.

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

National Service Agencies

There were five national agencies that furnished service to local agencies in the specific fields of Jewish centers, programs for the Armed Forces, Jewish education, religion, and vocational guidance. These agencies served as coordinating and consultative bodies and attempted to set standards for programs for their respective fields.
The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) was by far the largest of these agencies. The JWB received $1,236,000 in 1954 out of a total of $1,425,000 for the five agencies. The national association of Jewish centers, the JWB, also conducted a program of services to Jews in the Armed Forces, participated in nonsectarian United Service Organization (USO) programs, and sponsored a number of broad Jewish cultural projects. The JWB again participated in a cooperative budget review process with the LCBC in 1954 and 1955 which resulted in recommendations regarding its budgetary needs.

The LCBC also expressed support in 1954 for a national study of Jewish education conducted by the American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE). Studies of two pilot communities (Cleveland and Savannah) had been completed (see p. 209-26), and surveys were under way in additional communities. AAJE serviced local communities with studies in educational trends, stimulation of student enrollment, recruitment and placement of teachers, and pedagogic materials.

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

Cultural Agencies

Jewish cultural agencies are defined in this context as those which were primarily concerned with efforts in the field of Jewish scholarship, including research, training, and publication.

Each of the Jewish cultural agencies conducted separate, limited activities. While eighteen agencies in this field received $8,038,000 in 1954, compared with $6,998,000 in 1953, the three largest (Brandeis University, B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, and the Zionist Organization of America) accounted for 80 per cent of the funds. Half of the remaining agencies had income ranging from $10,000 to $50,000.

Four higher educational institutions were included in this group: Brandeis University (liberal arts), the National Agricultural College, Dropsie College (graduate studies in Semitic culture), and the Jewish Teachers Seminary and People's University. Jewish research and scholarship were engaged in by the Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO), the Conference on Jewish Social Studies, the American Academy for Jewish Research, the American Jewish Archives, and the American Jewish Historical Society; the Jewish Publication Society of America, Histadruth Ivrith of America, Bitzaron, and Menorah published literature of Jewish interest. The B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, Brandeis Youth Foundation, and Jewish Chautauqua Society emphasized youth activities.

The CJFWF planned to undertake a systematic study of national Jewish cultural programs as a step toward strengthening Jewish scholarly activities.
Religious Agencies

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion prepared religious functionaries for Reform Judaism, the Jewish Theological Seminary for Conservative Judaism, and Yeshiva University and several smaller institutions for Orthodox Judaism. While most Orthodox yeshivot were located in New York City, there were important institutions in other cities: the Hebrew Theological College in Chicago, Ill., the Rabbinical College of Telshe in Cleveland, Ohio, the Ner Israel Rabbinical College in Baltimore, Md., and the Chachmey Lublin Theological Seminary in Detroit, Mich.

These institutions sought support from the total Jewish community on the ground that they were training rabbis, Hebrew teachers, and religious functionaries who would serve in cities throughout the United States and who, in many cases, came from different cities to pursue their studies.

Some of the programs conducted by the major seminaries involved interfaith activities designed to promote better understanding between Jewish and Christian spiritual leaders.

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

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

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

Eighteen national religious agencies raised $8,997,000 in 1954, compared with $8,192,000 in 1953. All but one of the agencies increased their income in 1954, with the largest increases attained by the three major drives: Yeshivah University and Einstein Medical School, the combined campaign of HUC-JIR-UAHC, and JTS.

Financing Local Services

Jewish federations supplied about $31,442,000 in 1954 ($31,551,000 in 1953) to local services in the fields of health, family and child care, refugee aid, Jewish centers, Jewish education, care of the aged, and community relations. Federations constituted the major source of contributed income for these agencies.

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

Table 5 indicates how central communal funds (federations and chest income via federations) were distributed in seventy-two communities among various fields of local service in 1954 and 1952. The following observations are based on an analysis of the data for this group of cities, with selected references to earlier CJFWF studies where relevant.

The total dollar allocations for local services rose slightly (less than one per cent) between 1952 and 1954. This was the smallest rise in two-year periods in the last decade. It was made possible by reduced needs for local refugee care. The rise in costs continued, however, for all other local fields of service, excepting local community relations activities.

Federations and welfare funds decreased their support of local Jewish services in 1954 by 2.5 per cent (primarily because of lowered refugee costs), while community chests increased such support by 7.5 per cent for the areas of service receiving chest support. This continued a trend which became evident in 1950. Prior to that time (1944–48), federation support had increased more sharply than chest support.

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

**Shifts in Emphases of Specific Local Programs**

*Health and hospital programs.* These programs had emerged as the largest single category of local federation beneficiaries, with over 90 per cent of the allocations to these programs occurring in the very largest cities (with Jewish population of over 40,000). Funds granted had more than doubled since 1946 as year after year saw steady and substantial rises in allocations, until the allocation for health alone in the largest cities averaged 34 per cent of all allocations for local purposes. While income from “third party” payments—Blue Cross, tax support, etc.—had increased, the costs of operation had risen even more sharply. “Third party” payments had, however, helped prevent greater increases in allocations by federations. New and extended facilities, particularly for the chronically ill, had played a part in the rise in costs. The total rise in funds from chests had not kept pace with the rise in costs. In some cities, chests did not include hospitals in their allocations. The hospitals had a nonsectarian admission policy.

*Refugee programs.* These programs were financed locally, although they were sometimes considered to be a local extension of an overseas problem. Postwar immigration had begun late in 1946, had reached its peak in 1950, and had declined steadily since then. As refugees were resettled in American cities, these costs mounted sharply. By 1950, they were nine times as high as they had been in 1946. By 1952, however, they had fallen back to the

---

Based on data prepared for 1952 General Assembly of CJFWF, brought forward.
1948 level. By 1954, costs dropped 45 per cent below the 1952 level. While refugee costs accounted for 23 per cent of all local allocations in 1950, they accounted for only 7 per cent by 1954.

Recreational programs. These programs were conducted mainly by Jewish community centers. According to the JWB, there were some 345 such centers in 216 cities with a membership of about 550,000. Federation allocations to centers rose by almost 9 per cent between 1952 and 1954. Center allocations had more than doubled since 1946 in a steady year-by-year rise. Unlike hospital programs, center programs generally received relatively little income from fees, since fees had been kept at a level judged low enough to admit all who sought to use the facilities. In a number of cities, however, income from fees and memberships represented a substantial part of the total income. Chests shared in the support of centers in many communities but, as with hospitals, chest allocations had not kept pace with increased costs, resulting in higher federation and welfare fund allocations.

Family and child care agencies. The existence of these agencies had eased the problems of communities in resettling refugees. Agencies with trained casework staffs had been able to absorb efficiently and quickly the immigrants arriving in their communities with social and economic problems. During the peak of the refugee load, the normal program was displaced to some extent. With the refugee load diminishing, the family and children's agencies had been readjusting their operations to provide increased service to native-born families and children, particularly with regard to services to the aged, to disturbed children, and in family counseling programs. Allocations to these agencies rose by 8 per cent between 1952 and 1954. Between 1946 and 1954, the casework agencies received increased allocations of 57 per cent—actually little more than the price level increase in this period.

Jewish education. Allocations to local Jewish schools and bureaus of Jewish education were provided by Jewish federations and welfare funds. A slight rise (less than 3 per cent) occurred in federation allocations between 1952 and 1954. A slow, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education since 1946 paralleled the over-all increase in local allocations. While the rise had lagged in earlier years, since 1950 the rate of allocations to Jewish education had moved forward faster than the rate of the over-all allocations. Jewish schools received tuition fees, but these fees were set below actual tuition costs.

Aged Homes. Allocations to homes for the aged had almost tripled since 1946, rising steadily each year as the proportion of aged in the population continued to increase. Between 1952 and 1954, the rise in allocations was almost 16 per cent. Although the rise was greater than the over-all rise in total allocations, an even greater rise in costs had been avoided by old age assistance funds. Building programs under way to meet unmet needs were expected to result in further increases in maintenance costs.

Community Relations. Programs designed to improve intergroup relations and to deal with specific instances of anti-Semitism existed primarily in the larger centers of Jewish population. The local activities financed by federations and welfare funds received increased allocations from 1946 to 1948, and smaller shares after 1948. The level in 1954 was one per cent below the
1952 level. In some areas, local and regional community relations programs were financed by national agencies (mainly ADL) as part of a national network of regional offices. Such programs received increased grants from national agencies. As a result, combined local service by local and national agencies actually increased.

Employment and Vocational Guidance. These programs were designed to assist Jews in finding employment and in guiding Jewish youth and others in the selection of a trade or profession. They existed mainly in the larger cities. A complementary program, financed by the B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, operated a series of vocational service bureaus. Although local allocations for vocational programs rose by 16 per cent between 1952 and 1954, the rise since 1946 had been a moderate one, below the overall rise in local allocations. This lag may have partially reflected an improved employment market. Jewish vocational services had been a mainstay of the resettlement programs for newcomers. They too were currently concentrating increasingly on services to the native-born Jewish community.

S. P. Goldberg

TABLE 1
AMOUNTS RAISED IN LOCAL CENTRAL COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS, 1945–54
(Estimate in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>$71,162</td>
<td>$36,222*</td>
<td>$34,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131,421</td>
<td>44,273</td>
<td>87,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>156,589</td>
<td>50,227</td>
<td>106,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200,721</td>
<td>65,157</td>
<td>135,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>170,330</td>
<td>63,368*</td>
<td>106,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142,192</td>
<td>50,205</td>
<td>91,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136,035</td>
<td>48,187</td>
<td>87,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121,173</td>
<td>43,076</td>
<td>78,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>115,266</td>
<td>39,746</td>
<td>75,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>107,548</td>
<td>37,994</td>
<td>69,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,352,437</strong></td>
<td><strong>$478,455</strong></td>
<td><strong>$873,982</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes capital fund campaigns of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York: $14,264,000 in 1945, and $11,000,000 in 1949.
### TABLE 2
**INDEPENDENT FUND RAISING, 1954**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Funds Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah</td>
<td>$7,118,437(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>2,379,221(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
<td>2,210,185(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope</td>
<td>2,208,580(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal Agencies</td>
<td>2,067,350(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University and Medical School</td>
<td>1,985,327(^e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
<td>1,577,421(^f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal Agencies</td>
<td>1,430,237(^g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion—</td>
<td>1,429,849(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>1,405,925(^i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary of America</td>
<td>1,154,441(^h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Women Organization</td>
<td>1,064,525(^j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society</td>
<td>863,683(^k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of the Hebrew University</td>
<td>812,431(^k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science</td>
<td>677,718(^k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center (formerly JCRS)</td>
<td>660,266(^l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institutions</td>
<td>610,574(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United HIAS Service</td>
<td>572,101(^d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Mainly from funds raised by members.

\(^b\) Does not appeal to welfare funds.

\(^c\) Substantial proportion raised on the West Coast.

\(^d\) Mainly in New York.

\(^e\) New York City share substantial.

\(^f\) Limited inclusion by welfare funds.

\(^g\) Mainly from B'nai B'rith membership.

\(^h\) Does not seek allocations for capital funds.

\(^i\) Mainly in cities where no allocation is sought.

\(^j\) Does not appeal to welfare funds generally.

\(^k\) Does not appeal to welfare funds.
## TABLE 3

**DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF FUNDS RAISED BY CENTRAL COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS**

*(Estimates in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT BUDGETED.</strong></td>
<td>$90,676</td>
<td>$96,882</td>
<td>$29,997</td>
<td>$31,383</td>
<td>$60,679</td>
<td>$65,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas and Refugee Needs.</td>
<td>56,622</td>
<td>63,021</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>39,122</td>
<td>44,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>52,452</td>
<td>58,197</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>34,952</td>
<td>39,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas Agencies.</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>4,686</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>3,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>2,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>27,991</td>
<td>27,371</td>
<td>11,817</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>16,174</td>
<td>15,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between totals budgeted and totals raised represents "shrinkage" allowance for non-payment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, and contingency or other reserves. The figures for 1954 are preliminary, subject to revision when more complete reports are available.

b Figures for New York include the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) of Greater New York and Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugee costs in New York City were borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of the UJA nationally. Most overseas and domestic agencies which were normally included in welfare funds in other cities conducted their own campaigns in New York. The New York UJA included the following beneficiaries (in addition to the National UJA): The American Jewish Congress and the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB).
### Table 4
**Distribution of Contributed Funds in 1954**
*Estimates in thousands of dollars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Service, Per Cent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>By Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Through Independent Campaigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$94,392</td>
<td>$59,235</td>
<td>$35,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overseas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>52,453</td>
<td>52,453</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>18,698</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>16,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>4,804</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>2,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>4,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>6,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5

**Distribution of Federation Allocations (Including Chest Funds) for Local Services in 72 Communities, 1952, 1954**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$6,669,400</td>
<td>$7,010,500</td>
<td>+ 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Services</td>
<td>4,323,500</td>
<td>4,678,300</td>
<td>+ 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Culture</td>
<td>4,257,600</td>
<td>4,625,900</td>
<td>+ 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>2,611,300</td>
<td>2,685,000</td>
<td>+ 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>3,080,800</td>
<td>1,689,000</td>
<td>- 45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>1,292,700</td>
<td>1,496,500</td>
<td>+ 15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>663,400</td>
<td>769,500</td>
<td>+16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>621,500</td>
<td>614,200</td>
<td>- 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>306,200</td>
<td>428,100</td>
<td>+40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,826,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,997,000</strong></td>
<td>+ 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td>$16,188,600</td>
<td>$15,787,100</td>
<td>- 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Chests</td>
<td>$ 7,637,900</td>
<td>$ 8,209,900</td>
<td>+ 7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6
**Distribution of Federation Allocations* for Local Services in 79 Communities**
1946, 1954
(Amounts in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Service</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Amount Allocated in 1954 (thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Index of Change 1946 = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>$2,995</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>$4,712</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>$4,712</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Vocational Guidance</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of the Aged</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,276</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes both federation and community chest funds. Local services for refugees are excluded.

N.B. During this period the United States Consumer Price Index rose by 37.6 per cent.

### TABLE 6A
**Increases in Total Allocations in 79 Cities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Amount Allocated in 1954 (thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Index of Change 1946 = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>$4,712</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>$4,712</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7

**Receipts of National Jewish Agencies for Overseas Programs**

*From Federations and Welfare Funds and from Other Domestic Sources, 1954 and 1953*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal and Beneficiary Agencies</td>
<td>$48,612,855</td>
<td>$63,001,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Joint Distribution Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Israel Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Association for New Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT—Women’s Division</td>
<td>421,268</td>
<td>370,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UJA and Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>$48,612,855</td>
<td>$63,001,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Comm. for Weizmann Inst. of Science</td>
<td>$160,620</td>
<td>$165,786</td>
<td>$677,718</td>
<td>$497,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jews of Hebrew University</td>
<td>450,716</td>
<td>366,708</td>
<td>181,433</td>
<td>345,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society</td>
<td>189,876</td>
<td>174,260</td>
<td>863,683</td>
<td>769,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institutions</td>
<td>451,803</td>
<td>398,286</td>
<td>610,574</td>
<td>660,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra Torah Fund</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>11,598</td>
<td>156,920</td>
<td>149,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Council of Israel Institutions</td>
<td>108,988</td>
<td>128,123</td>
<td>38,705</td>
<td>89,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>7,118,437</td>
<td>7,204,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Hadassah</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>27,345</td>
<td>38,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School Campaign-Hebrew University</td>
<td>382,560</td>
<td>371,763</td>
<td>1,050,925</td>
<td>1,067,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>438,505</td>
<td>435,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,064,520</td>
<td>1,024,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pionier Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United HIAS Service</td>
<td>236,854</td>
<td>286,195</td>
<td>572,101</td>
<td>667,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,703,948</td>
<td>$2,680,879</td>
<td>$13,791,015</td>
<td>$13,528,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERSEAS TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$51,316,803</td>
<td>$65,682,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Income is for calendar year on cash basis; pledges for each campaign year are higher. Cash receipts in 1954 were delayed because of flotation of a special loan of $64,251,500 (excluded from totals) of which $12,998,140 was repaid in 1954.

*Excludes income from UJA; also reparations income of $6,807,900 in 1954 and $2,127,900 in 1953 for JDC and the dollar equivalent of about $23,500,000 in 1954 and about $8,000,000 in 1953 for the Jewish Agency, the major beneficiary of the United Israel Appeal.

*Traditional collections in U.S.; exclusive of Jewish Agency grants to JNF in Israel.

*FJIF estimates that additional direct transmissions to yeshivot in Israel are about $1,200,000 annually.

*Welfare income estimated by CJFW; amounts raised for JNF are excluded.

*Excludes grants from other organizations.

*Excludes overseas income.

*Exhibited by NCJW.
| TABLE 8 |
| RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS |
| FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1954 and 1953 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal</td>
<td>$1,632,364</td>
<td>$1,620,410</td>
<td>$1,781,500</td>
<td>$1,716,125</td>
<td>$228,900</td>
<td>$244,810</td>
<td>$3,413,864</td>
<td>$3,336,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committeea</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35,830</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation Leagueb</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>250,020</td>
<td>264,519</td>
<td>250,118</td>
<td>269,480</td>
<td>264,730</td>
<td>250,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress—World Jewish Congressc</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>59,631</td>
<td>60,775</td>
<td>111,869</td>
<td>99,235</td>
<td>863,000</td>
<td>880,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>206,426</td>
<td>226,726</td>
<td>245,581</td>
<td>316,626</td>
<td>56,224</td>
<td>43,938</td>
<td>508,231</td>
<td>587,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans of U.S.</td>
<td>113,405</td>
<td>115,949</td>
<td>24,434</td>
<td>12,145</td>
<td>125,849</td>
<td>128,642</td>
<td>253,638</td>
<td>256,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Relations Advisory Council</td>
<td>121,165</td>
<td>110,165</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30,455</td>
<td>34,375</td>
<td>151,620</td>
<td>144,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,764,860</td>
<td>$2,802,713</td>
<td>$2,396,996</td>
<td>$2,375,730</td>
<td>$2,522,940</td>
<td>$2,518,586</td>
<td>$5,684,796</td>
<td>$5,700,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center (formerly JCRS)</td>
<td>$ 26,944</td>
<td>$ 29,531</td>
<td>$ 660,266</td>
<td>$ 510,939</td>
<td>$ 82,126</td>
<td>$ 72,263</td>
<td>$ 769,336</td>
<td>$ 612,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;City of Hope&quot;d</td>
<td>38,744</td>
<td>42,839</td>
<td>2,208,580</td>
<td>2,016,150</td>
<td>265,187</td>
<td>194,376</td>
<td>2,512,511</td>
<td>2,253,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Patients Sanitarium for TB</td>
<td>7,559</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>132,697</td>
<td>147,165</td>
<td>8,814</td>
<td>6,196</td>
<td>149,070</td>
<td>162,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>76,236</td>
<td>80,494</td>
<td>201,796</td>
<td>199,762</td>
<td>127,386</td>
<td>133,943</td>
<td>403,418</td>
<td>413,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Home for Asthmatic Children</td>
<td>15,529</td>
<td>12,562</td>
<td>341,311</td>
<td>351,779</td>
<td>231,632</td>
<td>64,108</td>
<td>588,472</td>
<td>428,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
<td>65,430</td>
<td>73,510</td>
<td>1,577,421</td>
<td>1,522,755</td>
<td>622,853</td>
<td>565,343</td>
<td>2,265,704</td>
<td>2,161,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 228,442</td>
<td>$ 247,946</td>
<td>$ 5,122,071</td>
<td>$ 4,748,550</td>
<td>$1,337,998</td>
<td>$1,035,779</td>
<td>$6,688,511</td>
<td>$6,032,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$ 68,375</td>
<td>$ 67,411</td>
<td>$ 22,536</td>
<td>$ 38,920</td>
<td>$ 38,688</td>
<td>$ 25,672</td>
<td>$ 129,599</td>
<td>$ 132,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>10,275</td>
<td>9,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>6,655</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>6,629</td>
<td>5,795</td>
<td>13,761</td>
<td>12,629</td>
<td>27,045</td>
<td>24,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board</td>
<td>1,076,005</td>
<td>1,089,510</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>7,479</td>
<td>158,117</td>
<td>134,928</td>
<td>1,236,122</td>
<td>1,223,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>7,787</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7,785</td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>21,932</td>
<td>22,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,169,232</td>
<td>$1,178,095</td>
<td>$ 35,525</td>
<td>$ 52,194</td>
<td>$220,216</td>
<td>$181,544</td>
<td>$1,424,973</td>
<td>$1,411,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Research</td>
<td>$ 3,293</td>
<td>$ 3,630</td>
<td>$ 4,577</td>
<td>$ 8,480</td>
<td>$ 2,893</td>
<td>$ 4,389</td>
<td>$ 10,763</td>
<td>$ 16,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>15,306</td>
<td>15,381</td>
<td>18,765</td>
<td>14,054</td>
<td>35,965</td>
<td>29,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Tercentenary Committee</td>
<td>52,170</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>57,278</td>
<td>24,430</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>109,562</td>
<td>24,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>10,934</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>14,404</td>
<td>13,932</td>
<td>26,968</td>
<td>22,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFNA (formerly Jewish National Service Appeal)</td>
<td>433,873</td>
<td>426,219</td>
<td>1,430,237</td>
<td>1,238,606</td>
<td>57,652</td>
<td>54,412</td>
<td>1,921,764</td>
<td>1,719,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,379,221</td>
<td>1,924,389</td>
<td>1,267,966</td>
<td>1,021,329</td>
<td>3,662,187</td>
<td>2,901,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis Youth Foundation</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>124,154</td>
<td>149,905</td>
<td>46,227</td>
<td>95,631</td>
<td>174,236</td>
<td>249,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social Studies (CJS)</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>7,186</td>
<td>4,978</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>21,530</td>
<td>14,034</td>
<td>28,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 (Continued)

**Receipts of National Jewish Agencies for Domestic Programs from Federations and Welfare Funds and from Other Domestic Sources, 1954 and 1953**

<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><strong>Federations and Welfare Funds</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>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion</td>
<td>141,13</td>
<td>119,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Amer. Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>3,25</td>
<td>4,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Theological College</td>
<td>1,154,44</td>
<td>1,292,08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>243,14</td>
<td>272,38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion</td>
<td>7,61</td>
<td>8,03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$664,344</td>
<td>$594,947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Agencies</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>Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary</td>
<td>2,37</td>
<td>2,37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Campaign HUC-JIR-UHC</td>
<td>1,299,308</td>
<td>1,292,80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,408,656</td>
<td>$2,597,747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Domestic</strong></td>
<td>$5,328,262</td>
<td>$5,300,261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Excludes income from JDA.
* *Excludes overseas income.
* Includes "other income" of NCRAC obtained from national agencies to avoid double counting.
* *Excludes Building Fund Income.
* *Excludes ADL grants to prevent double counting.
* *Estimated by CJWF.
* *Excludes grants by national agencies, to prevent double counting.
* *Excludes foreign income.
* *Excludes Jewish Agency grant for ZOA House.
* *Excludes income from Combined Campaign.
DURING the American Jewish Tercentenary year from September 1954 to June 1955 celebrating three hundred years of Jewish settlement in the United States, Jewish social services in America were re-examined and re-evaluated, in terms of their past and present significance in Jewish communal life, and many plans were projected for future development. At the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds held in November 1954, and at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service held in May 1955, interest was focused largely on assessing various existing programs and future needs.\(^1\)

**Scope**

Jewish communal service as a whole includes much more than the specific social services, such as family service, child welfare, care of the aged, *et al.* However, since the article on Jewish communal programs by S. P. Goldberg (see p. 227) deals with Jewish communal service from the broader perspective of its relation to the total Jewish community picture, the present article is limited to a treatment of the specific social services rendered through Jewish social agencies. It deals with the programs of service offered by such agencies during 1954-55, the extent and distribution of services, their cost and the source of funds, and the changes in outlook or in operating philosophy within the particular fields of social service which such agencies represent.

The service common to the various functional fields is known under a variety of names. Sometimes it is referred to as casework, at other times it is called counseling or therapy, and in some instances it is referred to simply as individual helping. Regardless of the name given to this individualized personal service, it does represent the core of the work of most of the agencies and institutions we are concerned with in this article, and changes or developments taking place in our general understanding of personal service must affect the programs and operations in general of all such agencies.

During 1954-55 there was a good deal of continued technical development in the understanding of personal helping as it is carried out in the "casework" agencies. It is only twenty-five years since truly professional casework service was introduced in such agencies. The agencies existed before, and individualized personal service was rendered. But it is only since the Thirties that social workers have been trained through psychological and psychiatric understanding to render the distinct type of personal service which now characterizes the work of the so-called casework agencies. Each year therefore sees new technical developments, as well as new developments in public understanding of the kind of service offered in agencies of this type.

---

Jewish Family Service

Foremost among the casework agencies in technical contributions and in interpretation to the public have been the family agencies. Jewish family agencies originally were concerned primarily with providing concrete help for immigrants. At the turn of the century they devoted their energies and their resources to providing financial assistance, vocational help, health services, etc., primarily to newly arrived immigrants. Over the years, however, their function has changed, so that today, while still providing a great deal of concrete help for immigrants, most Jewish family agencies look upon this as an incidental function and prefer to concentrate on the psychological help which they can render to Jewish individuals and families. Through counseling with marital partners, parents, and children and, in some instances, with elderly persons and members of their families, the family caseworker attempts to bring about a state of better adjustment to the individual's conditions of life. The individual is helped to change his living circumstances to the extent that this is possible and desirable, and to adapt to them with positive spirit and with reduced friction where he himself has been the cause of that friction.

Jewish Content

Such helping requires much in the way of personal discipline and psychological and psychiatric understanding on the part of the worker. It further requires of the worker in the Jewish agency an understanding of what is specifically Jewish in the orientation of the Jewish client. Not only must he understand the grosser factors, such as cleavage between the generations in religious outlook and practice, but also the more subtle attitudinal factors involved in disposition, ambition, self-estimation, attitude towards other members of the family, etc. Thus far Jewish agencies have done comparatively little by way of differentiating and describing what is specifically Jewish in the Jewish client's way of understanding himself and his way of relating to his family and others, including the helping person. However, in January 1955, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York set up a committee for the purpose of studying "Jewish content" in the work of its casework agencies, and, on a smaller scale, attempts were being made by individual agencies to discover and to enunciate what was specifically Jewish in their work. Family agencies had taken the leadership in this area and undoubtedly could be expected to make a contribution to the general understanding of the psychology of the American Jew through their studies of how the Jewish person tended to act and react when he came for help.

Family Life Education

Another significant development in the field of Jewish family service was the stimulation of interest in "family life education." In addition to helping individuals who were in trouble and who needed individual help, several Jewish family agencies, notably those in New York and Cleveland, had set
up programs of a combined educational and therapeutic character for groups of persons who had an interest in better family living. These programs were preventive in nature and, if developed extensively, should have a very wholesome effect on Jewish family life in the future.

“Family life education” was defined as “a method of handling common individual problems in a discussion group.” In other words, it was “a process of group discussion, designed to assist people in their understanding of, and strengthening of, family relationships.” Thirteen Jewish family agencies carried out family life education programs and eight more were planning or considering such programs in 1954. The number of individuals reached by any one agency ranged from 12 to 4,000. The total number of group sessions given by any one agency ranged from 1 to 150.

**Fee Charging**

Another significant advance in the practice of Jewish family agencies took place in the realm of fees charged for casework and counseling services. While fees had been charged by family agencies, particularly in the larger cities, for some years, an impetus was given to this practice by the substitution of counseling services for concrete assistance to immigrants in many of the family agencies throughout the country. With a marked decline in the immigrant caseload, attention was shifted to services for local residents, and an upsurge in counseling services resulted. Family caseworkers were trained to the charging of a fee for such services, and as a result fourteen agencies not charging a fee in 1953 were planning or considering the institution of fee services in 1954. Mention might be made here of a related development in Jewish family service which came to the fore during 1954, namely, an interest in costs. Most of the larger Jewish family agencies were studying the number of interviews held each day by their workers, the time spent in travel, record-keeping, and other aspects of the job, all with the hope of finding logical criteria for determining costs in the Jewish family agency.

**Refugee Service**

In 1954 the number of nonimmigrant families served by Jewish family agencies increased 5 per cent over 1953. Nearly 49,000 families were served. Applications for service by immigrant families declined by 8.6 per cent and direct financial assistance by 9 per cent. In spite of this decline, care of refugee families still made up a substantial part of the family service caseload, as may be seen from the fact that $2,284,329 was spent by family agencies for refugee assistance. (This excludes $489,056 spent by the New York Association for New Americans.) Refugees constituted one-fifth of all active cases carried by Jewish family agencies.

---

3 Ibid., p. 2.
### TABLE 1

**Service to Immigrants in 63 Family Agencies and in the New York Association for New Americans, in 1953–54**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>63 Agencies Excluding NYANA</th>
<th>NYANA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aver. No. of Active Cases per mo.</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aver. No. of Assistance Cases per mo.</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>2,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures for Assistance</td>
<td>$2,450,536</td>
<td>$2,284,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aver. Monthly grant per case</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The statistics cited throughout this article are taken from the 1955 Yearbook of Jewish Social Services, published by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. The writer is greatly indebted to the Council for cooperation and assistance in the preparation of this article.*

It is important to note here that in August 1954 the United HIAS Service was created through merger of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, the United Service for New Americans, and the migration department of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. Immigrant services were thus unified under one agency offering a centralized, global service for Jews who wished to emigrate. Pre-migration services, documentation and technical immigration service, immigrant reception, immigrant sheltering, and restitution and indemnification were all regarded as functions of the new agency.

### AID TO TRANSIENTS

An interesting change in the service picture of Jewish family agencies was the substantial increase in service to transients during 1954. Table 2 shows

### Table 2

**Service to Transients, 61 Family Agencies, 1953–54**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Cases Under Care During Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5,269</th>
<th>676</th>
<th>4,593</th>
<th>$21,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>6,156</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>5,513</td>
<td>$25,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Change</td>
<td>+16.5</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>+20.0</td>
<td>+16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the number of individuals or families served and the amount expended for assistance during 1953–54 in sixty-one agencies providing information for both years.

These figures do not represent the total amount of service to Jewish transients during the year. Other programs, including those of synagogues, Traveler's Aid, Salvation Army and public shelters, all of which operated independently of Jewish family agencies, are not included. The figures cover service by family agencies to transients temporarily in communities, and include the use of boarding or rooming houses, hotels, and local shelters.

**PERSONNEL**

Casework, counseling, and all other services provided by Jewish family agencies were rendered by an aggregate full-time professional staff of 436 supervisors and caseworkers (in 74 reporting agencies). Thirty-seven agencies with a total staff of 389 professionals had professional staffs of more than two persons. The largest staffs were the Jewish Family Service of New York (57.6 per cent of all workers employed by family agencies) and the Jewish Family and Community Services of Chicago (32.5). Seventy-two specialists, including home economists, psychiatrists, psychologists, physicians, and dentists were employed. Except in the largest agencies, they functioned on a part-time basis.

The average number of active cases per worker was 39, ranging from 21 to 114 and 144 in the two agencies with the highest averages. In the case of one-man agencies, responsibility for supervision was sometimes carried by the executive of the local center or Jewish federation. In agencies with two staff members, one often carried responsibility for other community activities, such as the Jewish federation or the community center, in addition to his casework.

The total receipts of family agencies showed a drop in 1954 of 6 per cent under 1953. For 1954 receipts were about $7,500,000, with 90 per cent accounted for from philanthropic funds. Payments for service accounted for more than $200,000. This represented an increase of one-third over 1953. Individual contributions, public funds, investments, and other sources accounted for the remainder.

Nearly $2,625,000 was spent by Jewish family agencies for direct financial assistance in 1954. This represented an 8 per cent decrease from expenditures in 1953. The proportion of cases receiving public assistance supplementation was slightly over the 1953 level. Nearly 19 per cent of families receiving private family agency assistance also received public assistance.

**Jewish Child Care Services**

The volume of child care services in 1954 reflected a downward trend in evidence for a number of years. However, during 1954, this downward trend appeared to be slowing.

While the declines cited in Table 3 are significant, it should be noted that there was a decrease of just under .04 per cent in the number of children
under care at the end of the year, as compared with the beginning, while the comparable decrease for 1953 had been over 4 per cent.

The number of Jewish agencies reporting foster home and institutional care in 1954 was fifty-seven. Twenty-three were separate child care agencies, and thirty-four were combined family and children's agencies. Child care services were provided through family agencies in most small- and intermediate-sized communities, and also in some larger cities. Some of these agencies had separate child care departments. In others the casework staff carried both a family and child care load.

**TABLE 3**

**NUMBER OF CHILDREN CARED FOR IN CHILD CARE AGENCIES, 1953, 1954**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>Per Cent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children Under Care, Jan. 1</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Under Care</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>6,896</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Closed</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Care, Dec. 31</td>
<td>4,414</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Change Jan. 1—Dec. 31</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

**TYPES OF SUPERVISION OF CHILDREN—52 CHILD CARE AGENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Direct Agency Supervision</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Sup. of Another Agency</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Guardianship, etc.)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Direct Agency Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Foster Homes</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Agency's Own Institution</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Homes of Parents</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Homes of Relatives</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of December 31.

**SMALL GROUP RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS**

A significant change had taken place in the type of case load carried in child care agencies. More and more the child care caseload was shifting from one requiring simple custodial care to one requiring psychiatric and intensive...
casework treatment. As a result of this shift, a number of agencies had set up or were developing small group residential programs. These included agencies in Los Angeles, Detroit, San Francisco, Chicago, St. Louis, and Boston. In New York, the Jewish Board of Guardians and the Jewish Child Care Association had been developing residential facilities to meet special problems of children not served adequately in larger institutions. The cost of treatment through such specialized facilities was high, since the number of children treated through a particular type of program was small.

Parental Home Supervision

Fewer than half of the children placed received supervision in foster homes in 1954. There was an increase in the number and proportion of children receiving supervision in the homes of parents. This continued a long-term trend towards service for children in their own homes and early reestablishment of homes after placement.

In addition to direct work with children, the professional staffs of children's agencies were responsible for homefinding and adoption programs and community interpretation. The smallness of the loads was therefore sometimes misleading. The average load per worker in agencies providing foster home care only was eighteen. Institutions report loads of between twenty and forty, with several exceptional institutions giving much higher figures. A total of 156 child care workers was reported as of December 31, 1954. The average caseload per worker and supervisor was twenty, including both foster home and institutional care.

Income

Sixteen child care agencies in ten communities reported income of $6,933,000 in 1954. Of these funds, 58 per cent came from philanthropic contributions from central community funds, 25 per cent from public funds, 11 per cent from payments for service, and 6 per cent from other sources. While all agencies reported some receipts from individual contributions, only one, the Hebrew National Orphan Home in New York City, reported a major portion of its support from this source.

Care of the Aged

During 1954 an upward trend in services for the Jewish aged continued, with a rise of 4 per cent in the year-end census, as compared with that of the beginning of the year. There were slight decreases in the number of persons admitted to institutional care and in the number who died or were discharged. Probably, increased longevity and a longer stay in homes played a part in the rise in the number of persons under care.

In addition to care provided by institutions, a significant development in recent years had been that of care for older persons in their own homes, as well as of day care programs in which the elderly person came from his own home to the institution for meals, medical care, recreation, etc.

Another notable development was the apartment projects or residence
clubs which had been established in Chicago, Milwaukee, San Francisco, and New York. Mention should be made, too, of the use of private residences for the aged by family agencies and by institutions. In such programs, the elderly person remained in the community and lived with a private family, instead of moving into a home for the aged. Medical care was provided, work and recreation, where desirable, and a personal and family atmosphere maintained. Such programs were being developed rapidly throughout the country.

While institutional care of the aged was extremely important, attention should be given to the comparatively recent development of interest in the aged in Jewish family agencies. A study carried out by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds 6 indicated that the percentage of cases in family agencies in which a person of over sixty-five was the focus of attention had risen to 23 per cent, or nearly one out of every four clients. Twenty-one out of sixty-three family agencies now had either specialized departments or specially assigned workers to handle cases of persons over sixty-five.

Regardless of size, nearly all agencies offered a counseling service for the aged. In the larger cities, however, more responsibility was taken for the supervising of boarding homes, arranging nursing home care, and homemaker service. Smaller communities gave more service to residents of homes and did intake studies for homes. Much planning was taking place, however, in cities of all sizes, and many developments in family agency care for the aged could be expected within the coming decade.

TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF CASES OF ELDERLY PERSONS IN FAMILY AGENCY CASELOADS, 1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Jewish Population</th>
<th>No. of Agencies Reporting</th>
<th>Monthly Aver. Cases</th>
<th>No. of Aged Cases</th>
<th>Per Cent of Aged Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175,000 and over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000–175,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000–40,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–15,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCING

The financing of programs for the aged had been facilitated to some extent by government assistance. As of December 1954, over 44.2 per cent of all residents in sixty-seven homes reporting received Old Age Assistance. Proceeds were less than operating costs, but in a few communities, governmental payments were coming closer to actual costs, which now ranged from $150 to $200 per month per patient. Government benefits throughout the United States averaged about $51.00 per month. In certain instances, however, they were considerably higher.

Total receipts of fifty-three homes for the aged in 1954 were $11,914,000. The major portion of this, 65 per cent, was derived from payments for service. Philanthropic contributions accounted for 29 per cent, public funds 4 per cent, and other sources for the remainder.

Jewish Hospital Service

The upward trend in service was continued in Jewish hospitals during 1954, with the total number of patients served showing an increase of over 6 per cent in comparison with 1953, and an increase in nearly 5 per cent in the number of days of care provided. Just under 44 per cent of all patients admitted were Jewish, but the proportion varied greatly from one hospital to another.

In addition to the in-patient service reflected in the above table, mention should be made of the fifty-four out-patient clinics, forty-one of which reported nearly 1,428,000 visits by 227,000 different patients during 1954. Over 93,800 of the patients attending these clinics during the year had never attended the particular clinics before.

Statistics are not available on the social services rendered by these hospitals. All of the larger hospitals, however, had social service departments which provided counseling, financial assistance where appropriate, and other social services for clients in need of them. Some of the help given was carried out on a cooperative basis with family, child care, and other types of agencies.

TABLE 6

Service Rendered by 61 Jewish Hospitals in 27 Communities, 1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Hospital</th>
<th>No. of Hospitals</th>
<th>No. of Communities Represented</th>
<th>No. of Beds and Bassinets as of 12/31/54</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Admissions and Live Births, Entire Year, 1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Types</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18,120</td>
<td>13,919</td>
<td>491,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14,567</td>
<td>10,834</td>
<td>451,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Special</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCING

Forty-seven hospitals of all types reported total receipts of $93,340,000 in 1954. Payments for service accounted for 75.5 per cent of all receipts; 41 per cent of payments for service came through Blue Cross, Workmen's Compensation, private plans, etc. Public funds accounted for 8 per cent of total receipts for all hospitals. Philanthropic contributions were important in specialized hospitals, especially where a traditional policy of free admission was followed.
Jewish Vocational Service

While detailed statistics on Jewish vocational service are not readily available, the twenty-three vocational agencies rendered extensive service during 1954. Approximately 50,000 persons applied for job placement and 10,000 for vocational guidance. The volume of activity was essentially the same as in 1953, slightly lower than in 1952. About 45,000 job orders were received, and 20,000 individuals placed; 5,000 refugees were served and 2,500 were placed on jobs.

A trend in Jewish vocational service manifest during 1954 was the focusing of attention on the handicapped and the seriously disadvantaged. Many cooperative programs involving the Jewish Vocational Service (JVS) and other agencies, such as hospitals and rehabilitation clinics, were in the process of development. Sheltered workshops were operated by eleven JVS agencies, and four carried out studies on the need for this type of service.

In 1954 the JVS's also concentrated on revitalizing their programs for fighting discrimination, cooperating wherever possible with community relations councils. A number of formalized plans were developed which were to be implemented in 1955. The plans included "case-finding" involving business firms which did not employ Jews.

FINANCING

Increased financial support from foundations and governmental sources had been apparent. Under Public Law 565, grants had been made to three communities for studies on rehabilitative services for the handicapped. Three more had applied for such grants. Fifty per cent of the JVS's now charged fees for vocational guidance but not for job placement.

Trends

Several general trends in Jewish social service may be noted. Perhaps foremost among these was the trend toward suburbanization. Jewish agencies had found it necessary to move out of the dense centers of population in which they were formerly located and to establish outposts and branches in suburban localities where services were beginning to be needed.

Along with this trend went a marked development in fee services. The younger Jewish population no longer looked upon contact with a social agency as involving a stigma, and applications for child guidance, marital counseling, and assistance with problems of the aged now came from all economic strata. As a result, agencies of all types had been developing their fee programs, and it could be expected that the collection of fees, which was a comparatively small factor in agency financing, would become a much larger one in the none-too-distant future. This trend was undoubtedly associated with increased community acceptance of the idea that maintenance

---

7 These statistics were furnished by Roland Baxt, representing the Jewish Occupational Council and the Federation Employment and Guidance Service of New York City, the largest of the Jewish vocational agencies.
assistance was a public responsibility. It would leave private agencies free to concentrate on services for which people were willing to pay a fee.

Another important trend in Jewish agencies was the recent development of research programs. Agencies of all types were now recognizing the necessity for a sound and scientifically established factual background for the services they rendered, and as a consequence, research programs within agencies were coming to be looked upon not as a luxury, but as indispensable to the service of the agency. Within the next few years a considerable development of research programs within agencies (many financed by foundations or governmental support) could be anticipated.

The final trend which should be noted here was one toward unification in the social services. With a tendency towards greater longevity in the Jewish community itself, and with the influence of central fund raising, those contributing to the social services, and also those administering them, had developed an attitude that ran counter to the separateness and the internalized interest of many local and distinctly limited agencies and services. Agencies were coming to recognize their interdependence, and as a result, much more in the way of cooperative service could be expected. Family agencies and hospitals, vocational agencies and psychiatric services, and a variety of others, now cooperated to provide continuous and unified service for the client. The merger of child care and family agencies in many communities, and the development of new multiple service agencies in others, had undoubtedly contributed towards this trend. It could be anticipated that within the next few years great impetus would be given to the development of cooperative programs of all types. Individual agencies need not lose their identities through such a development. In cooperation with other agencies, however, they could render a more continuous service for the client—one that could be more determined by the client's need and less by specialized function.

HERBERT H. APTEKAR

JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS, 1946–55

THE PERIOD following the close of World War II was one of rapid expansion of Jewish community centers in the United States and in other countries. In 1946, the roster of the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) listed 295 centers, Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations, synagogue-centers, and center branches in the United States. By 1955, the listing had increased to 345. These were located in approximately 215 cities in addition to the various areas of metropolitan New York City.

Growth in the past decade was also reflected in the rise in the number of persons enrolled in centers, the increase in budgets of operation, the construction of new facilities, including center buildings and resident and day camp sites, and in the broadening of the program of services for all age groups.
History

Centers had been part of the American Jewish scene since 1854, originating as YMHA's in the same period of American history that saw the establishment of many new types of agencies and organizations including the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), and the settlement house movement. By the turn of the century, YMHA's and YWHA's were well established in buildings of their own in nearly 100 communities across the country. The late 1920's and the years subsequent to the close of World War II were the two most active phases of center development in this century. It was during these periods that the designation "Jewish community center" became general for these agencies, reflecting changes in their scope and purpose.

As described in an account of the history of center work in America by Louis Kraft, the character and program of centers underwent constant modification and growth to meet the changing needs of the Jewish community. Beginning as associations of young men interested in Jewish cultural pursuits, they merged eventually with similarly motivated Young Women's Hebrew Associations. The adjustment of immigrants to American life was a principal focus of these agencies in the 1890's and in the period preceding World War I. Jewish settlement houses, extensively developed during these years to aid in the Americanization process, gradually merged into the stream of center history and became identified with the developing purposes and program of this movement. Centers provided training programs and aid in obtaining employment to young people in periods of economic depression. In both world wars they served as recreational headquarters for members of the armed forces. They gradually emerged as community-sponsored Jewish leisure time agencies serving all members of the family from the youngest to the oldest in a program covering a wide range of social, cultural, physical education, and camping activities, conducted in all types of groups, from small friendship clubs to the mass gatherings.

A principal purpose of the modern Jewish community center is to provide opportunities to Jewish individuals and groups to engage in voluntarily chosen social, cultural, educational, and physical activities that are personally enjoyable and enriching; at the same time it aims to aid individuals to become more aware and effective in responsibilities in the Jewish and general community. The center philosophy as clarified in the JWB Statement of Principles on Jewish Center Purposes in 1948, is one of commitment to the thesis that significant Jewish group life and American democracy are compatible and mutually supportive. These principles as contained in the statement are as follows:

Preamble

The individual American Jew is identified with every phase of American life and is politically, economically, culturally and intellectually a part

1Louis Kraft, A Century of the Jewish Community Center Movement, monograph published by the JWB, 1953.
and parcel thereof. In addition, he recognizes certain aspects of life which concern him as a Jew. The Jewish community center is an agency with which he identifies himself voluntarily to satisfy his needs.

Article I

Jewish content is fundamental to the program of the Jewish center. In its total program, the Jewish center seeks to develop and enrich human personality and group association. To that end, all resources and skills of informal education and leisure-time planning should be employed.

Article II

The Jewish center should fulfill its Jewish purpose, although participation in the Jewish center is open to all inhabitants of the community.

Article III

The functions of the Jewish center include:

A. Service as an agency of Jewish identification.
B. Service as a common meeting ground for all Jews. Membership is open to the entire Jewish community, no one to be excluded by reason of Jewish doctrine or ritual or because of his political or social views.
C. Service as an agency of personality development. Jewish religion and tradition and the ideal of American democracy both emphasize the well being of the individual. The Jewish center is motivated by the same objective. The total needs of the individual, his interests and capacities for growth, and his needs for meaningful Jewish living in particular, are basic to the method and content of the Jewish center program.
D. Furtherance of the democratic way of life. This objective should be emphasized through the program of center activities and reflected in the structure and functioning of the Jewish center.
E. Assistance in the integration of the individual Jew, as well as of the Jewish group, into the total American community. The Jewish center aims to be an instrumentality of the Jewish people through which they may make a significant contribution to American culture. The center stimulates participation in the life of the total community.

Methods

Several methods from the fields of social work, education, and recreation are utilized in the program of the center to fulfill the aforementioned purposes. The principal method is "social group work." Group work is an aspect of social work in which individuals are helped to benefit from the experience of being part of a group. Group work endeavors to apply the findings of the social sciences in regard to the influence of significant group relationships on the personality development and social outlook of the members of the group and of the group as a whole. Its practitioners are generally trained in graduate schools of social work. In addition to group workers, centers also employ persons trained in the fields of physical education, nursery school education, adult education, and other specializations, such as music, dramatics, crafts, and other arts.
Membership and Participation

Enrollment of members in Jewish community centers increased annually during the period 1946–55. In the year 1946 445,000 members were on center rolls. At the close of 1954, the figure exceeded 550,000. The increase, though consisting of both sexes, was particularly noteworthy in respect to female members. In 1946, the ratio of male to female members was approximately 60 to 40. In 1954, the ratio was 54 to 46. Several factors contributed to influence the increase of female participation. These included: the increasing proportion of females to males in the general population over the past two decades, as indicated in the United States Census reports; the trend toward increased participation by women in community affairs; the development of family membership plans; and the expanded center programs for women and girls. The rise in center membership was due in a large measure to the broadening of the center program to include activities for persons at both ends of the age range of life. As indicated in the section below devoted to programs, there was a considerable expansion of center nursery schools to meet the needs of the greatly increased young child population, and of "golden age clubs" for the oldest age category, which also represents a much larger segment of the population than ever before. In addition to services for enrolled membership, various aspects of center programs were open to nonmembers and to the community-at-large. The expansion of the program to include all age groups was due in a substantial measure to the deliberate broadening of the focus of center services to include the entire Jewish community as reflected in the adoption of the designation "Jewish community center." It was also a response to changing community needs. During World War II, for example, the increase in the number of working mothers had led to pressure on centers to establish programs for children of pre-school age. This need had continued in the postwar years with the maintenance of a high birth rate. Similarly, it was recognized that the customary programs for adults did not meet the particular needs of the increasing older adult population. This led to experimentation in applying the techniques of group work to programming especially designed to meet the needs of the oldest age group.

Enrollment of children under fourteen years increased from 25 per cent to 35 per cent of the total membership between 1946 and 1953. During the same period, the fourteen to seventeen-year-old category remained fairly stable, ranging from about 12 per cent to 15 per cent of the total. The gradual decrease in the proportion of young adults in the general population was reflected in center membership, diminishing from a high of 27 per cent in 1947 to a low of 9 per cent in 1953. On the other hand, the adult membership, twenty-five years old and over, increased substantially from 38 per cent to more than 43 per cent. This included older adults, sixty years of age and over.

Actual participation in the center program during this period increased at an even faster pace than enrollment. In 1953, attendance rose by 6.8 per cent over 1952, while enrollment grew by only 2 per cent. Increased participation was influenced in part by the opening of new improved facilities located
more strategically in respect to the Jewish population, and in part by expanded program opportunities.

More than half of the aggregate attendance in these years was by persons taking part in group activities, such as regularly scheduled club meetings, gymnasium classes, meetings of local units of national youth and adult organizations, and special activities groups for crafts, dramatics, music, Jewish cultural programs, and the pursuit of hobbies. One-fourth of the attendance was in connection with lectures and forums, social events, and cultural programs. The remainder represented the use of center informal recreation areas, such as lounges, quiet game rooms, bowling alleys, table tennis and billiard rooms.

Physical Facilities

An active period of construction of new center buildings began at the end of World War II. This trend was sustained to 1954-55 and many new facilities were opened. New Jewish community center buildings were dedicated in 1954 and 1955 in Milwaukee, Wis.; Savannah, Ga.; Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; East New York, N. Y. C.; Syracuse and Utica, N. Y.; Plainfield, N. J.; Youngstown, Ohio; and Philadelphia, Pa. Buildings were under construction or in the blueprint stage in Atlanta, Ga.; Louisville, Ky.; Boston, Mass.; Detroit, Michigan; St. Louis, Missouri; Harrisburg, Pa.; Newark, N. J.; Washington Heights, N. Y. C.; Bronx, N. Y.; Brooklyn, N. Y.; Staten Island, N. Y.; Allentown, Pa.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Birmingham, Ala.; Tucson, Ariz.; Oakland, Calif.; Baltimore, Md.; Lawrence, Mass.; Atlantic City, N. J.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; New Brunswick, N. J.; Scranton, Pa.; San Antonio, Tex.; Kansas City, Mo.; Camden, N. J.; and Richmond, Va. This listing does not include synagogue-centers.

In the majority of instances, construction was preceded by studies conducted jointly by centers and Jewish federations. These analyzed such factors as current leisure time services available to the Jewish community, size and movement of Jewish population, and unmet needs for the foreseeable future. New center buildings reflected many changes over older buildings in such aspects as location (including both movement to new suburbs and to more strategic location within cities; Springfield, Mass., and Camden, N. J., exemplified the former type of movement, New Haven, Conn., and Milwaukee, Wis., the latter); inclusion of facilities for nursery schools and older adult programming; extensive outdoor play areas; off-street parking; and improved facilities for cultural programming, physical education, and small group meetings.

The estimated value of center buildings, existing and under actual construction in 1955, was about $75,000,000, as against a valuation of approximately $40,000,000 in 1946.

Programs

To fulfill their purposes, centers provided a wide variety of clubs, classes, interest groups, mass events, intergroup programs, physical education ac-
tivities, indoor and outdoor play programs, and city and country camping opportunities. Particular emphasis was placed on enriching the programs for the various age groups.

The expansion of programs for children of pre-school age (three to five years old) to meet needs created by the greatly heightened birth rate, represented one of the most significant examples of change since World War II. From a few isolated center nursery schools in 1946, the number grew to more than 100 in 1955. In addition, many centers provided guided play periods for this age group with activities that included simple crafts, singing, story-telling, and games. Several centers also conducted pre-school divisions of their day camps.

For children of elementary school age, after-school programs included clubs, simple athletics, holiday celebrations, cooperative programs with Jewish schools and with synagogues, Brownies and Cub Scouts, and hobby and special interests groups. City and country summer day camps drew their largest enrollment from this age group (see p. 271).

The great concern of parents and civic leaders with the need to provide leisure time programs for teen-agers was reflected in the high emphasis given to programming for this age group. National and regional conferences convened by JWB and the National Association of Jewish Center Workers focused attention on current problems of teen-agers and how these could be met through the center program. One result of this was an increase in parent-youth discussions in centers. Friendship clubs, local units of national youth organizations, special interest groups, and gymnasium activities remained the most popular teen-age programs in 1954 and 1955, as they had in previous years. Three out of every four centers reported the existence of all of these programs. Centers reported an average of eleven clubs under center auspices and an average of four youth clubs under national auspices. This was a national average which varied considerably in the individual experiences of centers. However, practically all centers reported both of these types of groups.

Centers continued their efforts to provide satisfying programs for young adult men and women, eighteen to thirty years of age. Within the center, they generally participated in social and dancing events, clubs, gymnasium activities, and cultural groups. In New Jersey, a state-wide council of center young adults sponsored a series of sub-regional gatherings in 1955 in order to provide young men and women from nearby cities with opportunities to socialize and to discuss current Jewish affairs. This was in the pattern of intercommunity programs and conferences followed in several other parts of the country. In many centers young adults also served as club leaders of children and teen-age groups under the supervision of the professional staff.

Adults utilized the center as a meeting place for clubs and local units of national organizations. They also took part in forums and lectures, general educational and physical education classes, and health clubs. The large majority of new center buildings included health club facilities and such facilities were added to several older buildings. Adults also participated on center boards and committees and served as leaders of youth groups. An estimated 10,000 men and women served on center boards of directors. Another 25,000
to 30,000 served on center committees or acted as youth group leaders. Center women's groups conducted educational, social, and fund-raising projects.

Lectures and forums were generally on Jewish themes, as were concerts and recitals. There was an increase in classes on Jewish subjects, such as Jewish history, literature, customs, and family relations. There were also increases in classes on home repairs, child-rearing, and mental hygiene, and in discussion groups.

Older adult programming for persons above sixty years of age, a relatively new area of service by centers, emerged as a vital part of the program during 1946–55. In 1954, about 100 centers sponsored such programs, alone or in collaboration with other organizations. Special lounge rooms, often equipped with kitchen facilities, were established in many centers, e.g., New York City, Newark, N. J., Cleveland, Ohio, Chicago, Ill., and Paterson, N. J. Programs were most frequently conducted in the afternoon, with some occurring in the evening. To a large extent, they were self-organized with the help of the center staff and of volunteers. The National Council of Jewish Women provided volunteer and financial support in many cities. Classes in a variety of subjects, lectures, dramatics, trips to interesting places, and birthday and holiday parties were typical programs. In some cases, special periods at camps were arranged. Bronx House-Emanuel Camps of New York City, for example, had established a regular camping program for this age group based on several years of successful experimentation in dealing with the special health, emotional, and social problems of the aging person in a camp setting. State-wide conferences held in New Jersey brought together hundreds of older adults from different cities during 1954 and 1955. At these conferences, older men and women asserted their interest in matters affecting Jewish and general community life. A metropolitan area gathering of a similar nature was conducted in Chicago in 1955.

Centers gave leadership to a variety of community-wide Jewish cultural and organizational activities, including Jewish book councils and music councils. These were generally co-sponsored with other Jewish organizations. Centers also provided staff leadership to city-wide Jewish youth and young adult councils in which all types of Jewish young people's groups were represented.

Finances

Expenditures by centers had increased steadily since 1946, reflecting both changes in the value of the dollar and expanded services. In 1946, national expenditures were in the amount of $8,207,000. By 1953, the figure had risen to $14,630,000, a growth of 58 per cent.

Approximately 50 per cent of the total costs were in connection with expenditures, including salaries of the program staff and materials utilized in the program. Administrative expenses, including executive and clerical salaries, took up 28 per cent of the cost, and maintenance 21 per cent of the cost. The remaining 1 per cent was for miscellaneous purposes.

During the same period, center income kept pace with expenditures. The principal sources of center income in 1953 were membership dues and fees
for activities (41 per cent), allocations from Jewish welfare funds (32 per cent) and community chest grants (19 per cent). The most notable increase over the years had been the proportion of funds received from Jewish welfare funds. In 1948, the average percentage of center budget received from this source was 22 per cent. By 1953, the proportion had reached 31.6 per cent. Centers in smaller communities tended to raise a higher proportion of income from membership dues than was the case in the larger cities.

**Personnel**

About 1,300 full-time professional workers were employed by Jewish community centers in 1954, as against the figure of 1,019 reported for 1951. These were executive directors, program supervisors, physical education directors, workers with various age groups, and specialists in different fields. The average number of professional staff members per center showed an increase from 6.4 in 1952 to 7 in 1954.

The center field had confronted a severe shortage of workers for several years. As reported by the JWB Bureau of Personnel and Training, at no time in 1954 were there less than 100 unfilled vacancies in centers, and in June of that year the number reached 199. The situation was aggravated by the paucity of Jewish students enrolled in graduate schools of social work, the principal source of recruitment of trained center workers. In several sections of the United States special scholarship projects were established by groups of centers to encourage young people to train for center work. In New York City, eighteen centers affiliated with the Metropolitan Section-JWB joined to provide five scholarships in 1955. Similar activities were conducted in New Jersey, New England, the Mid-Atlantic states, and the Mid-West. A national orientation institute was conducted in September 1955 to help new workers prepare for service in Jewish community centers.

About half of the professional workers employed in centers were members of the National Association of Jewish Center Workers. This body endeavored to raise standards of service and to improve conditions of work in the center field. It had been in existence since 1918, and conducted an annual conference, sponsored regional meetings of workers, collaborated in training institutes, and issued a publication—*The Jewish Center Worker*—which merged in 1954 with the *Jewish Social Service Quarterly*.

**Synagogue Centers**

The decade since the end of World War II witnessed the growth of synagogue-centers. These were generally located in very small communities or in the suburbs of larger cities to which Jews in large numbers had moved from neighborhoods within the cities themselves. In New York City, the growth of synagogue-centers had been particularly extensive in such areas as Queens and Nassau counties. Fifty-eight such organizations in greater New York held membership in JWB in 1955. Another sixty-three in other parts of the country were affiliated with JWB. Countless other organizations defined themselves as synagogue-centers, adopting such names as “Jewish Center,”
"Jewish Community Center," or a composite name such as "Congregation Beth Israel and Community Center."

In the very small Jewish community, the synagogue-center was often the only central Jewish organization and served in a multi-functional capacity. It was the single religious, educational, social, fund-raising, and community relations body of the entire Jewish community. The chief, and often only, professional was the rabbi, who served as the executive of the center, director of the welfare fund, and principal of the Jewish school. Typical was the Norristown (Pennsylvania) Jewish Community Center, which won the 1951 William J. Shroder Memorial Award for meritorious community service established by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) in honor of its first president.

In the larger cities, the synagogue-centers were, in the main, Orthodox, Conservative or Reform congregations which included leisure time facilities and provided activities principally to serve their members. As institutions for religious worship, the aim of their programs was to strengthen the identification of their members with the synagogue. However, some opened their programs to nonmembers. Their support was derived chiefly from membership dues, High Holy Day appeals, income from activities, and from special projects. As a rule, the synagogue-centers did not receive allocations from community chests and Jewish welfare funds. The staffs generally included a rabbi, who was the chief executive officer, and full or part-time workers to conduct the center aspects of their program.

There was a trend in many cities toward active collaboration between synagogues and Jewish community centers. This often took the form of the utilization of synagogue facilities for extension services by centers, or joint center-synagogue sponsorship of programs in synagogues. Formal arrangements for projects of this type, designed to serve all Jews in a given area, were in effect in 1955 in New York, Miami, Chicago, and Newark, among other cities. In 1954, the JWB established a Commission on Jewish Community Center-Synagogue Relationships for the stated purpose of "enhancing the effectiveness of cooperation between Jewish community centers and synagogues in service to Jewish communities."³ The work of this body was still under way at the time of publication. Cooperation was also the objective of a Joint Committee of the National Jewish Welfare Board and the Synagogue Council of America, which had held periodic discussions.

Center in the Community

Jewish community centers broadened their relationship to other Jewish and general communal agencies and organizations in the decade following the end of World War II. During this period, additional centers became affiliated with community chests and Jewish federations and welfare funds. In 1946, 89 centers were beneficiaries of chests, as compared to 122 in 1953. At the same time, the number of centers receiving allocations from Jewish federations and welfare funds grew from 74 to 151. Relationships between

centers and national youth groups were clarified through guiding statements developed through national discussions on this subject. Similarly, national guiding statements were developed through a joint committee of the JWB and the American Association for Jewish Education established to advise on effective relationships between centers and Jewish schools. As indicated above, JWB had established a commission on synagogue and center relationships. In 1954, JWB and the CJFWF established a joint commission to review experiences in local center-federation relationships and to consider the possibility of establishing guides for such relationships. The work of this commission was still under way. In many cities studies on leisure time needs were conducted cooperatively by centers and the federations. Such studies were undertaken in 1954 in San Diego, Cal.; Long Beach, Cal.; Brooklyn, N. Y. C.; Atlantic City, N. J.; Chicago, Ill.; Louisville, Ky.; Hartford, Conn.; San Antonio, Texas; Hackensack, N. J.; and Nassau County, New York.

Additional experiences in center cooperation with other bodies included the increased use of center facilities by national organization units for regular meetings and special events, the extension of center programs in synagogues, public schools, and homes for the aged, and collaboration with case work agencies and hospitals. The sponsorship of Jewish community youth councils by centers, and the leadership of centers in the formation of Jewish book and music councils co-sponsored by several Jewish organizations, were other types of community-wide activities.

In the field of sports, centers conducted city-wide and regional tournaments and leagues in basketball, volleyball, swimming, softball, and table tennis. Centers cooperated through the JWB with the Amateur Athletic Union, the United States Olympic Committee, and the United States Committee for Sports in Israel.

**Summer Camping**

There was a marked expansion of Jewish community center summer country camps resident and day camps. The number of resident camps under center auspices increased from thirty-six in 1951 to fifty-two in 1955. In the main, resident camps catered to children between the ages of eight and fourteen. These made up the largest portion of the approximately 25,000 children who were enrolled in resident camps under center auspices in 1955. For children above fourteen, many camps provided pioneer camping and counsellor training opportunities. There was an increase in camping for adults, older adults, and families, with several camps setting aside special periods for these categories. The children's camping season was usually of eight or nine weeks duration, beginning shortly after the close of school. The average daily child population per center camp in 1954 was 190. The average number of children in camp during the course of the summer was 463 per camp. Children attended in periods ranging from two weeks up to the entire season.

---

4 Statement on Relationships of Jewish Community Center and Local Units of National Jewish Youth Groups, JWB (no date); Statement on Relationships Between the Jewish Community Center and the Local B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, prepared jointly by staff of JWB and BBYO, 1953; Statement of Recommendations for Cooperation in the Fields of Jewish Education and Jewish Community Center Work, published jointly by the American Association for Jewish Education and the National Jewish Welfare Board, 1954.
The number of center day camps reached the figure of 203 in 1955. In day camps, children spent the morning and afternoon at camp and returned to their homes before evening. Day camps were conducted both within the city, often utilizing center facilities, and at country sites within commuting distance of the center. There was a steady increase in the development of country sites for center day camps. Eleven such sites were established in 1954, and an estimated thirty country sites had been developed since 1946. In New York City, two sites were created under the auspices of the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies for the use of the centers affiliated with the Federation. The first was opened in 1954 and the second in 1955.

National Jewish Welfare Board

The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) aided Jewish communities in the United States in the establishment and conduct of Jewish community centers and YM and YWHA’s, and provided for the recreational, welfare, and religious needs of Jewish men and women in the armed forces and in veterans’ facilities.

Its services in respect to centers were provided through nationally and regionally based consultants. The JWB published materials and conducted conferences and institutes for center staffs and board members. Through its national departments and bureaus, JWB made available specialized assistance in respect to center administration, programming for the various age groups, health and physical education, camping, the cultural arts, center publications, interpretation, recruitment and training of workers, and in planning, constructing, and equipping new center buildings.

JWB services to centers were provided under the direction of its Jewish center division. The policies which guided the work of the division were developed by national committees representative of the local centers and of the JWB regional federations of centers, called JWB sections. There were eight such sections covering the continental United States in 1954, one more than in 1946. These sections sponsored ninety intercommunity board and staff conferences and institutes and conducted a variety of intercenter athletic and social events. JWB field secretaries served as executive directors of the sections as part of their task of providing consultation to centers on problems of agency operation and programming. Field secretaries made 988 visits to centers in 289 communities in 1954.

JWB gave leadership to the recruitment of workers for the Jewish community center field. Under the direction of its bureau of personnel and training, staff members visited colleges and schools to describe center career prospects to students. In 1954, recruitment projects were established in six major cities in the United States; the bureau placed 218 workers in positions and conducted eleven courses and institutes on Jewish community center work, several of them in conjunction with schools of social work.

Principal emphases in the work of JWB in 1954–55, in addition to the recruitment of workers, included help to centers in adapting their services to meet the changing conditions brought about by an increased and mobile population, a clarification of the functions of centers in the community, at-
attention to the special problems of youth today, approaches to enriching the quality of Jewish group experience in centers, and initiation of programs to promote world understanding through the center program. These were subjects of discussion and study at national, regional, and local meetings and training programs.

**Tercentenary Celebration**

The JWB developed guides and materials related to the celebration of the American Jewish Tercentenary in 1954–55. The National Jewish Music Council, sponsored by the JWB, arranged for the commissioning of Tercentenary music and established a special reference library on such music. The Tercentenary was the official theme of the 1955 Jewish Music Festival celebrated in local communities as part of the program of the National Jewish Music Council.

The Jewish Book Council of America, sponsored by JWB, also focused its 1954 Jewish Book Month celebration on the Tercentenary. The JWB Jewish Center Lecture Bureau helped local communities in the selection of speakers and artists for local programs designed to commemorate this historic event. These were utilized by numerous Jewish organizations in addition to centers. Similarly, the Tercentenary was the theme of the 1954 annual assembly of the JWB-sponsored National Jewish Youth Conference, a coordinating body for local and regional Jewish youth councils.

**Planning**

In the field of planning in 1954, the Community Studies Department of JWB gave technical assistance to forty-five cities in studies to evaluate existing center services and to improve these services. Center self-studies in preparation for expanded services and facilities were carried out in San Antonio, Tex.; Hackensack, N. J.; Williamsburg, N. Y. C.; Chicago, Ill.; the Five Towns area of Nassau County, N. Y.; San Diego, Cal.; and Long Beach, Cal. Similar studies were under way in 1955 in New Orleans, La.; Hartford, Conn.; Atlantic City, N. J.; Denver, Colo.; Seattle, Wash.; and Dayton and Cincinnati, Ohio. The JWB aided in the opening of new buildings valued in excess of $10,000,000 in 1954 and 1955. Specialized services were rendered through its Building Bureau and Bureau of Public Information and its departments specializing in equipment planning and purchasing and center administration.

JWB consultants in the fields of the arts, adult education, Jewish literature and youth services aided centers through visits, conferences, and publications. *Jewish Center Program Aids*, published by the Program Section of the JWB, was issued periodically to center staffs. *Jewish Music Notes* and *In Jewish Bookland* were regular supplements of the monthly newspaper, the *JWB Circle*, widely read by center boards and staff. The *JWB Circle* also contained articles on center developments of a general nature.

Among the major publications issued by JWB in 1954 and 1955 were:
Aspects of the Jewish Community Center, published for the National Association of Jewish Center Workers by JWB as a memorial to Benjamin Rabinowitz, late director of the JWB Jewish Center Division, 252 pages; Louis Kraft, editor; Charles S. Bernheimer, associate editor; JWB Year Book on the Jewish Community Center Field, Volume IV, 1953-1954, 117 pages plus appendix tables; Jewish Community Center Self-Study Manual, by Elias Picheny, in collaboration with Myron B. Blanchard, 55 pages; Jewish Community Center Annual Meetings, by Bernard Carp, 40 pages; Health and Physical Education Activities in the Jewish Community Center, by Robert Morrison, 110 pages; Public Relations and Publicity for the Jewish Community Center, by Bernard Postal; The Unique Functions of the Jewish Community Center, by Sanford Solender, 16 pages.

JWB was financed principally through allocations from local Jewish welfare funds including the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York.

Services to Jewish Personnel in Armed Forces

Since World War I, JWB had been recognized by the United States government as the agency of the American Jewish community to provide for the religious, welfare and recreational needs of Jewish service personnel. Thirty-eight national Jewish organizations were affiliated with JWB in this aspect of its program. JWB had also been the representative of the Jewish community in the United Service Organizations, Inc. (USO) since the inception of this intersectarian organization.

In World War II, JWB intensified its services to the armed forces and to veterans, rendering these through three divisions: Armed Services Division, Women’s Organizations’ Division, and the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy. The work of these divisions continued following the end of World War II and the conclusion of the fighting in Korea and was adapted to the needs of Jewish military personnel during the postwar years.

In 1954, 3,000,000 men and women were in the United States armed forces stationed in forty-nine different countries. An additional half-million were patients in veteran’s hospitals. The number of Jewish men and women in uniform was in a ratio similar to the proportion of the Jewish population to the total population (approximately 3 per cent).

The JWB Armed Services Division maintained a field staff of twenty-nine professional workers who conducted programs in the United States and overseas. In addition, as part of its responsibility in the USO program, JWB conducted sixteen area and local operations and participated in the operation of clubs directed by other agencies. Along with its professional staff, the Armed Services Division relied on 239 local volunteer communities comprising approximately 10,000 individuals to aid in the fulfillment of the program of services.

The year-round program of recreational services for off-duty military personnel included socials, cultural activities, sight-seeing trips, picnics, holiday celebrations, and home hospitality. The endeavor was made to help Jewish young men and women in the armed forces retain contacts and relationships with the Jewish community. This was done by arranging for service personnel
to participate in the regular activities of Jewish community centers and other organizations, and by having men and women of the community serve as hosts and hostesses at both off- and on-base religious and social events.

Other aspects of the work of the Armed Services Division included assistance to service personnel and their families in personal and family problems, cooperation with chaplains, conduct of programs at Veterans Administration hospitals, and shipping of kosher foods and religious supplies for the use of men stationed all over the world. The Armed Services Division aided chaplains in the arrangement for Passover seders, High Holy Day services, and festival celebrations in the United States, as well as in Korea, Germany, Alaska, Japan, North Africa, the Philippines, Panama and other countries in 1954 and 1955.

The Women's Organizations' Division of JWB was the means by which nine national women's organizations joined in service to the Jewish men and women of the armed forces and hospitalized veterans. The organizations concerned were: Hadassah, the National Bureau of Federated Jewish Women's Groups, the National Council of Jewish Women, National Women's League of the United Synagogue of America, the United Order True Sisters, the Women's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, the Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress, and the women's groups in Jewish community centers. The work of this Division was carried out principally through "Serve-A" programs whereby local committees shipped gifts to isolated camps and to veterans hospitals located at a distance from communities. They also supplied packages of books, games, and gifts to chaplains for distribution to service personnel stationed overseas. Seventy-two "Serve-A-Camp" and "Serve-A-Hospital" committees were active in 1954. These shipped approximately 1,000,000 gifts to 126 different areas. The Women's Organizations' Division guided its local units in participation in the Veterans Administration Voluntary Service (VAVS), whereby committees of volunteers visited the bedside of patients in VA hospitals, worked in hospital libraries, planned parties, and cooperated in rehabilitation programs. Local units of the Women's Organizations' Division were the coordinated means for participation by Jewish communities in the VAVS programs at 115 hospitals in 1954.

**World Federation of YM and YWHA's**

JWB was the American affiliate of the World Federation of YM and YWHA's. Other affiliates included center groups in Europe, Canada, Latin America, Israel, and Australia. In 1954, JWB and American centers provided materials, through the World Federation, to centers in thirty-five countries. These included training bulletins translated into four languages, recordings, athletic equipment, and games. Students from France, Sweden, Denmark, French Morocco, and Italy completed their training in the United States in 1954 and 1955 through arrangements made by the Federation and through the financial aid of the Ford Foundation. Supervision of the students was provided by the JWB Bureau of Personnel and Training.

With funds allocated to European Jewish communities by the Conference
on Jewish Material Claims, the Federation aided in organizing centers in twenty-seven communities. It also helped the Jerusalem YM-YWHA and aided in the organization of a federation of the twelve centers which existed in Israel in 1954.

Herbert Millman

THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

During the year under review (July 1, 1954, through June 30, 1955), United States policy in the Middle East continued to be determined by two primary concerns: 1. the United States desire that the entire Middle Eastern area be strengthened militarily and economically as a bulwark against possible Soviet aggression or penetration, and 2. the reduction of tensions between Israel and the Arab countries, looking toward an eventual solution of the Arab-Israel conflict. During this period, the United States continued to avow its policy of impartiality and neutrality toward both Israel and the Arab nations.

Policy of Impartiality

Statements stressing United States impartiality were made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and United States Department of State spokesmen on several occasions.

In his message to Congress on April 20, 1955, requesting approval for the new Mutual Security Program, the President declared: "The continuing tension between the Arab states and Israel handicaps the peoples of all Near East nations. We should continue to work with the governments and peoples on both sides to improve their economic status and to accelerate their progress toward lasting peace between them."

In December 1954 the Department of State issued a background bulletin on Israel, in which it stated: "Our policy toward all countries in this vast area is substantially the same. It is a policy of impartial friendship which seeks to win the respect of their people."

In December 1954 the Department of State issued a background bulletin on Israel, in which it stated: "Our policy toward all countries in this vast area is substantially the same. It is a policy of impartial friendship which seeks to win the respect of their people."

Some elaboration on this statement came from a high-level conference of American diplomats stationed in the Middle East, which was held at the United States Embassy in Damascus beginning December 14, 1954, with Assistant Secretary of State George Allen presiding. This conference defined American policy in a five-point statement. Issued by the United States Embassy in Damascus on December 18, it called for: 1. complete and strict impartiality between the Arab states and Israel; 2. friendship for all Middle Eastern countries; 3. support of these countries in their efforts to create strong and stable governments; 4. reaffirmation of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950; and 5. support of the United Nations (UN) Truce Supervision Organization.
Despite these statements, many observers felt that in concrete situations, such as Middle East security and Israel-Arab border violence, the United States did not act with complete impartiality.

**Mutual Defense in the Middle East**

Implementation of plans for mutual security in the Middle East continued following the Turkish-Pakistani mutual defense treaty of April 2, 1954, the United States-Iraq military assistance agreement of April 21, 1954, and the United States-Pakistan military assistance pact of May 10, 1954 (see *American Jewish Year Book*, 1955 [Vol. 56], p. 283-84). Under the provisions of the United States-Iraq agreement, the first shipment of American military aid arrived in Iraq on December 19, 1954.

The United States continued its efforts to fill in the gaps in the northern tier defense line represented by Turkey and Pakistan. It was reported from Baghdad in *The New York Times* of January 14, 1955, that the United States had been encouraging Iraq to join the Turkish-Pakistani entente or conclude a separate bilateral agreement with Turkey, and that the amount of American military aid to Iraq would be closely related to Iraqi participation in a regional defense system.

As plans for a Turkish-Iraqi pact took shape, other Arab League countries, headed by Egypt, attempted to break up the proposed alliance. Despite the threats of the Arab League countries, Iraq concluded a mutual defense agreement with Turkey on February 24, 1955 (ratified by both countries on February 26). On February 25, Henry Suydam, United States State Department press officer, issued a statement hailing the treaty as "a growing recognition" that the true menace to the Middle East "lies in possible Communist aggression." Both countries called upon the United States, Great Britain, Iran, and Pakistan to join the mutual defense alliance.

In addition to concluding the treaty, Turkey and Iraq exchanged letters which stipulated that both had "agreed to work in close cooperation for effecting the carrying out of the United Nations resolutions concerning Palestine." 1

On April 4 Great Britain adhered to the Turkish-Iraqi alliance; on September 23 Pakistan joined the pact; on October 11 Iran announced that it too would join. This announcement was warmly welcomed by the United States State Department. The Soviet Union, however, on the day following the announcement, sent a note of protest to Iran declaring that Iran's accession to this alliance "is incompatible with the interests of consolidating peace and security in the region of the Middle and Near East." Nevertheless, on October 19 Iran's senate ratified the measure authorizing Iran to join the defense pact and the Majlis (lower house) ratified the measure on October 23.

**Military Aid to the Middle East**

Besides the United States-Iraq military assistance pact, the United States had, during this period, been discussing military aid with other Arab coun-

---

tries, including Egypt. In view of the Arab-Israel conflict, many Americans believed that arms shipments to the Arabs would increase the possibility of Arab aggression against Israel rather than provide defense against possible Soviet attack.

This view was not shared by the government. On October 20 President Eisenhower, in discussing the need for security in the Middle East, declared that the United States would make sure that any arms provided for defense would not create "local imbalances which would be used for intimidation of or aggression against any neighboring nations."

An enlargement of this view appeared in a letter of August 11, 1954, written by Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton in reply to a request for information from Rep. Emanuel Celler (Dem., Bklyn.). Morton declared that the State Department failed "to find evidence that any Arab state is desirous or capable of sustaining an aggressive move against Israel"; that Israel's present military position was not weak; that the United States was firmly committed to support of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950; and, finally, that "the threat posed by Soviet imperialism is of such a character that we feel obliged to take immediate measures to foster indigenous defensive strength, and not to delay such steps pending a definitive settlement of intra-area problems."

This State Department view found its most definitive expression in the address by John D. Jernegan, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, on March 6, 1955, before the Conference of Jewish Organizations at Washington, D.C. Jernegan stressed the importance of the entire area and the need to secure it from Soviet aggression. He said he saw no evidence of any intent on the part of Israel's neighbors to attack her. He said that the State Department was conscious of the tensions between Israel and the Arab states, but that all American military aid to that area was buttressed by guarantees that such aid would be used only for defense against aggression and not for any aggressive purposes by countries receiving such aid. Jernegan also indicated that he felt the Israel-Arab conflict constituted a barrier to the proper organization of collective defense in this area.

Despite the State Department's views, many Congressmen and Senators expressed reservations about the shipment of arms to the Middle East. On September 15, 1954, the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs addressed a communication to all nominees for Congress in the forthcoming election, requesting their views on arms shipments to Arab states. A total of 350 expressed disagreement with the current arms policy.

Rep. James P. Richards (Dem., So. Car.) was one of the few Congressmen who strongly supported the arms policy. After returning from an Asiatic survey mission, Rep. Richards issued a statement on December 13, 1954, to the effect that it was in the interest of the United States to send arms to the Arabs, and that this policy should be carried out "regardless of pressure groups."

Sen. Estes Kefauver (Dem., Tenn.), on November 18, 1954, charged that the State Department arms policy was a "policy of impartiality against Israel, increasing the danger of war and aggression by the Arab States."
Rep. James Roosevelt (Dem., Cal.) in a letter to Secretary of State Dulles, released on February 8, 1955, called on the government to halt further arms shipments to the Arab states or else strengthen Israel as well within the context of Middle East regional defense planning.

PUBLIC OPINION

Public opinion, too, seemed to be strongly against arms shipments to Arab states unless accompanied by military aid to Israel. Editorial opinion in the national press expressed reservations about arming the Arab states. The New York Herald Tribune, for example, on September 13, 1954, suggested that ideally no arms at all should be supplied in this area, but "if a generally strengthened Middle East is deemed essential to American policy," Israel should play its part in this defense chain.

Both the Democratic Party New York state convention (September 22, 1954) and the Liberal Party convention (September 23) adopted planks in their platforms on this issue. The Democratic Party urged that if arms shipments to the Arab states were necessary, Israel also should receive military aid "so that the delicate balance of power in this area remain undisturbed." The Liberal Party declared that "no military aid should be given to any of the countries in that area without substantial guarantees that it will not be used for aggressive purposes."

Labor organizations, too, opposed unilateral arms aid to the Arabs. The national convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in Los Angeles, adopted a resolution on September 29, 1954, urging that all countries in the Middle East be taken into account and that each country receiving arms must demonstrate "its earnest desire to improve the lot and rights of its people and live at peace with its neighbors." Similar views were expressed at the convention of the United Steelworkers of America in Atlantic City on September 30, and by the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) International Electric Union convention in Miami Beach on October 2.

The CIO at its national convention adopted a resolution on December 13, 1954, expressing its "angry opposition to a course of action which can only endanger the future of the struggling young democracy of Israel."

On November 22, 1954, more than 300 religious, educational, and community leaders wrote to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles urging them to refrain from sending arms to the Near East until peace within the region was secured, and calling for a reappraisal of America's policy in the Middle East.

The national convention of Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), meeting in Washington, D.C., adopted a resolution on March 20, 1955 that "United States aid and support of military alliances with or among the Arab states should be withheld until peace treaties between these states and Israel are negotiated."

Jewish organizations also expressed themselves on this issue. On October 13, 1954, the central committee of the Labor Zionist Organization of America issued a resolution opposing arms supplies to Iraq and Egypt, unless they agreed to negotiate a peace settlement with Israel.
Two public meetings to protest the policy of arming the Arab states were held on October 25, 1954, in New York: one sponsored by the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, in which all Zionist groups were represented, and another sponsored jointly by the Jewish Labor Committee and the Trade Union Council for Israel.

On October 26, representatives of sixteen American Jewish organizations met with Secretary Dulles and submitted a memorandum protesting the exclusion of Israel from America's military aid program.²

The national executive committee of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), prompted by the announced arrival in Iraq of the first United States arms shipment, at a meeting on December 27, 1954, unanimously endorsed an appeal to President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles for the "immediate suspension of further shipments of military supplies while the re-examination of our policy is taking place."

At its annual meeting in New York, January 28–30, 1955, the American Jewish Committee adopted a statement which reaffirmed the position taken at a meeting of its executive committee in October 1954: "If arms are to be furnished, each of the countries of the Near East, including Israel, should be dealt with without discrimination in accordance with its willingness to contribute to the common defense of the region and without creating an imbalance of arms in the area."

On March 5–6, 1955, a Conference of Jewish Organizations was held in Washington, D.C. to discuss the problems arising from recent developments in the Middle East and their effect on United States foreign policy. (The sixteen participating organizations are listed in footnote 2.) The meeting adopted a resolution which urged suspension of arms shipments to the Middle East in the absence of an Arab-Israel peace, and the inclusion of Israel in any regional defense arrangement.

In the course of the public discussion of arms shipments to the Arab states, Arab spokesmen in the United States several times attacked American Zionists and by implication American Jews. On October 27, 1954, the press department of the Egyptian embassy issued a release which impugned the loyalty of American Zionists, declaring that "the constant, persistent, unfounded and partial criticism of United States foreign policy by the Zionists indicates clearly where their real loyalty abides." On October 30, Emanuel Neumann, chairman of the executive committee of the ZOA, termed this statement "a public attack against a large body of Americans who are currently exercising their rights as citizens in criticizing certain policies of their Government which they regard as mistaken and harmful to America's true interests." Neumann further urged the United States government to "inform the Egyptian Embassy that it will not tolerate such unwarranted interference in the democratic life of our country."

M. J. Jamali, Iraq's chief delegate in the United Nations, issued a state-
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ment on November 16 in which he declared: "We wish all fair-minded Americans concerned primarily with the interests of the United States and world peace to be assured that any arms to Iraq will never be used for aggressive purposes and to beware Zionist propaganda, which does not serve either American interest or world peace, for a weak and unarmed Iraq serves only the Communist cause."

Another attack, aimed at the ZOA and the American Christian Palestine Committee, appeared in a letter to the editor in *The New York Times* of December 10, 1954, by Kamel Abdul Rahim (see below), who accused these organizations of trying to "high-pressure a reversal of American policy" without any concern for the defense of the free world. A reply from the American Christian Palestine Committee, published in *The New York Times* on December 14, dealt with the substantive problems involved and did not reply to the innuendoes in Rahim's letter.

**Border Tension**

During the period under review, the Egyptian-held Gaza strip, occupied by over 200,000 Arab refugees, was the scene of prolonged border violence and the subject of discussion in the United Nations (UN).

On February 28, 1955, according to an investigation made by the UN Truce Supervision Organization, two platoons of the Israel Regular Army entered Gaza and attacked an Egyptian military camp. At the same time another Israel Regular Army unit ambushed a truck proceeding with reinforcements to the Egyptian camp. As a result of the two actions, one Egyptian officer, thirty-five soldiers, and two civilians were killed and thirty-one persons were wounded.

On March 4, 1955, the UN Security Council began debate on this incident, on the basis of a preliminary report. On this day, James J. Wadsworth, United States delegate, declared that the action was "indefensible from any standpoint," adding: "We oppose any policy of reprisal and retaliation." Debate on the incident was, however, postponed until the arrival of Major General Eedson L. M. Burns, Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization. On March 17, debate was resumed after General Burns presented his report to the Security Council.

On March 29, the Security Council unanimously approved a joint United States-United Kingdom-French draft resolution condemning the attack by Israel military forces. In support of this resolution, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Representative in the United Nations, declared that "whatever the provocation might have been in this case, there was no justification for the Israeli military action at Gaza."

On the following day, the United States, Great Britain, and France introduced another draft resolution calling upon Egypt and Israel to cooperate with the Truce Supervision Organization in reducing tension along their border. Speaking in behalf of this resolution, Ambassador Lodge exhorted both parties to make "a far greater effort" in maintaining border security. The resolution, adopted unanimously, gave support to General Burns's proposals for easing border tension.
While discussions of the Gaza incident had been under way, Israel had on March 25 lodged a complaint with the Security Council against Egypt for a raid made the night before on the Israel village of Patish, in which one person was killed and eighteen wounded. Subsequently, Israel submitted other complaints about border unrest. These came before the Security Council on April 6; it was decided to request further information from General Burns. Upon receipt of his report, discussion was resumed on April 19. David Mck. Key, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, stated that the United States fully concurred in General Burns's conclusion that the majority of incidents about which Israel complained "may well be due to emotional tension following the action at Gaza on February 28." Without specifically condemning Egypt for these incidents, Key reiterated the United States position that "there is no justification, no matter what the cause, for retaliation, official or unofficial, by military or civilian personnel." In view of General Burns's report that there were encouraging indications of progress in the effort to implement the Security Council's resolution of March 30, Key felt that consideration and action by the Security Council would, at that time, neither remedy the present difficulties nor bring about a permanent peace in the area.

On June 7, Ambassador Lodge, that month's president of the Security Council, addressed a letter to the other members of the Council, with copies to the Egyptian and Israeli representatives, warning that unless Egypt and Israel would cooperate with the Truce Supervision Organization regarding the proposals for border security, he would call a meeting of the Council for the specific purpose of considering implementation of the March 30 resolution.

PUBLIC REACTION

The Gaza incident did not arouse as much public discussion as had the Kibya raid on October 14–15, 1953 (see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1955 [Vol. 56], p. 277-79). Editorial opinion was in the main neutral; criticism of Israel for the Gaza incident was frequently coupled with acknowledgement of sympathy for Israel in general.

While the Security Council was considering the Gaza incident, the American Christian Palestine Committee appealed to the Council and to the United States, in a statement issued on March 10, 1955, to make a concerted effort to bring Israel and the Arab states together in peace talks, since the armistice machinery seemed unable "to cope with this explosive situation."

On March 24, 1955, Gov. Averell Harriman of New York said that the basic reason for the border tensions was the "failure of Israel's neighbors to accept the fact that Israel exists and will continue to exist." Admitting that Israel's "frontier families" lived in a precarious situation, Governor Harriman said that Israel had a special duty, while guarding its borders, to "prevent acts of provocation and retaliation by its own citizens." He also criticized the State Department for not reaffirming and extending the guarantees of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.
The executive board of the American Jewish Committee, on May 7-8, 1955, adopted a statement on the Near East situation which condemned "the recurrence of violence on the Arab-Israeli borders, whether of a formal military character or not, whether by way of aggression or reprisal, and whether committed by Israelis or Arabs." The statement further expressed the desire that the United States assume responsibility with the UN "to secure concerted action towards peace in that area."

Addressing a meeting of the national executive committee of the ZOA on May 15, 1955, Emanuel Neumann, chairman of the group, urged the United States to enter "into mutual security negotiations with Israel," adding that this would remove "present dangers and further stabilize conditions in the Middle East."

The strongest attack against Israel as responsible for border violence came in an address by Kamel Abdul Rahim, UN representative of the League of Arab States, before the United Nations Correspondents Association on March 16. He charged then that Israel was trying to "shoot her way into peace."

In this same address, Rahim announced that an Arab League Arab Information Center would be opened in New York. This center opened officially on April 22, 1955, with Rahim as its policy director. He explained that the center was established so that "the people of the United States may be informed about Arab problems and the Arab governments and peoples as the Arab people are about America and Americans." Having in his speech of March 16 denied that the Arab Information Center would become involved with anti-Semites ("Let no anti-Semite think he can make common cause with us"), Rahim on this occasion declared that the Arab position on Israel "is in no sense a position against the Jewish people."

Secretary Dulles' Peace Proposal

On August 26, at a meeting of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City, Secretary Dulles delivered a speech in which he proposed a program to end hostilities between Israel and the Arab states. This address had been approved by President Eisenhower. The program called for an agreement on borders; an international guarantee of these borders, sponsored by the UN, in which the United States would participate through formal treaty obligations; an international loan, with substantial United States participation, to enable Israel to pay compensation to Arab refugees; and a United States contribution to help create more arable land in the area where these refugees could find a better way of life.

On the day the speech was made, United States embassies in Israel and the Arab states delivered to each government a copy of Secretary Dulles' address. Britain's foreign office on the following day issued a statement in which Britain pledged its full support to Secretary Dulles' proposals and its willingness to participate in the suggested guarantees and international contributions. Commendation of the "generous and constructive spirit" of the United States proposals was expressed immediately by UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold. On August 30 the American Jewish Committee issued
a statement welcoming Dulles' proposals as "a hopeful new basis" for establishing peace in the Middle East.

On September 6 Israel Ambassador Abba Eban called on George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, African, and South Asian Affairs, informing him that Israel considered the Dulles proposals "constructive," but would like to know more about their meaning. Israel subsequently expressed reservations about the proposal dealing with adjustments of its borders. At the time of writing (November 15, 1955) no official comment by the Arab states had appeared.

Suez Canal Controversy

On a complaint by Israel that Egypt had on September 28, 1954, seized an Israel vessel, the SS Bat Galim, the Security Council discussed the matter between October and December 1954. On January 1, 1955, the Egyptian Government released the crew of the ship. Discussion on the case was resumed in the Security Council on January 4. Ambassador Lodge then indicated that the "sole desire" of the United States was "to see a just and equitable settlement of the outstanding problems between Israel and her neighbors." He also declared that Egyptian restrictions on transit of ships through the Suez Canal were "inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement, contrary to the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951, and a retrogression from the stated objectives" to which both sides were committed in the armistice agreement.

Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, chairman of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, in a letter to Ambassador Lodge on January 12, expressed the "warm appreciation" of the Zionist movement for the "firm and positive position" taken by the American delegation on this issue.

Jerusalem

When it became known that Edward B. Lawson, newly appointed American Ambassador to Israel, would present his credentials in Jerusalem, the ranking diplomatic representatives of the Arab League states (Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Syria, and Egypt) called on Secretary of State Dulles on November 3, 1954, to protest this decision. The Arabs charged that this action would disregard the UN position that Jerusalem should be internationalized, and that it would "undermine the improvement that has begun to show itself in the relations" between the United States and the Arabs. In the course of the conversation Dulles recalled the policy of the United States government to look to the UN as primarily responsible for determining the future status of Jerusalem. Following normal practice, he explained that the presentation of credentials by Ambassador Lawson would take place where the chief of state actually was. Presentation of credentials in Jerusalem did not imply any change in the American attitude regarding Jerusalem nor did it imply any change in the location of the American Embassy in Israel, which was at Tel Aviv.

Despite this statement, Philip M. Klutznick, president of B'nai B'rith, at
the annual meeting of its board of governors on November 6, hailed the action as a “bellwether act,” which he hoped would result in UN recognition of Jerusalem “as the real capital of Israel.”

Arab Refugees

The problem of the Arab refugees was discussed in the UN General Assembly during the period from November 16 to December 4, 1954. On November 16, Henry R. Labouisse, director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), presented his annual report before the Ad Hoc Political Committee of the General Assembly. A draft resolution jointly sponsored by the United States, Britain, France, and Turkey was introduced in the committee on November 23. It provided for the extension of the life and mandate of the UNRWA until June 30, 1960; approved a relief budget of $25,100,000, a rehabilitation budget of $36,200,000 for the current fiscal year, and the maintenance of the existing $200,000,000 rehabilitation fund; and requested the governments of the area to continue to cooperate with UNRWA.

The United States position was presented by James J. Wadsworth, United States Representative to the General Assembly. Speaking on Labouisse’s report on November 19, Wadsworth explained that the United States favored the extension of UNRWA’s life only if certain reclamation projects would be started very soon. Otherwise, the attitude of the United States “must inevitably undergo thorough reexamination.”

Speaking in favor of the four-power draft resolution on November 24, Wadsworth urged upon the Arab and other members of the committee the conviction held by the United States delegation that “the eventual resolution of the refugee problem rests not in looking back but in looking forward to a new and stronger economy for the Arab states, coming to regard many of their Arab refugee brothers not as temporary residents but as fellow citizens and cosharers in the Near East future.” As for Israel’s responsibility, he declared that the United States believed that “Israel ought to satisfy one or the other of the two rights” of the refugees—repatriation or compensation. Two days later, Wadsworth clarified his statement which had been interpreted by some delegates as a change in United States policy. Wadsworth declared that no one should read into his statement any question of the abandonment of repatriation in favor of compensation, and “no one should read into that statement that Israel instead of the refugee has the choice of these rights.”

The four-power draft resolution on UNRWA was passed in the Ad Hoc Political Committee on November 30, by a vote of 41, none opposed, and 8 abstaining (the Soviet bloc, Israel, Iraq, and Burma). On December 4, the plenary session of the General Assembly approved the resolution, 48 for, none opposed, and 7 abstaining (the Soviet bloc, Israel, and Iraq).

On March 24, 1955, Rep. John M. Vorys (Rep., Ohio), chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and James P. Richards (Dem., So. Car.) submitted to the Committee a report on their Survey Mission to the Far East, South Asia, and the Middle East, which they had conducted at the end of
1954. In discussing refugees, the Congressmen urged that the United States should not assume responsibility for the repatriation or resettlement of refugees resulting from disputes between other countries, and that where it was in the American interest to help refugees, United States help should be directed toward permanent solutions.

A Senate Foreign Relations Committee report on the Mutual Security program, issued May 27, 1955, declared that a permanent solution of the Arab refugee problem "can only be found through rehabilitation and resettlement" and expressed "its deep concern over the lack of progress in this direction."

On May 3, 1955, the State Department made known that forty-five Palestinian Arab refugees had been granted American visas for permanent residence in the United States as the first of the 2,000 Arab refugees authorized admission under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

ECONOMIC AID TO REFUGEES

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, the United States contributed $16,700,000 to the UNRWA; the original U.S. pledge had been $12,000,000. On February 24, 1955, the United States announced a contribution of an additional $4,700,000 which would be given on the understanding that the United States share of the UNRWA budget would not exceed 70 per cent of the totals received from all governments.


Economic Aid to Israel

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, the United States made $40,000,000 available to Israel in development funds and $1,426,000 in technical assistance, under the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. In the first six months of this fiscal year, July-December 1954, the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) allotted to Israel $30,300,000 of which $15,000,000 was on loan. According to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, part of the economic aid to foreign countries was to be in the form of loans. Israel announced that it would use the loan to buy surplus agricultural commodities, primarily wheat, cotton and corn, from the United States. The loan was to be repaid in Israel currency in forty years at 4 per cent interest.

On May 2, it was announced that Israel Ambassador Abba Eban and Harold Stassen, director of the FOA, had concluded an agreement on an additional $9,700,000 in economic aid.

The Mutual Security Act of 1955, passed by Congress July 28, 1955, and signed by President Eisenhower on August 2, 1955, provided an over-all amount of $73,000,000 for economic assistance in the Near East and North Africa ($115,000,000 was provided in 1954). It was expected that the grant to Israel would be less than $35,000,000. Funds for technical assistance, however, had been increased to $2,000,000.
Economic Aid to Arab States

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, Egypt received development assistance of $40,000,000, of which $7,500,000 was to be repaid to the United States. In addition, $2,900,000 was allotted for technical cooperation activities. Emphasis of the development assistance program was placed on improvement of railways and highways, major components of Egypt's ten-year development program. Egypt was expected to spend the equivalent of $48,300,000 from its own resources as its share of the cost of the projects.

During 1954–55 the United States made $5,000,000 available to assist Jordan in its development program. Half of this amount was in the form of local currency purchased with pound sterling from the proceeds of the sale of United States coal to the United Kingdom. Most of the local currency was used to pay Jordanians and refugees who had been put to work on road construction, afforestation, and waterspreading activities. The technical cooperation program provided $2,200,000.

As of December 31, 1954, Lebanon had received $6,000,000 for development purposes, including stepping up of wheat production, providing an adequate water supply for village communities, and repairing and extending roads. In June 1955, an agreement was signed with Lebanon which provided for United States assistance in the amount of $5,700,000 to help finance construction of a modern highway from Beirut to the Syrian border, where it would then connect with the road to Damascus. Of this total, $5,000,000 was to be in the form of a fifteen-year loan at 3 per cent interest; the remaining $700,000 would be used to purchase American road-building equipment and to finance a $200,000 engineering survey by an American team. Lebanon also benefited from the technical cooperation program.

Iraq did not receive economic assistance during 1954–55, but did receive transport vehicles and signal and engineering supplies under the military assistance agreement with the United States. Iraq also received technical cooperation funds.

In previous years Saudi Arabia had entered into agreement on a joint technical cooperation program; but at the demand of Saudi Arabia that this program be halted, the United States Operations Mission in that country was closed on October 17, 1954.

Jordan River Development

On January 24, 1955, Eric Johnston, chairman of the International Development Advisory Board, began a five-week series of negotiations with Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Israel regarding the plan for joint development of the Jordan River valley. This was Johnston's third mission to the Middle East as President Eisenhower's special representative on this project (see American Jewish Year Book, 1955, [Vol. 56], p. 288). Upon his return Johnston gave President Eisenhower an encouraging report on March 5. He said tentative agreements had been reached on many major problems, but that the division of water rights still remained an unsettled issue.
Zionist Organizational Developments

The American Zionist movement continued to discuss its present and future role vis-à-vis the State of Israel. At a meeting of the American Zionist Council in New York on September 23, 1954, Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the Jewish Agency, expressed his dissatisfaction with the nature of this public debate. He said, “There can be no raison d’être for a Zionist movement whose membership restricts itself to supporting Israel politically and economically, which is something all friends of Israel do, in large or small measure.” But Goldmann claimed that it was unrealistic to say, as had some Zionist leaders in Israel, that to be a Zionist meant that one must emigrate to Israel.

Some reflection of the dissent among American Zionists as to their functions was seen in the public statement issued by veteran Zionist leader Louis Lipsky on June 19, 1955, in which he declared that he would not attend the fifty-eighth annual convention of the ZOA (held June 16–19, 1955). In addition to criticizing the ZOA for “losing its sense of direction” and “being confused as to its functions,” Lipsky also charged that the ZOA sought to escape from the problems facing it by identification with the General Zionist Party in Israel. Hence, Lipsky claimed, “this concentration of zealous partisanship and an itch for controversy has inhibited the ZOA from taking up the causes that are its own immediate concern.” Lipsky was not alone in his objections. On June 23, three prominent Zionist leaders, Judge Louis Levinthal of Philadelphia, Ezra Shapiro of Cleveland, and Dewey Stone of Taunton, Mass., issued a joint statement associating themselves with Lipsky’s statement.

While the ZOA convention took no public cognizance of Lipsky’s absence, ZOA president Mortimer May issued an attack on Lipsky on June 23 in which he charged that the “liberal” group within the ZOA whom Lipsky represented had refused to abide by majority rule.

In addition to internal dissension, the ZOA also had differences with the newly established organization to sell Israel bonds in the United States (for details, see p. 232). At the meeting of the National Administrative Council of the ZOA held in New York on April 17, 1955, Jacques Torczyner, a national ZOA vice president, expressed “regret that when the reorganization of the Bond Campaign set-up was decided upon, no Zionist leaders were consulted.” The group passed a motion urging that the ZOA be officially and adequately represented in the new Israel bond organization.

On June 20, 1955, Rudolf G. Sonneborn announced that initial steps had been taken at a meeting held that week in New York to broaden the American Friends of Israel as “an active organization concerned with Israel affairs.” This organization, of which Sonneborn was president and Henry Montor, formerly chief executive officer of the American Financial and Development Corporation for Israel, was secretary, had been established about the end of 1952 to raise funds for the establishment of the Eliezer Kaplan School of Economics and Social Sciences.

On December 27, 1954, a four-day founding convention of the Student
Zionist Organization was opened at Columbia University in New York. It was attended by about 300 students from 60 colleges and universities. Under the sponsorship of the Youth Department of the American Zionist Council, the new group adopted a program to promote the Hebrew language, encourage emigration to Israel, and develop a Zionist education program among students.

Lucy Dawidowicz