Communal

Religion*

THE PERIOD under review (July 1, 1962, to December 31, 1963) reached its climax in the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy on Friday, November 22. Sabbath eve services following the assassination were crowded beyond capacity, and the Synagogue Council of America reported that during the long weekend of November 22-25, several million Jews attended synagogues and temples, perhaps more than during High Holyday worship. For instance, well over 6,000 crowded Temple Emanu-El in New York City, and in White Plains, N.Y., over 6,000 Jews, half the Jewish population of that community, gathered in three synagogues, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. It was evident that even the unaffiliated Jew sought comfort in congregational worship. In the moment of national stress, the American Jew turned to religion.

Organizationally, 1962-63 was a year of consolidation rather than expansion for the American synagogue. Reports to the conventions of the national congregational bodies were concerned, not with the numbers of synagogues or members, but with quality of program. UAHC (Reform), meeting in November 1963 in Chicago, discussed "the pursuit of excellence," the improvement of standards in worship, youth and adult education, and social action. Addressing the convention of the United Synagogue (Conservative) which met in Kiamesha Lake, N.Y., at the same time, President George Maislen asked for a serious reevaluation of the movement's philosophy.

The ultra-Orthodox hasidim showed visible signs of growth. Breaking out of the narrow confines of certain sections of Brooklyn, N.Y., they were creating new communities in upstate New York and in New Jersey embracing not only modern cooperative housing, but also commercial and industrial enterprises. In June 1963 UOJCA announced plans for erecting two non-profit, middle-class 20-story apartment buildings on 4.3 acres of land in

* For meaning of abbreviations, see p. 361.
Newark, N.J. The $12-million development program was to include a $2-
million nursing home.

Religious-school enrolment had leveled off at slightly below 600,000, with
only the Orthodox day-schools showing any signs of substantial enrolment
increase. The UOJCA convention in November 1962 heard a report that
its 290 schools had over 54,000 students, compared with 50,300 in the pre-
vious year.

A slight trend toward the support of day schools was discernible among
non-Orthodox groups. Conservative religious leaders had for some time
been expressing dissatisfaction with the quality of Jewish education avail-
able to children attending the public schools. At the 1963 UAHC convention
Reform leaders heard Vice President Jay Kaufman and Education Director
Alexander Schindler declare that it was time for liberal Jews to consider
the advisability of sponsoring day schools to provide intensive Jewish edu-
cation.

MAJOR ISSUES

Five major issues dominated the thinking of Jewish religious groups during
the year: the plight of Soviet Jewry; civil rights; religion and public educa-
tion, especially in the light of the June 1963 Supreme Court decision pro-
hibiting public-school prayers (p. 42); the status of religion in Israel, and
the possibilities for Ecumenical Council consideration of “the attitude of
Catholics toward non-Christians, particularly toward the Jews.”

Soviet Jewry

The growing restrictions against Jewish religious practice in the Soviet
Union evoked vigorous protests by the synagogue bodies of the United
States. While they acknowledged that the Communist regime was tradition-
ally anti-religious, they insisted that especially repressive measures were
exercised against the practice of Judaism. At its convention, UOJCA de-
declared that “with the exception of the Jewish faith, the major religions of
the Soviet people are permitted to maintain central bodies and to produce
the prerequisites for their worship.” UAHC President Maurice Eisendrath
insisted to his convention that “the moment of quiet diplomacy is past.
. . . The American Jewish community can no longer permit itself to be
fobbed off by Soviet officialdom and fear of offending.”

In January 1963 the New York Board of Rabbis offered to send matzot
for distribution through local synagogues but received no response from the
government or the Jewish community. In March SCA invited Judah L. Levin,
chief rabbi of Moscow, to lead a delegation of Soviet Jewish leaders in a
visit to the United States. At the same time, SCA officers met with a visiting
delegation of Russian churchmen to seek information about the status of
Jewry in their country. (The meeting was not very productive.) In June
they held a series of talks with Anatoly Myshkov, first secretary of the
Soviet embassy in Washington, who tried to reassure them by saying that regular services were held and a new prayer book was being published. In October SCA proclaimed Yom Kippur as a "Day of National Concern for Russian Jews."

When the Russian Jewish editor Aaron Vergelis (p. 275) visited the United States late in 1963 with a group of Soviet writers, SCA urged American Jews to avoid all contact with "one of the architects of the destruction of Judaism," and the advice was generally followed.

One critical voice was raised in opposition to these protest measures. The Orthodox Agudath Israel of America at its convention in November 1963 deplored "the highly publicized aggressive tactics that various Jewish organizations have adopted . . . regarding the situation of the Jews in Soviet Russia."

But the mood of bitter resentment prevailed throughout the synagogues of America, and in the overwhelming majority of pulpits, rabbis adhered to the theme that Russian Judaism would die within a generation unless the Soviet policy of systematic repression were modified.

The Synagogue and Civil Rights

On August 28, 1963, well over 200 rabbis, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform, participated in the March on Washington for Negro civil rights (p. 18). Newspapers and television programs highlighted the banners of UAHC, the United Synagogue, CCAR, and several religious youth groups, many of which quoted the Bible in Hebrew on the theme of social justice. Scores of leading laymen marched, and congregational social-action groups supported their efforts in local meetings throughout the country.

In July 1963 a Baltimore, Md., rabbi joined Christian clergymen in picketing a privately owned amusement park, and national attention was focused on their arrest. Several rabbis spent time in jail in the wake of "freedom rides" to Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi.

In November 1963 UAHC Board Chairman Emil Baar issued a "Call to Racial Justice," bidding members to sign a pledge on behalf of the cause. "There exists today," he said, "a deep sense of urgency on the part of Jews regarding the racial crisis in America." SCA declared June 1, 1963, as a special Sabbath to stress that "racism has no place in Jewish belief or practice." In July the council joined Protestant and Catholic bodies in a statement to the House judiciary subcommittee supporting legislation enforcing the right to vote, integration of schools, and nondiscrimination in public housing, and calling for a four-year extension of the Commission on Civil Rights.

UAHC gave a gift of $1,000 to a memorial fund honoring the martyred NAACP official, Medgar Evers (p. 16). Both the United Synagogue and UAHC honored the nation's leading Negro, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, at their biennial conventions. The United Synagogue presented him with the Solomon Schechter Award (given only once previously, more than
a decade earlier, to the late Senator Herbert Lehman) "for translating the prophetic vision into a living reality."

As the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation ended, CCAR noted that there was need to recognize "the magnitude and the difficulties of the unfinished task which confronts the American people" in fulfilling the promise inherent in the proclamation.

**Religion and Public Education**

The Supreme Court decision of June 1963 (p. 42), widely regarded as a major breakthrough in the struggle for separation of church and state, found the Jewish religious community somewhat divided. Conservative and Reform groups applauded the decision as a step forward in guaranteeing the principle of religious liberty. Orthodox groups tended to disagree.

The Orthodox Rabbinical Alliance declared at its annual convention in July 1963 that it was not opposed to nondenominational prayer in the public schools, though it agreed with the court decision on Bible reading. In September 1962 a leading Orthodox spokesman, UOJCA leader Moses Feinstein, expressed concern lest "the emphasis on freedom of religion by Jewish civil-liberties leaders become a concept of freedom from religion."

At its June 1963 convention CCAR hailed the court decision and voiced opposition to a program of "shared time" being introduced experimentally in Philadelphia and other communities, predicting that such a plan "would likely accentuate religious differences" in the school community.

In September 1962, the Jesuit weekly, *America*, criticized the role of Jewish religious organizations in initiating litigation leading to the Supreme Court action, asserting that their action had created anti-Jewish attitudes among Catholics. A highly critical reply by the American Jewish Committee was published in their following issue, and UAHC and CCAR characterized the editorial as "a disservice to the cause of religious amity in the United States."

In October 1963 the New York Board of Rabbis, in a joint action with the Catholic archdiocese and the Protestant Council of New York, criticized the New York City Board of Education for failing to consult the religious communities as it did other civic groups when making appointments to the board. Some Jewish organizations, notably AJCongress, construed the action as a dangerous attempt to establish a so-called "religious balance" on a public board. Officials of the three faiths, replying in the *Christian Century* (November 6, 1963), affirmed the principle of separation but felt that religious bodies should not be excluded from participation with other civic groups in helping to select suitable public-school officials.

**Religious Controversy in Israel**

There was an increased tempo of participation by American groups, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform, in the spiritual affairs of Israel. All American synagogue groups reached out to establish new institutions,
strengthen existing ones, and, on occasion, participate in street demonstrations in support of Israelis making demands on their government.

American Orthodox leaders complained about Conservative and Reform institutions in Israel. They demanded of the chief rabbinate that marriages and divorces solemnized by non-Orthodox rabbis be invalidated and issued a warning in August 1963 that the Conservative synagogue movement "constituted a serious threat to Israeli Jewry."

The World Union for Progressive Judaism continued to establish new Reform congregations in Israel. In November 1963 it complained that it was "constantly harassed by the official rabbinate" and declared its determination "to establish the right of non-Orthodox rabbis to perform religious functions there."

In the fall of 1963 hasidic students in New York City picketed the Israeli consulate, protesting against the alleged persecution of ultra-Orthodox groups by Jerusalem police. The Orthodox RCA joined with Conservative and Reform rabbis to deplore the action, especially the painting of swastikas on the consulate building by a few of the students.

Much controversy centered on the activity of Christian missionaries in Israel. A delegation of rabbis from UOJCA, returning from a study tour of the Holy Land in August 1963, called on the government of Israel to take measures against these missionary activities.

In November 1963 Agudath Israel asked all Orthodox groups "to lay aside ideological differences to cope unitedly with latest religious tensions in Israel." They urged the government of Israel to close the Mandelbaum gate in Jerusalem on the Sabbath in order to protect religious sensibilities of residents of the area.

On one issue all three branches of American religious Jewry were united. In December 1962 the Supreme Court of Israel ruled that Brother Daniel, a Carmelite monk seeking naturalization under the Law of Return (p. 316), could not be regarded as a Jew. The Reform and Conservative rabbinate of America, along with the Orthodox, accepted the decision as correct.

The Vatican and the Synagogue

The overtures made by the Vatican for improving Catholic-Jewish relations found a response among synagogue groups in the United States. President Theodore Friedman, addressing the 63rd annual meeting of the Rabbinical Assembly (Conservative) in May 1963, stressed the need for closer cooperation between Christians and Jews, saying that "the old image of Jews and Judaism" was being revised by both Protestants and Catholics. He expressed gratification at the contribution made by Pope John XXIII in eliminating the phrase "perfidious Jews" from the Holy Week Catholic liturgy and applauded his encyclical, *Pacem in terris*, as the basis for a united religious front on behalf of world peace.

A remarkable outpouring of grief followed the death of Pope John in June 1963. Synagogues throughout the United States had heard prayers on
behalf of his recovery, and eulogies during the period of mourning echoed the thought that he had sought "to establish a world where people of all faiths would join together in the pursuit of the common good."

Jewish religious groups expected the new Pope Paul VI to continue the tradition of interreligious cooperation. In October 1963 he received a delegation of American Jewish leaders. "We have a common Bible and a common God," he said. "Therefore we pray together so that the Almighty guide and bless us." Many rabbis hailed the introduction of a draft statement by the Ecumenical Council in October 1963, proposing a basic revision in the church's interpretation of the role played by the Jews of Jesus' time in the crucifixion (p. 238). Though there was some disappointment in the failure of the council to ratify the proposed statement before its adjournment, there was much evidence of closer rapport between Catholic church groups and Jewish congregations in many American communities. In New Orleans in November 1963 Rabbi Julian B. Feibelman launched a "Project Understanding." Synagogues of the city were to be open to Protestants and Roman Catholics, and a concrete program of interfaith cooperation was to be initiated in tribute to the memory of Pope John XXIII and his ecumenical effort to spread understanding.

Some controversy was stirred by President Eisendrath's address to the 1963 UAHC convention in which he urged that the Jewish response to the new ecumenical spirit should be to reinterpret Jesus "as a positive and prophetic spirit in the stream of Jewish tradition." Several rabbis, including HUC-JIR President Nelson Glueck, took issue with Rabbi Eisendrath, declaring that there was no need for such a revision.

TRENDS WITHIN ORTHODOXY

American Orthodoxy continued its work of strengthening Sabbath observance and promoting intensified religious education and kashrut adherence. The Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada organized a delegation of Orthodox Jewry, representing 14 national and New York agencies, to seek the support of Governor Nelson Rockefeller and legislative leaders in Albany for legislation permitting Sabbath observers to do business on Sunday. Such legislation was passed in April 1963 (p. 65).

The day school remained the pivotal point of religious education among the Orthodox. Rabbi Joseph Lookstein, addressing the 1962 UOJCA convention, described these schools as "the fortress of traditional Judaism" because "Judaism is not a faith like other faiths . . . [but] a way of life outlined by the Divine law" which can only be transmitted through intensified education.

At RCA's annual convention in June 1963, President Abraham AvRutick sought support for legislation making parochial-school tuition deductible for income-tax purposes. He said that such legislation would "not constitute an infringement of the basic American scheme of separation of church and state."
The *Wall Street Journal* (April 10, 1963) reported that the demand for kosher products had been increasing steadily in recent years. A survey by the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada found that approximately 2,000 kosher products were being produced, by more than 400 companies, compared to 1,000 products, by 225 companies four years earlier. The organization issued an *issur* (ban) against restaurants and catering establishments maintaining both kosher and non-kosher departments.

**Hasidim**

In 1963 a number of hasidic sects, notably the disciples of the Lubavitcher, the Satmar, and the Skvirer rabbis, reached out into the community with aggressive programs for religious education and for social-service work at home and abroad. Officials of the Lubavitcher movement estimated that 200 to 300 thousand American Jews were interested in their work. Acting with great zeal, the Lubavitcher disciples had developed elaborate social-welfare programs and were making aggressive efforts to enlist new members. Over 30,000 students, including 7,000 in Israel, 4,000 in Morocco, and several hundred in England, were enrolled in their schools, under a well-organized and centralized office in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn. The movement published religious textbooks, studies of hasidic thought, and even novels of Jewish interest, in 12 languages. It sponsored a news service and published monthly and quarterly journals in English, French, Yiddish, Hebrew, Italian, and German.

In the summer of 1962, under the leadership of Rabbi M. M. Schneerson, they had an educational exhibit at the Chicago International Trade Fair and planned similar exhibits in other cities.

**Conservative**

The Jewish Theological Seminary reorganized its governing board “to strengthen the role of the layman in the education of rabbis.” In October 1963 former Judge Simon H. Rifkind was named chairman of the board of directors and Alan M. Stroock, president of the Seminary corporation.

In the same month the National Institute of Mental Health gave JTS a grant of about $100,000 to carry on a special psychiatric-training program for rabbis. The American rabbi was assuming counseling responsibilities and required professional skills for such pastoral psychiatry.

In September 1963 JTS opened a new department of special education to train young people as leaders in synagogue activities. Certification was to be granted to students completing courses in Hebrew, Jewish history, and classical texts.

In August 1963 Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan, the founder of Reconstructionism, who had been associated with the seminary for more than half a cen-
tury, retired from active teaching. He planned to continue writing and lecturing.

Conservative Jewry continued its program of expansion in Latin America. In October 1963 the World Council of Synagogues (WCS) began a survey to determine the religious needs of the Jewish communities in six Latin American countries, and other surveys were planned for the Far East, India, Israel, and Europe.

At its 1963 convention the United Synagogue of America considered the growing problem of intermarriage (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], pp. 3-53). JTS Professor Robert Gordis warned that “some of our Jewish youths are being weaned away by other creeds. . . . More are led to intermarry and far more, who may not formally break the ties that bind them to their people and tradition, are effectively and permanently alienated from Jewish life.”

The Rabbinical Assembly participated actively in the sit-in movement on behalf of Negro civil rights. At its May 1963 convention, 19 rabbis were selected to join in the protest demonstrations in Birmingham, Ala. Notwithstanding criticism by the local Jewish community, the rabbis attended a rally at a Negro church and were warmly welcomed by the Negroes of the state. Martin Luther King hailed their support as “urgent and of great importance.”

In March 1963, after the Rabbinical Assembly had announced plans for a convocation in Israel, it canceled them to protest against the Israeli rabbinate’s refusal to recognize two divorces executed by the Rabbinical Assembly’s Beth Din (rabbinical court).

REFORM

UAHC, representing 649 congregations in the United States and Canada had a biennial assembly in November 1963 attended by more than 2,000 delegates. “The pursuit of excellence” was the theme, and the delegates undertook to elevate standards of synagogue leadership, substantially increase minimum requirements for confirmation, and introduce more Hebrew into the religious-school curriculum. Resolutions in support of United States foreign aid, the nuclear-test ban, and the United Nations were passed. For the first time, congregations were to be asked to sign a statement of policy on civil rights which would implement the national program on a local level; congregants would be asked to avoid discrimination in housing and not to patronize discriminatory shops or firms.

Some concern was expressed about the future of Reform Judaism in the major cities. Because of great mobility, young Jews were not returning after college to the smaller communities of their parents. In November 1962 UAHC Vice President Jay Kaufman warned that “unless we can provide for the spiritual growth of thousands of our youngsters living in the great city centers, we face a certain and drastic decline of Reform Judaism in the years ahead.” Myron Schoen, director of the union’s commission of
synagogue administration, pointed to the high price of urban real estate as a deterrent to synagogue expansion. He suggested the possibility of providing commercial facilities in synagogue buildings, as some Protestant churches had done.

The National Federation of Temple Youth sponsored a Jewish “peace corps” project in Puerto Rico during the summer of 1963, ten young people helping to build houses for families which had been living in shacks. Strong emphasis was being placed on the education programs of new summer camps in New York, Wisconsin, Georgia, and California. An elaborate network of regional conclaves involved thousands of young people from Reform congregations.

COMMUNITY CENTERS

Controversy arose regarding proposals by some Jewish community centers to sponsor activities on the Sabbath. The Denver (Col.) Rabbinical Council in August 1963 condemned the plans of the local community center to conduct a poll on opening its facilities on the Sabbath, while the center president maintained that physical and cultural recreation programs would be “in consonance with the spirit of the Sabbath.” In February 1963 the committee on religious affairs of New York’s Federation of Jewish Philanthropies recommended that YMHAs be closed on the Sabbath. Where circumstances made it advisable for a center to remain open, the committee urged, the program should be in the spirit of the Sabbath and the counsel of the local rabbinate should be sought.

METROPOLITAN BOARDS OF RABBIS

Rabbis representing the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform congregations worked closely through city- or state-wide associations. The associations concerned themselves primarily with local Jewish problems. Oldest of these was the New York Board of Rabbis, which celebrated its 80th anniversary in 1962. The New York board serviced local and state hospitals and prisons with chaplains. It maintained relations with Jewish religious communities throughout the world and on many occasions during 1963 vigorously protested the suppression of Jewish religious liberty in the Soviet Union. In November 1963 ground was broken for the new Idlewild (now Kennedy) Synagogue, which was to be erected at a cost of over half-a-million dollars.

The Massachusetts Board of Rabbis fought for enactment of fair Sabbath laws and for support of the Supreme Court decisions on religion in the public schools. Many of the associations, including the Philadelphia, Chicago, New York, and Massachusetts groups, set up standards for dignified funeral procedures. They sought also to standardize and add dignity to wedding practices in their communities.

Morris N. Kertzer
Jewish Education*

As a result of improved and new administrative practices introduced into Jewish education during the past 15 years or so, an increasing number of children are benefiting from a greater variety of educational situations than ever before, and the probability of achievement has increased accordingly. Improved texts and tests have also become available. Comparable progress, however, has not been made in the clarification of aims and in the creation and ordering of the appropriate means.

Recent Trends

High Schools

The terminal level of Jewish education is changing in a positive direction. Jewish high schools are being established throughout the country by the energetic efforts of the national religious organizations and bureaus of education in cooperation with local synagogues. Parents and students are acknowledging the value of continued Jewish education. Synagogue boards and community agencies are accepting the idea that Jewish education is indispensable to the survival of Judaism in any form. Despite increasing public-school demands on time, the number of Jewish-high-school students is growing.

Figures from New York City's Jewish Education Committee provide an illustration—though, because it is from New York, not necessarily representative—of increasing high-school attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1951-52</th>
<th>1962-63</th>
<th>Per-cent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-day</td>
<td>3,273</td>
<td>8,127</td>
<td>+148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>+144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-day</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>+214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A noteworthy achievement has been the emergence of the joint high school as a viable institution. This was made possible by the cooperation between synagogues and community and among synagogues themselves, many of which have learned to submerge parochial interests for the sake of common gain.

* For meaning of abbreviations, see p. 361.

1 Azriel L. Eisenberg and Louis L. Ruffman, A Hard Look at the JEC, 1963, mimeographed, p. 5.
**Summer Study**

Schools (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], pp. 151–66) are no longer the exclusive centers of Jewish education. Summer overnight and day camps have become increasingly important, and agencies and private entrepreneurs are regularly opening new ones. National religious organizations, local federations, Hebrew teachers' colleges, synagogues, day schools, and other cultural organizations maintain them. Three factors especially favor good educational achievement in camp: the group is composed of students who by virtue of self-selection are more highly motivated than those in a typical city class; staff can be drawn from a larger pool of teachers and recreational workers than is normally available to Jewish schools, and opportunities to implement abstract ideals inhere in the problems of day-to-day living.

The camps differ greatly in their programs. Some function primarily as Hebrew schools, where formal classes take precedence over recreation. Others emphasize recreation, offering plays, music, dance festivals, and the like as primary vehicles for Jewish content. Still others base their programs on formal study programs held one or more periods a day, but provide planned recreational programs as well. Some stress a religious orientation and others the use of Yiddish or Hebrew, knowledge of Israel, or “universal values.” It is quite clear that formal Jewish studies and religious observance have not been a barrier to a high rate of reenrollment.

The better camps have contributed to the recent systematic upgrading of content in year-round Jewish schools. They also influence leisure-time activities. For many young people, their summer experience provides a quality of Jewish education and an inspiration which, to their dismay, year-round schools do not equal.

One investigator has concluded that summer camps have transcended their supplementary status to become basic components of Jewish education. Day camps have paralleled the growth of overnight camps. Synagogues and occasionally other bodies have organized educational-recreational programs heavily weighted with Jewish content, often in conjunction with year-round schools. Less expensive than resident camps, day camps nevertheless benefit from many of the same advantages.

Organized trips to Israel have developed as another instrument of Jewish education, whether for post-bar mitzvah young people or graduate students. Lectures, tours, and short work periods are included in such trips, and their variations range from summer camps approximating American models to six-week formal study courses in Judaica, having Hebrew as the language of instruction. They are sponsored by the three religious groups, Zionist groups, and private entrepreneurs.

---

2 Daniel Isaacman, in a forthcoming doctoral dissertation, Dropsie College.
Day Schools

The number of day schools continues to grow.

In May 1962 there were 271 day schools in this country and 19 schools in Canada. . . . The school enrolment [was] approximately 50,000. . . . There are 102 communities spread over 29 states and the District of Columbia, and six communities in Canada in which are found day schools.3

Conservative synagogues, alone or cooperatively, have begun to establish day schools in harmony with their religious outlook, and the Reform movement has begun to examine the value of day schools from its point of view.4 Special schools have been developed or are on the horizon to meet needs not provided for in the traditional day schools. The National Conference of Yeshiva Principals (affiliated with Torah Umesorah) was contemplating the establishment of a vocational day school for pupils who do not expect to go to college. The Maimonides Institute of Middle Village, N.Y., maintains a day school for mentally handicapped children 6 to 16 years of age and a pre-vocational program for young adults, 17 years old and over.

Accreditation

Accreditation, a means of stimulating the development and maintenance of quality education, requires the services of a respected educational authority to evaluate schools objectively. Criteria for accreditation must vary with the circumstances within which given schools operate, but they must always be directed toward increasing the probability of educational success through the best use of professional personnel, effective administrative procedures, systematic teaching of an accepted curriculum, establishment of standards for admission and promotion, provisions for in-service teacher training, and similar good practice.

In the absence of an organization with authority to compel compliance with acceptable standards, Jewish schools and school systems have only their own self-discipline on which to rely. In cooperation with a project directed by Jewish Education Committee Associate Director Louis Ruffman, the Conservative, Orthodox, and Reform groups of metropolitan New York have agreed upon criteria for evaluating and accrediting their elementary schools. In 1964, 53 schools had been thus accredited: 22 Conservative, 9 Orthodox, and 23 Reform.5

The Commission on Jewish Education of the United Synagogue of America has begun to create an accrediting procedure for Conservative schools across the country.

3 Alvin Schiff, "The Jewish Day School and the Jewish Community," Jewish Education, Fall 1962, p. 29.
Professionalization

AAJE established standards for the certification of teachers in 1951. In 1962 its license committee began to develop national standards for the certification of principals, and in January 1964 it granted its first principals' licenses.

A national pension plan for Jewish educational personnel was instituted in 1960 under the auspices of AAJE. In 1963 personnel from 24 communities were enrolled. The teacher pays one-third of the premium cost, and in a number of cities the local bureaus have assumed equal responsibility with the school for the rest of the cost.

Through its committee on teacher and education welfare, AAJE encouraged the formation of communal boards of review and conciliation to "take the grief out of grievances."

Teacher Training

Central bureaus of Jewish education (AJYB, 1958 [Vol. 59], pp. 135–36) long ago instituted in-service courses in methods and content for teachers. Some bureaus offer teachers' training courses in conjunction with their development of new texts and manuals. The Hebrew-language programs, sponsored by the bureaus in New York and Chicago, have sustained such an in-service program since 1956 and 1959, respectively. Outlying regions, removed from Hebrew colleges, have benefited particularly from the services of education bureaus. In 1959 AAJE, through its committee for teacher education and welfare, instituted off-campus college courses for teachers who required them for an academic degree or teacher's license. Every major Jewish teacher-training institution in the country has participated in the effort to furnish outlying areas with instructors. The JTS Teachers' Institute has established branches for undergraduates at Cornell University and the University of Michigan.

Summer seminars and schools for Jewish educators have become standard. Besides its summer workshops in Israel, the Department of Education and Culture of the Jewish Agency, in cooperation with Hebrew teachers' colleges, local bureaus, and AAJE, conducts intensive Hebrew-language and literature courses and refresher courses in educational theory and practice. The JTS Teachers' Institute offers graduate and undergraduate courses in its summer school, and Yeshiva University, under a National Defense Education Act grant, conducts a summer institute for secondary-school teachers of modern Hebrew.

Jewish teachers' colleges are beginning to recognize that the skills needed by teachers in a Jewish context are not readily transferable nor derivable from preparation for public-school teaching. Gratz College in Philadelphia now offers a course in group work, and Yeshiva University's Teachers' Institute for Women offers one in early childhood education. The JTS Teachers' Institute has established a department of special education, which will pro-
vide an integrated series of courses in the philosophy and techniques of Jewish youth work.

**Professional Study**

There is a growing recognition that especially in our period of rapid cultural changes, Jewish education needs first-rate scholars of Judaica. To encourage and assist young scholars, the National Foundation for Jewish Culture in 1961 established postgraduate grants to promising candidates. In 1960 Har Zion Temple of Philadelphia formalized a program which it had started in 1954 by establishing a unique three-year scholar-in-residence program for a full-time student in advanced Judaica. In September 1963 the Melton Research Center awarded its first fellowships to college graduates interested in Jewish scholarship or Jewish education as a career.

**CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENTS**

It would be hard to find a Jewish school or school system with a rationally developed, organically integrated plan of instruction. Such a plan would have to include a statement of aims and hypotheses about man's fundamental nature and how he changes and learns. It would take into account whatever new light science sheds on those aims and hypotheses, and would offer students experiences most likely to achieve the aims. The plan would also provide for continuous self-evaluation procedures to check the parts of the educational enterprise, their interaction, and the end result.

Most schools publish no curriculum at all. Although some schools, bureaus, and national organizations do publicize aims, texts, reading assignments, and time allotments, and sometimes even indicate the methods they employ, the curricula of even the best of these lack internal coherence and are inadequate for their purpose. Education bureaus, teachers' colleges, and recreation centers seek to serve the largest number of people and therefore strive to be congenial to every ideological group. In the long run, therefore, the unique requirements of particular groups tend to receive scant attention.

On the whole, the texts, tests, in-service training, supervision, and standards which community-serving agencies introduce may be excellent, but they reflect this reality. They have been developed in those areas which do not force the bureaus to cope with the essential differences among the various ideological groups which make each of them unique.

The basic objectives of each ideological group—those, in fact, which have impelled it to create its separate educational enterprise—are rarely evaluated professionally with an eye to teaching techniques, time allotments, self-evaluation procedures, and supervisory practices. Simultaneously students and teachers of all groups develop respect for the noncontroversial subject matter because of the visible status granted to them by the paraphernalia of mass testing (IBM answer sheet, printed test booklets, etc.) and attractive text books. The supervisors' use of impressive statistical data reflecting the
“achievements” of students and schools reinforce the teachers’ and pupils’ concern for the “common elements” of the Jewish school. In time, schools with distinctive ideologies which knowingly and provisionally make use of the beneficial services rendered by community agencies tend imperceptibly to petrify into a policy stance which they did not choose deliberately. Teachers lose sight of their prime objectives and laymen never learn what they were. Whatever the extenuating circumstances, too many ideological leaders of every type of school except day schools have failed to react energetically to this obvious deficiency.

Hebrew

Hebrew-language instruction has been the most systematically developed in recent years. The Chicago Board of Jewish Education, under Edward A. Nudelman’s direction, since 1956 has experimented with a coherent plan based on a clearly envisioned objective and a hypothesis about learning, and utilizes new classroom materials, new methods, and teacher-training techniques.

The objective is to teach students to read Hebrew with comprehension. An entire year is allowed for the growth of audio-lingual skills before students are taught to read, to develop the same kind of relationship to the reading of Hebrew as the pupil has to the reading of English. Thus, the student learns more Hebrew than he is called upon to read throughout the elementary Hebrew-school years. The hypothesis is that by maintaining this distance between his audio-lingual skills and the material he is expected to read, he more readily learns to read with comprehension.

Since 1961 the JEC has been developing an “educational package” for Hebrew-language teaching. This is based on the Curriculum Outline for Congregational Schools, which seeks to make use of every opportunity provided in the curriculum to teach Hebrew. Rebekka Kohn, who prepared the materials, stresses efficiency in the use of a variety of tried techniques. A typical experimental kit, for the teaching of first-year Hebrew, includes a manual, Hebrew stories, Hebrew songs, dialogues, a word list, prayer and worship, curriculum, and model lesson units. In Chicago and New York workshop sessions for prospective teachers and standardized objective tests for evaluating students’ progress were used in successful trials.

The Reform movement has clearly indicated its concern for the improvement of Hebrew-language instruction. By 1960 three-quarters of the Reform congregations conducted midweek Hebrew classes. It has been pointed out, however, that with the exception of a few congregations there has really been “no tradition of sustained elementary Hebrew instruction in Reform Judaism in the United States.” Consequently, instructional aims are unclear and much of the Reform effort has yielded poor results. To remedy the

---

situation, in June 1962 the UAHC–CCAR Commission on Jewish Education recommended a time schedule for Hebrew-language study in Reform religious schools. It calls for an eight-year three-sessions-per-week program with an annual total of 120 hours of Hebrew instruction. Because available instructional material is not designed for such a program, the commission arranged for a comprehensive review of existing Hebrew texts and supplementary aids from which appropriate materials might be drawn.

**RESEARCH**

Research and reexamination of first principles often go together. The declaration by Reform Jews in 1962 that knowledge of Hebrew is important for Jewish living was the product of research into Hebrew-language teaching, and resulted in a recommendation for an increased time allotment for Hebrew instruction. Similarly, the (Conservative) Educators Assembly's study of Bible teaching in its 1963–64 Area Research Seminars started an examination of the place of inquiry in religious education at its 1964 Convention. In 1962 the National Conference of Yeshiva Principals established a research commission to deal with problems common to their affiliated schools. It is currently investigating programmed instruction, transmission of values, character development, and religious behavior. Yeshiva principals are particularly interested in discovering what is the best time between the fifth and seventh years of school at which to begin the study of Talmud.7

The bureaus of Jewish education continually do research of immediate and practical utility, such as that bearing upon the development of new texts or methods. Often their contributions are popularly adopted even before they are described in professional journals, and they are not credited for their pioneering efforts.

**The National Curriculum Research Institute**

The National Curriculum Research Institute (NCRI) was established by AAJE in 1960 in response to the challenge of widespread shallowness in Jewish education. It seeks to serve the variegated needs of the entire Jewish community. In August 1963 its program consisted of three major activities: clarification of aims and objectives, research and experimentation, and tests and measurement.8

In a document entitled *Jewish Education in Response to the Challenge of Our Times* distributed to the Jewish press, organizations, bureaus of Jewish education, schools, etc., in November 1960, NCRI emphasized the need for

(a) an appreciation of the element of change in the world at large, and in Jewry in particular, which must be reckoned with in any reexamination of the Jewish school program;

7 Louis Nulman, Torah Umesorah, personal communication.
greater emphasis on the current scene, relating the past to the present and rendering Jewish education relevant to modern life;
(c) the recognition of the pluralistic character of Jewish life in the modern world.

According to the director's report, the NCRI's subcommittee on research and experimentation has begun to

(a) spell out . . . aims in Jewish education, in terms of specific goals to be attained on the elementary and high school levels;
(b) constructed and used three opinionnaires in which 127 specific goals were listed and individuals were asked to assign priorities through a rating scale from "Essential" to "Detrimental";
(c) studied the "views" of high school students with regard to their image of the young Jew which our school should aim to develop;
(d) tested graduates of high schools in four communities on Jewish concepts and values, Bible comprehension, advanced Hebrew and modern Jewish life;
(e) formulated a tentative set of criteria for a curriculum in secondary Jewish education;
(f) set in motion an action-research program in secondary schools of ten communities. Units of instruction in two subjects, *The Contemporary Jewish Scene* and *Basic Jewish Concepts*, were made available. The material on modern Jewish life has been published and six units on *Basic Concepts* in Hebrew and in English were scheduled for publication.

**Melton Research Center**

The Melton Research Center, the educational research arm of the Teachers' Institute of JTS, was established in 1960 to formulate a comprehensive program for the religious education of Jewish youth and to develop and articulate the necessary philosophy and psychology, materials and methods, and evaluational techniques.

A series of papers, prepared by scholars associated with the center and tentatively entitled *Some Basic Motifs for Jewish Education* and scheduled for publication in 1964, singles out attitudes and principles that it is desirable for students to identify themselves with and make their own. Subject to continued reexamination, it is to provide the Jewish educator with answers to such questions as these: How is the appropriate knowledge to be acquired? What are the thinking patterns arising from the materials being learned which a student must master and to which he must become habituated? What moral actions, ritual actions, and actions of worship does Jewish religious education include? What educational elements are necessary in religious education, e.g., what attitude and inner experience are appropriate to the act of worship? What are the physical objects through which our feeling, thinking, and understanding of the divine and the holy are communicated from generation to generation? What is the entire behavior which should characterize a good man, a good Jew, a good Jewish community? What should be the relations of a Jewish community to the larger culture of which it is part? What are the competences and habits of learning, of scholarship,
and of critical thought which permeate Jewish tradition? This volume in experimental form is already guiding a second group of scholars in selecting subject matter as they write source-texts for the curriculum which will emerge, Jewish history, Jewish thought, ritual, and Hebrew language. A third group of writers is using the motifs and source-texts to develop teaching units and students’ texts.

The center has also assumed the task of contributing to the theoretical structure for moral education, by converting data from the behavioral sciences into guiding principles for pedagogy. Several prominent theories of behavior are being analyzed to extract the key factors basic to all. Simultaneously the center is attempting to translate the insights of psychiatry to education, specifically as they apply to the teacher-student relationship. The evolving theory and practice for moral education is being introduced into all of the Conservative movement’s Ramah camps for controlled experimentation. From the synthesis of formal and informal education it is hoped that much will be learned for wider application in the year-round Jewish school.

More than 30 pilot schools in 28 cities of the United States and Canada have been chosen to use the first experimental materials for Bible instruction in selected classes during 1964–65. By September 1969 the center intends to select at least 30 schools which will use in an integrated way all the material it will provide and will serve as experimental centers.

LOUIS NEWMAN

Jewish Communal Services:
Programs and Finances *

THIS REPORT deals with the major developments in 1962 and 1963 in the principal fields of Jewish communal service and with their financing, provided at an annual cost of almost $560 million (Table 1A).

Health, welfare, recreational, community relations, cultural, religious, and educational services are provided in the United States and overseas, mainly through Jewish federations and welfare funds, which operate as central community-planning organizations and conduct annual fund-raising campaigns. They distribute the proceeds to local, national, and overseas beneficiary organizations upon review in each of the communities of their programs and finances.

Federations and welfare funds associated in CJFWF operate in communities in which over 90 per cent of the Jewish population of the United States

* For meaning of abbreviations, see p. 361.
and Canada reside. Their campaigns are supported by an estimated total of more than a million contributors. Local committees are organized for fund-raising purposes in the hundreds of small, scattered areas where the remaining 10 per cent of the Jews live, but the loose structure of these temporary committees does not assure continuity in annual campaigns. The national UJA is the major beneficiary of such joint community campaigns (as it is of the federated campaigns generally), although a small number of other appeals are frequently included.

While each federation or welfare fund is autonomous and determines its own specific structure and scope of activity, their functions are essentially similar, and they attempt to meet what are generally accepted as broad Jewish responsibilities. The data in this report cover services supported by central Jewish community organizations in some 200 cities, as well as major Jewish agencies which campaign independently. The terms “federation” and “welfare fund” are used interchangeably.

### FUND RAISING BY CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

About $2.66 billion was raised in the annual campaigns of central Jewish community organizations in the 25 years from 1939, when UJA was founded, through 1963. Almost $1.5 billion which UJA received during this period came mainly from welfare funds. These annual campaigns raised $1.18 billion during the fifties, or an annual average of $118 million.

Annual campaign proceeds during the quarter century show the following major changes:

1. From 1939 through 1942 annual levels were at about $27 to $29 million.
2. From 1943 through 1945 annual rises of over $10 million brought the level to $57 million at the end of World War II.
3. From 1946 through 1948, the period of massive displaced persons' needs and the effort related to the creation of the State of Israel, fund raising was at a peak; the 1946 level was more than twice as high as for the previous year and moved forward to the 1948 peak of over $200 million.
4. From 1949 through 1955 there were successive declines until the post-war low of $107 to $110 million was reached in 1954 and 1955.
5. From 1956 through 1963 campaign proceeds ranged from a high of $138 million in 1957 to a low of $123 million in 1958 with results in the last five years confined within a narrower range of $125 to $130 million.

If totals were adjusted for changes in the Consumer Retail Price Index, the 1948 peak would be four times as high as the 1939-43 level and twice as high as in most years since 1952.

Proceeds of these campaigns with minor exceptions, provide for maintenance and operating needs only. Totals do not reflect income from capital-fund or endowment drives conducted by federations alone or together with
local Jewish agencies for local hospitals, homes for the aged, centers, and other structures.\(^1\)

Welfare funds raised $129.6 million in 1962 and $125.6 million in 1961 (Table 1). Preliminary data for 1963 indicate a drop of about four per cent under 1962 results. On the basis of this trend, 1963 results may approximate $125 million.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York City obtained over $75 million in pledges and grants by the end of 1963 toward a building-fund goal originally set at $104.4 million in 1961 but later revised to $156 million. Pledges were payable over a five-year period. Earlier campaigns for capital purposes had raised $11 million in 1949, $14 million in 1945, and $3 million in 1943.

Because of their long-term nature, systematic annual data on local capital fund-raising efforts were not available, but partial figures indicated the magnitude of these campaigns, conducted by federations, for the most part, in addition to their annual campaigns. In 1963 alone there were reports of plans and drives for community centers in 16 cities with an estimated construction cost of over $16 million. Hospital and medical centers in 14 cities were to cost about $69 million. New homes for the aged (some including hospital facilities) in 17 cities were planned at a cost of about $27 million. Some 45 temples had goals of about $33 million. Many of these efforts were started before 1963 and were to continue for three to five years after 1963 with noncontributed income (matching federal funds, proceeds of sales of old structures, mortgage loans, etc.) covering substantial portions of the cost. These figures do not include the campaigns of the New York Federation for $156 million, of the Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Agencies for $15 million, and similar combined capital drives in Chicago, Detroit, and San Francisco.

Endowment funds of the 12 largest federations, restricted and unrestricted, as well as, in some instances, capital funds, were reported to have grown to over $70 million by 1963, or more than twice what it was a decade earlier.\(^2\)

Reports from cities with a combined Jewish population of 2.4 million listed 520 thousand individual gifts, not counting the contributions of tens of thousands of individuals through organization, trade union, synagogue, landsmanschaften, Yiddish newspapers, and other channels, especially in the largest cities. Since these cities contained about 40 per cent of the Jewish population in the United States, the number of givers may be estimated at more than a million.

---

1 By contrast, data for independent efforts of national and overseas agencies include major capital-fund drives, mainly for educational and religious institutions and hospitals. Comparisons between annual federation-campaign totals and independent appeals are inappropriate.

INDEPENDENT CAMPAIGNS

Each federation is autonomous and determines for itself what beneficiary agencies it will finance through allocations. Eleven nonlocal appeals are included almost universally by federated campaigns. Fourteen other agencies are included by half or more of the combined appeals, and other agencies by fewer combined appeals.

The general practice is for beneficiary agencies to waive independent fund raising in localities where they receive federation allocations. Those agencies which do not receive federation allocations may raise funds directly, generally clearing the timing and other aspects of their campaigns first with the appropriate federation. In some cases federations support maintenance needs of agencies while the agencies conduct independent appeals for capital funds. In 1962 some 70 agencies raised $62.4 million independently in addition to the allocations they received from welfare funds.

Since New York UJA beneficiaries are limited to national UJA, JWB, and UHS, other nonlocal agencies raise funds independently in New York City. While no accurate estimates are available regarding the totals thus raised, partial information suggests that over two-fifths of $62.4 million raised independently was secured in New York City.

Of $22.8 million raised independently by overseas agencies in 1962, Hadassah raised $7.4 million through membership efforts while three other women's organizations—Women's American ORT, National Council of Jewish Women, and Pioneer Women—raised $1.2 million, $0.6 million, and $1.1 million respectively. The three institutions of higher learning in Israel raised over $6.0 million, mainly in New York City, with a substantial portion earmarked for building funds. JNF's traditional appeal raised $2.8 million, and Histadrut raised $1.7 million, largely from Labor Zionist sources in cities where it received no welfare-fund allocation.

Most of the $3.6 million raised independently in the community-relations field was secured by JDA in New York City and Chicago, by the supplementary but separate drives of the JDA agencies for specific projects, and by supplementary efforts in cities where welfare-fund grants were conditioned upon a waiver of separate fund raising.

A total of $8.5 million was raised by hospitals, mainly City of Hope (Duarte, Calif.) and National Jewish Hospital (Denver, Col.). For the most part, these agencies no longer had wide acceptance as welfare-fund beneficiaries and were thereby not precluded from vigorous independent efforts.

Major amounts in the cultural field were raised independently by Brandeis University ($7.4 million) which does not seek welfare-fund support, and by B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal (about $2.8 million), mainly from membership sources.

3 UJA, American Jewish Committee, ADL, JWB, University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal, America-Israel Cultural Foundation, B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, UHS, AJCongress, AAJE, and NCRAC.
Of $16.1 million raised independently by religious agencies, over $5.2 million, most of which was raised in New York City, was for the Einstein Medical School of Yeshiva University; $4.1 million was raised by the Combined Reform Campaign, mainly within its membership, and $3.3 million was raised by JTS, mainly from supporters of Conservative Judaism.

Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies, generally arranged by agreement with federation, provides smaller sums for operating purposes. Local hospitals, centers, family agencies, child-care agencies, and homes for the aged raised a total of $7 million independently in 1962. These funds supplemented the major share of income, furnished by Jewish federations and community chests.

**Distribution of Funds**

Jewish federation campaigns are conducted on a pledge basis and payments are frequently made in installments, except for the smallest gifts. Most campaigns are conducted in the spring, and about a third of all pledges for a given campaign year are paid in succeeding years. As a result, an allowance of about four per cent is made for "shrinkage," the difference between cash and pledges.4

Federation administrative costs, including those for fund raising, budgeting, planning, and other central functions, average about 12 per cent. These major elements explain the difference in the figures shown for amounts raised (Table 1) and distributed (Table 3).

About 59 per cent of amounts budgeted in 1962 by welfare funds were applied to overseas needs, 4 per cent to national agencies, and almost 37 per cent to local services. The major shift in 1962 was an increase of about one per cent in the UJA share outside of New York City and a decrease of about the same amount for local services.

The UJA share (included in overseas) rose from 58 per cent in 1955 to 65 per cent in 1957 and leveled off at 56 to 60 per cent between 1958 and 1961. In 1962 the UJA share was 56.5 per cent with the prospect, on the basis of indicated changes in campaign results, that it might decrease in 1963. Overseas agencies other than UJA continued to receive under 3 per cent of the totals budgeted. All nonlocal non-UJA agencies, including national agencies, continued to receive about 7 per cent of the totals budgeted.

A major factor affecting the distribution of funds is the existence of Jewish hospitals in almost all of the large centers of Jewish population. Thus, a higher share of funds is allocated for local Jewish services in the largest cities, and a lower share for nonlocal agencies; the reverse is true in very small cities. In 1962 nonlocal agencies received 61 per cent of funds budg-

---

4 105 federations (outside of New York City), which raised $74.1 million in 1962 provided for shrinkage allowances of $3.2 million and set aside $8.9 million for central administration, planning, budgeting, and fund-raising.
eted in cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over, while the very smallest communities (Jewish populations under 5,000), with the least developed networks of local Jewish services, continued to give nonlocal agencies 84 per cent of their budgeted funds. Intermediate-sized cities provided nonlocal agencies with about 75 per cent of budgeted funds.

Local services received about $36.3 million for operating purposes in 1962 compared with $35.3 million in 1961. The increases were shared by all local services. Income for Jewish local services from community chests rose more than 3 per cent in 1962. This was proportionate to the rise of total costs of services eligible for chest support (health, family and child care, recreation and aged care). Jewish federation allocations also rose almost 3 per cent, based on reports from 110 cities in 1962.

There was little change in allocations for local capital purposes in 1962, and such allocations did not exceed 1.4 per cent of the total nationally or 2.1 per cent of that outside of New York City. The figure refers only to minor funds (about 40 out of 110 communities reported the inclusions of such funds in 1962). Local capital funds are generally excluded from annual maintenance campaigns.

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

The pattern of fund distribution results from budget reviews by allocations committees of federations and welfare funds. This involves study of agency programs and finances, use of factual reports and intercommunity statistical comparisons prepared by CJFWF, and consideration of recommendations by the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC), consisting of welfare funds in 23 of the largest communities. LCBC recommendations deal with 14 nonlocal agencies which receive about three-fifths of all nonlocal federation allocations, exclusive of UJA.

UJA and major UJA agencies—the Jewish Agency for Israel (JAI), Inc., and JDC—participated in a process of budget-information exchange and consultation with CJFWF in 1963.

**AID TO ISRAEL**

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States is channeled through UJA and other overseas agencies and through the Bonds for Israel. From 1948 through 1962 UJA provided about $660 million for the Jewish Agency for Israel through UIA (which transmitted another $115 million, mainly between 1948 and 1952). JDC expended $130 million of UJA funds for its

---

5 If hospitals were excluded from local allocations, the percentage would be 73 per cent, close to that of all but the very smallest cities.

6 Excludes local refugee care.

7 This was included in total JDC receipts of about $510 million received through UJA from 1948 through 1962.
programs in Israel. Hadassah raised over $120 million in this period, and sales of Israel Bonds were over $553 million in the United States.

United States governmental assistance and German reparations and restitution payments were the other major external sources of aid to Israel. United States government aid to Israel through 1962 was about $730 million,\(^8\) German reparations payments totaled over $700 million, or 90 per cent of total reparations due.

In 1962 there was a rise of $126 million in Israel's foreign-currency balances, which resulted in a record balance of $490 million. This was more than offset by $806 million in foreign-currency liabilities, mainly loans (Israel Bonds, $451 million; intergovernmental loans, $111 million; other loans, $244 million). There was a further rise in foreign-currency reserves of about $80 million in 1963.

Israel's own earnings accrue largely from exports of goods and services, foreign investments, and private transfers of funds. Commodity exports reached $272 million in 1962, or about 45 per cent of imports of $610 million.\(^9\) The annual trade deficits have ranged from $224 million to $337 million since the creation of the State of Israel, with the 1962 deficit at $337 million (a preliminary estimate for 1963 is $300 million).\(^10\)

If services are included (tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $402 million in 1961 and $416 million in 1962. These deficits were partially offset in 1961 by $346 million and in 1962 by $335 million in "unrequited transfers" consisting mainly of restitutions and reparations, campaign proceeds in the United States and other countries, personal transfers, and United States government aid.

Preliminary data indicate that the deficit in trade and services was reduced by about $50 million in 1963. The gain was mainly in citrus and diamond exports.\(^11\)

**Philanthropic Programs**

Philanthropic funds continue to be an important source of income for Israel. Although these funds are for welfare programs, the exchange of dollars for pounds was helpful to the country in earlier years in making available foreign currency. With the rise of foreign-currency reserves since 1959, this aspect no longer was significant. By 1963 the government was able to pay off $50 million for foreign-currency debts in advance of due dates.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to CJFWF had available for overseas purposes about $96.6 million in 1962 compared with about $94.3 million in 1961. About 80 per cent of these funds were for Israeli purposes.

---

\(^8\) *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1963, p. 862. Most recent annual rate was $57 million.


\(^10\) Budget message by Minister of Finance, Phinehas Sappir (*Jerusalem Post*, December 24, 1963).

A major development in the Israel programs supported by philanthropic funds was the resumption of large-scale immigration between 1954 and 1957. Total immigration increased to about 55,000 in 1956 and to about 70,000 in 1957, but averaged under 25,000 annually in 1958, 1959, and 1960. Immigration increased in 1961 to over 46,000 and to almost 62,000 in 1962.\(^\text{12}\) There was a further increase in 1963.

**Bond Sales**

Three bond issues have been floated since 1951: Independence Bonds, Development Bonds, and Second Development Bonds. A fourth issue is planned for 1964.

The three-year flotation period of the Independence Bonds ended in May 1954 with sales of $145.5 million, of which $72.5 million was outstanding at November 30, 1963. The Development Bonds, floated in 1954–59, had sales of $234.1 million of which $140.1 million was outstanding on the same date. The Second Development Bonds, floated in 1959, had sales reported at $281.1 million by the end of 1963. From 1952 through 1963, a total of $58 million in bonds was transmitted to UJA in payment of pledges, of which $6.7 million was transmitted in 1963. The new 1964 issues will have a holding period of two years prior to use in payment of pledges.

Total sales for all bond issues were reported at almost $661 million by the end of 1963.\(^\text{13}\) Bond sales in the United States totaled $55.5 million in 1963, a rise of almost 20 per cent over the 1962 total of $46.4 million. Reinvestment of proceeds of redeemed bonds and purchases by pension funds and financial institutions accounted for most of the rise. Worldwide sales in 1963 totaled $69.2 million.

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

**Reparations and Restitution Funds**

Individual restitution payments from Germany constituted the largest single source of foreign currency for Israel during 1962, $134 million compared with $111 million in 1961. Payments from Germany under the reparations agreement were $47 million during 1962 and reached $700 million, or almost 90 per cent of the total of $821 million due. The figure had risen to $772 million by the end of 1963.

In March 1963 CJMCAG made the tenth yearly allocation of funds put at its disposal by Israel from reparations payments. (This was in addition to reparations funds used directly by the Israel government.) Of $10.1 million allocated to Nazi victims outside of Israel, $7.8 million was granted

\(^{12}\) Based on data provided by the Jewish Agency for Israel to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (May 23, 1963), p. 1418.

\(^{13}\) About $180.7 million worth of bonds (including those used to pay UJA pledges) had been redeemed through 1962. In 1962 redemptions totaled $31 million.
for relief and rehabilitation, including about $7.0 million for JDC and $325,000 for UHS. There were also grants for cultural and educational reconstruction in Europe and the United States totaling about $1.9 million. Between $10 and $11 million annually has gone for relief programs in Israel in recent years, mostly through the Jewish Agency.

**OVERSEAS AGENCIES**

American Jewish financial support for needs in Israel and in other overseas areas is provided mainly through federation allocations to UJA and about a dozen other overseas agencies. UJA continued to receive about 95 per cent of such allocations. Other overseas agencies raised most of their funds independently.

Total income in 1962 of all overseas agencies was $96.6 million, of which $22.8 million was raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities (accounting for $18 million of this total) were those of Hadassah, which raised $7.4 million through membership activities; Hebrew University and Technion, which raised $3.5 million through their building and special fund drives; National Committee for Labor Israel, and Pioneer Women, which raised $2.8 million for welfare activities conducted by Histadrut in Israel; JNF, which raised $2.8 million through its campaign for “traditional income,” and the Weizmann Institute, which raised $2.5 million.

**United Jewish Appeal**

UJA is a partnership of UIA (formerly United Palestine Appeal) and JDC for joint fund raising. Over 90 per cent of UJA income is received from federations, the remainder (about $4 million), coming from hundreds of small nonfederated communities. From its inception in 1939 through 1962, UJA received about $1.435 billion and distributed $775 million to UIA, $510 million to JDC, and $83 million to the United Service for New Americans (USNA), the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), and UHS.

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

The distribution of UJA funds in 1962 was in accordance with a formula which has remained unchanged since 1951 and will be effective through 1968. This provides that, after deduction of campaign expenses and allocations to NYANA, UIA is to receive 67 per cent and JDC 33 per cent of the first $55 million raised each year. Beyond $55 million, UIA is to receive

---

14 The UJA share of all funds budgeted was 56 per cent in 1962. Its share of gross pledges was 46 per cent (50 per cent outside of New York City).
87.5 per cent and JDC 12.5 per cent. The formula was not applicable to the proceeds of "special" campaigns. In 1961 proceeds above $50 million were treated as though they were "special" funds.

Beginning in 1956, and every year since then except 1961, UJA conducted special fund drives designed to augment its regular funds.

On a pledge basis, UJA income was $63.5 million in 1962. A preliminary estimate put the 1963 pledge total at about $61 million. On a cash basis, UJA had receipts of $60.6 million in 1963 and $63.8 million in 1962. These were the cash amounts received each year without reference to the years in which they were pledged.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its share of campaign proceeds. In 1963 UJA proceeds of about $60.6 million compared with gross campaign proceeds of about $125 million.

In 1961 UJA undertook a ten-year debt liquidation program to consolidate its own debts and those of the Jewish Agency for Israel (JAFI), Inc., totaling $65 million. The debts were to be repaid at the rate of ten per cent each year, with renewal of the remainder of the loan at two-year intervals. The next renewal was scheduled for May 1965. The loans were arranged by federations and local banks and were underwritten nationally by UJA.

Funds amounting to $64.8 million, borrowed by UJA through federations in 1954, were transmitted to the Jewish Agency for Israel (JAI) (by way of UIA) and resulted in an equivalent credit in Israeli pounds for carrying out JAI's welfare activities—immigration, absorption, and land settlement.

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

Amounts outstanding at the end of each year and the new long-term borrowing during each year is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>New Borrowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At 12/31/55</td>
<td>$39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/56</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/57</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/58</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/59</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/60</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/62</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/63</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During</th>
<th>Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United Israel Appeal

UJA funds destined for the Jewish Agency for Israel are disbursed through UIA, one of the two official partners in UJA. The reorganization
of the Jewish Agency (see below) did not affect the use of this channel.

UIA receipts in 1962 were $39.5 million and in 1963 were estimated at $38.3 million. This compared with peak receipts of about $55 million in 1957 and lowest annual receipts of about $35 million in 1954 and 1955. While the peak year of UJA fund raising was 1948, UIA received a lower share from UJA in that year ($37 million) than in more recent years when the JDC share of UJA funds declined.

Jewish National Fund

JNF, under the UJA agreement, is permitted to raise $1.8 million annually from traditional collections in the United States, after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Its total United States income, including traditional income, bequests, and other receipts, was about $2.8 million in 1961-62. In addition, JNF receives annual allocations in Israel directly from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). This was about $1.4 million in 1961-62 and about $1.3 million in 1962-63, of which almost $0.7 million was provided by JAFI, Inc. In 1962-63 this financing was turned over by the JAFI, Inc., to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem).

Reorganization of the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.

The Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., was reorganized in 1960 as an autonomous American body, administered by a board of 20 (26 as of 1963) Americans and one Israeli. Eighteen members of the board were designated by UIA, and nine by the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc. The only non-American on the board is the Israeli treasurer of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem. The Jerusalem Jewish Agency maintains a separate branch in the United States (Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.) for activities which are not financed through UJA.15

The major changes involved in the reorganization were as follows:

1. Complete responsibility for the use of American Jewish philanthropic funds provided by federations to UJA for needs in Israel was centered in America. The tax-exempt and tax-deductible status of these contributions was not altered since American control of funds was in line with policies developed by the Internal Revenue Service for all agencies providing funds for use overseas.16

2. The reorganized Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., utilized American staff (stationed in Israel) appointed by and responsible to itself for review of the budget of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem in order to assure American

15 There are three Jewish Agencies for Israel, as follows:

(a) Jewish Agency for Israel in Jerusalem—This is the operating agency within Israel.
(b) The Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.—This is its branch in the United States.
(c) The Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. (JAFI)—This is the domestic agency which shares in UJA proceeds (via UIA) and which determines how such funds are to be spent for it by the operating agency in Israel.

16 This status was not affected by IRS rulings regarding criteria for deductibility of contributions for overseas activities, issued in December 1968.
control of specified services which it financed. The operating agency continued to be the Jerusalem Jewish Agency.

3. After January 1, 1961, there was no further channeling of UJA funds for the "constructive" enterprises of the Mizrachi Palestine Fund, the Agudath and Poale Agudath Israel, the World Confederation of General Zionists, or the United Zionist Revisionists.

**Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem)**

The sources of Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) income are primarily JAFI, Inc., earmarked grants from the United States; the major share of Keren ha-Yesod receipts in Jewish communities outside the United States; counterpart income flowing from the German reparations agreements; grants and loans by the Israeli government for costs of agricultural settlement, and earmarked contributions for Youth Aliyah. About 80 per cent of contributions generally come from the United States. In 1962–63 contributions accounted for over half of total income (net of repayment of loans), new loans (net of repayment) for about 30 per cent, and Israeli government agricultural grants for about 10 per cent. The balance of income came mainly from reparations and earmarked funds. In the year ended March 31, 1963, exclusive of loans it received $51 million and spent $70.4 million.

The largest block of expenditures in 1962–63 as in the past, was for agricultural settlement, $25.9 million, or 37 per cent of all costs net of loans. This was partially offset by government income of $7.6 million. The objective continued to be eventual self-support for the newcomer by extending financial aid for the founding of new settlements and for irrigation projects, citiculture, equipment, seed, instruction, supplementary employment, and long-term loans. Some 470 villages, most of them founded since 1948, received Jewish Agency assistance. Almost a third of these costs were covered by government grants. The Jewish Agency has been transferring to the government settlers' agreements to repay Jewish Agency loans in consideration for government grants earmarked for agricultural settlement.

Costs of permanent immigrant housing were $13.2 million in 1962–63, or almost 20 per cent, exclusive of funds used for rental housing.

Immigration, transportation, and reception of immigrants required $18.9 million, or over a quarter of costs in the year ending March 30, 1963.

Youth Aliyah programs for maintenance and education of over 9,000 immigrant and other youth (aged 6–17) cost about $4.3 million in 1962–63. Hadassah and other women's organizations provided about 60 per cent of these costs, with the major remaining share borne by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) and JAFI, Inc.

Other Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) expenditures included grants of $1.9 million to institutions of higher learning (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew Uni-
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17 The dollar aggregates for income were $35 million from contributions, $7 million from reparations, $7.6 million from the government of Israel, $21.8 million from new net loans, and $1.4 million from other sources, for a total of $72.8 million.
versity, Technion, Bar-Ilan University, and Tel-Aviv University), and $1.3 million to JNF; and allocations on account of German reparations, organization and information activities, and general administrative expenses within and outside Israel.

JAFI, Inc., provided financing toward specific, agreed-upon projects conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) but not those of its American section or the American Zionist Council or WZO.

In 1961–62 JAFI, Inc., provided over $34 million toward costs of $83 million for programs operated by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). These expenditures were based upon an agreement that the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) would make specific expenditures on behalf of, and in accordance with, the instructions of JAFI, Inc. Although JAFI, Inc., decreased its share of costs to $28.5 million in 1962–63, its share of the new total of expenditures, $66.4 million, remained about the same.


(In thousands of dollars) a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$13,007</td>
<td>$11,675</td>
<td>$10,655</td>
<td>$7,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>5,927</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>6,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Settlement</td>
<td>24,891</td>
<td>34,795</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>10,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>13,187</td>
<td>16,070</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Aliyah</td>
<td>4,279</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to JNF</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to Other</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$66,393</td>
<td>$83,415</td>
<td>$28,462</td>
<td>$34,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Exchange rate was £0.55 = $1 before devaluation in February 1962 and £0.33 = $1 after devaluation. Since fiscal period ends in March, conversion from pounds to dollars was computed on a pro-rata basis.

In addition, the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) spent $16.1 million (mainly for debt service) in 1962–63 in which JAFI, Inc., did not participate and analogous sums in prior years.

**American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee**

JDC maintains a worldwide program of aid to Jews. It assisted 277,000 persons in 1962: 84,000 in Israel (including ORT and yeshivah students), 89,000 in Europe, 98,000 in Moslem areas, and about 6,000 in other areas.

JDC has two major sources of income: UJA and CJMCAG. In 1962 JDC
had cash receipts of $27.5 million, of which $17.8 million was from UJA, $8.1 million from CJMCAG and other types of restitution income, and $1.0 million from campaigns abroad. These receipts were $0.8 million more than the 1961 total of $26.8 million. JDC spent $27.4 million in 1962, compared with $28.3 million in 1961.

The Malben program of service to sick, aged, and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to account for the largest single share of JDC appropriations, over 28 per cent, or $7.7 million in 1962. This was $2 million less than in 1961 and was equivalent to the level in 1951, the first full year of Malben operation. An additional $0.7 million went to aid 114 yeshivot and other traditional institutions in Israel. Malben aided about 49,000 persons during 1962, including care for the aged in institutions and in their own homes, and medical services. Malben accounted for the greatest portion of the total of over $130 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1962.

Relief, health, and educational programs in Moslem countries, mainly North African, have expanded since 1955, and in 1962 JDC appropriated $6.1 million for this work. The largest number of recipients of JDC aid, 75,000, were in Morocco, and there were 34,000 in Tunisia and Iran. JDC assistance is channeled through such agencies as OSE, for health; the Alliance Israélite Universelle, Otzar ha-Torah, and the Lubavitcher schools for education, and ORT for vocational training.

JDC program operations in at least 13 European countries, served 89,000 Jews, of whom the largest number, 56,000, many of them Algerian refugees, were in France. JDC assisted 12,000 of the 25,000 Jews in Poland.

ORT and Vocational Education

Vocational training overseas is provided by ORT in Western Europe, several Moslem countries, and Israel. In Israel vocational education is also provided by Histadrut, Hadassah, Youth Aliyah, and Technion, as well as by the Israel government and local governmental units.

The global expenditures of the World ORT Union were at an annual level of $7.3 million in 1961 and 1962. There were 36,000 ORT trainees in 1962, of whom 16,000 were in Israel, 8,500 in Moslem countries, and most of the remainder in Europe.

American Jewish support of the ORT program is channeled in two ways: through the JDC grant (from funds received by JDC as a UJA beneficiary) and through membership contributions. In 1962 the JDC grant to ORT was $1.85 million, and Women's American ORT raised $1.3 million. An ORT-JDC agreement permits ORT to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25.

Migration Services

UHS provides a worldwide service designed to enable Jews to migrate to countries where they can make an economic and social adjustment. In 1963
UHS assisted 5,194 Jews to migrate (including 1,918 to the United States), compared with 9,277 in 1962. A migration level of about 5,800 was expected for 1964.

Because a large proportion of the Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remain in New York City, support of NYANA is considered to be a national responsibility. This is reflected in the continued inclusion of NYANA as a direct beneficiary of national UJA.

Jewish immigration to the United States in 1963 known to NYANA was estimated at 7,000, including both those who were aided by agencies and those who were not. About 3,200 of those who settled in New York City in 1963 received aid from NYANA. UJA grants to NYANA declined from $1,032,000 in 1962 to $866,000 in 1963.

**Hadassah**

Except for UJA, Hadassah had the largest income of any overseas service agency, $10.7 million in 1962. Hadassah’s major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah.

The 500-bed Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem, launched in 1951, was opened in 1961; its cost was almost $23 million since 1951. In Israel medical services are also provided by the Kupat Holim of Histadrut, and the JDC Malben program as well as the government. Hadassah planned to transfer some of its health stations to governmental agencies.

The Youth Aliyah program for maintenance and training of immigrant youth (in the earliest years orphaned, now mainly with families in Israel) was conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) at a cost of about $4.3 million in 1962–63. Hadassah’s annual contribution has been about $2 million, other women’s groups providing smaller supplementary funds. Youth Aliyah was caring for 9,196 children in March 1963.

**Higher Education In Israel**

Israeli institutions of higher education (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, and Technion) had American income of about $10.2 million in 1962, mainly from contributions. In addition, all three schools received grants from JAFI, Inc., and the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), as well as from the government of Israel.

Weizmann Institute income in the United States is derived from an annual fund-raising dinner and from an investment program.

Hebrew University and Technion received about $650,000 annually from federations in recent years. Their building- and special-fund campaign proceeds were at the $3.5 million level in 1962. The maintenance appeals of

---

18 All hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary, and private) total about 15,600 and provide about 5.5 million days of care annually.
19 Of $1,251,500 earmarked for higher education by JAFI, Inc., in 1962–63, Weizmann Institute received $444,000, Hebrew University $211,200, Technion $63,000, Bar-Ilan University $30,000, and Tel-Aviv University $3,300.
the two institutions were combined, but their capital fund drives were conducted separately.

Both institutions have had marked enrolment increases in recent years; in 1962-63, 8,381 students registered at Hebrew University (including its Tel-Aviv branch) and about 3,250, at Technion. Increased enrolment, additional courses of study, inaccessibility of the Hebrew University campus on Mt. Scopus, and inadequacy of the old Technion plant motivated the building-fund efforts.

Hebrew University includes schools of humanities, social sciences, education, social work, physical sciences, agriculture, law, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy. Technion includes schools in various branches of engineering, architecture, industrial sciences, as well as a technical high school. The Tel-Aviv School of Law and Economics was merged with Hebrew University in 1959.

In 1962–63 Bar-Ban University, founded in 1955 by the Mizrachi Organization of America, had a student enrolment of about 860 in four faculties, Jewish studies, natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and languages and literature. Its fund raising in the United States has been restricted to Mizrachi membership groups and friends.

Tel-Aviv University, affiliated to the municipality, was reorganized as an independent agency and planned to seek limited public financial support in 1964 for capital needs. In 1961–62 there were about 1,140 students enrolled in the humanities and in natural sciences.

Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel

In 1962 there were 12,000 students enrolled in 185 yeshivot, of which 22 provided secular secondary education or vocational-training programs. Many had no age limits, although most students were 14 to 17 years old. Yeshivot are known as traditional institutions because of their roots in the traditional religious life in Eastern Europe.

Many yeshivot receive support from JDC ($661,000 in 1962), and some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel Institutions ($123,000 raised in 1962). But a great number also seek funds separately in the United States through collectors (meshullahim) and mail appeals. There are no comprehensive records of the extent of these appeals or their support in Israel, but 1961 receipts of yeshivot in Israel were reported at $7 million, exclusive of traditional hospitals and aged homes.

Cultural programs in Israel were supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation (AICF) ($1.54 million in 1962, and almost $2 million estimated for 1963), which campaigned in behalf of some 60 Israeli agencies in the fields of music, theater, dance, art, and literature.

Other Overseas Agencies

In addition to UJA, which received almost all its income through welfare funds and joint-community appeals, other overseas agencies benefited in varying degrees from these funds. The Federated Council of Israel Institutions, UHS, and AICF received the highest proportion of their income from federations. National Committee for Labor Israel raised funds independently in the largest communities, where its membership strength is centered, while seeking federation allocations in smaller and medium-sized communities. American Friends of the Hebrew University and American Technion Society concentrated their independent appeals on their building and special funds, while seeking federation support for maintenance needs.

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

Almost all of these agencies were authorized to conduct campaigns for Israel under conditions set by the Jewish Agency Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns, whose purpose is to help assure the primacy of UJA by avoiding a multiplicity of campaigns for Israel.

Fourteen non-UJA overseas agencies had incomes of $28.1 million in 1962, compared with $27.4 million in 1961.

UHS and AICF participated in the cooperative budget review process of the Large City Budgeting Conference.

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

JTA is a worldwide news service reporting events of interest to the Jewish people. It was reorganized in 1962 and with LCBC approval sought direct federation allocations. These rose from about $36,000 in 1961 to about $145,000 in 1963, including New York UJA.

Of the agencies with more limited overseas programs, the National Council of Jewish Women provides social-work and education scholarships and aid to the department of secondary and higher education at the Hebrew University; the Jewish Labor Committee (JLC) aids political and labor refugees in Europe and in Israel.

Some domestic community-relations agencies have programs to protect the rights of Jews overseas: the American Jewish Committee, the AJCongress, WJC, B’nai B’rith, JWV, and JLC.

21 Authorized agencies in recent years were: America-Israel Cultural Foundation; American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund-raising dinner only); American Friends of Hebrew University; American Red Mogen Dovid for Israel, Inc. (membership campaign only, no application to welfare funds); American Technion Society; Federated Council of Israel Institutions; Hadassah, the Women’s Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish National Fund (traditional collections only; no application to welfare funds); Pioneer Women, the Women’s Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women’s League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).
Domestic agencies reflect the continuing needs of American Jews for the protection of civil rights, religious and secular education, youth services, culture, and the like. The task of serving these needs is divided between national and local agencies, particularly in community relations, Jewish education, health, and vocational training.

Federations and welfare funds link local, national, and overseas services by means of centralized fund raising, review of agency programs in the process of budgeting funds, and planning—and sometimes operating—local services. CJFWF is their national service agency. It helps strengthen fund raising, budgeting, planning and coordination of services, and basic community organization. It advises and helps in public relations, intercity, and national-local relations. It provides specialized consultation in such areas as overseas needs, family service, child care, care for the aged, and health services.

Community Relations Agencies

Modern Jewish community-relations agencies developed largely in response to threats to the status of Jews in other countries. The major present emphasis is on improvement of domestic group relations.

All five major national Jewish community-relations agencies serve memberships—the American Jewish Committee, AJCongress, and JWV, directly; ADL (B'nai B'rith membership) and JLC (trade union membership) indirectly. They also conduct cultural programs and issue publications of interest to circles wider than their own memberships.

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

The other three agencies have more specialized approaches: AJCongress, legal and legislative activities; JLC, work with labor unions, and JWV, work with veterans' groups. Interfaith and other community-relations activities are also conducted by congregational associations, although their major efforts are centered on aid to the religious programs of affiliated congregations.

For 21 years the American Jewish Committee and ADL raised most of their funds through JDA, sharing equally in the proceeds of its fund-raising efforts. This arrangement was terminated at the end of 1962, when both agencies began separate fund-raising campaigns. Preliminary data for 1963 indicate that the ADL received $3.2 million—including almost $0.6 million from JDA campaigns for prior years—and that the American Jewish Com-
mittee, similarly, had receipts of $3.2 million. (Both agencies had additional income from sales of publications, and the like.)

NCRAC serves as the coordinating and clearance agency for the AJCongress, JLC, JWV, the three congregational associations, and 69 local and regional community-relations councils. These four organizations participate in the cooperative budget review process of the Large City Budgeting Conference. In 1963 they were joined by ADL.

The five national operating agencies and the NCRAC received $7.9 million in 1962 compared with $7.7 million in 1961.

**National Health Agencies**

National Jewish hospitals came into existence before many of the present local Jewish hospitals were organized. Subsequent improvement in the health status of Jews and recent medical advances in tuberculosis therapy led the tuberculosis hospitals to concern themselves with heart, cancer, research, and treatment of asthma in adults. However, tuberculosis continued to be the major ailment treated as measured by days of care.

Most of the funds of these agencies are raised independently, less than one per cent coming from federations. Income of the six agencies in 1962 was $12.5 million, with two (City of Hope and National Jewish Hospital) accounting for almost 80 per cent of the total.

The Albert Einstein Medical School of Yeshiva University began functioning in 1955. In 1962 it received $12.6 million of the university’s total receipts of $17.1 million. It awarded 88 M.D. degrees in 1962, and its student enrolment in 1962–63 was 380.

**National Service Agencies**

Five national organizations furnish service to local Jewish community centers, armed-forces programs, Jewish education, religion, and vocational guidance.

In 1962 JWB, the largest of these agencies, received $1,417,000 of the $1,777,000 received by all five. JWB provides assistance to Jewish community centers, conducts a program of service to Jews in the armed forces, and sponsors Jewish cultural projects. In 1961 JWB adopted a new financial plan related to the magnitude of federation income for its armed-services program and to community-center budgets for its center-services program. Since federations frequently provide funds to centers (as do community chests), JWB continues to look to federations for support of both of its basic programs. After April 1964, as a result of a general reorganization of the United Service Organization, its support of JWB’s programs for the armed forces was sharply reduced.

AAJE serves local communities with studies and consultation in educational trends, stimulation of student enrolment, recruitment and placement of teachers, and pedagogic materials.

Other national service agencies are the Jewish Occupational Council, which
serves local Jewish vocational-service agencies and national Jewish agencies concerned with occupational adjustment; the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, which serves as a forum for professionals in all fields of Jewish communal-service, and SCA which represents its affiliated Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbinical and congregational associations.

**Cultural Agencies**

A CJFWF survey of national Jewish cultural programs published in November 1959 (AJYB, 1960 [Vol. 61], pp. 149-64) recommended the establishment of a Jewish cultural foundation "to serve as the focus of the national cultural effort" and the establishment of a council of Jewish cultural agencies related to the foundation. Such a foundation was established in 1960 as an autonomous corporation, with 16 agencies participating in an associated Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies (CJCA).

In its first four years the foundation developed a program of awards to scholars for research, earmarked grants to cultural agencies for high priority projects, disseminated information about Jewish cultural endeavors, helped CJCA develop a process for joint cultural agency consultation, and provided information about cultural agencies to welfare funds.

Specialized committees review proposals for projects dealing with publications, scholarship, and archives, which are the basis for CJCA recommendations to the foundation.

Of the many agencies serving the cultural field, 16 had income of $22 million in 1962. Brandeis University accounted for 63 per cent; B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal for 16 per cent, and the American Jewish Historical Society, ZOA and Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture for four to five per cent each. The remaining 11 agencies received $1.5 million.

Four of the agencies are institutions of higher learning: Brandeis University, Delaware Valley College, Dropsie College, and Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University.

Research and scholarly publication programs are conducted by YIVO and by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies in the fields of sociology, economics, and linguistics; by the American Academy for Jewish Research; by the American Jewish Historical Society, the American Jewish Archives, the American Jewish History Center, and the Jewish Museum of JTS in the fields of history and archives, and by Histadruth Ivrit and Bitzaron for Hebraism.

The Jewish Publication Society specializes in publishing books of Jewish interest; the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service publishes a journal dealing with social-work developments; Dropsie College publishes the Jewish Quarterly Review, and CJFWF issues research reports on community organization, health and welfare planning, campaigning, and budgeting.

Reference annuals include the American Jewish Year Book, published

---

22 This was windfall income. The usual annual level is closer to $50,000.
Religious Agencies

National religious agencies provide training for rabbis, cantors, Jewish educators, shohatim, and other religious functionaries and assist in the development of congregational programs including elementary Jewish education.

The three religious wings have their own rabbinical and congregational associations, with affiliated national associations of sisterhoods, men's clubs, and youth groups. Nationally, they help organize new congregations and publish ritual and educational materials. The three wings are represented in SCA.

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

HUC-JIR prepares religious functionaries for Reform Judaism, JTS for Conservative Judaism, and Yeshiva University and several smaller institutions for Orthodox Judaism. Yeshiva University combines a theological seminary and a school for Jewish educators with a liberal arts college, a medical school, and other graduate schools, including a social-work school.

Most Orthodox yeshivot are in New York City, but there are also the Jewish University of America (formerly Hebrew Theological College) in Chicago, the Rabbinical College of Telshe in Cleveland, the Ner Israel Rabbinical College in Baltimore, and the Chachmey Lublin Theological Seminary in Detroit.

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

In 1962, 22 national religious agencies received $32.8 million, compared with $27.1 million in 1961. Most of the rise was accounted for by the Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, whose income increased $4.2 million. The Combined Campaign for Reform Judaism and JTS also had substantial rises in income.

LOCAL SERVICES

Jewish federations were the major source of contributed income for local Jewish agencies in 1962. Central communal sources (federations and chest-
united funds) provided about $56 million, of which federations supplied about $38.4 million (compared with $37.3 million in 1961). These funds were used for services in the fields of health, family and child care, refugee aid, Jewish centers, Jewish education, care of the aged, vocational services, and community relations.

Nonsectarian community chests and united funds provided an additional estimated $17.5 million in 1962, usually through Jewish federations, but sometimes directly to Jewish service agencies. Jewish federations and local Jewish agencies in thirteen of the largest cities embracing 75 per cent of the Jewish population received $11.3 million of this sum. Community chests generally restrict their support to the fields of health, family and child care, care of the aged, and Jewish centers. In 1962, community chests provided funds for 77 centers, 52 family and child-care agencies, 18 homes for the aged, and 14 hospitals in 110 communities. A substantial share of contributed communal income even in these fields, and especially for health and care of the aged, comes from Jewish federations. In addition, federations have exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

Available data for 110 communities for 1961 and 1962 show how central communal funds (income from federations and chests) were distributed among various fields of local service (Table 5). Federations continued to provide roughly three-fifths and community chests two-fifths of central communal funds received by local agencies in these communities but these totals included many fields of service and agencies receiving no chest support. The rise in funds in 1962 was 3.1 per cent. Allocations by Jewish federations for local services have risen dollar-wise since 1954, but the ratio of federations' to chests' contribution was lower in 1962 than in 1954.

In 1962 there were rises of from 2.4 to 5.6 per cent in central-community grants for recreation, health, family and child care, employment and guidance services, Jewish education, and local community relations. There was a moderate decrease in grants for care of the aged, 1.2 per cent. A rise of 17.8 per cent in grants for refugee care reflected costs for Cuban Jewish refugees and reversed a recent downward trend. Local refugee care is generally administered in conjunction with family agencies, with shared central costs.

The major sources of funds for local service agencies, other than central funds, are payments for service and public tax funds. These have risen more than community funds. From 1958 through 1962 about 30 general hospitals received increases of $44 million in patients' fees and $6.5 million in public tax funds, while grants from central-community funds, 5.5 per cent of receipts, changed little.

About 55 homes for the aged increased their income from service payments (from $13.5 million to $18.9 million), and family agencies doubled theirs (from $0.4 million to $0.9 million). Child-care agencies showed little
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23 Includes Greater New York Fund and New York City United Hospital Fund.
change in such income (about $1.0 million), but income from tax funds more than doubled (from $2.8 million to $5.7 million.)

An analysis of allocations for local services by 98 communities over a five-year span (1958–1962) indicates significant changes. Chest grants rose less sharply than federation grants: 11.7 per cent compared with 18.9 per cent. The federation share of allocations was about 58 to 60 per cent. There were sharp rises in allocations for aged care and vocational services—24 to 29 per cent since 1958. Allocations for Jewish education and recreational services rose 21 to 25 per cent; for family and child-care agencies 15 per cent, for local community-relations agencies 13 per cent, and for health services 10 per cent. Grants for local refugee care fell 21 per cent in the same period.

Health Programs

There were 19,904 beds in 65 general and special hospitals under local Jewish sponsorship. Federations and chests provided $13.7 million for 48 of these local hospitals in 23 cities: 22 hospitals (mainly in New York City) received funds from both sources (but largely from federations); 17 received funds from federations alone, and 9 from chests alone, and 8 from neither. Where separately identified, federation allocations were twice as large as those from chests.

Most local Jewish hospitals were in the largest centers of Jewish population. There were local Jewish hospitals in 15 of the 16 cities in the United States and Canada with Jewish populations of more than 40,000; in 8 out of 16 cities with 15,000 to 40,000 Jews, and only three hospitals in smaller cities. As a result of this concentration of health services, allocations for local health institutions in the largest centers of Jewish population continued to average almost 30 per cent of their total local allocations.

In 1962, 6.1 million days' care was provided by 66 local (general and special) Jewish hospitals. Sixty-four per cent of the patients admitted were not Jews.

Third-party payments for service (e.g., Blue Cross insurance, tax support) have risen more in recent years than federation grants, which have been rising moderately. In 60 hospitals, all payments for service (individual patient fees, Blue Cross insurance, and tax support) rose to $204 million in 1962, or over 85 per cent of operating receipts.

Family and Child-Care Agencies

Family agencies provide personal and family counseling, family-life education, psychiatric services, and a limited amount of economic aid, frequently in cooperation with child-care and refugee services. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most of the cities with Jewish populations of more

---

24 Statistics cited for local services are for comparable agencies, wherever possible, for which data were available in both years. They do not include all agencies in the respective fields.
25 Yearbook of Jewish Social Services (CJFWF), Tables H-III and H-V.
26 The exception is Washington, D.C.
than 5,000. Most services are provided locally, although there are several regional programs (Bellefaire in Cleveland, New Orleans Jewish Children's Home Service, Atlanta Jewish Children's Service) and one national home for asthmatic children.

In 1962, 85 family agencies reported a total of 64,116 open cases on their rolls. Twenty-four per cent of all those receiving financial assistance were refugees, but only 5.5 per cent of refugee cases were active. Refugee cases accounted for over 40 per cent of financial assistance, with average monthly allowances of about $138 per case.

There were 7,823 children under care in 51 child-care agencies for which data were available. About 35 per cent of the children were in foster homes, 27 per cent in institutions, and most of the rest were living at home or with relatives.

Central communal allocations for family and child-care services rose 3.7 per cent in 1962 and accounted for about 79 per cent of total receipts for family agencies and they were 31 per cent of receipts of child-care agencies. An additional 47 per cent came from public funds.

Refugee Programs

Refugee programs are financed locally, although they may be considered as extensions of an overseas problem. Postwar immigration to the United States began in volume late in 1946, reached its peak in 1949, and has declined since then except for brief upturns in 1951, 1957, and 1962. There was a parallel decline in local refugee costs until 1962, when they rose. However, while refugee costs accounted for 2.8 per cent of local allocations in 1958, they accounted for only 1.9 per cent in 1962.

Because well over half of the immigrants tend to settle in New York City, NYANA (financed by UJA) bears the largest share of refugee costs. UHS encourages resettlement in other communities where the prospects for adjustment may be better than in New York City. Refugee programs, generally administered by local Jewish family agencies, provide economic aid and counseling to newly-arrived immigrants.

Recreational Programs

According to JWB there were some 340 Jewish community centers with a membership of about 670,000 in 1961. About a third of the members were under 14, 18 per cent were between 14 and 25, and almost half were 25 or older.

Estimated total community-center expenditures were about $27 million in 1961, compared with $25 million in 1960, exclusive of separate camping agencies. In 1951 these expenditures had been $12.8 million and in 1945, $7.2 million, for a smaller network of centers. Federation and chest alloca-

---

27 Reports for these agencies include refugee services which may account for about eight per cent of allocations to family and child-care agencies (see relative proportions in Table 5).
tions to centers and other recreational facilities rose 2.3 per cent in 1962 and 21 per cent in the five-year period 1958–1962.

Although centers have generally kept their fees low enough to allow popular utilization of the facilities by all who seek them, the proportion of their income derived from fees, memberships, and other internal sources increased in recent years, reflecting higher dues rates of new centers. Fees rose from 54 per cent of center receipts in 1955 to 60 per cent in 1961. Central community support from federations and community chests provided the balance. Except for New York City (where centers receive minor chest support), Baltimore and Boston (where they receive none) and five other major cities (where lump-sum grants from chests are not earmarked), chests generally provide greater support than federations.

In 1962 centers received $12.8 million from federations and chests, of which $9.5 million was allocated to communities outside of New York City. Lump-sum, nonearmarked chest-fund grants accounted for $2.1 million of this total. Cities with exclusive federation support received $0.9 million, and those with exclusive chest support, $0.3 million. But the greatest number of cities received support from both sources: $3.6 million from chests and $2.4 million from federations.

Homes for the Aged

There were 75 homes for the aged with 12,623 beds caring for 15,440 residents (148 more than in 1961) who received 4.3 million days’ care during 1962. Federations and chests provided 12.5 per cent of receipts, service fees, including public funds, 78 per cent. Federation allocations to the homes rose about 24 per cent between 1958 and 1962, reflecting the continued increase in the proportion of aged in the population.

Sixty-two homes reported receipts of $28.8 million for 1962, of which service fees accounted for $20.8 million. Federations and chests gave $3.6 million, of which $3.0 million was allocated outside of New York City to 49 homes. Thirteen homes received support from neither source.

Jewish Education

Federations provide over $5 million annually for Jewish education. Major support comes from congregational fund-raising activities. Estimated enrollment is 600,000.28

Allocations to local Jewish schools and bureaus of Jewish education in 110 communities were about $4.5 million outside of New York City in 1962, an increase of 4.4 per cent. A gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education has occurred each year: they were 25 per cent higher in 1962 than in 1958. Tuition fees were usually set below actual costs.

28 JTA Community News Reporter (Education Issue) (September 12, 1963).
Community Relations

Programs to improve intergroup relations and to combat antisemitism exist largely in the large and intermediate communities. Federation allocations for such activities rose about 5 or 6 per cent to about $845,000 in 1962, 13 per cent more than in 1958.

In some areas, local and regional community-relations programs were part of a national network and were financed by national agencies (mainly ADL).

Employment and Vocational Service

Jewish vocational agencies or vocational departments of Jewish family services operate mainly in the larger cities. They assist Jews in finding employment and offer professional and vocational guidance to Jewish youth and others. Federations provided $1.3 million in 1962 while substantial supplementary income was received from government sources and service payments. A complementary program, mainly for group guidance, is provided by a network of vocational-service bureaus financed by the B’nai B’rith National Youth Service Appeal.

Local allocations for vocational programs rose 2.4 per cent in 1962. The gain since 1959 was 29 per cent.

Changes in Financing Since 1954

Of the major changes in federation and chest support of local Jewish services in the nine-year period 1954–1962 only refugee costs decreased, by $1.1 million. Increases in other fields were as follows:

1. Recreational services, almost $3.0 million.
2. Family and child-care services, over $2.1 million.
3. Jewish education, over $1.4 million.
4. Aged care, almost $1.2 million.
5. Hospitals, almost $0.6 million.
6. Employment and vocational service, local community relations, and chest grants for federation administration, over $0.2 million each.

Of total rises of about $8.1 million since 1954, chests provided almost $3.8 million, and federations $4.3 million.

S. P. Goldberg
### TABLE 1. AMOUNTS RAISED IN CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS
1939–1963

*(Estimates 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>NYUJA</td>
<td>FIPNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$28,469</td>
<td>$6,644</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>26,911</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>6,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28,152</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>6,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>29,249</td>
<td>4,671</td>
<td>7,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>34,935</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>6,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>46,984</td>
<td>9,184</td>
<td>9,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>56,898</td>
<td>12,180</td>
<td>9,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131,421</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>11,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>156,589</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>13,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200,721</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>13,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>159,330</td>
<td>40,250</td>
<td>12,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142,191</td>
<td>36,660</td>
<td>13,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136,035</td>
<td>34,562</td>
<td>13,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121,173</td>
<td>29,737</td>
<td>13,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>115,266</td>
<td>26,237</td>
<td>13,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>107,013</td>
<td>23,465</td>
<td>13,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110,127</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>13,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>130,493</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>15,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>138,078</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>15,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>123,328</td>
<td>28,078</td>
<td>16,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>130,702</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>17,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>127,679</td>
<td>28,881</td>
<td>17,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>125,613</td>
<td>28,054</td>
<td>17,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>129,592</td>
<td>27,905</td>
<td>17,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>125,000b</td>
<td>44,000b</td>
<td>81,000b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 1939–1963**: $2,661,949 $942,337 $1,719,612

*Excludes amounts raised annually in smaller cities having no welfare funds but includes multiple-city gifts which are duplications as between New York City and the remainder of the country. Excludes capital-fund campaigns of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York: $3,000,000 in 1943, $14,264,000 in 1945, $11,000,000 in 1949, $74,400,000 in 1961 and 1962. Also excludes major capital fund raising by federations for local agencies.

b Provisional Estimate.
TABLE 1A. ESTIMATED ANNUAL LEVEL OF INCOME AND COSTS OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES IN U.S., INCLUDING RECEIPTS FROM WELFARE FUNDS, OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS, SERVICE PAYMENTS, PUBLIC FUNDS AND OTHER SOURCES

*(In millions of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds)</td>
<td>$129.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Grants by United Funds and Community Chests</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies (including capital funds)</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hospital Income (excluding A and B)</td>
<td>205.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Family Service Income (excluding A and B)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Child Care Income (excluding A and B)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Aged Care Income (excluding A and B)</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Center Income (excluding A and B)*</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Jewish Education Income (excluding A and B)*</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$559.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This total excludes endowment income in most communities; local capital fund campaigns for centers, hospitals, homes, temples, etc., and internal congregational operating expense.]*

*Based on JWB estimate that 60 per cent of income comes from internal sources and that estimated cost of all centers approximates $27 million.*

*Based on estimate in the AAJE's National Study of Jewish Education in 1959, less welfare-fund allocations.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cash Sales</th>
<th>Sales in United States</th>
<th>Sales Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951b (May 1-Dec. 31)</td>
<td>$52,647</td>
<td>$52,506</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>47,521</td>
<td>46,516</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>36,861</td>
<td>31,551</td>
<td>5,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>40,406</td>
<td>34,361</td>
<td>6,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>43,507</td>
<td>36,681</td>
<td>6,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>54,525</td>
<td>45,699</td>
<td>8,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>49,854</td>
<td>40,696</td>
<td>9,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>46,541</td>
<td>37,763</td>
<td>8,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>52,265</td>
<td>42,628</td>
<td>9,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>51,965</td>
<td>41,390</td>
<td>10,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>57,405</td>
<td>45,287</td>
<td>12,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>58,125</td>
<td>46,396</td>
<td>11,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>69,221</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>13,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$660,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>$556,974</strong></td>
<td><strong>$103,869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes conversions.

b Redemption of 12-year bonds issued in 1951 falls due beginning May 1, 1963. "Turn-ins" of bonds in this period reduced the principal and interest due in 1963 to $24.5 million.
### TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS

*(Estimates in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted^c d</td>
<td>$105,328</td>
<td>$102,056</td>
<td>$33,177</td>
<td>$33,391</td>
<td>$72,151</td>
<td>$68,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>62,477</td>
<td>60,041</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>18,332</td>
<td>44,627</td>
<td>41,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>59,503</td>
<td>57,116</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>42,003</td>
<td>39,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>2,974</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>4,686</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>4,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>2,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>36,351</td>
<td>35,285</td>
<td>14,977</td>
<td>14,395</td>
<td>21,374</td>
<td>20,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care^a</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^ Based upon communities which are currently CJFWF members and some smaller cities which are not CJFWF members but which had been included in the base group of communities used in 1948 when this statistical series was started. Minor differences in amounts and percentages due to rounding (generally less than 0.1%).

b Figures for New York City include New York UJA and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugee costs in New York City are borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of the UJA nationally. Most overseas and domestic agencies which are normally included in welfare funds in other cities conduct their own campaigns in New York. New York UJA included the following beneficiaries (in addition to National UJA): AJCongress (through 1961), UHS, and JWB. Data for New York UJA based on estimates of distribution of 1962 and 1961 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash was received.

c The difference between totals budgeted and total raised (Table 1) represents “shrinkage” allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, elimination of duplicating multiple-city gifts, and contingency or other reserves.

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

* NYANA is included in UJA totals.

 Less than .05 of one per cent.
TABLE 3A. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF FUNDS

(Excludes Total Under 5,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount</strong></td>
<td>$72,150,710</td>
<td>$68,665,248</td>
<td>$7,980,696</td>
<td>$7,756,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetedb</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overseas Agencies</strong></td>
<td>44,626,837</td>
<td>41,708,609</td>
<td>6,160,050</td>
<td>5,952,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Jewish Appeal</strong></td>
<td>42,003,447</td>
<td>39,115,712</td>
<td>5,858,204</td>
<td>5,646,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Overseas</strong></td>
<td>2,623,390</td>
<td>2,592,897</td>
<td>301,846</td>
<td>306,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Agencies</strong></td>
<td>4,070,666</td>
<td>4,022,071</td>
<td>515,187</td>
<td>521,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relations</strong></td>
<td>2,362,280</td>
<td>2,337,003</td>
<td>205,162</td>
<td>207,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Welfare</strong></td>
<td>52,044</td>
<td>60,181</td>
<td>27,154</td>
<td>33,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td>478,054</td>
<td>454,064</td>
<td>67,390</td>
<td>58,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious</strong></td>
<td>328,099</td>
<td>341,407</td>
<td>140,638</td>
<td>145,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td>850,189</td>
<td>829,416</td>
<td>74,843</td>
<td>76,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Operating Needs</strong></td>
<td>21,374,049</td>
<td>20,889,928</td>
<td>1,179,757</td>
<td>1,170,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Refugee Care</strong></td>
<td>716,270</td>
<td>598,956</td>
<td>6,535</td>
<td>6,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Capital Needs</strong></td>
<td>1,358,001</td>
<td>1,442,855</td>
<td>116,964</td>
<td>103,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The difference between totals budgeted for beneficiaries and gross budgeted for all purposes represents "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses and contingency or other reserves. The difference between what a community may budget for all purposes (its gross budget) and totals raised may also reflect the extent that the budgeted amounts may include funds on hand from previous campaigns (reserves, etc.). Minor differences in amounts and percentages (generally less than 0.1%) are due to rounding.
RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS

*New York City*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5,000–15,000</th>
<th>15,000–40,000</th>
<th>40,000 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1962</strong></td>
<td><strong>1961</strong></td>
<td><strong>1962</strong></td>
<td><strong>1961</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$11,676,724</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,248,260</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,807,079</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,564,789</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8,048,872</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,678,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,712,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,496,099</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7,535,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,152,733</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,217,433</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,028,265</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>525,563</strong></td>
<td><strong>495,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>467,834</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>811,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>800,724</strong></td>
<td><strong>574,657</strong></td>
<td><strong>579,466</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>403,475</strong></td>
<td><strong>401,323</strong></td>
<td><strong>355,664</strong></td>
<td><strong>356,825</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17,407</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,541</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,572</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78,299</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,665</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>151,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,832</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,052</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>160,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>118,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>117,352</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,291,779</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,248,331</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,189,127</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,192,893</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>89,804</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,505</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,656</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,265</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>432,298</strong></td>
<td><strong>438,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>214,839</strong></td>
<td><strong>219,066</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**a** Includes small undistributed amounts.

**c** Less than .05 of one per cent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>$13.6</td>
<td>$ 5.9</td>
<td>$ 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. Free Loan)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Aid</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Admin</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total**     $55.9  $17.1  $38.8

**Provided by Federations** $38.4  $15.0  $23.4

**Provided by Chests**  17.5  2.1  15.4

**Total**          $55.9  $17.1  $38.8

\(a\) This table is projected from known data for 95 per cent of total amounts involved. Unreported data were estimated as follows:
- Recreation, $0.7 million; Family and Child Care, $0.6 million; Aged, $0.3 million;
- Jewish Education, $0.4 million; Community Relations and other, $0.1 million each.

\(b\) Provided by NYANA, financed by UJA.

\(c\) Provided mainly by national agencies.

\(d\) Most capital campaigns excluded because conducted apart from annual campaign.
TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* (INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 110 COMMUNITIES, 1961, 1962
(Excludes New York City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Financed by Federations and chests</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (14)b</td>
<td>$7,491,928</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>$7,733,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services (52)b</td>
<td>7,456,549</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7,733,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture (77)b</td>
<td>8,559,948</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>8,760,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care (18)b</td>
<td>2,792,547</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2,759,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance (6)b</td>
<td>1,270,017</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,300,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Financed by Federations Alone</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,310,282</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4,501,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>566,197</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>666,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>802,207</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>844,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>444,169</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>437,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>447,057</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>468,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | $34,140,901 | 100.0 | $35,205,955 | 100.0 | +3.1 |

Provided by Federations: 20,332,197 59.6 20,906,795c 59.4 +2.8
Provided by Chests: 13,808,704 40.4 14,299,160 40.6 +3.6

* Includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of administrative and fund-raising costs ($9,293,282 in 1961 and $9,606,346 in 1962) reported for these 110 cities. Federation allocations for administration are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs, and are not shown.

b Number of cities out of 110 which receive chest funds for this service.

c This total represents 98 per cent of local operating funds provided by Federations outside New York City.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,049</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>$7,147</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>$7,417</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>$7,492</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>$7,733</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>109.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child</td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6,984</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>7,226</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>7,402</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7,683</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>7,097</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>7,392</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>7,890</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>8,409</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>8,598</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>121.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>123.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>129.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4,135</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>125.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>113.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>108.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$30,122</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$31,337</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$32,749</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$33,861</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$34,903</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>115.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income:
- Federations: $17,508 (58.1)  $18,724 (59.7)  $19,468 (59.4)  $20,233 (59.8)  $20,815 (59.6)  118.9
- Community Chests: 12,614 (41.9)  12,614 (40.3)  13,281 (40.6)  13,628 (40.2)  14,088 (40.4)  111.7

a Includes both Federation and Community Chest funds; excludes New York City.
b During this period the United States consumer price index rose by 5.7 per cent.
c Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs. Total chest participation in these costs is about 5.0 per cent of total administrative costs for these cities.
d Slight differences due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (98)</th>
<th>(41) Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(31) 5,000–15,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(14) 15,000–40,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(12) 40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

- **Federations**: 58.1 59.6 65.3 64.7 46.2 46.5 47.9 47.3 61.8 63.9
- **Community Chest**: 41.9 40.4 34.7 35.3 53.8 53.5 52.1 52.7 38.2 36.1

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

<sup>b</sup> Jewish population.

<sup>c</sup> See Table 6, note c.

<sup>d</sup> Less than .05 of one per cent.

<sup>e</sup> Slight difference due to rounding.
| TABLE 7. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1962 AND 1961 |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Federations and Welfare Funds | Other Contributions | Other Income | Total |
| **United Jewish Appeal & Beneficiary Agencies** | | | | | | | | |
| United Jewish Appeal | $63,755,873 | $62,724,582 | $ | $ | $ | $ | $63,755,873 | $62,724,582 |
| American Joint Distribution Committee | | | | | | | | |
| United Israel Appeal | | | | | | | | |
| Jewish National Fund | | | | | | | | |
| New York Association for New Americans | | | | | | | | |
| ORT—Women's American ORT | | | | | | | | |
| —American ORT Federation | | | | | | | | |
| **TOTAL UJA AND BENEFICIARIES** | | | | | | | | $63,755,873 | $62,724,582 | $63,755,873 | $62,724,582 |
| **Other Overseas Agencies** | | | | | | | | |
| American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science | | | | | | | | $2,515,073 | $1,399,610 | $1,011,547 | $821,829 | $3,616,620 | $2,221,439 |
| American Red Mogen David | | | | | | | | $195,685 | 239,583 | 23,850 | 195,685 | 263,433 |
| University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal | 650,000 | 658,543 | 2,354,109 | 2,459,027 | 438,212 | 283,633 | 2,792,321 | 2,742,660 |
| American Friends of Hebrew University | | | | | | | | |
| American Technion Society | | | | | | | | |
| America-Israel Cultural Foundation | 238,142 | 253,331 | 1,288,559 | 1,684,255 | 1,060,540 | 1,876,174 | 1,540,409 | 1,943,969 |
| Ezra Torah Fund | 8,666 | 7,508 | 212,089 | 191,456 | 14,672 | 2,107 | 236,222 | 201,072 |
| Federated Council of Israel Institutions | 101,611 | 103,676 | 20,946 | 20,759 | | | 122,557 | 124,435 |
| Hadassah | 275,000 | 613,000 | 7,416,767 | 7,633,099 | 2,668,495 | 1,988,309 | 10,655,262 | 10,254,318 |
| National Committee for Labor Israel | 275,496 | 281,248 | 1,695,013 | 1,596,452 | | | 1,970,509 | 1,877,700 |
| National Council of Jewish Women | 30,000 | 30,000 | 559,159 | 521,369 | 252,993 | 258,101 | 842,162 | 809,470 |
| Pioneer Women Organization | 21,000 | 21,000 | 1,149,202 | 1,015,471 | 135,798 | 133,660 | 1,106,000 | 1,170,131 |
| United Hias Service | 1,030,920 | 938,036 | 151,934 | 141,013 | 692,961 | 771,788 | 1,875,815 | 1,850,837 |
| World Jewish Congress | | | | | | | | |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | $2,925,835 | $2,906,342 | $18,787,107 | $18,316,311 | $6,379,712 | $6,165,834 | $28,092,654 | $27,388,487 |
| **TOTAL OVERSEAS** | $66,681,708 | $65,630,924 | $22,817,751 | $22,256,579 | $7,099,044 | $6,400,285 | $96,598,503 | $94,287,788 |

* Includes joint community appeals.
* Cash received in each calendar year.
* Excludes income from UJA and from campaigns abroad, intergovernmental agencies, and reparations.
* Traditional collections in the United States exclusive of Jewish Agency grants to JNF in Israel.
* Excludes contributions and earnings of investment fund.
* Income from welfare funds is estimated.
* Includes Swope Endowment Fund.
* Excludes grants from other organizations.

1 Welfare-fund income estimated by CJFWF; amounts raised for JNF are excluded. Hadassah other income includes membership dues, shekels, and Zionist youth funds.
1 Excludes overseas income.
1 Excludes overseas income and income from CJMCAG, but includes UHS income from N.Y. UJA.
1 Excludes JTA, reorganized in 1962. Data for 1962 are not comparable with prior years: $133,866 from welfare funds out of total income of $286,539.
<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>$1,940,029</td>
<td>$1,901,838</td>
<td>$2,102,453</td>
<td>$2,222,527</td>
<td>$475,362</td>
<td>$414,799</td>
<td>$1,125,505</td>
<td>$1,036,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committeea</td>
<td>475,882</td>
<td>698,468</td>
<td>355,435</td>
<td>119,778</td>
<td>180,044</td>
<td>155,325</td>
<td>1,011,361</td>
<td>973,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congresse</td>
<td>138,360</td>
<td>150,327</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>11,680</td>
<td>237,535</td>
<td>174,001</td>
<td>397,815</td>
<td>336,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans</td>
<td>166,959</td>
<td>156,167</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,121</td>
<td>25,953</td>
<td>35,644</td>
<td>197,912</td>
<td>197,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Relations Advisory Council</td>
<td>2,938,675</td>
<td>3,122,709</td>
<td>3,604,965</td>
<td>3,435,162</td>
<td>1,393,013</td>
<td>1,180,132</td>
<td>7,936,653</td>
<td>7,738,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare Agencies</td>
<td>89,540</td>
<td>97,509</td>
<td>64,493</td>
<td>63,919</td>
<td>60,645</td>
<td>54,152</td>
<td>214,679</td>
<td>215,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center at Denverf</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$520,467</td>
<td>$691,710</td>
<td>$655,857</td>
<td>$103,174</td>
<td>1,178,324</td>
<td>797,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;City of Hope&quot;</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>9,728</td>
<td>4,350,888</td>
<td>4,265,214</td>
<td>3,133,546</td>
<td>1,502,752</td>
<td>5,639,287</td>
<td>5,288,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Patients Sanitarium</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>87,218</td>
<td>97,751</td>
<td>43,382</td>
<td>5,165</td>
<td>134,566</td>
<td>106,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>45,796</td>
<td>47,546</td>
<td>200,007</td>
<td>217,687</td>
<td>279,931</td>
<td>249,041</td>
<td>525,374</td>
<td>171,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Home for Asthmatic Children</td>
<td>7,696</td>
<td>8,744</td>
<td>673,829</td>
<td>897,155</td>
<td>192,791</td>
<td>235,343</td>
<td>874,379</td>
<td>1,141,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospitalb</td>
<td>29,812</td>
<td>37,106</td>
<td>2,698,713</td>
<td>2,634,010</td>
<td>1,083,606</td>
<td>631,453</td>
<td>3,812,131</td>
<td>3,302,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$98,016</td>
<td>$109,697</td>
<td>$8,531,185</td>
<td>$8,803,527</td>
<td>$3,889,324</td>
<td>$2,537,722</td>
<td>$12,518,525</td>
<td>$11,450,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service Agencies</td>
<td>89,540</td>
<td>97,509</td>
<td>64,493</td>
<td>63,919</td>
<td>60,645</td>
<td>54,152</td>
<td>214,679</td>
<td>215,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>19,238</td>
<td>18,058</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>21,506</td>
<td>20,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>9,180</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>8,152</td>
<td>23,070</td>
<td>22,543</td>
<td>39,328</td>
<td>37,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>1,210,956</td>
<td>1,182,211</td>
<td>33,450</td>
<td>32,515</td>
<td>172,866</td>
<td>158,388</td>
<td>1,417,282</td>
<td>1,373,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board1</td>
<td>14,337</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>63,307</td>
<td>58,099</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>84,102</td>
<td>79,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>14,337</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>63,307</td>
<td>58,099</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>84,102</td>
<td>79,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$1,343,261</td>
<td>$1,318,698</td>
<td>$170,177</td>
<td>$164,285</td>
<td>$263,458</td>
<td>$242,809</td>
<td>$1,776,896</td>
<td>$1,725,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Agencies</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>12,171</td>
<td>9,309</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>18,506</td>
<td>16,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Research1</td>
<td>9,764</td>
<td>10,610</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>1,188,523</td>
<td>35,381</td>
<td>1,199,865</td>
<td>48,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>9,792</td>
<td>11,124</td>
<td>16,099</td>
<td>15,557</td>
<td>27,916</td>
<td>28,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith National Youth Service</td>
<td>502,255</td>
<td>478,453</td>
<td>2,818,493</td>
<td>2,641,783</td>
<td>240,391</td>
<td>206,328</td>
<td>3,561,139</td>
<td>3,326,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>7,414,805</td>
<td>6,147,191</td>
<td>6,521,898</td>
<td>5,050,635</td>
<td>13,938,483</td>
<td>11,655,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social Studies</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>9,561</td>
<td>17,968</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>16,910</td>
<td>24,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsie Collegef</td>
<td>43,083</td>
<td>45,264</td>
<td>41,176</td>
<td>43,477</td>
<td>64,740</td>
<td>75,392</td>
<td>148,999</td>
<td>164,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadruth Ivritf</td>
<td>19,706</td>
<td>19,197</td>
<td>11,719</td>
<td>95,070</td>
<td>85,440</td>
<td>87,842</td>
<td>222,565</td>
<td>202,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>18,244</td>
<td>9,880</td>
<td>75,607</td>
<td>79,747</td>
<td>20,179</td>
<td>24,213</td>
<td>114,497</td>
<td>110,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>8,968</td>
<td>8,652</td>
<td>190,298</td>
<td>179,896</td>
<td>9,861</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td>209,027</td>
<td>196,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Societym</td>
<td>15,853</td>
<td>12,939</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>23,266</td>
<td>445,751</td>
<td>426,368</td>
<td>464,556</td>
<td>462,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers' Seminary &amp; People's University1</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>35,398</td>
<td>22,084</td>
<td>23,498</td>
<td>46,825</td>
<td>61,326</td>
<td>70,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In dollars.
3. Excludes social security taxes.
4. In绍dental expenses.
5. Includes catastrophe and emergency funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Domestic Funds</th>
<th>Overseas Funds</th>
<th>Total Domestic</th>
<th>Total Overseas and Domestic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture</td>
<td>$2,490</td>
<td>$5,071</td>
<td>$733,460</td>
<td>$735,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture</td>
<td>$71,221</td>
<td>$70,637</td>
<td>$25,175</td>
<td>$31,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO Institute for Jewish Research</td>
<td>35,176</td>
<td>34,025</td>
<td>85,174</td>
<td>87,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
<td>20,000*</td>
<td>25,000*</td>
<td>45,000*</td>
<td>55,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$753,540</strong></td>
<td><strong>$733,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,197,091</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,729,797</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Domestic Funds</th>
<th>Overseas Funds</th>
<th>Total Domestic</th>
<th>Total Overseas and Domestic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Jacob Schools and Hebrew Teachers College</td>
<td>$19,926</td>
<td>$15,998</td>
<td>$230,063</td>
<td>$244,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>35,175</td>
<td>35,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>37,683</td>
<td>37,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Campaign for Reform Judaism</td>
<td>112,501</td>
<td></td>
<td>953,250</td>
<td>962,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>681,597</td>
<td>682,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118,814</td>
<td>119,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>96,534</td>
<td>106,227</td>
<td>3,111,255</td>
<td>3,118,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish University of America (HTC)</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>184,975</td>
<td>185,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesita Tifereth Jerusalem</td>
<td>7,099</td>
<td>7,148</td>
<td>35,974</td>
<td>36,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miry Yeshiva Institute</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>192,403</td>
<td>192,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirzachi Haapoel Hamizrachi National Council for Torah Education</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>24,277</td>
<td>24,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ner Israel Rabbinical College</td>
<td>8,943</td>
<td>7,009</td>
<td>210,876</td>
<td>218,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Chaim Berlin, Yeshiva &amp; Mesíta</td>
<td>9,691</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>133,691</td>
<td>145,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td></td>
<td>333,344</td>
<td>333,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>13,022</td>
<td>14,103</td>
<td>142,536</td>
<td>142,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminary Yeshiva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,277</td>
<td>24,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chachmey Lublin</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>70,374</td>
<td>71,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>103,837</td>
<td>108,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Vodaath, Yeshiva and Mesíta</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,344</td>
<td>361,600</td>
<td>362,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Chabad-Lubavitch Jewish Congregations</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>134,810</td>
<td>134,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Lubavitch Yeshivot</td>
<td>7,228</td>
<td>7,734</td>
<td>417,119</td>
<td>424,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva World Network</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>175,769</td>
<td>178,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University (Including Medical School and Yeshiva Endowment Fund)</td>
<td>76,021</td>
<td>80,744</td>
<td>5,256,340</td>
<td>5,261,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$423,763</strong></td>
<td><strong>$444,459</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,088,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,141,359</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Domestic</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,557,255</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,729,023</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,592,318</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,751,341</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overseas and Domestic</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72,238,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71,359,947</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,410,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,570,116</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*JDA reports do not permit complete segregation of welfare-fund income. Welfare-fund income is overstated and other contributions understated by about $260,000 annually. In addition, other contributions of about $600,000 annually in New York City and Chicago are used for fund-raising purposes and are not included in the net figures shown.

American Jewish Committee figures are gross receipts exclusive of JDA income covering all funds (including Institute Fund) and all earnings.

Federal income includes allocations from N.Y. UJA.

Excludes overseas income.

Represents dues from national agencies.

Data for 1961 excludes income from Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation, excepting for a grant. ERCF was set up by the Jewish National Fund of America and was dissolved from reports filed with New York State Department of Social Welfare.

h Includes building fund.

i Includes fees from CJMCCAG and from National Foundation for Jewish Culture.

j Includes special funds; reports unavailable.

k Includes grants by other national agencies to avoid double counting.

l Excludes Bible fund balance of $935,000 at end of 1962.

m Excludes building fund of $81,109 in 1962 and $144,998 in 1961.

n Excludes building fund.

o Excludes gross sales of religious education publications of $434,559 in 1961 and $426,420 in 1962.

p Includes grants in 1961 due to change in fiscal period.

q Exclusive of local federation grants made directly to 11 local yeshivot.
**Jewish College Students in the United States**

In an address to the college Menorah society in December 1907, Harvard University President Charles W. Eliot said that not a single Jewish student had been in attendance at the college when he was a student there and that the condition had persisted through the early years of his teaching career at Harvard. In 1854, when Dr. Eliot was graduated, Harvard had 320 undergraduates. By the time of his 1907 address, enrolment had grown to about 2,200, among them about 60 Jews. In February 1963 about a fifth of Harvard University's students were Jews—2,610 among a student population of 12,413.

**GENERAL COLLEGE ENROLMENT**

The Harvard statistics illustrate the enormous and in many instances explosively rapid growth of the college population in the United States during the past 75 years. In 1890 American colleges and universities had an enrolment of 157,000. By 1900 the figure had increased to 238,000, accounting for about one out of every 42 young people of college age (18–24). By 1934–35 enrolment had passed a million (1,055,000) and the ratio of college students to college-age population had risen to one in 15. Since then the rate of growth has been even more rapid. In 1946 college enrolment reached 1,677,000; it increased to 2,637,000 in 1956, and 3,610,000 in 1960, when almost one out of four young people of college age actually attended an institution of higher learning.

Between 1890 and 1960 the population of the United States had tripled, the number of college students had increased more than 23 times, and the number of institutions of higher learning had more than doubled, from 998 to 2,008.

By the fall of 1962 enrolment increased 18 per cent to 4,207,000 and in

---

* For meaning of abbreviations, see p. 361.
4 Hillel survey, February 1963.
5 College-enrolment figures from 1890 until 1956 are taken from the *Historical Statistics of the United States*, pp. 210–11 and college-age populations are calculated from the table on p. 214.
1963 another five per cent, with 4,420,000 degree-credit students registered in 2,139 institutions of higher learning: universities, professional schools, and two- and four-year colleges, including teachers' colleges. Approximately 2.7 million students were enrolled in 762 publicly financed institutions and about 1.7 million in 1,377 private colleges and universities, nearly two-thirds of which were under religious denominational control. Junior colleges, with an enrolment of about 614,000, accounted for a seventh of the entire enrolment.10

The student population will continue to expand substantially for at least another decade, reflecting the high postwar birthrate and the growing value of a college degree. The prediction is for a college enrolment of 4,810,000 in 1964, 5,257,000 in 1965, 7,007,000 in 1970, and 8,677,000 in 1975.11

Among other states, Michigan expects to spend about $150 million in capital funds by 1970 in order to enlarge existing colleges and universities or to provide new ones. California plans to spend $136 million on its state colleges and $89 million on its state university within the next decade. Pennsylvania has already established 14 new commonwealth colleges and plans six more by 1970, a two-year college to be located within reach of every major community within the state, so that the state university can be reserved for students continuing beyond the sophomore year.

JEWISH STUDENT ENROLMENT

The enormous growth of college enrolment has been accompanied—despite significant variations—by an equally rapid growth in Jewish enrolment. Unfortunately, no systematic studies of Jewish student enrolment seem to have been attempted before World War I, and only random information is available until then. It is known that Judah Monis, who received an M.A. degree from Harvard University in 1720, was probably the first Jew (he later became an apostate) to achieve such recognition from an American university; that two brothers, Solomon and William Pinto of New Haven, were graduated from Yale in 1777, and that Harvard had no Jewish students until about 1874 and only a handful in the years that immediately followed.12 By the beginning of the 20th century, however, the number of Jewish students had sufficiently increased, especially in the New York metropolitan area and other centers of Jewish concentration, to permit the formation of the first Jewish student organizations. In New York City the Zeta Beta Tau fraternity was founded in 1898, and a students' Zionist society in 1902; a Jewish literary society was organized at the University of Minnesota in 1903, and the first Menorah society was established at Harvard in 1906. Between 1911

12 Hurwitz and Scharfman, op. cit., p. 29.
and 1913 the various Menorah societies reported that there were 21 Jewish students at the University of Colorado, 62 at Ohio State, 400 at Cornell, 50 to 60 at Pennsylvania State, 160 at Harvard, 50 at Rutgers, 100 at Minnesota, 75 at Missouri, 325 at Pennsylvania, and 70 at Wisconsin.\(^\text{14}\)

The first systematic nationwide census of Jewish students was undertaken in 1935\(^\text{15}\) by Lee J. Levinger on behalf of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Commission. B'nai B'rith Vocational Service took a second similarly comprehensive census in 1946 and a third in 1955.\(^\text{16}\) In February 1963 the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations studied Jewish enrolment at about 850 colleges and universities.

It found that Jewish enrolment in 215 institutions in the United States served by Hillel units was 165,148 (including Canada: 170,615). Enrolment in 600 institutions not served by Hillel, of which 539 responded, was about 63,000. Another 38,000 Jewish students estimated to be enrolled at junior colleges, and 9,000 at denominational and theological institutions, brought the estimated Jewish student enrolment in 1963 to about 275,000, or a little more than six per cent of the total college population of 4,420,000. In 1935 Levinger had found 105,000 Jewish students, constituting 9.3 per cent of a total college population of 1,148,000.

Nevertheless, the proportion of Jewish college students to all Jews of college age in 1963 was probably more than three times as great as that of all college students to all Americans of college age—between 70 and 80 per cent for Jews, and 27 per cent for all Americans.

In October 1962 the college-age population (18 to 24) of the United States was 16,153,000, or 8.75 per cent of the total civilian resident population; 3,869,000,\(^\text{17}\) or about 24 per cent, were receiving a higher education.

Although comparable data for the Jewish population were not available, they could be estimated. There were proportionately fewer young people (under 25 years of age) among Jews than among Protestants and Catholics.\(^\text{18}\) Similarly, recent Jewish population studies in eight communities\(^\text{19}\) showed proportionately fewer Jews under 25 than urban white Americans generally. These data suggest a college-age population (18 to 24) of at most seven per cent, or about 390,000, but more probably six per cent, or about 335,000. Given an estimated Jewish enrolment of 275,000, then, the percentage of college-age Jewish youth attending college in 1963 was at least 70 per cent, and probably closer to 80 per cent.

14 Hurwitz and Scharfman, op. cit., pp. 98–142.
15 Lee J. Levinger, The Jewish Student in America (Cincinnati, 1937), p. 3. Levinger calls attention to previous studies, one by UAHC in 1915, another published in the Menorah Journal, October 1916, and a third by the Bureau of Social Research in 1918–19. Pointing to the flagrant discrepancies between the studies, Levinger nevertheless, for reasons pertinent to his own purposes—but not here, used the third (which he considered least reliable) as a point of reference. In this article, we have used Levinger's study as a point of departure.
19 AJYB, 1963 (Vol. 64), pp. 59–63,
It is doubtful whether Jewish college attendance will continue to grow absolutely, let alone relatively. The proportion of Jewish young men and women aged 18 to 24 now in college is already close to its potential maximum, while the proportion of college youth in the general population continues to rise. While the total white urban population has more younger than older children, among Jews the 5-to-9-year-old group is smaller than the 10-to-14-year group, and the youngest group—children below 5—is the smallest of all. This suggests that the number of Jews of college age will probably reach a peak within the next five to eight years and will then gradually decline.

The rise in Jewish enrolment has been accompanied by substantial shifts in the geographic distribution of Jewish students. In 1935, 53 per cent of all Jewish college students in the United States were enrolled in New York City schools. In 1963 an estimated 76,000 Jewish students in New York City schools comprised only about 28 per cent of all Jewish students in the United States. (Nevertheless, it still was the largest concentration of Jewish college students in any city in the world.)

New York City's decreasing share of the total Jewish student population reflects several developments. Much of the city's Jewish population has achieved middle-class status, and consequently the ability to provide its children with a college education. Out-of-town enrolment, now financially feasible for many parents, has been further encouraged by the growth of the New York State university system and the liberalization of admissions policy on the part of many private colleges, especially but not exclusively in the East.

Corollary to the proportionate decline in New York City enrolment, there has been a large increase in most other parts of the country, especially in New England, the Middle Atlantic states (New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania), California, sections of the Southwest, and Florida. New York City students are increasingly seeking admission to out-of-town colleges. Sometimes, as when they choose schools in California, Arizona, or Florida, students may be influenced by climate. More often, students seek the better opportunities for professional training offered by many New England schools, the Ivy League and other prestige colleges, and the big state universities, especially in the Midwest. In some cases the choice is determined by economic factors such as tuition fees, living cost, and distance from home. In others, the academically less demanding institutions, usually small colleges, offer the only realistic choice.

**JEWISH COLLEGE ORGANIZATIONS**

Despite the steadily growing number of Jewish students, the adult Jewish community made virtually no effort until the early 20s to initiate or support programs of Jewish education and guidance for college students. Occasionally, some individual or organization expressed concern about their spiritual
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20 Hillel survey, February 1963.
welfare, and Rabbis Louis Grossman, Samuel Schulman, and Emil G. Hirsch recommended to the CCAR as early as 1896 that a special committee be appointed to supply Jewish students with religious services and personnel for courses and lectures in Jewish history and literature.\textsuperscript{21} Committees on religious work among Jewish college students were later established by the CCAR and the Rabbinical Assembly of America, but their reports and recommendations rarely eventuated in any action. The UAHC subsidized a part-time chaplaincy to the Jewish students at Yale for several years, and the United Synagogue of America supported student centers at the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University in Philadelphia. Nevertheless, these efforts were local and sporadic; the impulses for the development of organized Jewish activities on the college campus came largely from the students themselves.

The first organized Jewish campus group in the United States was the Zeta Beta Tau fraternity, founded under a Hebrew name (\textit{Zion Be-mishpat Tip-padheh}—Zion shall be redeemed by justice: Isaiah 1:27) in New York City in 1898 to encourage the study of Jewish history and culture among Jewish students, but shortly afterwards converted into a Greek-letter fraternity. Other organizations soon sprang up elsewhere—Zionist societies at the College of the City of New York (CCNY) in 1902 and at Harvard and Columbia in 1905; the University Jewish Literary Society at Minnesota in 1903; Menorah societies at Harvard in 1906 and at Missouri in 1907; the Ivrim at the University of Illinois and the Society for the Study of Jewish Literature at the University of Texas in 1907; the Hebraic Club at Yale in 1909, and the Calipha club for the Study of Jewish Culture and Questions at the University of California in 1910.

\textbf{The Menorah Movement}

Most of these groups were gradually absorbed by the growing Menorah movement, which originated at Harvard in 1906 and spread to about 30 universities during the next two decades. Its founder and driving spirit, Henry Hurwitz, had been active in the Harvard Zionist Society but broke away from it to build an organization that would promote the serious academic study of Jewish culture in the university and serve as a platform for the nonpartisan discussion of Jewish problems. Hurwitz aimed to liberate the Jewish college student from the feeling that his Judaism diminished his American identity. He hoped to "dispel the ignorance and raise the morale of the Jewish students," nourish an interest in Jewish studies among them, demonstrate the existence of this interest to the university administration, and thus ultimately win a "rightful place for the field of Jewish history and culture in the university."\textsuperscript{22}

He also wanted to counteract the resentment with which the Jewish student of that day frequently reacted to the fact of his Jewish identity. As one

\textsuperscript{21} CCAR, \textit{Yearbook}, 1897, VII, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{22} Hurwitz and Scharfman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 4.
of them put it later: "I regarded the term 'Jew' as a name for a fear-nurtured error called religion, and also as a name for an invidious error called race. Together they automatically imposed a gratuitous penalty upon anyone called 'Jew.' Why then endure the label?" 23

In 1913, 12 Menorah groups founded the Intercollegiate Menorah Association at a convention at the University of Chicago and formulated the principles which were to guide all affiliated Menorah societies. Membership was open to all members of a university community, students and faculty, Jews and non-Jews alike. Menorah's primary purpose was intellectual—the study of the history and culture of the Jewish people, so conceived that nothing Jewish should be alien to it. It was to be a nonpartisan and nonsectarian open forum. Nonactivist, as well, it would neither sponsor purely social functions nor engage in philanthropic or social-service activities. Its energies were to be concentrated upon its cultural purposes.

The association organized a speaker's bureau (the Menorah College of Lecturers) to serve all its societies; it sought to stimulate, albeit unsuccessfully, the establishment of courses and chairs in Jewish history and culture at various universities; it attempted to provide modest Judaic libraries to several universities, usually with the help of the Jewish Publication Society, local B'nai B'rith lodges, or private donors; it secured and offered several prizes for essays by undergraduates "on a subject in the history and achievement of the Jewish people"; it envisioned the preparation of educational resources for college students such as syllabi, pamphlets, and translations of selected Jewish classics, and it published the Menorah Journal, edited by Henry Hurwitz from its inception in 1915 until his death in 1961.

Membership in the association, which had never been large, began to decline in the late 20s. Its program, which had been geared to the intellectual interests of a small minority, lacked a mass base on which to draw for new leadership and support. Nor did it win sufficient community support to develop its projects and to provide field services and the sustained professional leadership which might have assured the continuity of program and structure. Above all, however, the mood of the college campus was no longer receptive to the Menorah idea. Menorah could not hold the loyalty of the small but vigorous band of committed student Zionists who rebelled against what they felt were its pale and uncommitted nonpartisanship and its lack of activism in matters of vital concern to the Jewish people. 24 Neither did Menorah appeal to many non-Zionist intellectuals of the 30s. Menorah's founders and early leaders had been the products of a vibrant East European Jewish environment, which they sought to project into the future. For many Jewish students of the 30s, however, the Jewish past was dead. They were in flight from it. It was an irrelevant anachronism to a generation which had witnessed the economic collapse of its society, rejected religion as the relic

of a prerational past, and put its trust in new social systems that promised to cure the ills of mankind by the radical reorganization of the economy. No active Menorah chapter survived World War II, nor did the Menorah Journal survive the death of Henry Hurwitz; a valedictory issue appeared in 1962. The Menorah Association was dissolved in June 1963.

Campus Zionist Societies Before World War II

Parallel to but independent of Menorah, Zionist societies had begun to emerge on the American campus with the founding of the Students' Zionist Society at CCNY in 1902. Its program consisted mainly of weekly discussions and courses in Jewish history and the history and development of the Jewish national idea. At the 1905 convention of the American Federation of Zionists in Philadelphia, the CCNY club joined with other Zionist societies which had been formed at Harvard, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Western Reserve, and Johns Hopkins to organize a Collegiate Zionist League (CZL).

The first CZL failed to attract sufficient members and was short-lived. It was supplanted by a more effective organization, bearing the same name, which was founded in New York City in 1906 through the merger of the student Zionist clubs at CCNY and Columbia and the later affiliation of the Zionist societies at New York University and Hunter College. The new CZL presented lectures and discussions for the education of its own members, provided speakers for other groups, raised funds for JNF and, in 1910, published a volume of essays, The Collegiate Zionist.

Elsewhere campus Zionism was dormant until 1914, when some of the leaders of Harvard's Menorah Society, dissatisfied with that group's lack of activism and its refusal to take a positive stand on Zionism, decided to establish a new Zionist student society, independent of it. A year later the society's officers and CZL representatives prepared the ground for a new student Zionist movement by founding the Intercollegiate Zionist Association (IZA), with headquarters at Harvard. IZA organized seven new university Zionist societies in 1916, had 20 affiliates in 1917, and 33 in 1919. At its peak, IZA had a membership of 2,500, principally in Boston, New York City, and Baltimore.

IZA sponsored courses and study groups, lectures, debates, conferences, and conventions. Justice Louis D. Brandeis offered an annual prize through IZA for the best original essay on some phase of Jewish life and culture. IZA established a small (and little-used) lending library of Zionist books and journals and published a Bulletin, first sporadically and later on a monthly basis. In 1918 it published an annual, named Kadimah after the famous student Zionist society of Vienna; the second and final issue appeared in 1920.

The expansion and intensification of IZA's work was made possible largely by a ZOA grant, which in 1918 provided sufficient funds for an executive
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25 This section has drawn on material in Grand, op. cit.; Brandeis Avukah Annual of 1932 (Boston, 1932), and "Avukah," Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, I (New York, 1939), 649-50.
secretary, clerical assistance, and a modest program of publications, conventions, and field services. IZA in turn considered itself the collegiate branch of ZOA. The arrangement was terminated in 1920 when a new ZOA administration, determined to devote its energies and budget exclusively to practical work in Palestine, dissolved its department of youth and education and canceled its allocation to IZA. IZA could not raise the funds required to carry on and went out of existence as a national organization; a few local chapters continued to function sporadically.

A similar cycle of growth and decline characterized the 17-year history of Avukah, American Student Zionist Federation, which attempted to fill the vacuum left by the disappearance of IZA. Avukah was founded in Washington, D.C., in 1925 with the encouragement and active support of an advisory council of Zionist veterans, among them Maurice Samuel, Louis Lipsky, Henrietta Szold, Mordecai M. Kaplan, Harry Wolfson, Louis Schwefel (Judah Shuval), Norman Salit, and Reuben Brainin. ZOA responded to the revival of student interest and recognized Avukah as “the only national Zionist organization in the United States operating among colleges and universities.”

The number of Avukah groups increased from 14 to 29 in 1927, and to 56 in the United States and Canada in 1939.

Avukah initiated Hebrew classes and lectures for its members, organized a summer school for the training of Zionist leaders, and published the Avukah Bulletin, succeeded in 1938 by Avukah Student Action, a biweekly journal of news and comment. It also published an elaborate Zionist anthology, the Brandeis Avukah Annual in 1932; S. H. Sankowsky’s Short History of Zionism in 1939; Meir Ya’ari’s Analysis of Zionism (translated from the Hebrew) in 1936, and Brandeis’ Call to the Educated Jew in 1936. It was one of the organizations to petition the New York City board of education to introduce Hebrew instruction in the high schools, and it established two annual fellowships for members for travel in Palestine.

The organization drew considerable national attention with its sponsorship of such programs as a protest meeting in Madison Square Garden in connection with the 1929 Arab riots, a public lecture by Albert Einstein shortly after his arrival in the United States, and a public debate between Clarence Darrow and John Haynes Holmes on the subject “Will Zionism Succeed?”

The vigor of its program could not offset the problems which Avukah, like its predecessors, faced as a result of the rapid turnover of student leadership, the persistent inadequacy of funds (intensified by the impact of the depression), and, especially, its failure to attract significant numbers of Jewish students to its program. The intellectual climate of university life during the 30s, which had affected Menorah adversely, was not hospitable to Avukah either. Zionism was rejected as either parochial or bourgeois. Liberal students thought in terms of internationalism and the more radical students disparaged attempts to find solutions to what they considered small and irrelevant problems that were bound to disappear in the classless society of the future.

26 New Palestine, August 7, 1925, p. 129.
The ideological conflicts spilled over into Avukah, and in 1934 it was split by a conflict between Revisionists and Labor Zionists. The Labor Zionists prevailed, and Avukah increasingly identified itself ideologically with Po'ale Zion and Ha-shomer Ha-tza'ir, while continuing to claim affiliation with the ZOA and to accept its subsidy. The split widened as Avukah took up the battle against "fascism and imperialist war." In 1942 ZOA and Hadassah, convinced that it "was in hands ... not representative of the Jewish student interested in Zionism," rescinded their recognition of Avukah as the only Zionist organization on the college campus. Deprived of recognition and support and weakened by the loss of leaders and members who had entered military service, Avukah went out of existence.

B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations

The experiences of Menorah and the Zionist campus movements demonstrated the weaknesses inherent in collegiate societies operating without strong community support. They had to depend on volunteer student leaders who rarely trained successors to replace them upon graduation, and upon the inadequate financial resources of the students themselves. With the entrance of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations on the American college campus, permanent professional direction, organized program services, administrative continuity, and the assurance of adequate and regular community support were provided for the first time.

The first Hillel unit was established by Rabbi Benjamin Frankel in 1923 to serve the religious and cultural needs of about 300 Jewish students at the University of Illinois. There had been earlier attempts to establish a Jewish collegiate program at Illinois. In 1907, a group of about 30 Jewish students founded a society, Ivrim, "to promote the acquisition of a broader knowledge of matters pertaining to Judaism." It struggled to survive, with varying degrees of success, until 1912, when it affiliated with the Intercollegiate Menorah Association, but even then failed to attract more than a handful of students. A few faculty members and community leaders, concerned about Jewish students' indifference to, and ignorance of, Jewish values began to cast about for ways to strengthen their loyalty to Judaism and the Jewish community. In 1915 Mrs. Simon Litman, the wife of a faculty member, organized a weekly study group in postbiblical Jewish history, which had a regular attendance of 10 to 15. The same year saw also an abortive attempt by the small Jewish congregation of Champaign-Urbana to obtain outside financial assistance to help secure the services of a spiritual leader for the Jewish university students. Their concern was shared by Christian faculty members, among them a professor of biblical literature, Edward Chauncy Baldwin, who, troubled by the attrition of Jewish knowledge and loyalty which he

28 From letters by Isaac Kuhn and Professor Armin H. Koller to Adolph Kraus and Rabbis Charles Levi, Felix A. Levy, Dr. Gotthard Deutsch, Dr. Kaufman Kohler, Dr. Joseph Stolz, Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, et al., November 18, 1915, in the Hillel archives.
observed among his Jewish students, pleaded with rabbinical and lay leaders in Illinois to develop the envisioned college program.

In 1923, Rabbi Frankel returned to Champaign, where he had previously served as a student rabbi, to take charge of the Illinois student community. He coined the name “Hillel Foundation” for the agency which he was building. A year later he won the sponsorship of B’nai B’rith, with whose support the Hillel program, in four decades, has spread to 247 campuses with an enrollment of about 185,000 Jewish students on five continents. In 1963 Hillel maintained 77 full-time foundations and 146 part-time counselorships in the United States and Canada, four chairs of Judaic studies, and 20 units at institutions of higher learning in Australia, Great Britain, Holland, Israel, Switzerland, and the Union of South Africa. Fifty-two foundations operated in their own buildings; 180 colleges, many with substantial Jewish enrollments, were on a waiting list for the establishment of Hillel service. Seventy per cent of Hillel’s financial support came from B’nai B’rith, 20 per cent from community sources (mainly federations and welfare funds), and the rest from student registration fees and activities income.

Principles of Organization

1. From its inception, Hillel has provided professional direction for each of its units. Every foundation operates under the guidance of a director, usually a rabbi; counselorships—extension-service units—are served by rabbis in nearby communities, educators or group workers, or Hillel directors from nearby foundations. A staff of 80 directors and 82 counselors directed the Hillel program in 1963.

2. Each Hillel unit functions as the Jewish community on campus. It seeks to serve all Jewish students regardless of background, ideology, denominational preference, or intellectual level. It does not sponsor or endorse any partisan view of Jewish life, but invites all expressions of Jewish interest or concern. Hillel directors and staff members, themselves recruited from all segments of the community, do not favor any one denominational point of view. They respect differences of conviction but encourage a sense of community which eschews divisiveness and relates the Jewish student to the totality of Jewish group experience.

3. Hillel recognizes that Jewish education for college students should be geared to the intellectual needs of the academic community. Its program is designed to bridge the gap between the childhood notions concerning religion and Judaism held by many students and the intellectual challenge of the university. It is concerned that Jewish values do not remain frozen on the Sunday-school level. It considers the development of a college-level approach to Jewish life and experience as its raison d’être.

4. Hillel seeks to synthesize information and participation in the educational process, looking upon unapplied knowledge as being socially sterile and as no less undesirable than action based on insufficient knowledge. It seeks to relate Jewish values and ideals to current issues of Jewish or general
concern, thereby stimulating students to translate their convictions into socially responsible action.

In 1963 Hillel, in cooperation with the Newman Club Federation, representing Catholic students, and the National Student Christian Federation, representing Protestant students, convened a Student Leadership Conference on Religion and Race in Washington, D.C. The four-day conference was attended by 326 students from 84 campuses and by 58 campus religious advisors. The meeting sought to clarify the relationship between religious conviction and racial justice and developed guidelines for student action. Small student delegations visited senators and congressmen from the 35 states represented at the conference.

Hillel units in the United States were asked to serve as centers for Peace Corps information and to encourage recruitment among college students. Hillel directors, together with other campus religious leaders and university officials, were asked to help organize student support groups for the Peace Corps. Material was exhibited and distributed among the student body by the foundations.

In March 1963 President John F. Kennedy appointed National Hillel Director Benjamin Kahn to the 23-member Peace Corps Advisory Board.

5. Lastly, Hillel considers self-motivation a fundamental principle of operation. Students elect their own leadership groups to help plan and administer the program, thus sharing responsibility with the directors.

Activities

The combination of professional direction, community cooperation, and student participation, buttressed by sustained financial support, has contributed to Hillel's steady growth. While aspects of the program vary from one campus to another, there is a core of activities which is central to the program of every foundation.

All Hillel units provide religious services on Sabbaths and holidays, sponsor festival observances, present interpreters of Jewish letters and art, and conduct regular classes and seminars in the major areas of Jewish thought and life. About a dozen foundations have developed institutes of Jewish study offering intensive courses. In 1963 nearly 600 extracurricular courses and classes were offered by Hillel foundations.

The core program is supplemented by regular lectures, discussions, book reviews, and forums on Jewish or general topics. There are film programs, art and book exhibits, lectures and recitals in Jewish art, music, dance, and drama. In 1963 individual foundations published 15 newspapers and 8 literary magazines; a great many Hillel units sponsored folk-dance and drama workshops and choral groups. Most foundations have Judaica libraries, participate in campus interreligious activities, assist students through scholarships and loan funds, and provide facilities for recreation and social activities.

A number of foundations have succeeded in winning university credit for some of their courses. In 1963, 38 colleges and universities offered courses
in the field of Judaic studies under Hillel auspices. These were usually taught by Hillel directors who were either faculty incumbents or were appointed to the faculty \textit{ad hoc}. In addition, Hillel sponsored full-fledged chairs of Judaic studies at Vanderbilt University, the State University of Iowa, the school of religion of the University of Missouri, and the department of Judaic studies at the University of Manitoba.

A national department of leadership training, established in 1946, plans annual directors' conferences and administers a national summer institute which provides leadership-training courses for nearly 200 students from the United States and Canada. It also supervises a network of intercollegiate institutes and study seminars. In 1963 nearly 2,000 students participated in 24 such forums.

In 1949 Hillel established a national department of program and resources. Among its projects are the Hillel Library Series, which has released ten titles since 1943; the Hillel Little Book Series, which has published five titles since 1954; program monographs; professional program aids; readers and anthologies for group study and discussion, and professional publications, including \textit{A Guide to Hillel Purposes, Program, Policies; A Handbook for Student Leaders}, and \textit{Clearing House}, a bimonthly bulletin for Hillel directors and counselors.

After World War II, Hillel expanded its social-service activities. In 1946 it initiated a foreign-student service, which brought 108 students from Displaced Persons' camps to the United States, saw them through college, and sponsored their settlement in this country. Social-service committees function at all Hillel foundations and many smaller units; they sponsor, among other projects, annual United Jewish Student Appeal drives, which have raised $1,305,000 since 1947. A special UJA department works with Hillel to train philanthropic and social-service leaders.

In 1963 Hillel initiated a faculty program to provide regular opportunities for Jewish faculty members for discussions and seminars, and to encourage research in fields of Jewish scholarship. Twelve hundred faculty members at 31 universities participated in the program. The program is guided by a national faculty consultative committee of 17 members, headed by Louis Gottschalk, professor of modern history at the University of Chicago and chairman of the B'nai B'rith Hillel commission.

Hillel is a founder and sponsor of World University Service and sponsors the annual Summer Institute for Students in Israel, in cooperation with the American Zionist Youth Foundation.

\textbf{Independent Student Groups}

Student organizations similar to but independent of Hillel exist at Columbia, Long Island, and New York universities. The Counselorship to Jewish Students at Columbia University was established in 1929 to provide counseling services and educational, religious, and social activities. It sponsors lectures, discussion groups and seminars, luncheons, worship services, Sab-
bath meals, and dances, and participates in intergroup activities. It also integrates the activities of the Jewish Student Society for Undergraduates (the Seixas-Menorah Society) and the Jewish Graduate Society. The program is headed by a full-time counselor assisted, since 1960, by a full-time associate. Together with the counselors to other religious groups, they are members of the Earl Hall staff under the chairmanship of the university chaplain. The university provides the physical facilities for the counselorship program, which is privately financed through the efforts of an advisory board consisting of 50 alumni.

The New York University Jewish Culture Foundation was established in 1937 as an all-embracing Jewish student organization. It sponsors a threefold program: a students' organization, a library of Judaica and Hebraica (established in 1942), and a chair of Hebrew culture and education for all degrees from B.A. to Ph.D. The foundation sponsors weekly forums, holiday observances, general meetings, classes, social activities, and interfaith programs. It also offers several scholarships and prizes for outstanding achievement in Hebrew culture and education. Its activities are guided by a director, who is a faculty member, and two associates, one at the Washington Square Center and the other at University Heights. The organization is governed by a board of directors consisting of faculty members, and is maintained by a board of sponsors composed of representatives of the community at large, and a women's division.

The Hebrew Culture Society at Long Island University, too, has the services of a professional director.

Other, unaffiliated student groups function at numerous smaller colleges and universities without such professional guidance. The 1963 Hillel survey showed that groups using names such as Hillel, Menorah club, Brandeis club, Jewish Student Fellowship, etc., existed at 113 colleges. Most of these groups had applied for affiliation with the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations.

**Student Zionism Since World War II**

After Avukah's dissolution (p. 139), campus Zionism was carried on largely by local Brandeis clubs, usually operating within Hillel foundations. In 1946 a new national organization, the Intercollegiate Zionist Federation of America (IZFA), was founded with the encouragement and partial support of the American Zionist Youth Commission. IZFA conducted classes, seminars, lectures, and conferences; it sponsored public meetings, raised funds for the support of special youth projects in Palestine, sought to encourage aliya among its members, and helped found Kibbutz Yiftah in Upper Galilee. During the crucial period immediately preceding the partition of Palestine and the proclamation of the State of Israel, IZFA's membership rose to nearly 10,000, but it dropped rapidly after the state had been established,
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and, lacking adequate financial support and experienced leadership, went out of existence in 1953.

In 1954 IZFA was succeeded by the professionally directed Student Zionist Organization (SZO), whose support came from the American Zionist Youth Foundation. In 1963 SZO had about 2,500 members in 70 college chapters in the United States and Canada. Nationally, SZO sponsors an annual college ulpan (intensive Hebrew course), a leadership training seminar (since 1963), and social, recreational, and sports activities; some chapters sponsor weekend Hebrew seminars. SZO encourages its members to participate in the annual Israel Summer Institute and other training projects in Israel, such as the Jewish Agency’s leadership institute for foreign students. Since 1954 over 200 members have immigrated to Israel. SZO publications include the Zionist Collegiate, program guides, and a recently published Manual for Zionism on the Campus.

Denominational Collegiate Organizations

As the number of Jewish students grew, they became of increasing concern to the Jewish denominational groups, and several national congregational bodies decided to form their own college-age chapters to further the denominational interests of their student members and to retain and strengthen their ideological and institutional loyalties while they were at college.

Atid, the college-age organization of the Conservative movement, was founded in 1960 under the auspices of the department of youth activities of the United Synagogue. Designed for students as well as non-students in the 18-to-24 age group, Atid, in 1963, had a membership of 834 in 34 chapters, of which 7 were campus-affiliated and 21 were attached to congregations.30 The organization is professionally directed and employs 15 salaried and 25 volunteer instructors. Its activities are nationally planned and directed and include an eight-day encampment for study and discussion, national conventions, local study groups, Hebrew classes, participation in specific synagogue and community activities, social and recreational programs, and the publication of Kol Atid and program manuals.

In 1960 a group of Orthodox Jewish students representing the Yeshurun club at Columbia University, a sister chapter at Barnard College, and Orthodox student groups at 12 other universities founded Yavneh, “a national religious Jewish students association” to “promote Jewish education on an intellectually sophisticated level, facilitate Jewish observance on campus, develop a sense of community responsibility among Jewish students, and explore ways in which Jewish and secular civilization can benefit from each other.”31 Yavneh’s campus activities include classes in Bible, Talmud, and Jewish theology and philosophy, and the sponsorship of lectures and discussion groups. Yavneh publishes the Jewish Collegiate Observer, a newspaper, and

31 Communication by Yavneh president Louis Dickstein, Nov. 7, 1962.
the *Yavneh Review*, a magazine. It sponsors a summer-study institute, regional and national conventions, and a study institute in Israel. In 1963 it had a membership of about 1,000, aged 16 to 25, in 30 chapters. The organization is professionally directed and has six salaried and 30 volunteer instructors.

A Reconstructionist university fellowship, T’hiyah, was formed in 1959 for “the study and advancement of Judaism as the evolving religious civilization of the Jewish people, the development of Eretz Yisrael, and the furtherance of universal freedom, justice, and peace.” Committed to the principle of an “organic Jewish community,” T’hiyah conceives of itself as a supplementary Jewish student organization and encourages its members to participate in the work of institutions and organizations which promote Jewish unity, learning, and creativity. T’hiyah’s local programs include seminars, lectures, and Sabbath institutes. Nationally, it sponsors study institutes during the fall and winter and a week-long summer institute for study and leadership training. The fellowship is supported by a grant from the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation and individual contributions.

ALFRED JOSPE

The United States, Israel, and the Middle East *

Two major themes dominated the Middle East during the period under review (July 1, 1962, to December 31, 1963): revolution and Arab unity. The fall of 1962 began with the overthrow of the Yemen monarchy that ignited a civil war and provoked internecine Arab conflict, with Egypt supporting and Saudi Arabia and Jordan opposing the revolutionary government. In Iraq an unexpected Baathist-inspired coup in February 1963 brought down the regime of Premier Abdul Karim Kassim. It was followed in March by a Baathist military coup in Syria, which overturned the anti-Nasser government there.

Following unsuccessful attempts to achieve unity between Egypt, Iraq, and Syria, the latter two nations issued a joint communiqué on September 2, 1963, looking toward full economic unity and closer military cooperation. This new alliance between Syria and Iraq came to an end with the overthrow on November 18 of the new Iraqi regime.

Given this shifting political climate, United States intervention became increasingly difficult and hazardous during the period under review, complicated by the cold-war moves of the USSR and Communist China.

* For meaning of abbreviations, see p. 361.
The overthrow of the Yemen monarchy on September 26, 1962, created considerable concern in Washington that intervention by Arab states might touch off a war in the Middle East. Cold-war implications developed when Moscow and Peking moved quickly behind the UAR to recognize the new regime. The United States withheld recognition in deference to the views of Great Britain and Saudi Arabia. Influenced by its oil interests in Yemen and its military commitments in the Aden Protectorate, Great Britain favored the royalist regime as opposed to the new government, which was beholden to Gamal Abdul Nasser. Saudi Arabia, seat of large private United States oil investments, wanted the United States to withhold recognition.

Royalist forces were supported by Saudi Arabia and Jordan in their battle for restoration; the revolutionary regime, under the leadership of Abdullah al Salal, received extensive military aid from Nasser. In an effort to mediate the quarrel, President John F. Kennedy addressed messages to Prince Faisal, prime minister of Saudi Arabia; King Hussein of Jordan; President Nasser of the UAR, and President Salal of Yemen. He proposed, as a first step, that Egyptian troops withdraw from the republican side of Yemen, and that Saudi Arabia and Jordan halt material support of the royalist cause.

On December 19 the United States recognized the revolutionary regime. Recognition was reportedly based on two factors:

1. that the United States had received assurances from the Salal government that it would honor previous international obligations, including a treaty with the British guaranteeing nonintervention in the Aden Protectorate;

2. that the UAR would withdraw Egyptian troops serving the republican cause in Yemen, provided that Jordan and Saudi Arabia thereupon ceased supplying arms and gold to royalist tribesmen.

Israel took exception to American recognition on the ground that a Nasser-supported rebellion in Yemen served only to further Nasser's expansionist "Grand Design."

Nor did American recognition lead to the disengagement of the interested Arab states. On January 2, 1963, the United States sent a note to Cairo deploping UAR air attacks on Najaran, a Saudi Arabian settlement near the Yemen border, said to be an important arms depot.

Having failed to settle the dispute, the United States prompted the UN Secretariat to explore the possibilities for UN mediation. On February 26, 1963, UN Secretary General U Thant sent Ralph J. Bunche, UN Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, to head off the deepening Arab crisis. Almost three months later, on June 11, after a period of continued warfare of varying intensity, the UN Security Council voted into existence a 200-man United Nations Yemen Observation Mission. In a year-end report on August 26, U Thant declared: "In the conditions prevailing in Yemen, the
implementation of the disengagement agreement is not an easy matter for either side, and it is as yet too early to make a judgment on the effectiveness of the mission in assisting in bringing about the actual disengagement.” On December 13, following an exploratory tour of the capitals involved, Pier P. Spinelli, chief of the UN mission, reported that the stalemate persisted and that a settlement “will take time.”

Iraq

On February 8, 1963, Premier Kassim of Iraq was overthrown by rebel junior officers, led by Abdul Karim Mustafa, with the support of the Baath party, a socialist, pan-Arabic movement. The new government, headed by Colonel Abdul Salam Arif, was promptly recognized by the United States, Great Britain, and the USSR. The western countries were pleased by early large-scale arrests of Communists by the new government. Eager to exploit the Soviet reverses, the State Department announced that “with its recognition the United States extends its best wishes for the success and prosperity of the government of Iraq and its hopes that the traditional ties of friendship between the American and Iraqi peoples will be expanded and strengthened.”

The Arif government was believed to be Nasser-inspired, and it was rumored that there would soon be a union of the two countries. The rumors were reinforced in March when a new revolution led to the creation of a Baathist regime in neighboring Syria, as well.

Syria—Projected Arab Federation

On March 7 the third Middle Eastern revolution in six months, and the seventh army coup in Syria since its independence in 1941, took place. As they had in the case of Iraq, the United States, Britain, and the USSR were quick to recognize the new government. A junta headed by Premier Salah el Bitar ousted the conservative regime of anti-Nasser Premier Khalid al-'Azm and installed a new government pledged to “Arab unity, freedom, and socialism.” On April 17 representatives of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq signed in Cairo a unity manifesto providing for a plebiscite within five months on a yet-to-be written federal constitution, to be followed by an interim government for 20 months.

The agreement floundered during the following months because Syria and Iraq, although ready to join an Arab federation based on equality and self-government, refused to be subordinate to Nasser or accept his unitary governmental system. After months of charges and countercharges, especially between Syria and Egypt, and frequent changes in the Syrian government (three crises within five months), the federation program was formally terminated by Nasser on July 23 in an address at the 11th-anniversary observance of the Egyptian revolution: “We cannot possibly have any alliance or any unity of objective with a fascist state in Syria,” he declared.
During the early part of May, before the collapse of the federation program, Jordan had been fearful that pro-Nasser riots in Amman and Jordanian Jerusalem might lead to the dissolution of the Jordanian parliament and the downfall of King Hussein. Israel, too, was alarmed, because such an event would pose the possibility of the extension of Egyptian influence. While not reacting officially to the Jordanian events, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, addressing the opening summer session of the Knesset on May 6, attacked the proposed federation. When its proponents spoke of the liberation of Palestine as a national duty, he said, they meant that the primary aim of the federation would be to attack Israel. The Knesset reiterated Israel's longstanding request for a defense pact with the United States.

At a press conference on May 8 President Kennedy was asked whether the balance of power had changed "as a result of recent developments" and what United States policy would be "towards the security of Israel in case they are threatened." He answered: "The United States supports social and economic and political progress in the Middle East. We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We seek to limit the Near East arms race, which obviously takes resources from an area already poor and puts them into an increasing race which does not really bring any great security. . . . In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression. . . ."

On May 8, 1963, Senator Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N.Y.) introduced a resolution in the Senate calling on the president to initiate a mutual-defense agreement and help provide military and other assistance to protect Israel and any other threatened nation. Senator Kenneth B. Keating (Rep., N.Y.) co-sponsored the resolution; he said that increasingly aggressive moves by Arab nations had raised concern in Israel "about her ability to maintain her integrity and sovereignty."

Senator Wayne Morse (Dem., Ore.) condemned the administration's policy of continued assistance to Nasser as "dead wrong," helping countries that were "a threat to the peace of the world." Senator Ernest Gruening (Dem., Alas.) said that Soviet arms, Nazi scientists, and United States money made "a wonderful combination" in the UAR. "Unless the United States policy of building up Nasser is reversed," he went on, "it is going to produce a bloody war in the Middle East for which we will bear a certain responsibility and into which we may well be drawn."

Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 13, 1963, Secretary of State Dean Rusk rejected demands that United States aid to the UAR should cease pending its peace with Israel. He said: "Our consistent policy in the Near East has been to do all that we can to avoid and contain conflicts within the region. As has been already demonstrated in this area, the use of an assistance program as a bludgeon to force solutions will not work where deep-seated beliefs and long-standing grievances are held." He
said that the history of the Middle East in the past ten years demonstrated why the United States should continue furnishing surplus farm products and some dollar loans to the UAR, the United States position having been adversely affected by the failure of arms negotiations with the UAR in 1955, the withdrawal of the Aswan Dam offer in 1956, and the withdrawal of aid in 1957–58. During that time, he pointed out, Soviet arms went to the UAR, Arab hostility towards Israel became more intense, and the Suez Canal was first nationalized and then, during the Suez crisis, closed. “Our recent experience since resuming aid to the UAR in 1959 has been a gradual reversal of the adverse situation that developed from 1954 to 1958,” he said. “The Soviet presence, prestige, and influence in the Arab world diminished to its lowest point in years with a resulting shift westward in UAR trade, training, and cultural contacts. The UAR has adopted a nonalignment policy increasingly more compatible with free-world interests.”

**Syrian Border Incident**

Israel’s disappointment with the United States’ position on the UAR was somewhat tempered by the strong support it received from the United States during UN debate on an Israel-Syria border incident on August 19, 1963, which resulted in the death of two young Israeli farmers.

On September 3, 1963, following two weeks of deliberation, eight members of the Security Council voted in favor of, two against, a resolution introduced by the United States and Great Britain condemning “the wanton murder at Almagor in Israel territory of two Israel citizens on August 19, 1963.” The Soviet Union exercised its veto power. On September 4 the State Department expressed the opinion that the vote ought to be a source of gratification to Israel, and that it was obvious that the Soviet Union, by its veto, was attempting to exploit Arab anti-Israel passions.

The Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations telegraphed President Kennedy its “profound appreciation” for the position taken by the United States in the Security Council debate. Conference President Irving Miller said that the Jewish leaders were “greatly heartened” by the address of United States Ambassador to the UN Adlai E. Stevenson, who urged the UN body “to accept its responsibilities and act with courage and wisdom.”

**The ‘Palestine Question’**

The Special Political Committee of the UN received three draft resolutions and one amendment in connection with the perennial “Palestine question.” The first draft resolution, introduced by 21 sponsors, called for direct negotiations between the parties concerned. The second, presented by four sponsors, called for the appointment by the secretary general of a UN custodian for the administration and protection of Arab property in Israel. The
third, sponsored by the United States and approved by the General Assembly on December 20, 1962, by a vote of 100 to 0 with 2 abstentions, extended the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees until June 30, 1965. This action had been recommended by the Special Political Committee, where it was sponsored by the United States and amended by Cyprus. The Assembly noted with deep regret that no substantial progress had been made towards repatriation or compensation of the Arab refugees from what is now Israel, as provided for in its resolution of December 11, 1948.

That the motion for direct negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis was sponsored by 21 powers, in contrast to previous years when similar resolutions had had only 16 and 17 sponsors, was considered significant. Ambassador Michel Galin-Douathe of the Central African Republic stressed the necessity for negotiations, even without hope. He urged the Arab countries to understand that their attitude would divert them from a peaceful settlement of a dispute whose standing victims were the Arab refugees. Ambassador Arsene Assouan Usher of the Ivory Coast saw the proposals for negotiations as a means to avoid war and the arms race.

Carl T. Rowan presented the traditional American position that direct negotiations would serve no purpose. His presentation resulted in withdrawal of the resolutions calling for direct negotiations and for the appointment of a UN custodian to administer Arab property in Israel. With respect to the latter proposal, Rowan did not think that it offered a realistic basis for compensation or aid for the refugees. He thought the proposal was a retrograde step since it was clearly designed to undermine the very foundation of Israel sovereignty.

On October 1, 1962, before the Special Political Committee gave official consideration to the Palestine problem, it released a report by Joseph E. Johnson, special representative of the Palestine Conciliation Commission (PCC), offering proposals for the resolution of the Arab refugee problem. One proposal would have enabled the refugees to express their preferences for a return to their old homes in Israel, or relocation on new sites in Israel, or resettlement in the Arab lands or elsewhere. On October 2 State Department spokesman Lincoln White stated that the United States had “no objections” to the proposals. The next day, however, White issued a clarification to the effect that “neither the United States nor the PCC has taken a position on the proposals.”

The 18th General Assembly, which met in the fall of 1963, offered no changes in approach to the Palestine refugee problem. On the eve of the annual discussion of the problem, John H. Davis, head of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees, issued a gloomy report. As long as Arab-Israel relations remained strained, he said, the UN agency could only chip away at the refugee problem, but not solve it. The stalemate continued, he said, with the Arab states insisting that all refugees be returned to what is now Israel, and Israel regarding such repatriation as economically and
politically impossible. "The problem . . . remains as intractable as ever," he declared.

One new political wrinkle was added to the annual debate. It was reported in the New York Times on November 21, 1963, that the United States had held "quiet talks" at a high level with Israel and the Arab states, and that these discussions had been useful. Arab members denied that such talks had been held, but the United States, in the committee, affirmed that it had, indeed, initiated the talks in its role as one of three members of the Palestine Conciliation Commission. Arab members were particularly incensed by the report's declaration that the talks had been held "without preconditions." They apparently felt that this implied a readiness to consider solutions other than repatriation, such as resettling the refugees in the countries where they were living.

The two rival resolutions considered by the 17th session were again introduced: one by Israel, endorsed by more than 20 countries, calling for direct Arab-Israel talks, and the other by Afghanistan, Indonesia, and Pakistan, on behalf of the Arab states, calling for PCC supervision over property left behind by refugees from Israel. Both resolutions were withdrawn after Italy appealed to the sponsors to settle for a less controversial text, sponsored by the United States. Last-minute changes making the text acceptable to the Arabs, however, made it "wholly unacceptable to Israel." The Special Political Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 83 to 1, with Israel casting the single negative vote.

Israel specifically objected to Paragraph 11, which was identical to a clause in the 1948 resolution and emphasized repatriation or compensation of the Arab refugees without direct reference to resettlement. In debate the Arab states had customarily quoted a section of the paragraph stating that "refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbors shall be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date," with compensation for properties to those who choose otherwise. Israel had customarily, in turn, disputed this interpretation, noting that the same paragraph elsewhere spoke of resettling the refugees, meaning in the Arab land where they now lived.

**U. S. RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL**

"Hawk" Missile Sale to Israel

Despite the differences between the United States and Israel regarding American economic support of the UAR, there were many areas of mutual agreement.

On September 26, 1962, the United States took cognizance of Israel's growing sense of insecurity in the face of the arms imbalance in the Middle East, created by the increasing flow of arms from the USSR to Egypt, with the announcement that it would sell ground-to-air missiles to Israel. Israel thus became the first non-NATO nation to acquire "Hawk"-type missiles for
anti-aircraft defense. United States officials stressed that the Hawk missiles were purely defensive and that the sale was being made only to counter the flow of Soviet jet bombers and missiles to the Arabs. Israel welcomed the decision of the United States warmly. The press commented that while the Hawk missiles were no answer to the threat of Egypt's ground-to-ground rockets, the United States' move to strengthen Israel's security was in itself a deterrent to Arab attack.

The Arab reaction to the United States move was hostile. Nasser condemned the United States for undermining Middle Eastern peace and for blockading Cuba. He termed Israel a foreign base of aggression in the "heart of the Arab homeland."

In the United States the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations sent a telegram to Secretary of State Rusk hailing the decision as a contribution to "peace and stability in the Middle East. It will prevent a dangerous imbalance of power resulting from the flow of arms into the Arab states, and their aggressive use against Israel."

**German Nuclear Scientists in Egypt**

On March 25 Israel submitted similar notes to the United States and West German governments protesting the activities of German nuclear scientists developing nonconventional weapons in Egypt. Attached to the notes were copies of a resolution adopted by the Keneset, requesting West Germany to halt these dangerous activities. On the same day two congressmen, Leonard Farbstein (Dem., N.Y.), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and Seymour Halpern (Rep., N.Y.) voiced demands in the House for closer scrutiny of West Germany's NATO role in view of the aid rendered by its scientists to Egypt's anti-Israel war program. At a press conference on April 2 President Kennedy commented that the German scientists working on missiles in Egypt "do affect tensions in the Middle East." He noted that the German government had shown its displeasure. Many Jewish organizations in the United States made representations to the government.

The State Department expressed its opposition to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by either the Arab states or Israel, but stressed that the government had no evidence that any weapons of mass destruction were being produced by the UAR.

**Arab Boycott and Bias Resolutions**

As in previous years, attempts were made to attach to the Foreign Aid bill an anti-bias clause aimed at the Arab states. On September 18, 1962, Representative John J. Rooney (Dem., N.Y.) stated that the House Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee had restored an anti-bias clause, deleted at the request of the State Department, to the Foreign Aid Act for 1963. The clause inserted by the subcommittee and included by the full committee in the bill sent to the floor, said: "It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or
religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial
access, or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens gen-
erally, is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the
United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated
under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may de-
termine."

In testimony to the House Foreign Operations Appropriations Sub-
committee, Assistant Secretary of State Philip Talbot countered: "When it
comes to using the aid instrument as a club on one country or another, we
think that in the American interest there are likely to be more difficulties
and more disadvantages than there are advantages." He said there had been
"some indication of willingness on the part of the UAR to put the Israeli
question in the icebox for some time. This does not solve it, but at least puts
it back so it is not a day-to-day irritant in their relations." In line with this
approach, the Administration again omitted the anti-bias clause from its
foreign-aid proposals for 1964. Nevertheless, on September 7, 1963, the
Senate voted, 65 to 13, to disqualify the UAR and Indonesia for foreign
aid. In the debate it was clear that Nasser was the primary target. Senator
Ernest Gruening (Dem., Alas.), who had introduced the restrictive amend-
ment, explained in the New Republic (November 30, 1963):

Sixty-five Senators (of the 78 voting) voted for my "anti-aggressor amend-
ment" because they felt strongly that it made no sense to continue to pour
$224 million per year into Egypt (nearly $1 billion to date) while that
country continued to spend approximately the same amount waging ag-
gressive wars in Yemen and continued to purchase offensive Communist
weapons, including ground-to-ground missiles, submarines, jet fighter
planes, to carry out its repeatedly announced intention of waging war
against Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Israel, and Morocco.

In the same article Gruening reported that the State Department was
working very quietly "with one or two of the Arab states" to lift anti-Jewish
measures affecting Americans. Indeed, the State Department had announced
on June 13, 1963, that Jews were serving with the United States forces in
Saudi Arabia, where they had previously not been assigned.

In June 1963 the Defense Department made public a letter it had sent
to the American Jewish Committee, on May 24, 1963, saying that some
Jewish servicemen would serve in the conduct of a joint United States–Saudi
Arabian military training exercise. Saudi Arabia denied on June 13, 1963,
that American Jewish servicemen "have been allowed or would be allowed"
into Saudi Arabian territory.

In connection with anti-Jewish restrictions applied by Arab governments,
the State Department indicated its readiness to protest boycott actions caus-
ing injury to American commercial interests. The L. Oppenheimer & Co.
firm of New York received a questionnaire from the Arab Boycott office
pertaining to an order of 10,000 kilograms of Idaho hops to a brewery in
Egypt, asking whether the firm traded with Israel, supported Jewish causes,
or had Jews among its directors. It brought the matter to the attention of the State Department. On October 29, 1962, Thomas R. Mathews, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, stated that "the Department has repeatedly made known its objections to the general principles of the Arab boycott to the various Arab states concerned. The Department will refer to the example cited by Mr. Oppenheimer in its continued representations."

**Aramco**

Saudi Arabia suffered another setback in its boycott of Jews when, on September 26, 1962, the New York State Commission for Human Rights ordered the New York office of the Arabian-American Oil Company to stop refusing to hire Jews because of creed or ancestry. The order, announced by Commissioner George H. Fowler, also prohibited the company from using application forms that implied, directly or indirectly, that certain creeds or ancestries were preconditions for employment. Among the forms specifically banned was a visa-application blank containing questions about faith and national origin. The AJCongress, which had been pressing for a legal ban on the oil company's discriminatory hiring practices for 12 years, hailed the order as a "historic step forward."

**Sixth Fleet**

Discriminatory practices against Jewish military personnel were brought to public attention in October 1962, when Jewish officers and men on Sixth Fleet duty revealed they had been denied leave at certain Arab ports because of the policy of Arab governments. On January 14 Vice Admiral David L. McDonald, the commanding officer of the fleet, said that a recent canvas of individual Sixth Fleet ships indicated that "there had been no restrictions placed on the shore liberty of Jewish personnel by individual ship-commanding officers." He went on to say that "it is a well-known fact that under normal circumstances a number of Arab countries, including Lebanon, place restrictions upon the entry of American Jewish personnel. These restrictions are originated by the countries concerned just as the United States originates laws concerning entry there."

**Barring of JTA Correspondent**

The State Department found itself directly involved in charges of discrimination. On January 28, 1963, JTA correspondent Milton Friedman was denied admission to a background briefing by Robert C. Strong, director of the State Department's Office of Near Eastern Affairs. Strong said he took exception to JTA reporting of news involving department policies, and complained that Israeli diplomats had used JTA news reports as the basis for queries to his department. JTA's board of directors protested to Secretary of State Rusk. The American Civil Liberties Union and six members of Connecticut's congressional delegation added their protests. The incident was
closed on February 26, when the State Department agreed that Friedman should have been admitted to the press conference. The exclusion was attributed to an official "misunderstanding."

Economic Aid

On March 26, 1963, Administrator of the Agency for International Development David E. Bell, in an address to the Magazine Publishers Association, said that aid programs to individual countries ought to be, as much as possible, "self-terminating." He bracketed together Israel, Greece, and Taiwan, which, because of United States help, he said, had achieved a position warranting the withdrawal of aid within the next few years.

A review of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, however, revealed only a slight decrease in the extent of American economic aid to Israel—from $85 million in 1962 to $83 million in 1963. Much of the aid during these two years, it is true, was in the form of loans, not grants as had been previously the case, but they were given under terms resembling those of grants-in-aid. For example, in 1963, Israel received $45 million in Agency for International Development funds, a small part of which was a grant, while the rest included a 20-year loan payable at the low interest rate of 2 per cent and $25 million worth of surplus food commodities, the last under terms of a separate three-year agreement with the United States, payable in Israeli currency. The Export-Import Bank lent Israel $1.5 million, in addition to an earlier $2 million earmarked for the building of an "oven" for the phosphate works. Another $12 million for electrification was awaiting confirmation from the Export-Import Bank.

There were several other sources of supplementary economic aid. On December 18, 1962, AID made available to the Falk Project of Economic Research in Israel a $500,000 credit that was matched by the Falk Foundation of Pittsburgh, Pa., to continue its two-year-old study of the Israeli economy conducted under terms of a contract with the United States Department of Agriculture. On February 26, 1963, the department authorized Israel to purchase $500,000 worth of inedible tallow with "Food For Peace" funds. In August 1962, the State Department granted $25,000 in counterpart funds to Brandeis University's Jacob Hiatt Institute in Israel to further a program to provide students from seven American colleges and universities with first-hand knowledge of Israel.

American Jews and Israel

The American Friends of the Hebrew University sponsored its ninth consecutive one-year study program for American college students at the university. Hebrew University President Eliahu Elath said in New York on December 23, 1962, that there were about 200 Americans among the 300 foreign students attending the university. On December 26, 1962, a new secondary school to prepare students for the university’s John Dewey School of
Education was dedicated. The $500,000 building was financed by the National Council of Jewish Women of the United States.

**Cultural Relations**

On August 13, 1962, more than 500 delegates, educators and laymen, convened for the First World Conference on Jewish Education in Jerusalem. American delegates emphasized the need to give priority to Jewish education in the United States. Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, professor emeritus of philosophies of religion at JTS, urged the creation of a world-wide agency to administer Jewish education and a special college at the Hebrew University to train Jewish teachers in the Diaspora.

A delegation of American Jewish Committee leaders, headed by the committee's President Abraham M. Sonnabend, met with Prime Minister Ben-Gurion and other top-level government officials during an eight-day stay in Israel in December 1962. In a statement issued upon their return they said: "We . . . strongly believe that Jews in other countries, especially American Jewry, will do their utmost to continue and increase their cooperation with Israel so that the bridges of understanding will be strengthened through our mutual beneficial influences upon one another."

A second Dialogue of American Jewry and Israel was sponsored by the AJCongress in June 1963. Present were such leading American intellectuals as Leslie Fiedler, critic and novelist; Max Lerner, Brandeis University professor and newspaper columnist; novelist Philip Roth, and David Boroff, author and critic. The major topics discussed were “The Jewish Intellectual and Jewish Identity”, “The Creative Writer as a Jew in Israel and the United States,” and “The Fact of Jewishness as it Influences the Creative Process.”

**Religious Activities**

The Hebrew Union College opened its fourth unit in Jerusalem, the Biblical and Archeological School, which received a United States institutional development grant of $71,200 to allow 25 students to participate in a seminar on Near Eastern Civilization. The new school was the only permanent American academic institution of higher learning in Israel and was to serve as a post-doctoral biblical and archeological research center for American and other universities.

American-Israeli religious rapport struck a snag when, because of a dispute with the Israeli rabbinate, the (Conservative) Rabbinical Assembly canceled a convention that had been scheduled to be held in Israel during the week of July 14, 1963 (p. 82). The World Conference of the Mizrahi-Ha-po'el Ha-mizrahi had expressed the opposition of Israeli religious circles to the establishment of Conservative institutions in Israel on August 27, 1962. A resolution had been adopted expressing concern over efforts by “Conservatives and their like” to establish centers here “alien to the Torah of Israel.”

A new organization, the American Christian Association for Israel, with
Dr. Howard M. Le Sourd, formerly director of the American Christian Palestine Committee, as president, was launched in September 1962. Its statement of principles declared: "We shall devote ourselves to the presentation and interpretation of Israel's vital role as a democratic force in the world of today, and as a nation with an indispensable mission in saving a people and redeeming the Holy Land." Its first research project was to be an investigation of "the relationship of anti-Zionism and anti-Israelism to antisemitism."

Zionism

Ideologically, the Zionist movement had a relatively peaceful year; there were no conspicuous challenges from Prime Minister Ben-Gurion regarding its tasks.

At its March 1963 session in Jerusalem the actions committee of the Zionist General Council continued the recent efforts of the world Zionist movement to define operational goals. It received a message from Ben-Gurion reiterating, somewhat less militantly than usual, his equation of Zionism and 'aliyah: "You will succeed in bringing back to the movement its former glory, and in explaining to all those who call themselves Zionists in countries abroad that Zionism means a return to Zion."

On the other hand, Moshe Sharett, chairman of the Jerusalem section of the Jewish Agency Executive, viewed Zionism as the most effective weapon to guard against the assimilationist trend which was "sweeping Jewish life in both the Diaspora and Israel." Sharett minimized the capacity of religion to stem the tide.

Mrs. Rose Halprin, chairman of the New York section of the Jewish Agency Executive, took exception to Sharett's depreciation of the role of religion, saying that since the establishment of the state there could be no Jewishness without Judaism. She further declared that American Zionists regarded 'aliyah as a major pillar in the Zionist program, although "we do not see a mass immigration from America." Mrs. Halprin added, however: "There will not even be a sizable minimal immigration until there is a change in the reception and attitude in Israel."

ZOA President Max Nussbaum discussed the decline in the prestige of the Zionist movement, attacks against which had become "the daily fare of Israel's leading figures." He said that Israel's chief support came from the American Zionists, without expectation of reward and because of faith in the resurrection of the Jewish people. Zionist history was made when the ZOA held its first national convention in Israel—its 66th—in July 1963.

Fulbright Investigation

The activities of the American section of the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) were subjected to intensive questioning by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright at hearings on May 22 and August 1, 1963.

The questioning pertained primarily to the nature of the interlocking
relationships of various groups with the Jewish Agency. The committee sought to determine whether the Agency covertly used other organizations to perform functions on its behalf which it failed to acknowledge in its statements to the Department of Justice, required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. Senator Fulbright reasoned that since other organizations received payments indirectly through the Agency, which was registered as a foreign agent, in effect they were also foreign agents.

In opening the August hearing, Senator Fulbright stressed that “this committee’s interest in the Agency’s activities in Israel are not at issue. There can be little but respect for an organization which over the last 15 years has resettled 1,150,000 refugees in Israel—indeed American Jews have shown their support for the Agency through contributions of over one billion dollars, and the United States government has over the past 15 years supplied another $878,000,000 in grants and loans to Israel for similar purposes.” What he was interested in, he said, was the activities of the Jewish Agency’s agent in the United States—namely, the Jewish Agency for Palestine until April 1960 and after April 1960 the Jewish Agency-American Section—“not because of the nature of its foreign principal, nor because of the cause or nation it espoused, but rather because of the methods and techniques it has employed in the United States and their relationship to the workings of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.”

Senator Fulbright was particularly interested in the relationship to the Agency of I. L. Kenen, editor of the Near East Report, who emerged as a major subject of the investigation. The senator charged that Kenen was not an independent entrepreneur, but in effect an employee of the American Zionist Council, which financed him either directly or through the purchase of his publication.

In an extended statement to the committee, Isadore Hamlin, executive director of the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc., described the role of the Jewish Agency in general and of the American Section specifically. The twofold task of the American Section, he said, was to help in the preservation and extension of the Jewish cultural heritage and to inform the American public of Israeli achievements and assist the fund-raising agencies to obtain continuing financial support for this work.

On August 5, Kenen informed Senator Fulbright that his services to the American Zionist Council had terminated in July 1960.

On August 13 Dr. Emanuel Neumann of the Jewish Agency-American Section, issued a statement declaring that the Fulbright hearings completely vindicated the Jewish Agency program: “The only issue that developed concerns a technical question: Whether reports filed by the Jewish Agency periodically, in accordance with legal requirements, were in every instance sufficiently detailed. We have every reason to be proud of the record. It is a vindication of our program.”

The American Council for Judaism used the testimony at the trial as
justification for its contentions that the money contributed was used for political purposes.

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy evoked universal mourning in Israel, and President Zalman Shazar headed the Israeli delegation to Mr. Kennedy's funeral. To Prime Minister Levi Eshkol's message of condolence to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, President Johnson replied that President Kennedy's friendship for Israel "was in the tradition of the close bonds which link our two countries. I intend to carry on the tradition to the best of my ability."

LOUIS SHUB