Communal

Religion

The description of the state of American Judaism as one of "consolidation rather than expansion" (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 75) holds true also for the years 1964 and 1965. There has been no decline in Jewish religious life, but the force of the upsurge, which characterized the American Jewish community immediately after World War II, has abated. The leaders who fathered the upsurge have grown old in office, and the forces which might effect a revitalization have not yet come to power. In the opinion of Rabbi Walter S. Wurzburger of Toronto, however, the leveling-off had broader implications. Speaking at the biennial meeting of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations in November 1964, he predicted an end to the "so-called religious boom," which, he added, might be a "blessing in disguise for authentic and vital religion." For while "the task of preserving religious institutions may become more difficult when religion no longer conveniently offers the path of least resistance to an age of conformity, the new challenges afford religion an opportunity to purify itself so that it may emerge as a more vital and dynamic force."

It must be emphasized that organizations continued to maintain high levels of activity, but there has been no sign of rethinking within any of the Jewish religious groups, comparable to the major reformation that has taken place within Catholicism. Moreover, the implications of some of their activities do not seem to be consistent throughout. Witness the strong advocacy of proselytism at the assembly of the (Reform) Union of American Hebrew Congregations in the light of the resentment expressed by Jewish leaders at the conversionist sentiment expressed in one of the drafts of the schema on the Jews before the Vatican Council.

What spirit other than a broad togetherness the activities of these institutions inculcated in the large body of their adherents is open to question; surveys indicated that weekly attendance at worship was only 25 per cent among Jews, as against 40 per cent for Protestants and 71 per cent for Catholics (Time, June 25, 1965). And in 1965 the "vanishing American Jew" became a focus for national attention. There were prognostications, repeated widely, that the forces of assimilation, secularization, and intermarriage pre-
sented a real threat to American Judaism. To counter this, Rabbi Wolfe Kelman, executive vice-president of the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly of America, described the "vanishing Jew" as a "myth," pointing to the large number of non-Jewish partners in mixed marriages who are "willing and eager" to convert to Judaism (New York Herald Tribune, May 24, 1965). At the same time Label Katz, a former president of B'nai B'rith, observed that while the danger of assimilation persists and grows, it is also profoundly true that Jewish peoplehood persists and grows. He pointed to the impact of Judaism on American culture, saying that "it is a popular pastime to probe the world through Jewish lenses."

Notwithstanding the indifference of their members, the tendency was for the religious groups to emphasize their differences: "... the spirit of ecumenicity appears to be diminishing within the Jewish community," noted one observer in 1964. It was in the hope of counteracting this tendency that a private "ecumenical conference" of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis serving in North America was held in Montreal in 1965. In spirit this gathering was a success, but its private and unofficial nature precluded any immediate influence on the situation it sought to remedy. The fact that it was convened was proof that there was enough sectarian rigidity to cause concern. Sectarian differences disappeared, however, when all religious groups joined in supporting the civil rights movement (p. 124) and the war on poverty (p. 131).

Jewish-Christian Relations

The third session of the Ecumenical Council opened in Rome on September 16, 1964. Before it met in session, the draft declaration on the Jews had been revised to eliminate the term "deicide" and to include what many Jews considered a call to conversion. Leaders of all wings of Judaism in the United States, not only openly criticized the draft, but also any involvement of Jewish groups in the matter (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 130-31). The Orthodox held strongly that it was not the concern of Jews to express opinions about doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. The new draft of the schema was amended, adopted by the Council on October 20, 1965 and promulgated by the Pope on October 28 (p. 64).

The chilling of hopes for the speedy adoption by the Vatican Council of a conclusive statement on the Jews led some sections of Jewish opinion—largely Orthodox—to condemn dialogue with Christians. "There was an undisguised joy in these circles," commented Rabbi Seymour Siegel of the Jewish Theological Seminary, "when the Vatican Council was reported to have backed down in its schema on the Jews. Some statements hinted that a small dose of enmity was good for Judaism." 1 Rabbi Siegel alluded specifically to statements by Rabbis Joseph B. Soloveitchik of Boston and Menahem M. Schneerson, the Lubavitcher Rebbe, and to "the undeserved and unwar-
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ranted condemnation" of Professor Abraham J. Heschel who had submitted a memorandum suggesting positive action by the Ecumenical Council for the improvement of Catholic-Jewish relations.

Rabbi Soloveitchik at the 1964 mid-winter conference of the Rabbinical Council of America declared that the schema on the Jews failed to "recognize Jews as people with the right to live their own lives and worship in their own way," and merely stated that the Church was willing to wait until "we see the light and embrace Christianity." He therefore considered it "nothing more or less than evangelical propaganda."

Rabbi Schneerson, in a letter of March 12, 1965, addressed to rabbis, stated that dialogue with Christians was incompatible with the "prohibition the Torah imposes upon the study of other faiths" and therefore has "no place in Jewish life." Since such dialogue has been "misconstrued to require members of one faith to explain their religious beliefs and practices to members of another faith, and in return to receive instruction in the religion of others," it has been used "with missionary zeal by those religions which are committed to proselytizing members of other faiths." President Samuel Belkin of Yeshiva University declared that the Jews do not seek or desire dialogues with other faiths (May 7, 1965).

The Orthodox attitude to Jewish-Christian dialogue appeared more affirmatively in a letter which Rabbi Israel Miller sent to St. Vincent's Archabbey in Latrobe, Pa., declining an invitation to participate in a theological colloquy on Catholic-Jewish relations under the auspices of the American Benedictine Academy and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He said (JTA, January 29, 1965):

> It would be highly improper for one faith community to offer interpretations of, or suggestions for change in, the religious doctrine of another faith community. We would of necessity be speaking to ourselves rather than to each other. The Rabbinical Council of America, of which I am president and would perforce represent, has taken a position on the dialogue of separate faith communities which questions the value and usefulness of theological discussions such as you plan to have.

At its 1965 convention, when the attitude of the spokesmen for Orthodoxy had become known, the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly of America adopted a resolution welcoming "the efforts of men of good will of all faiths who have sought occasions and created institutions wherein men of learning may meet together to learn from and about one another." The resolution continued:

> We reject the criticism of those who assert that open discussion in matters of faith is inimicable to the best interests of Judaism. We believe that only scholars deeply steeped in the teachings of our tradition should be considered suitable representatives in any discussions which deal with the relations of the Jewish people with any other historic faith. We believe that the present deliberations of the Ecumenical Council are primarily the concern of the delegates to this Council, and we can only express the hope that the Church will find means com-
patible with its own tradition so to clarify its teachings on the relations between it and other religions as to enable all men of good will to join in building a world where mutual respect and justice will prevail.

At its biennial assembly in November 1965 the (Reform) Union of American Hebrew Congregations summoned its member congregations “to enter more intensively into dialogue with our Christian compatriots even into those areas which touch on matters of faith.”

**Religion in Israel**

On March 4, 1964, seven major Jewish organizations, including the Conservative and Reform rabbinic and congregational groups, addressed a cable to Prime Minister Levi Eshkol of Israel, expressing deep concern about attempts by the Orthodox to restrict religious freedom in Israel; this action brought sharp criticism from the spokesmen of American Orthodoxy (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 310). The controversy continued, but became more subdued. At the annual convention in May of the (Orthodox) Rabbinical Council of America its president, Rabbi Israel Miller, urged the leaders of Conservative and Reform Judaism to desist from efforts to introduce their religious programs in Israel. At the time the Rabbinical Assembly of America was in session, and it resolved to extend “support to all those synagogues, groups, and institutions in the State of Israel which are unable to accept the monopoly of the controlling religious bodies and yet are unwilling to abdicate their search for a religious alternative and spiritual identity.” The resolution mentioned a number of institutions in Israel as worthy of support.

The biennial assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in November 1965 called “again for an end to discrimination in Israel against our non-Orthodox congregations and rabbis.”

**Synagogue Council of America**

The Synagogue Council of America is the Jewish religious spokesman for Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism in relations with secular and Christian agencies. It initiated the American Conference on Soviet Jewry, representing the 24 major American Jewish organizations, which first met in Washington in April 1964 to express deep concern for the situation of Soviet Jews and developed into an ad hoc conference to coordinate the organizations’ public action expressing this concern (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 315 ff.). The council was also invited to participate in the Faith and Order Study Conference of the World Council of Churches in Montreal in July 1964, and in August 1965 held a consultation with the World Council to explore “The Situation of Man in the World Today.”

In matters of domestic concern the Synagogue Council, in May, testified before the House Judiciary Committee against a proposed constitutional amendment to permit prayers in public schools (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 226). Acting on the concern expressed by its constituents regarding policies
of many community centers and YM and YWHAs which "indicated at times a lack of regard for the sensitivities of Jewish religious communities in the United States," the council asked for the establishment of an advisory agency to the Jewish Center Division of the National Jewish Welfare Board on matters affecting religion in synagogue-center relationships (p. 188). It criticized also the practice of some national Jewish communal agencies "which arrange unfitting business and communal meetings as well as luncheons and dinners on Friday evening and on the Sabbath."

A guide to funeral practices, adopted by the council in April 1965, emphasized the traditional aspects of "simplicity and equality" and condemned "lavishness, lack of solemnity and other violations of sacred Jewish tradition."

In June Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen (Conservative) of Chicago was elected president to succeed Rabbi Uri Miller (Orthodox) of Baltimore.

Orthodoxy

An issue on which the various Orthodox bodies were divided was their participation in general Jewish coordinating agencies, such as the Synagogue Council of America and the local boards of rabbis. The protest of the Reform and Conservative national organizations to Prime Minister Eshkol over the exclusive rights of the Orthodox movement in Israel was used as an occasion for renewed arguments in favor of withdrawal. This matter was considered in November 1964 at the convention of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (UOJC) the representative body of an estimated 1,600 congregations (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 25). The decision was that the creation of a permanent Orthodox coordinating committee must precede any move to withdraw from umbrella religious organizations.

Another matter on which there were divergent views was shehitah legislation (p. 149). The Communal Relations Commission of UOJC reported to the convention that the American Society for the Protection of Animals had bought the patent rights to "several pre-shehitah devices" which obviate the need for shackling and hoisting of the animals and that ASPCA had made them available free of charge to packing plants. The report congratulated the Rabbinical Council of America (RCA) on this move, adding that "for the first time, a Humane Society is now taking positive steps, rather than limiting itself to negative attacks, to solve this problem." However, it made clear that "the Orthodox Jewish community shall continue to oppose any humane slaughter legislation on the state level, at least until economic devices are available for the pre-shehitah handling of smaller animals." The Synagogue Council of America—of which both UOJC and RCA are members—a month later concurred with this report and also stated that it would oppose legislative restrictions on the slaughter of small animals, and, in cooperation with the ASPCA, would continue "its efforts toward the development of an acceptable restraining pen for the slaughter of small animals."

The Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, on the
other hand, sought to mobilize Jewish public opinion in New York and in other states against the enactment of state legislation which aimed to restrict shehitah or preparations for shehitah. A United Orthodox Committee for the Protection of Shehitah was established consisting of eleven organizations. These included neither RCA nor UOJC, but the committee did have the support of the Lubavitcher movement, the Rabbinical Alliance of America, and the National Council of Young Israel. At its annual religious convention in February 1965, RCA presented a plaque to William Mapel, executive vice-president of ASPCA, in recognition of the society’s efforts in behalf of animal welfare and for its recognition of the need for kosher slaughtering.

With 846 members, RCA is the largest of the associations of Orthodox rabbis.* It was represented at the world conference of Orthodox rabbis held in London in February 1965, and anticipated the establishment there of an international Orthodox agency which would coordinate cultural and religious activities throughout the world. In March the council announced the establishment of a task force for civil rights designed to intensify involvement by Orthodox rabbis in the Negro fight for equality.

At RCA’s annual convention in May, its president, Rabbi Israel Miller announced plans for an education center for newly-ordained American rabbis and the establishment of a body “to help bolster the religious belief and practices of college students on the American campuses.” A note of self-criticism was sounded by Professors Charles S. Liebman and Irving Greenberg of Yeshiva University. Liebman was critical of the Orthodox leaders’ failure to relate Jewish law to contemporary problems, especially the relationship between Jew and non-Jew, the role of women in religious life, and the radical criticism of religion in modern thought. Greenberg stressed that Orthodoxy must become an integral part of every phase of social, political, economic, and educational life in America.

Criticism of the attitude of the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) towards federal aid to education was voiced in September 1965 by Moses I. Feuerstein, president of UOJC. He stated that there was no unified Jewish position on the measure, but that the union, while holding firmly to the principle of separation of church and state, rejected fears that implementation of the education act would result in serious infringements of that principle.

**Conservatism**

The Rabbinical Assembly (RA) showed a tendency to assert an independent point of view, even where this involved cooperation with Reform, as against the deference to the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS) which had traditionally been taken for granted in the Conservative movement. (JTS, the major institution of Conservative Judaism, had an en-
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* RCA accepted 26 new members in 1964 and 25 in 1965, most of whom were recently ordained. In June 1964 the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University, with an enrolment of 440 students, ordained 28 rabbis.

At its 1964 convention, RA adopted resolutions calling on the State of Israel to authorize all rabbis who meet objective qualifications established by its authorities to perform religious marriage ceremonies and to officiate at funerals. In his presidential address to the convention, Rabbi Theodore Friedman recommended that RA “take all necessary measures, not excluding court action” to secure recognition by the Israeli authorities of religious divorces granted by American Conservative rabbis.

The convention elected Rabbi Max Routtenberg president to succeed Rabbi Friedman.

At the 1965 convention RA adopted a resolution favoring a reorganization of the Jewish chaplaincy. It called for “immediate negotiations with other rabbinical organizations to place the Commission of Jewish Chaplaincy of the Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) under responsible religious auspices, such as the Synagogue Council of America.” Commenting on the resolution, Sanford Solender, executive vice-president of JWB, indicated that the commission was at present representative of the rabbinate (p. 191).

Another proposal at the convention urged the formation of a new world-wide Jewish organization to replace the World Zionist Organization, deemed to be no longer necessary. A world Jewish assembly representing all national rabbinic and synagogal groups and other large national and international Jewish organizations was to be convened to establish the new agency.

The convention also reported that a new prayerbook for Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom Kippur would be issued, containing Yiddish poetry and other material on the martyrdom of the Jews in Europe, with English translation.

The United Synagogue of America in November 1965 called on federations and welfare funds to increase their allocations for Jewish education. The resolution, adopted at the biennial convention, declared that the responsibility for maintaining Jewish education “must be shared by the total Jewish community.” (The Conservative movement maintained 25 Jewish day schools.) The convention also called on its 800 constituent congregations to eliminate the “widespread violations of kashrut” under existing methods of supervision.

The (Conservative) World Council of Synagogues held its fifth international convention in Mexico City in July 1964.

Reform

In January 1965 the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) numbered 660 congregations, with 210,000 member families. Its 1964–65 budget was almost $2.78 million. For the fall of 1965 it was announced that the half-way mark of the Development Fund for Reform Judaism had reached $7 million in pledges.

The biennial general assembly of UAHC in November 1965 was attended by official observers from the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the
National Council of Churches. The 32 resolutions adopted dealt with organizational matters, but also with such issues as poverty, conservation of natural resources, reapportionment, and civil liberties. The resolution sparking off the keenest debate called upon President Lyndon B. Johnson, "subject only to the requirements of the safety of our armed forces," to declare that "at a given date, our armed forces will cease firing" in Vietnam with a view to opening of negotiations for peace. Another resolution declared that "those who are critical of the United States' policies . . . must neither be stifled nor intimidated by the threat of investigation. Neither shall their motives nor their loyalties be impugned."

Attention was also attracted by Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath's assertion, in his presidential address, that Judaism must once again adopt an "active proselytizing program directed to all who are spiritually alone." The assembly adopted a resolution recognizing and agreeing with his desire to share "the light of Reform Judaism with all who are searching for religious direction and spiritual values in our age" and authorizing the formulation of a program toward this end.

The assembly also urged minimum standards for bar mitzvah and the extension and intensification of secondary Jewish education by congregations through the establishment of Hebrew schools.

A decision was reached to launch a $2-million campaign for the establishment of a religious art center in New York.

In July 1964 Temple Emanu-El in New York City announced its withdrawal from UAHC to protest its method of operation, including the selection of the union's board of trustees. The 1965 assembly agreed in principle that the board be enlarged to 180 members, half to be elected through regional conventions.

In 1964 the various schools of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) had an enrolment of over 700 students. Thirty-one rabbis were ordained by the college in 1964, and 33 in 1965. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El of New York, was appointed chairman of the board of alumni overseers to succeed the late Abba Hillel Silver. In May 1965 the overseers approved an optional rabbinical-internship program by which students in their third year would interrupt their studies to spend a year working in a congregation. The college established a Nelson Glueck Chair in Bible in honor of its president's 65th birthday in June. Plans were completed for a new building for the California school of the college on a site adjacent to the University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) showed a desire to assert itself more strongly in the affairs of HUC. Its convention in June 1965 commended its president, Rabbi Leon Feuer, for his proposal to establish with the college a permanent joint consultative committee on rabbinical education to raise standards and to enlist large numbers of qualified candidates for rabbinical education. CCAR also expressed a desire for formal representation on the HUC board of governors.
The World Union for Progressive Judaism, at its international conference in Paris in July 1964, elected Rabbi Jacob Shankman of New Rochelle, N.Y., president. He succeeded Rabbi Solomon Freehof of Pittsburgh, Pa., who had held office since 1959.

At the June 1964 convention of CCAR, Rabbi Feuer expressed concern over the growth of intermarriage and the "growing fear that some day, not too far distant, Judaism as a vital force may be attenuated to the point of utter ineffectiveness, and the Jewish people perhaps will all but disappear." He called for an educational effort to deal with this problem, but added: "We do not wish to isolate ourselves from the other communities of our country, nor from the American civilization of which we are an integral part."

The convention adopted a statement reaffirming the rabbi's "right and obligation to exercise political responsibility as a citizen and as a moral teacher," and his prerogative to take a public position in public campaigns "at crucial times in the life of a community or the nation, and when in his judgment it is deemed necessary." It cautioned the rabbi, however, to exercise restraint, speak for himself rather than for his congregation, and to remain aware that "his words and actions receive greater public attention than those of the average person."

During the presidential campaign CCAR issued a statement which, in urging voters to support candidates promoting a "just and peaceable America in a world safe and secure for all," indirectly endorsed President Johnson's election. Though neither Republican nor Democratic candidate was mentioned by name, the Conference noted that its position on a number of foreign and domestic issues was identical with that of President Johnson.

CCAR, adopting a report of its committee on church and state, declared in June 1965 that it was "more essential than ever that the time-hallowed democratic doctrine of church-state separation be re-affirmed." It went on record as being "gravely concerned by provisions in the [Elementary and Secondary Education] Act (p. 134) which may seriously breach the wall of separation between church and state and threaten the future of the public school system the Act was designed to assist."

Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein of Chicago was elected president.

Immediately following this convention a seminar on theology took place in which over 100 members participated.

SEFTON D. TEMKIN
The Jewish Community Center

The Jewish community center movement had its beginnings in the Young Men's Hebrew Associations, the first of which was established in Baltimore, Md., in 1854 as an organization of Jewish young adults interested in Jewish associational, cultural, and recreational activities. Female counterpart organizations were established later, and rapidly moved toward merger in YM and YWHAs. (The same period also saw the emergence of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations.) These and other new types of voluntary sectarian associations were founded as a reaction to increasingly complex social problems arising out of the industrial revolution, urbanization, and immigration.

By the early 20th century, the growth of the YM and YWHAs had led to the establishment of several regional federations and, in 1913, of the National Council of YMHA and Kindred Societies. Before World War I the council had served the armed forces through its Army and Navy Branch, and at the end of the war it merged with the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), founded in 1917. JWB henceforth became the national coordinating body of Jewish centers and YM and YWHAs, and the communal service agency for Jewish military personnel, their families, and hospitalized veterans.

CENTER AS COMMUNITY AGENCY

A period of rapid expansion in construction and programming in the 1920s came to a halt with the depression decade in 1929. Priority was now given to more immediate needs of the Jewish community. Centers sought to aid the unemployed by vocational guidance and action against discrimination in employment and education. In many cities center leaders helped to organize and expand Jewish fundraising to aid the victims of persecution abroad.

Programs gradually broadened to include activities for all age groups. Resident camping, first organized at the turn of the century, was expanded. Day camping was introduced in the 1930s for younger children of families with limited means. At first "home camps," as they were called, were housed in center buildings or on their grounds. Later they were moved to borrowed, rented, or purchased tracts with waterfronts, serving as day-camp and family-recreation sites.

In the 1920s and 1930s the centers ventured into Jewish education, often establishing the first Sunday school in a community where none had existed. This function was gradually taken over by synagogues.

Perhaps the most important development of the depression years was the increasing awareness that centers could serve effectively only if they were
staffed by professionally-trained personnel. Center workers participated in developing social group work as the method employed in the program. This is an aspect of social work which seeks to help the individual develop through experiences as a group member, and to encourage the group as a whole to raise its level of interest and behavior.

The emerging major function of the center was to impart to the Jewish group a sense of entity in a social setting which reflected the diversity of the larger society. Transcending differences of class, age, origin, ideology and "denominational" loyalties, the center became a meeting ground for Jews of all sorts, where Zionists, Yiddishists, religionists, secularists, and others argued their differences in forums, joined forces against a common adversary, or participated in activities for the advancement of common interests. As centers increasingly accepted their role as a Jewish communal agency, they began to call themselves Jewish Community Centers.

MEMBERSHIP AND PROGRAM

Like many other institutions, the centers extended their services and enlarged their physical facilities after World War II (AJYB, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 262; 1958 [Vol. 59], p. 186; 1960 [Vol. 61], p. 92; 1962 [Vol. 63], p. 262). By 1965 their investment in new facilities had reached $125 million, and annual operational expenditures had grown from less than $12 million in 1950 to more than $32 million in 1965.

In 1965 the centers had about 1,600 full-time staff members, trained in social group work, health or physical education, pre-school education, adult education, recreation, or the fine arts, besides part-time workers. Still, the shortage of qualified staff continued to be a problem.

From 1950 to 1965 center membership rose from fewer than 500,000 to more than 700,000. In 1964 slightly more than half were male, and nearly a third were 14 years old or younger. The largest increase of members was in the older adult group, reflecting the increase in the American population. There were 29,100 organized activities, attended by slightly more than half of the 28,800,000 total participants. Lectures, concerts, social gatherings, and the like drew 30 per cent attendance. The remaining 20 per cent came to the center for casual or unorganized activities, such as bowling, table tennis, swimming, and the library.

Modern centers had excellent indoor and outdoor facilities for these purposes. The approximately 300 centers in the United States operated some 450 units, including main buildings and branches, day camps, and recreation areas. Decisions to replace older facilities or to open new centers were made after joint consideration, and often joint planning, by centers and central community bodies such as Jewish federations, community councils, and welfare funds.

As a result of community survey of their needs, new centers were being planned, were under construction, or had recently been completed in Worces-
CLARIFICATION OF PURPOSE

The objective of strengthening the tie between the individual Jew and the Jewish community was reflected in the early 1950s in a "Statement of Principles on Center-Federation Relationships" issued jointly by JWB and the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, on the premise that both agencies were "working to advance the best interest of the community."

The relationship between center and community has expressed itself in various ways. For instance, the National Association of Jewish Center Workers (NAJCW) cooperated with the community-organization unit of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service in a major session of the conference's 1965 annual meeting on "The Jewish Community Center as an Arm of the Organized Jewish Community." A survey conducted for this session among local center and federation executives on the scope of the centers' current community assignments indicated extensive activity in welfare-fund campaigns, services to Jewish military personnel and hospitalized veterans, community-wide projects such as Jewish Book Month, Jewish Music Festival, and Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Observance, programming for synagogues and Jewish communal agencies, and leadership recruitment for youth councils and federations, social-welfare and community-relations work, extending service to newer, outlying areas of Jewish settlement, and representing the Jewish group in community-wide organizations, such as health and welfare councils, anti-poverty programs, and mayors' committees.

It was generally expected and accepted that the center should function as an instrument of the Jewish community. As a 1965 study for the Jewish Community Council of Rochester put it,

... Jewish community centers can and should be a major expression of the objectives of the organized Jewish community. ... It [the center] has the same objectives as the central community in ... strengthening Jewish life. ...

As a consequence of the prevailing concern over the Jewish future in the United States, a special conference of 50 Jewish social scientists, communal workers, educators, rabbis, and center workers was called by JWB and NAJCW in 1963. It suggested that the center's effectiveness depended on the professional training and Jewish orientation of its staff and the quality of programming to give Jews an appreciation of their heritage; to help them clarify for themselves their relations to the Jewish people and Judaism and to the general society and culture, and to provide opportunity and direction for considering current problems and issues affecting Jewish life.

JWB took a number of concrete steps to implement the suggestions made.
at the conference. It established a “task force” of experienced center workers who, working with young people, tested new approaches to leadership training and programming. In cooperation with NAJCW, it founded a research center, with program headquarters at the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare at Brandeis University, for the preparation of information regarding effective center programming.

National and local in-service training programs for professionals offered courses in Jewish history and the Jewish community, and tried to help social workers relate their knowledge to their work. An intensive five-year recruitment program was initiated in 1964, with funds made available by the Lavanburg-Corner House, a private philanthropic fund, to attract young men and women to career training for center work. Other approaches included the establishment in 1965 of an annual training seminar for American center workers in Israel, the placement of Israeli workers in American centers, and teen-age and adult-education tours to Israel. In June 1965 JWB, the B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundations, and CJFWF held a joint consultation on the problems and needs of college-age (but not necessarily college-matriculated) Jewish youths, which provided guidelines for united action.

**JCCs AND SYNAGOGUES**

The relationship of centers and YM and YWHAs to synagogues has been a subject of discussion and debate almost from the beginning of the center movement. There have been both active supporters and severe critics of centers among rabbis. In recent years the trend, as reported by center workers, has been toward growing cooperation between center and synagogue, including the use by centers of synagogue facilities, joint sponsorship of “preparation for college” courses for high-school students, and adult-education programs. However, *Conservative Judaism*, the journal of the Rabbinical Assembly, published a “Symposium on Relationship Between the Synagogue and the Center” (Winter-Spring 1962), challenging the validity of the Jewish community center as a Jewish institution. It was suggested that community funds allocated to centers could be put to better use by synagogues. The symposium evoked wide discussion. Several rabbis, representing the major religious movements, took issue with the criticisms, including Rabbi Louis M. Levitsky, who had been a president of the Rabbinical Assembly.

Several rabbinical groups, on the other hand, voiced criticism of Sabbath programs and kashrut observance in some centers. This led JWB to review its 1948 guidance policy, which had recommended that “on the Sabbath, Jewish festivals and Jewish holy days, Jewish centers shall conduct only such activities as are in consonance with the dignity and the traditions of these days.” Reaffirming this policy, in 1958, it also urged center boards to plan the kind of Sabbath programs which would not violate the sanctity of the day and would help develop an understanding and appreciation of the meaning of the Sabbath. Controversies in Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and elsewhere, were resolved by agreements between rabbinical groups and center boards.
As for kashrut, JWB's national policy in support of its observance is prevalent in centers across the country, with relatively few exceptions. Since 1952 the Commission on Synagogue Relations of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in New York has been arranging discussions among rabbis, social workers, and center members on such topics as mental health and Judaism, intermarriage, and the roles of the YMHA and the synagogue in formal and informal Jewish education. The Jewish Education Committee of New York, in cooperation with the Metropolitan New York Region of JWB, has since 1955 sponsored orientation and training seminars for the staff of Jewish communal agencies. Conducted by eminent rabbis and Jewish educators, these have sought to provide social workers with a Jewish historical perspective and a frame of reference for their work. Similar study courses have been offered in other cities, with centers frequently granting workers time off from work to attend.

THE CENTER IN THE GENERAL COMMUNITY

Centers have sought to clarify their functions in the general community, especially with regard to civil rights and the government's war on poverty.

Civil Rights

In the South, where centers had long been hospitable to non-Jewish participation, they had to consider the various implications of the fact that for the first time Negroes would test their rights by asking for admission to center activities. In several cities in the North the problem was accentuated by the movement of Negro families to neighborhoods served by the centers, and concern was expressed that an unlimited admission of Negroes would discourage participation by Jews.

Beyond this question, however, centers sought to clarify the basis for their support of the civil-rights effort. A special conference in October 1963, and subsequent national and regional discussions in 1964 and 1965, evoked these guiding principles: policies in regard to membership or participation by non-Jews are to apply identically to all non-Jews, regardless of race; admission of non-Jews to membership or participation should not deflect centers from their basic purpose—the preservation and enhancement of Jewish community life in America; discriminatory practices should be avoided in the centers' business and administrative operations, and programs should be designed to help fight bigotry, awaken awareness that the support of civil rights is dictated by Jewish ethics, and suggest what Jews as individuals and as a group can do to help the civil-rights effort.

Centers were also advised to establish public affairs committees which, in consultation with Jewish community-relations agencies and other local and national groups, were to advise their boards, staff, and membership on appropriate action to be taken on civil rights matters and other public issues.

Both JWB and NAJCW adopted formal statements in support of civil
rights, JWB published articles on the center's role in the struggle, and NAJCW members took part in a tutoring program in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, in the summer of 1965 to demonstrate this support.

Anti-poverty Projects

After the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, typical questions at meetings and conferences had to do with the effect of center participation in anti-poverty programs on the nature and stated purpose of the center program, the advisability of engaging in activities not primarily aimed at the predominantly middle-class Jewish community, and the need for establishing conditions and limitations regarding participation. A survey conducted in 1965 found centers across the country involved in such projects as the neighborhood youth corps and work-training opportunities for high-school dropouts; remedial educational classes; "head start" programs to provide preschool preparation for children; making day camps available to neighborhood children, and providing work opportunities for older people.

In the main, Jews did not avail themselves of such service activities. A striking exception was a day camp for a hundred children of poor Hasidic families conducted in the summer of 1965 by the Williamsburg YM and YWHA of Brooklyn, New York, with the aid of an Office of Economic Opportunity grant of $10,474. Federal grants were given to the Associated YM and YWHAs of Greater New York for work with orthopedically handicapped children, to the St. Louis Jewish Community Centers Association for a research project testing teen-age programs and training, to be conducted jointly with Washington University, and to the Cleveland Jewish Community Center for a project (in collaboration with the Western Reserve University Clinical Heart Center) to identify coronary-susceptible persons and to provide preventive programs. State and municipal grants were made available to the Educational Alliance of New York for the maintenance of a mental health consultation service.

Discussions in the community on the implications for the center of accepting government funds elicited agreement that meaningful participation in society's general effort to improve conditions of the poor and the handicapped was, in itself, an expression of Jewish purpose, that funds should not be accepted unless there was a clear understanding of the conditions attached to such acceptance and assurance of the center's competence to conduct the planned projects, and that centers should not, and need not be diverted from their basic function by performing special services for the common good.

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

Services to Jews in the Armed Forces and to Veterans

JWB began the year-long observance of its 50th anniversary at its convention in April 1966. It was founded three days after the United States
entered World War I (AJYB, 1937–1938 [Vol. 39], pp. 149–77) by outstanding leaders of the American Jewish Community, including Jacob H. Schiff, Felix M. Warburg, Louis Marshall, Judge Irving Lehman, and Cyrus Adler, to assure a communal approach in religious and other ministrations to Jews in the armed forces. The United States government officially recognized JWB as the service agency for Jewish military personnel.

At the beginning of World War II, JWB expanded its Jewish chaplains committee into a Committee on Army and Navy Religious Activities (CANRA), which was the instrument of the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbinates for recruiting a total of 311 chaplains (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 290). JWB aided the chaplains with supplies and consultation, and supplemented their work with a corps of civilian field workers. These enlisted local Jewish communities to serve nearby military installations. JWB was among the founders and an active participant of the United Service Organizations (USO), an interfaith morale agency representing it, the YM and YWCAs, the Salvation Army, National Catholic Community Service, and National Travelers Aid. A Women's Organization Division coordinated efforts in support of soldiers and sailors by Hadassah, National Bureau of Federated Jewish Women's Organizations, National Council of Jewish Women, National Women's League of the United Synagogue, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, United Order of True Sisters, Women's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Congregations of America, Women's Division of American Jewish Congress, and the Jewish Community Centers' women's groups. It also gathered and maintained a record of Jews who served in World War II, which was published in a two-volume work, Jews in World War II, by Samuel C. Kohs and I. Kaufman (New York, 1946).

During the Korean war and again in the Vietnam crisis, JWB again expanded work with the men in the armed forces. Its principal service units for Jewish military personnel and veterans were the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy (successor to CANRA), the Armed Forces and Veterans Services, and the Women's Organizations Services (formerly Women's Organizations Division). In 1965–66 about 70 full-time chaplains served in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps and in government hospitals. Three Jewish chaplains were assigned to South Vietnam in 1965 and early in 1966, and 275 part-time chaplains ministered to the religious needs of men in domestic posts and in Veterans Administration hospitals. Local communities adjacent to major military installations supported and supplemented the work of the chaplains through JWB armed-services committees, in cooperation with local centers.

Services to Centers and Communal Projects

Normally, in times of peace, JWB has emphasized the development of Jewish community centers, recruiting and training staff, technical assistance in building planning, and guidance in programming and administration. It also has sponsored and staffed the Jewish Book Council of America which encourages the reading and collection of Jewish books through the annual Jewish Book Month and its publications, the Jewish Book Annual and In
Jewish Bookland, a periodic review of Jewish books and program materials, published as a supplement to the JWB Circle.

The National Jewish Music Council, another JWB organization, seeks to stimulate interest in good Jewish music and to encourage its performance. Its leadership consists of cantors, rabbis, educators, and musicians. The Council promotes the annual Jewish Music Festival, a month-long event in the early spring at which synagogues, centers, and organizations are urged to feature programs of Jewish music. The theme in 1965 was "The Renaissance of Jewish Music in America: The Life and Work of A.W. Binder." The Council also encourages the formation of local Jewish music councils, and publishes Jewish Music Notes as a supplement to JWB Circle. Other 1964-65 publications were The Life Work of A.W. Binder, Bibliography of the Works of A.W. Binder, and The Artistic Life of Leib Glantz.

The JWB Lecture Bureau is a non-profit service to Jewish institutions that wish to engage speakers and artists for Jewish programs. Between 1948 and 1965 it arranged 22,100 bookings for a thousand different organizations.

JWB is financed principally by Jewish welfare funds, UJA of Greater New York, and its constituent centers. Of its 1965 expenditures of $1,520,864, $758,608 was supplied by welfare funds, $359,233 by UJA of Greater New York, and $166,727 by local centers. Additional income sources were associate memberships in JWB, contributions, and fees for services.

Cooperation with National and International Agencies

JWB represents its local constituents in a number of national bodies, including the National Social Welfare Assembly, the United States Commission to the United Nations, the Council on Social Work Education, the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, and the United States Olympic Committee—besides maintaining close working relations with the major national Jewish organizations and with such organizations as the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of the USA. It also services the Canadian Council of YM-YWHAs and Jewish Community Centers.

JWB serves as a link between Jewish centers in America and abroad by providing staff service and other assistance to the World Federation of YM-YWHAs and JCCs. An estimated 100 centers and 75 camps were established in 17 European countries and in 10 Latin American countries with funds made available by the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany and staffed by JDC. At present the World Federation is acting as consultant in the financing and construction of a modern YM-YWHA building in Jerusalem, to be completed in 1967.

Herbert Millman
Many types of Jewish communal services are provided under organized Jewish sponsorship. Some needs of Jews are exclusively individual or governmental responsibilities, but a wide variety of services are considered to be the responsibility of the total Jewish community. Although the aim is to serve Jewish community needs, some Jewish services may be also made available to the general community.

Most services are provided at the geographic point of need, but their financing may be secured from a wider area, nationally or internationally. Geographic classification (i.e. local, national, overseas) is based on areas of program operation.

A more fundamental classification would be in terms of types of services provided or needs met, regardless of geography. On this basis, Jewish communal services would encompass:

- Economic aid, mainly overseas—largely a function of government in the United States.
- Migration aid—a global function, involving movement between countries, mainly to Israel, but also to the United States in substantial magnitude at particular periods.
- Absorption and resettlement of migrants—also a global function; involving economic aid, housing, job placement or retraining, and social adjustment. The complexity of the task is related to the size of movement, the background of migrants, and the economic and social viability or absorptive potential of the communities in which resettlement takes place.
- Health—mainly general hospitals, some specialized hospitals, and outpatient clinics in larger cities in the United States, including facilities for the chronically ill aged. This also includes health facilities in Israel and, to a lesser extent, in Europe.
- Welfare services—primarily family counseling, child care, and care of the aged; some of these services are maintained on a regional, as well as a local basis. They are rarely organized on a national basis except for coordinating and clearance services. Child care and care for the aged are also major activities in Israel.
- Youth and recreational services—mainly Jewish centers, summer camps, Hillel units on campuses, and other youth services provided by B'nai B'rith.
- Community relations functions—provided by a network of local agencies and a series of national agencies, some of which also operate on regional and local bases. Some national agencies also seek to provide aid to overseas communities in relation to civil rights.
- Religious agencies—local congregations, national groups of congregations, and associated rabbinical bodies.
- Jewish education—provided through congregational, communal and independent schools, coordinating bureaus of Jewish education, specialized national agencies, yeshivot, teacher-training schools and theological seminaries.
- Cultural agencies—under Jewish sponsorship and include higher education (other than theological seminaries); research in the social sciences, history, linguistics; publications; library, archive and museum facilities, and lecture bookings.
- Vocational services—provided in larger communities in the United States through specialized agencies (Jewish Vocational Services and Vocational Service of B'na'i B'rith) for individual and group guidance in sheltered workshops and sometimes as part of family agencies; overseas in the form of vocational education programs conducted by ORT, Histadrut, Hadassah and other agencies.
- Service agencies—mainly specialized national agencies designed to make for more effective clearance of activities in each field of service among national and local agencies.

The cohesive elements in planning and financing these services are mainly federations and welfare funds for local services, and federations together with national and overseas agencies for non-local services.

Federations identify needs, plan for their provision, conduct annual fund-raising campaigns and, through budgeting, provide the resources requisite to planning. After review of programs and finances, each federation distributes its campaign proceeds to those local, national, and overseas beneficiary organizations which are generally accepted as broad Jewish responsibilities.

**INCOME AND COSTS OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES**

Estimates of income and costs of Jewish communal services can be made for most but not all activities; exceptions where data are not available are noted below. Income and costs approximate each other roughly, particularly for operating programs, as distinct from capital projects.

The aggregate value, or cost, may be described loosely as the "gross national product" (GNP) of such services.

On this basis, the minimal estimate for the "gross national product" for Jewish communal services was over $680 million in 1964. Excluded from this total are: almost all endowment income of federations and local agencies, all local capital fund campaigns, and all internal congregational operating expense. Costs of Jewish education may also be understated in this total.

---

1 Preliminary data for 1965 indicate a rise of about $15 million in welfare fund and Israel Education Fund pledges, with about $26 million pledged in 1965 to the capital fund goal of the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. The minimal estimate for the 1965 GNP was $720 million.
This sum is related to the major sources of income: annual campaigns for contributions, service payments and public tax funds.

There have been major increases in service payments in tax funds, with moderate changes in contributed income in the last decade. If data for 1964 were compared with data for 1954, the following major changes are indicated:

- Federations provided $20 million more in annual campaigns.\(^2\)
- Nonlocal agencies raised $39 million more, including $12.7 million more for Brandeis University; $5.4 million more for Yeshiva University (including the medical school); $4.2 million more for the Conservative and Reform theological drives; $3.4 million more for the City of Hope and National Jewish Hospitals; $3.1 million more for three institutions of higher education in Israel; $1.5 million more each for B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, American Jewish Committee, and Anti-Defamation League, and $1 million more for ORT.
- Other non-contributed income (earnings, investments, service payments, government grants, etc.) rose by $46 million, of which $28 million was accounted for by Brandeis and Yeshiva Universities.
- Grants by community chests for local Jewish services rose by $7 million.
- Hospital income rose by at least $158 million—over 85 per cent from service payments and most of the remainder from public funds.
- Care for the aged income rose by about $19 million—mainly from service payments and public funds. Some service payments resulted from public welfare programs.
- Center income rose by about $16 million, of which $11.5 million came from internal services (membership and activities fees).

While there are gaps in some of the data (mainly for congregational income and local capital fund campaigns), the data summarized above indicate that income and costs of Jewish communal services rose by over $300 million from 1954 to 1964.

Results of Jewish Federated Fund Raising

Over $2.9 billion was raised by the central Jewish community organizations of the United States in their annual campaigns in the 27-year period 1939 through 1965.\(^3\) This period coincides with the organization of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), which received over $1,622,000,000, mainly from welfare funds.

The $3 billion dollar mark in federated fund-raising was reached in 1966.

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

---

\(^2\) From 1953 to 1963 book values of endowment funds increased by $37 million for large cities, with market values $13 million higher.

\(^3\) UJA partners raised funds jointly in 1934 and in 1935 but raised funds independently prior to 1934 and in 1936 through 1938: JDC raised funds since 1914, Keren Hayesod since 1920, and JNF since 1910.
• From 1939 through 1942 annual levels ranged from about $27 to $29 million.
• From 1943 through 1945 there were annual rises of over $10 million, so that a level of $57 million was reached by the end of World War II.
• From 1946 through 1948 peak fund raising was reached during the period of the massive postwar DP problem and the effort related to the creation of the State of Israel; 1946 results more than doubled and moved forward to the peak of over $200 million in 1948.
• From 1949 through 1955 the impact of these historic events diminished, resulting in successive declines, until the level of $107 to $110 million was reached in 1954 and 1955.
• From 1956 through 1964 campaign results ranged from a high of $138 million in 1957 to a low of $123 million in 1958, with results in the last six years within a narrower range of $125 to $130 million. Most of these year-to-year changes reflected the introduction of special-fund efforts to supplement regular campaigns. If these special-fund efforts are excluded, regular campaigns ranged from $109 to $115 million in the five-year period 1956-60 and from $120 to $125 million in the three succeeding years.
• 1965 results of $132 million were the highest since 1957. If pledges to the Israel Education Fund of $9.6 million were included, the total would be the highest in the last sixteen years. In 1964, the total campaign results had been $126.7 million.

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

By contrast, the data for independent efforts of national and overseas agencies include major capital and endowment fund drives, mainly for educational and religious institutions and hospitals. Comparisons between totals for annual federation campaigns and for independent appeals would be inaccurate because the former annual campaigns do not include local capital and endowment drives of substantial magnitude.  

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York (FJPNY) and its beneficiaries obtained from 1961 through 1965 about $114.7 million in pledges and $17.5 million in government grants, endowments, and investment and other income, toward a building fund goal, originally set at $104.4 million, but later successively revised to over $250 million.  

The plan encompasses about 300 projects, including a proposed affiliation of Montefiore Hospital with the Einstein College of Medicine and the establishment of a

4 For example, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies' experience of securing $26.1 million in capital fund pledges in 1965 alone was unique in size, but not in occurrence; many other cities raised substantial capital sums beyond their annual maintenance campaigns.

5 Pledges and collections at June 30, 1964 were about $68 million but rose to $98.5 million a year later. In addition, federation beneficiaries reported $16.5 million in "available and potential resources."
medical school at Mt. Sinai Hospital. Earlier campaigns for capital purposes had raised $16.5 million in 1949, $13.5 million in 1945, and $3 million in 1943.

Systematic data on local capital fund raising are not available on an annual basis because of the long-term nature of these efforts, but partial figures indicate their magnitude. They are largely conducted by federations outside their annual campaigns.

The National Jewish Welfare Board reported that in 1963 and 1964 alone 18 cities had newly-completed community centers at an estimated construction cost of over $17.5 million. There were partial reports of plans and drives in 1965 for centers in seven other cities at costs of over $15 million.6

Hospitals and medical centers in three cities involved an aggregate cost of about $27 million. New homes for the aged (some including hospital facilities) in ten cities were planned at a cost of over $22 million. Six new facilities for Jewish education had goals of about $5 million. Some 12 temples had goals of about $8 million. Many of these efforts were begun prior to 1965 and will continue for three to five years after 1965 with non-contributed income representing substantial portions of the cost (matching federal funds, proceeds of sale of old structures, mortgage loans, etc.). This was exclusive of the combined drives of New York Federation for over $250 million, of Philadelphia for $15 million, of Chicago for $8.5 million, and of Washington, D.C. for over $5 million.7

Reports from cities with a total Jewish population of 2,575,000 listed 545,000 individual gifts, but excluded tens of thousands of individuals covered by organization gifts, Yiddish newspaper gifts, and the like, especially in the largest cities. Since these cities represent about 40 per cent of the Jewish population in the United States, the number of givers may be estimated to exceed one million.

Individual gifts to federations in 1964 averaged about $130, but these were mainly designed to cover family units and were equivalent to per capita gifts of from $35 to $40 if campaign totals are related to total Jewish population in the respective areas.8 Per capita gifts are affected by the relative size of the largest gifts in specific cities. In many federation campaigns, particularly in the larger communities, over half of the amounts raised are in the form of gifts over $1,000, over three-quarters of individual gifts are under $100.

The amounts raised by federations are augmented by funds provided by nonsectarian united funds of community chests for local Jewish services. These grants totalled $18.5 million in 1964 to federated agencies and about $0.6 million to non-federated agencies. Outside New York City, chests provided $16.2 million to federations. Among the largest cities, only Baltimore

---

6 Mainly from 1965 issues of *JTA Community News Reporter*. Since coverage is not complete, figures cited are understatements.

7 Mainly from 1965 issues of *JTA Community News Reporter*. Since coverage is not complete, figures cited are understatements.

8 Based on a listing of 390,000 gifts totalling $50.8 million.
and Boston did not receive chest funds. Most larger and intermediate-sized cities received such support but the smallest federations tended to receive less chest funds.

Cities with the same Jewish population frequently raised varying amounts in their federated campaigns and received widely different levels of chest support. This was related to the relative fund-raising success of particular chest campaigns, to the stage of development of local services in specific communities, to the levels and sources of internal income of local Jewish agencies, and to the prevailing relationships among Jewish federations, Jewish local agencies, and chests.

Independent Campaigns

Each federation determines for itself the beneficiary agencies which it supports through allocations. There are about 25 nonlocal appeals which are included by most federated campaigns, with other agencies receiving less extensive inclusion.

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

Agencies raise funds directly in cities where they are not included by federations, generally with federation clearance on timing and other aspects of the campaign. Welfare funds do not usually allocate funds for capital needs of nonlocal agencies. In some cases, maintenance needs of agencies are included by federations, while independent solicitations are conducted by the same agencies for capital needs not eligible for federation support.

In 1964, some 70 agencies raised $74.4 million independently. In most cases these were not additions to the allocations they received from welfare funds but represented the sole funds raised in communities for particular purposes.

The New York UJA's inclusion is limited to the national UJA, JWB, and UHS; other nonlocal agencies raise funds independently in New York City. While no accurate estimates are available regarding the totals raised in New York City, partial information suggests that over two-fifths of $74.4 million raised independently are secured in New York City. These funds are not supplementary to allocations by welfare funds.

Of $21.9 million raised independently by overseas agencies in 1964, Hadassah raised $7.6 million through membership efforts, while the other three women's organizations—ORT, National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), and Pioneer Women—raised $1.5 million, $0.6 million and $1.0 million, respectively. Most welfare fund allocations to Hadassah were earmarked for the Youth Aliyah program with other programs financed mainly by membership. ORT does not appeal to welfare funds because of the support it receives from the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee
(JDC), while NCJW and Pioneer Women receive welfare fund support in a minority of cities.

The three institutions of higher learning in Israel raised over $4.8 million, mainly in New York City, with a substantial portion earmarked for building and special funds. Welfare funds provided maintenance funds to Hebrew University and Technion. The Jewish National Fund (JNF) continued its traditional appeal and raised $2.6 million, with no support sought from welfare funds. The other major effort was that of Histadrut which raised $1.5 million, mainly from Labor Zionist sources in those cities where it received no welfare fund allocations.

Most of the total of $5.2 million raised independently in the community-relations field was accounted for by the efforts of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League in New York City and Chicago, and by supplementary efforts in cities where welfare fund grants were conditioned upon a waiver of separate fund raising or upon clearance of such efforts with the respective welfare funds affected.

A total of $9.9 million was raised by hospitals, mainly City of Hope (Duarte, California) and National Jewish Hospital (Denver). Most of these agencies no longer have wide acceptance as welfare fund beneficiaries, and they are not thereby precluded from vigorous independent efforts.

In the cultural field the major amounts raised independently are by Brandeis University ($15.1 million), which does not seek welfare fund support, and by B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, which raises about $2.9 million, mainly from members of B'nai B'rith.

While $18 million was raised independently by agencies under religious auspices, the major components were for the Einstein Medical School of Yeshiva University (over $7.4 million, the greatest portion of which was raised in New York City); $2.4 million raised by the Combined Reform Campaign, mainly within its membership; and $4.5 million raised by the Jewish Theological Seminary, mainly from supporters of Conservative Judaism.

The magnitude of funds raised independently by specific agencies is based on effectiveness of campaign techniques, attractiveness of the nature of the appeal, effective organization of supporting groups, and, especially, the response in New York City.

The major efforts are those which do not appeal to welfare funds or which do not receive significant Welfare Fund support (e.g. Brandeis University, national health appeals, membership drives of ORT and B'nai B'rith, JNF, and Weizmann Institute); agencies which receive allocations for operations but not for capital or special purposes (Hebrew University, Technion, Yeshiva University); and agencies which rely mainly on their own member-

---

9 With the exception of the Levi Memorial Hospital they were receiving less than one per cent of their income from welfare funds.
10 Brandeis raised about $76 million in pledges by June 1965 toward a three-year Academic Development Campaign.
ship with supplementation by welfare funds (reform campaign, Jewish Theological Seminary, Hadassah, Pioneer Women.)

The agencies falling into these three categories account for over 80 per cent of all funds raised independently in 1964.

A comparison of independent drives in 1964 and ten years earlier, in 1954, indicates that there were 20 fund-raising efforts which were now raising annually more than $1 million independently. This group of agencies had increased their independent proceeds from $30 million to $66 million. However, $19 million of the rise of $36 million was attributable to the two major fund-raising efforts: Brandeis University and Yeshiva University.

Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies (generally arranged by agreement with federations) provides smaller sums for operating purposes. Local hospitals, centers, family agencies, child care agencies, and homes for the aged raised about $10 million independently in 1964. These were supplementary contributions, with the major share of income derived from Jewish federations and community chests. These amounts do not include capital fund campaigns and endowment income (bequests, etc.) received by local agencies.

Distribution of Funds

Jewish federation campaigns are conducted on a pledge basis with payments made in installments, except for the smallest gifts. Most campaigns are conducted in the spring of the year. Possibly one-third of cash collections on pledges for a given campaign year are paid in succeeding years. As a result, an allowance for "shrinkage" averaging 4.3 per cent was made in 1964 for the difference between cash and pledges.11

Cost of administering federations, including costs of fund raising, budgeting, planning, and other central functions averaged 13.8 per cent.

These major elements explain the difference in the figures shown for amounts raised (Table 1) and the figures shown for amounts distributed (Table 3). Amounts distributed also include over $2.7 million outside New York City from sources other than current campaigns: investment earnings, bequests, unexpended income of prior years, and the like. Of the $2.7 million, $1.6 million was identified by 17 of the 82 cities as investment earnings, bequests, etc.

About 57.5 per cent of amounts budgeted for 1963 by welfare funds were applied to overseas needs, 4.3 per cent to national agencies, and 38.2 per cent to local services.12 The shifts in 1964 were less than one-tenth of one per cent, except for local capital needs.

11 Eighty-two federations which raised $67.9 million in 1964 (outside New York City) provided for shrinkage allowances of $2.9 million and set aside $9.4 million for central administration, planning, budgeting and fund-raising.

12 Note that amounts raised are larger than amounts budgeted generally to the extent of shrinkage allowances and costs of operating federations; therefore, percentages of amounts raised will be lower than percentages of amounts budgeted.
The UJA share (included in "Overseas") rose from 58 per cent in 1955 to 65 per cent in 1957 and levelled off at 56 to 60 per cent in 1958 to 1961. In 1963, the UJA share was at 54.8 per cent compared with 54.7 per cent in 1964.

Overseas agencies other than UJA continued to receive under three per cent of totals budgeted. Together with national agencies all non-local non-UJA agencies continued to receive about seven per cent of totals budgeted.

A major factor affecting the distribution of funds is the existence of Jewish hospitals in almost all of the large centers of Jewish population. This is reflected in higher shares of funds for local Jewish services and lower nonlocal shares in the very largest cities. Thus, nonlocal agencies received 58.6 per cent of funds budgeted in 1964 in cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over. The very smallest communities (under 5,000 Jewish population) with the least developed networks of local Jewish services, continued to give nonlocal agencies 82 per cent of their budgeted funds. Intermediate-size cities provided nonlocal agencies with about 70 to 73 per cent of budgeted funds.

Local services received, for operating purposes, about $36.6 million annually in 1963 and 1964. While the total dollar amount remained stable, increases were shared by most local fields of service where aid was secured from community chests. Income for Jewish local services from community chests rose by five per cent in 1964. This was equivalent to three-quarters of the rise of total costs of services eligible for chest support (health, family, and child care, recreation, and care for the aged). Jewish federation allocations rose by almost three per cent, but this was affected mainly by increased allocations for Jewish education and by the need to supplement chest grants (based on reports from 127 cities in 1964).

There was a moderate increase in allocations for local capital purposes in 1964. Such allocations did not exceed 1.7 per cent of the total nationally or 2.4 per cent outside New York City. Local capital funds are frequently excluded from the annual maintenance campaigns. The figure of allocations for capital-fund purposes from federations relates only to minor funds provided for these purposes in the annual campaigns.

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

There are important variations in local services included by federations even among cities of the same relative size in terms of Jewish population or campaign results. Federations do not receive community-chest support for Jewish education, local community relations, and local refugee aid programs.

In order to determine the relative support provided by federations to various local fields of service, it is necessary to make adjustments for the contribution made by community chests.

In making intercity comparisons of allocations for specific fields of service,
it is important to note whether the federations being compared have the same inclusion pattern, and if they do not, the approximate percentage value of services excluded by one community but included by another.

The pattern of fund distribution described above is based on budget review by allocations committees of federations and welfare funds. This involves study of agency programs and finances, utilization of factual reports and intercommunity statistical comparisons prepared by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), and consideration of recommendations by the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC), consisting of 23 of the largest communities. LCBC recommendations deal with 15 non-local agencies which receive over 70 per cent of all nonlocal federation allocations, exclusive of UJA.

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

AID TO ISRAEL AND OTHER OVERSEAS AREAS

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States is channelled through the UJA and other overseas agencies and through the Israel Bond Drive. From 1948 through 1965 the UJA provided about $775 million for the Jewish Agency for Israel via the United Israel Appeal (UIA) which included transmissions of $115 million to the JNF, mainly between 1948 and 1952. The JDC used UJA funds for its program in Israel (as part of its ramified overseas services) to the extent of about $150 million. Hadassah raised over $150 million in this period. Sales of Israel Bonds were over $704 million in the United States.

United States governmental assistance and reparations and restitution payments from Germany are the other major external sources of aid to Israel. United States government aid to Israel through 1964 was about $813 million. German reparations payments totalled $795 million through 1964, or 96 per cent of total reparations due. The balance was paid in 1965 and 1966.

There was a rise in foreign currency balances of $31 million in 1964 which resulted in a record balance of $646 million (or $518 million after deduction of foreign deposits in Israeli banks). This was more than offset by foreign-currency liabilities of $1033 million, mainly loans (including Israel bonds, $499 million; other loans, $534 million).

Israel's own earnings are largely in the form of exports of goods and

---

13 This was included in total receipts of JDC of about $540 million received from 1948 through 1965. Total JDC receipts in the 52-year period 1914 through 1965, from all sources, was over $830 million.

14 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1965, page 864. The most recent annual rate was $34 million.

services, supplemented by foreign investment and private transfers of funds. Exports reached $352 million in 1964, or about 43 per cent of imports of $815 million. Preliminary data for 1965 indicate exports of about $406 million in 1965, or about 50 per cent of imports of about $812 million. The annual trade deficits had ranged from $223 million to $464 million from the creation of the State of Israel through 1964. The 1965 deficit reached $406 million.

These figures deal with trade in commodities only. If services are included (tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $404 million in 1963 and $528 million in 1964. These deficits were partially offset in 1963 by $347 million and in 1964 by $335 million in “unilateral transfers” consisting mainly of restitution and reparations, campaign proceeds in the United States, and other countries, personal transfers and United States government aid.

**Philanthropic Programs for Israel**

Philanthropic funds continue to be an important source of income for Israel’s economy. Although these funds are for welfare programs, the exchange of dollars for pounds is helpful to the country.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF had available for overseas purposes about $92.1 million in 1964, compared with about $91.4 million in 1963. About 80 per cent of these funds are for Israel. Campaigns in other overseas countries also provide funds for programs in Israel (about $11.3 million in 1963–1964). The Bank of Israel reported global transmissions of about $80 million to Israel in 1964.

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 70,000 in 1957, but averaged under 25,000 annually in 1958, 1959, and 1960.

Immigration in the five-year period, 1961 through 1965, was over 260,000, with annual rates ranging from about 34,000 to 64,000. Total immigration since the creation of the State of Israel, was over 1,240,000.

**Bond Sales for Israel**

Four State of Israel bond issues have been floated since 1951: Independence Issue, Development Issue, Second Development Issue, and Third Development Issue. Sales of the Third Development Issue began on March 1, 1964.


the Development Issue, which was floated for a five-year period from 1954 to 1959, resulted in sales of $234.1 million, and sales of the third issue, known as the Second Development Issue, were $293.7 million in 1964, the end of the five-year period of flotation. Sales of the fourth issue, known as the Third Development Issue, began on March 1, 1964. At the end of 1965 $164.4 million had been sold.

Total bonds sold for all issues were $837.9 million at the end of 1965.

At the end of November 1965 there were outstanding in the hands of the public $479.8 million, consisting of $34.8 million Independence Issue; $112.1 million Development Issue; $201.4 million Second Development Issue, and $131.4 million Third Development Issue.

From the inception of sale of Israel bonds in May 1951, through November 1965, $64.1 million worth of State of Israel bonds were surrendered in Israel for pounds by the Jewish Agency for Israel. In 1965, $4.1 million worth of bonds were received by the UJA in payment of individual pledges to local welfare funds. This was a decrease from the 1964 level of "turn-ins" of Bonds of $5.2 million.

The Third Development Issue provides that a bond must be held for a period of at least two years before a charitable institution may surrender it in Israel for Israeli pounds. As a result, these bonds may not be used in payment of pledges during this two-year period.

Redemption of the Twelve Year Dollar Savings Bonds of the Independence Issue began on May 1, 1963 and redemption of the Ten Year Dollar Savings Bonds of the Development Issue began on April 1, 1964. The appreciated value of bonds of both issues which matured May 1, 1963 to the end of 1965 is $107.4 million. This amount includes $21.5 million Independence Issue Bonds which matured during 1965, and $20.3 million Development Issue Bonds which matured during 1965.

The appreciated value of the Savings Bonds which will mature during 1966 is $34.3 million. This consists of $3.4 million Independence Issue Savings Bonds issued during 1954, and $30.9 million Development Issue Bonds issued during 1956. In addition, on May 1, 1966 Independence Issue Coupon Bonds mature in the amount of $30.8 million. All bonds maturing in 1966 will total $65.1 million, compared with $43.5 million in 1965.

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

Bond sales in the United States totalled $76.7 million in 1965—an increase of about nine per cent over the 1964 figure of $70.3 million. There was a substantial increase in sales to individuals, which accounted for a major portion of the increase in sales in 1965. In Canada 1965 sales amounted to $5.5 million, as compared with $5.1 million the preceding year. Elsewhere, $9.3 million in bonds were sold so that worldwide sales amounted to $91.4 million, the largest amount of Israel Bonds ever sold in any one year.

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

Reparations and Restitution Funds

Foreign currency income for individual restitution payments from Germany constituted the largest single source of foreign currency for Israel during 1964. This totaled $139 million in 1963, compared with $134 million in 1964.

Payments from Germany under the reparations agreement were $17 million during 1964 and had reached $796 million, or 96 per cent of the total due.

In March 1964, the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (CJMCAG) made the eleventh and last yearly allocation of funds put at its disposal by Israel from reparation payments. This was in addition to reparation funds used directly by the Israeli government.

There was a loss in income of about $7.5 million for the JDC for programs in Europe and Australia and $425,000 for UHS.

There had also been grants for cultural and educational reconstruction in Europe and the United States. About $10 to $11 million annually had gone for relief programs in Israel in recent years, with the Jewish Agency as the major beneficiary. These were scheduled to end early in 1966.

No further annual allocations were available after 1964 but a Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1964 with $10 million from CJMCAG funds for the support of “Jewish history, religion, education, traditions, etc.” Operations began in 1965.

Overseas Agencies

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

Total income in 1964 of all overseas agencies was $92.1 million, with $21.9 million raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities (accounting for over $18 million of this total) were: Hadassah, which raised $7.6 million through membership activities; the building and special fund drives of Hebrew University and Technion, which raised $3.7 million; the drives of National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women for welfare activities conducted by Histadrut in Israel, which raised $2.5 million; the JNF campaign for “traditional income,” which raised $2.6 million, and Weizmann Institute, which raised $1.1 million.

The UJA share of all funds budgeted was 54.3 per cent in 1964. Its share of gross pledges was 46 per cent (48 per cent outside of New York City).
United Jewish Appeal

The UJA is a partnership of the United Israel Appeal (UIA) and JDC for joint fund raising. Over 90 per cent of UJA income is received from federations. The remainder (about $4.7 million in 1964) is secured in hundreds of small nonfederated communities where the UJA enlists the cooperation of community leaders to take responsibility for conducting local campaigns for the UJA or joint appeals, with UJA as the major beneficiary.

From its inception in 1939 through 1964, the UJA received about $1,557 million and distributed $851 million to the UIA (formerly United Palestine Appeal), $546 million to the JDC, and $85 million to United Service for New Americans (USNA), New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), and United Hias Service (UHS).

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

The distribution of UJA funds in 1964 was in accordance with a formula which has remained unchanged since 1951 and is 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 87.5 per cent and JDC 12.5 per cent. This formula was not applied to the proceeds of "special" campaigns. For 1961, proceeds over $50 million were treated as though they were "special" funds.

The UJA initiated its Israel Education Fund in September 1964. The objective is to conduct a five-year capital-fund campaign to provide $127.6 million for high school buildings, teacher-training programs, student scholarships and related centers, equipment, and facilities. This effort is separate from the annual UJA campaign.

A total of $9.6 million in pledges was received in 1965, in addition to the usual allocations from welfare funds. (This total exceeded $12 million by the spring of 1966.)

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

The JDC will not share in this fund. The funds will be turned over to JAFI, Inc. which would "own, manage, and operate the schools and related institutions" to be built with the donated funds, with the Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem) as operating agent in Israel.

The government of Israel will cooperate by providing land for construction, exempting the institution from governmental tax, providing funds to-
ward the cost of maintenance, and making no similar arrangements with other comparable efforts without prior consultation with the UJA and JAFI, Inc.

**UJA Special Funds**

Beginning in 1956, the UJA received "special" funds designed to augment the proceeds of its "regular" funds each year (except for 1961).

On a *pledge* basis, UJA income was $62.6 million in 1965, exclusive of the Israel Education Fund. This was about four per cent higher than the 1964 pledge total of $59.6 million.

On a *cash* basis, the UJA had receipts of $61.4 million in 1965 and $60.7 million in 1964. These were the cash amounts received each year regardless of years in which the pledges were made. In addition, $4.3 million was received in 1965 for the Israel Education Fund on pledges of $9.6 million.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its percentage share of campaign proceeds. UJA allocation proceeds for 1965 of about $62.6 million compared with gross campaign proceeds of about $132 million.

**UJA Special Loans**

**CURRENT LOAN**

Borrowing from banks has been a major factor affecting the financing of the UJA, the UIA and the JAFI, Inc. in the last decade.

The current loan was negotiated in April 1965 for $50 million for a 15-year period with a group of 11 insurance companies.

These funds were borrowed by JAFI, Inc. and guaranteed by UJA.

This represented a refinancing of prior bank loans of about $45.2 million which had been borrowed earlier for a 10 (and then a 12) year term by federations from local banks and underwritten nationally by the UJA.

The consolidation of the loan in 1965 resulted in repayment of the outstanding balances of the earlier loan. The difference in the terms of loans was expected to make about $4 million per year additional in cash available for the work of JAFI, Inc.

The terms of the loan also limit short-term debt (for 12 months) at any time to $10 million. The loan for $50 million is exclusive of financing provided by some of the insurance companies for capital requirements for housing in Israel.

**PRIOR LOANS**

The UJA borrowed $64,751,500 through welfare funds in 1954. These funds were transmitted to JAFI (by way of UIA) for use in carrying out the welfare activities of the Jewish Agency in Israel (immigration, absorption and land settlement).

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

The UJA undertook in 1961 a ten-year debt liquidation program which consolidated prior debts of UJA and JAFI, Inc., totalling $65 million. The debts were to be repaid at the rate of ten per cent each year. The loans were arranged by federations and local banks and underwritten nationally by the UJA. There were 39 cities involved in the loans with $40 million borrowed outside New York City and $25 million in New York City. The balance of about $45 million in these loans were repaid out of the proceeds of the current loan in April 1965.

In addition, the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem borrowed IL 410 million in medium- and long-term loans and repaid IL 275 million in principal and interest in the four fiscal years ending March 31, 1964.19 In the succeeding year (1964–1965), long- and medium-term loans which were made and repaid were roughly in balance at about IL 84 million but net short-term loans which were made amounted to IL 51 million. JAFI, Inc. has no legal responsibility for loans made outside the U.S.

**United Israel Appeal**

UIA funds destined for JAFI, Inc. are disbursed through the UIA which is one of the two official partners in the UJA.

Receipts of the UIA in 1964 were $38 million and in 1965 an estimated $41.2 million, including $4.3 million for the Israel Education Fund. This compared with peak receipts of about $55 million in 1957 and the lowest annual receipts of about $35 million in 1954 and 1955. While the peak year of UJA fund raising was 1948, the UIA received a lower share from UJA in that year ($37 million) than in more recent years when the JDC share of UJA funds declined.

**Jewish National Fund**

The JNF, under the UJA agreement, is permitted to raise $1,800,000 annually from “traditional collections” in the United States, after deduction of expenses, not exceeding $300,000. Its total U.S. income, including traditional income, bequests, and other income, was about $2.6 million in 1963–64. In addition, the JNF received annual allocations in Israel of about $1.2 million directly from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) through 1964–65. The responsibility for financing was turned over by JAFI, Inc. to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) in 1962–63, and the latter terminated its grants on April 1, 1965.

In the four fiscal years ending March 31, 1964, JNF had global income of almost IL 102 million, or an annual average of $8.5 million at current rates

---

19 *Report to 26th Zionist Congress in Jerusalem, December 1964, Appendix I* and *Report to Zionist General Council, Jerusalem, January 1966.*
of exchange. JNF plans for the four-year period 1965–68 are premised on the annual goal of $10 to $11 million in global contributions. Most of the funds are used for land reclamation, afforestation, road-laying, and drainage.

**Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.**

JAFI, Inc. was reorganized in 1960 as an autonomous American body. It is administered by a board of 26 Americans and one Israeli. 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.\(^{20}\)

The governing board of JAFI, Inc. consists of eighteen designees of the UIA and nine designees of the international Jewish Agency.

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

The reorganized JAFI, Inc. utilizes American staff appointed by and responsible to itself (stationed in Israel) in order to assure American control of the specific programs and costs in resettlement, absorption of immigrants, and related services for which it assumes responsibility for financing. The operating agency continues to be the Jerusalem Jewish Agency, with which JAFI, Inc. contracts for the financing and operating of specific agreed-upon projects in Israel.

**Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem)**

Sources of Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) income are primarily JAFI, Inc. earmarked grants from the U.S.; a share of Keren Hayesod campaigns in Jewish communities outside the U.S.; counterpart income flowing from the German reparations agreements; grants and loans by the Israel Government for costs of agricultural settlement, and earmarked contributions for Youth Aliyah.

In 1948 through 1965, the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) received UJA funds of about $660 million. (In earlier years during this period JNF had received an additional $115 million.)

About 80 per cent of contribution income generally comes from the United States. Contributions in 1964–65 accounted for about $42 million trans-

---

\(^{20}\) There are three Jewish Agencies for Israel, as follows: (a) Jewish Agency for Israel in Jerusalem—the operating agency within Israel; (b) the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.—its branch in the United States; (c) the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.—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.
mitted to Israel from the United States and other countries. This was about
two-thirds of total income (exclusive of loans) but less than half of total
income if loans are included. Over $28 million was derived from new long-
and medium-term loans, and about $27 million was repaid (exclusive of net
short-term borrowing of $17 million). Israel government grants for agricul-
ture and remaining receipts (mainly from reparations and sales of housing to
earlier immigrants—and earmarked funds) covered the balance of income.

The Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) spent about $108 million in the year
ended March 31, 1965, including loan repayment principal and interest of
about $27 million.

The largest single area of functional expenditures in 1964–65 was for
agricultural settlement, amounting to $25 million. This was partially offset by
government of Israel income of $3.1 million. The objective is eventual self-
support for the newcomer. Aid is provided in the form of founding new
settlements, irrigation projects, citriculture, equipment, seed, instruction, sup-
plementary employment, and long-term loans. Part of these costs were cov-
ered by advances and grants by the Israel government. The Jewish Agency
has been transferring settlers’ agreements to repay Jewish Agency loans to
the government in consideration of government grants for agricultural set-
tlement.

Costs of permanent immigrant housing were $18 million. Immigration,
transportation, and initial reception of immigrants required about $25 million.

Youth Aliyah programs for maintenance and education of immigrant and
other youth costs about $5.2 million in 1964–65. Hadassah in the United
States and other women’s organizations in the United States and abroad pro-
vided a major share of these costs, with the remaining share of costs borne
by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) and JAFI, Inc.

Other Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) expenditures included grants totalling
about $2.5 million for institutions of higher learning in Israel (Weizmann
Institute, Hebrew University, Technion, Bar-Ilan University, and Tel Aviv
University), a terminal allocation of $1.2 million to JNF, allocations on ac-
count of German reparations, organization and information activities, and
general administrative expenses within and outside Israel.

JAFI, Inc. provided financing toward specific agreed-upon projects con-
ducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) but not those of its American Sec-
tion, or the American Zionist Council or the World Zionist Organization.

Programs Financed by Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.

In 1964–65, JAFI, Inc. provided $34.0 million toward costs of $75.6
million for programs operated by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). These
expenditures were based upon an agreement that Jewish Agency (Jerusalem)
would make specific expenditures on behalf of, and in accordance with, the
instructions of the JAFI, Inc. In addition, JAFI, Inc. had repaid $4.2 million
in loans and in interest in the United States. (These repayments were made
prior to the refinancing of the UJA-JAFI, Inc. loan in April 1965, involving
the borrowing of $50 million and the repayment of principal and interest of the earlier UJA loan of $45.2 million.)

In 1963–64, the JAFI, Inc. share of costs had amounted to $27.3 million. The rise in the 1964–65 share was based on availability of borrowed funds rather than on the JAFI, Inc. yield of the UJA campaign.

The program which received the largest shares of JAFI, Inc. financing were those for initial immigrant care, including immigration, transportation, and absorption.

Other non-UJA sources of income were available to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) for particular programs. These were funds provided by the government toward the agricultural settlement program and by Hadassah and other groups for Youth Aliyah. In each case, JAFI, Inc. earmarked its funds for specific programs.

**FINANCING OF JEWISH AGENCY PROGRAMS 1963–64 AND 1964–65**

*(In millions of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Transportation</td>
<td>$17.655</td>
<td>$16.323</td>
<td>$11.597</td>
<td>$12.597</td>
<td>66% 77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>6.487</td>
<td>7.782</td>
<td>5.230</td>
<td>6.242</td>
<td>80 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Settlement</td>
<td>25.218</td>
<td>23.069</td>
<td>3.530</td>
<td>5.577</td>
<td>14 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>27.200</td>
<td>18.020</td>
<td>3.810</td>
<td>5.220</td>
<td>14 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Aliyah</td>
<td>5.139</td>
<td>5.729</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>2.134</td>
<td>21 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to Higher Education</td>
<td>1.764</td>
<td>2.468</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>69 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to Other General Administration</td>
<td>1.617</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>— 0.015</td>
<td>— 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$87.293</td>
<td>$75.837</td>
<td>$27.333</td>
<td>$34.000</td>
<td>31% 45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Exchange rate was $1.00 = £ 3.00.

*b In addition, the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) spent $28.7 million for debt service in 1964–65 and $33.2 million in 1963–64 in which the JAFI, Inc. did not participate. Other expenditures for which JAFI, Inc. does not allocate funds amounted to $2.1 million for 1963–64 and $2.4 million in 1964–65.

**American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee**

JDC maintains a worldwide program of aid to Jews. It assisted about 237,000 persons in 1965. Of these, 97,000 were in Israel (including ORT and yeshivoth), 78,000 in Europe, 57,000 in Moslem areas, and about 5,000 in other areas.

JDC had two major sources of income up to 1965: UJA and CJMCAG.
In 1964 JDC had cash receipts of $27.3 million, of which $17.8 million was from the UJA and $7.6 million from the Claims Conference and from other types of reparations income, and $0.8 million from campaigns abroad.

As a result of the loss of reparations income in 1965, cash receipts fell to $20.4 million and disbursements fell to $24.0 million, with about $3.3 million additional secured from borrowing. UJA provided $17.9 million, reparations income less than $1.2 million, and campaigns abroad (mainly Canada, Great Britain, and Latin America) less than $0.6 million.

The JDC Malben program of service to sick, aged, and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to account for the largest single share of its appropriations: $6.5 million, or 22 per cent of the 1964 total. This represented a reduction of $0.9 million. An additional $0.9 million was provided for aid to 109 yeshivot and other traditional institutions in Israel. Malben aided about 52,255 persons during 1964, including care of the aged in institutions, in their own homes, and medical services. Malben accounts for the greatest portion of the total of about $155 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1965.

The largest number of North African Jews receiving JDC aid was in Morocco, where 26,000 Jews were being assisted in 1965. About 29,350 Jews in Tunisia and Iran were also receiving JDC aid. JDC appropriated $5.9 million in 1964 for work in Moslem areas. JDC assistance is channeled through such agencies as OSE in the health field; the Alliance Israelite Universelle, Ozar Hatorah, and Lubavitcher schools in the educational fields, and ORT for vocational training.

JDC programs operated in about a dozen European countries, but the largest numbers were assisted in France: 51,600 aided included a large proportion of Tunisian and Algerian refugees. The JDC assistance program was aiding 11,800 Jews in Poland and almost 15,000 in Italy, Belgium, Austria, and other countries.

ORT and Vocational Education

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

The global expenditures of the World ORT Union were at an annual level of about $10.5 million in 1965. Total ORT trainees in 1965 were 46,192, of which 24,924 were in Israel, 5,293 in France, 4,569 in Moslem countries, and the balance mainly in Europe.

American Jewish support of the ORT program is channeled in two ways: through the JDC grant to ORT ($1,850,000 in 1965), derived from the JDC budget.

21 In 1965 the Malben budget of $5.8 million was about one-quarter of the total JDC budget.
participation in the UJA, and through membership contributions of ORT in the United States. Women's American ORT raised $1.6 million in 1965 and almost $1.5 million in 1964. The agreement between ORT and JDC permits ORT to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25.

Global income and expense of ORT were about $10 million in 1964, and were estimated at close to $11 million in 1965. About half of the outlay was in Israel and about one-quarter in France, but local sources (mainly governmental, tax revenues, and school fees) provided the major share of financing.

**Migration Services**

UHS provides a worldwide service designed to enable Jews to migrate to countries where they can make an economic and social adjustment. UHS assisted 12,412 Jewish immigrants to migrate in 1965 (including 8,267 to France and 2,098 to the United States), compared with 10,599 in 1964. A migration level of about 11,900 is expected in 1966.

A large proportion of the Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remain in New York City. Hence, the financing of the program of NYANA is considered to be a national responsibility, reflected in the inclusion of NYANA as a direct beneficiary of national UJA.

Jewish immigration to the United States in 1965 was estimated at about 7,800 by UHS and NYANA, including those aided by agencies and those arriving independently. Of those who settled in New York City in 1964 or earlier, about 4,700 received aid from NYANA in 1965. UJA grants to NYANA in 1964 and 1965 were about $700,000 annually.

**Hadassah**

The largest income of an overseas service agency, other than UJA, was that of Hadassah which received $10.3 million in 1964. Hadassah's major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah. The new 545-bed Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem was opened in 1961 at a cost of over $25 million. Medical services in Israel are also provided by the Kupat Holim of the Histadrut, by governmental departments, and by the Malben program of JDC. Hadassah was planning to effect transfer of 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) is conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) at a cost of about $5.2 million in 1964–65. Hadassah's transmission to Youth Aliyah was about $1.7 million in 1964–65. Other women's groups in the United States and overseas provide smaller supplementary funds for Youth Aliyah toward a total income of almost $2.9 million. The number of children cared for at the end of March 1964 was 12,300, including 2,500 in day centers.

---

21a All hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary, and private) totaled about 17,600 and provided about 6.1 million days' care in 1964.
Higher Education in Israel

The institutions of higher education in Israel (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, and Technion) had income in America of about $7.7 million in 1964, mainly in contributions. In addition, all three institutions received grants from JAFI, Inc., a beneficiary of UJA funds, from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), and 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 had received about $615,000 annually from federations in recent years. Their building-fund and special-fund campaign proceeds were at the $3.7 million level in 1964. Pledges for Hebrew University, including the Truman Peace Center, rose sharply in 1965 and exceeded $10 million. The maintenance appeals of the two institutions were combined; their capital-fund drives were conducted separately.

Both institutions have had marked enrollment increases in recent years, with 10,164 students registered at Hebrew University (including a Tel Aviv branch) and 3,928 at Technion in 1964-65. 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.

Bar-Ilan University, founded in 1955 by the Mizrachi Organization of America, had a student enrollment of 2,126 in four faculties in 1964-1965: Jewish studies, natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and languages and literature. Fund raising in the United States has been largely restricted to Mizrachi membership groups and friends.

Tel Aviv University, affiliated to the municipality, was reorganized as an independent agency and sought public financial support for capital needs on a limited basis beginning in 1964. There were 1,406 students enrolled in 1964-1965 in humanities, in natural sciences, and in post-graduate medical courses.

Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel

There were over 14,000 students in attendance in 1964 in 109 yeshivoth receiving JDC support and almost 1,500 students in 39 other yeshivoth.

22 Government support to higher education in Israel has been over one-half total costs. It was almost $24 million in the draft budget for 1966-67.
23 Of $1,255,000 earmarked for higher education by JAFI, Inc. in 1964-65, Weizmann Institute received $859,000, Hebrew University $233,000, Technion $67,000, Bar-Ilan University $43,000 and Tel Aviv University $53,000.
25 Aaron Greenbaum, The AJDC and the Yeshivoth in Israel (Jerusalem, AJDC, October 1964).
Many of these yeshivoth have no age limits, although most students are aged 14 to 17. They are termed “traditional institutions” because of their roots in the traditional religious life in Eastern Europe.

Many of the yeshivoth receive support from the JDC (about $800,000 annually in 1964 and 1965). Some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel Institutions ($150,000 raised in 1964), but a great number also seek funds separately in the United States through collectors (meshulochim) and through mail appeals. There are no comprehensive records of the extent of these appeals or their support in Israel, but 1961 receipts of yeshivoth in Israel were reported at $7 million, with about one-third from contributions in Israel and about one-third from other contributions.

Cultural programs in Israel were supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation (AICF) ($1.8 million in 1964), which included some 60 agencies in Israel in its appeal. These were mainly agencies in the fields of music, theater, dance, art, and literature. Building funds are sought by AICF, in addition to funds for maintenance. The major current capital project is for a new structure to house the National Museum.

Other Overseas Agencies

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

Hadassah, Pioneer Women, and NCJW have traditionally raised most of their funds through membership activities; National Committee for Labor Israel has raised funds independently in the largest communities where its membership strength is centered, while seeking Federation allocations in smaller and medium-sized communities; American Friends of the Hebrew University and American Technion Society have concentrated their independent appeals on their building and special funds, while seeking federation support for maintenance needs.

Almost all of these agencies were authorized to conduct campaigns for Israel by the Jewish Agency Committee on Control and Authorization of Campaigns 28 under conditions regarding timing, goals, scope of campaigns, and clearance with welfare funds, set by that Committee. The objective of the Committee is to help assure the primacy of the UJA among appeals for

28 Authorized agencies in recent years were: American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund-raising dinner only); American Friends of Hebrew University; America-Israel Cultural Foundation; American Red Mogen Dovid for Israel, Inc. (membership campaign only, no application to welfare funds); American Technion Society; Federated Council of Israel Institutions; Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish National Fund (traditional collections only, no application to welfare funds); Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women's League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).
Israel by cooperating with other authorized campaigns and by avoiding a multiplicity of campaigns.

Fifteen overseas agencies other than UJA agencies had income of $26.3 million in 1964, compared with $26.2 million in 1963.

UHS and the America-Israel Cultural Foundation participated in the cooperative budget review process of the LCBC, a grouping of welfare funds in 23 of the largest cities.

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.

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency is a worldwide news service reporting news affecting the Jewish people. It was reorganized in 1962 and sought, with LCBC approval, to secure direct federation allocations. (Such allocations rose from about $36,000 in 1961 to about $142,000 in 1964, including New York UJA.)

There are agencies which center their activities in other areas, but include limited overseas programs: NCJW, for social work and education scholarships, and for activities related to the department of secondary and higher education at the Hebrew University; the Jewish Labor Committee for aid to political and labor refugees in Europe and in Israel.

Overseas concerns are also shared by some domestic agencies in the form of intervention with governmental bodies on behalf of the rights of Jews overseas; the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Section of World Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, Jewish War Veterans, and Jewish Labor Committee.

NATIONAL AGENCIES AND SERVICES

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

Some agencies operate in more than one field of service. As a result there are selective multiple references to specific agencies in the sections which follow.

The local federation and welfare fund provides a link between local, national, and overseas services by means of centralized fund raising, through federation review of agency programs in the process of budgeting funds, and in planning and sometimes operating local services.

CJFWF serves local central community organizations by means of aid in strengthening of fund raising, budgeting, planning and coordination of
services, public relations, inter-city and national-local relations, overseas services, specialized consultation in such services as family service, child care, aged care and health services, and in basic community organization.

Community Relations

Response to threats to the status of Jews in other countries was an important factor in the creation of modern Jewish community-relations agencies. The major current emphasis is on improvement of domestic group relations.

Each of the five major national Jewish community-relations agencies serves a membership; directly in the case of the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress and Jewish War Veterans, indirectly in the case of the Anti-Defamation League (for B'nai B'rith membership) and the Jewish Labor Committee (for trade union membership). Some of them also conduct foreign affairs activities and cultural programs, and issue publications of interest to circles wider than their own membership.

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

The other three agencies concentrate on more specialized approaches: American Jewish Congress, on legal and legislative activities; Jewish Labor Committee, on work with labor unions, and Jewish War Veterans, on work with veterans’ groups. Interfaith and other community-relations activities are conducted also by congregational associations, although the major portions of their programs are centered on aid to the religious programs of affiliated congregations.

After the Joint Defense Appeal (JDA) arrangement was terminated at the end of 1962, both the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League conducted separate campaign for funds. Both increased their gross receipts from their independent New York City and Chicago campaigns, while welfare fund support, in the aggregate, was closer to the previous JDA level.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) serves as the coordinating and clearance agency for the American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, NCJW, and the three congregational associations, and for 78 local and regional community-relations councils. The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League re-joined NCRAC in 1965.

NCRAC, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee and Jewish War Veterans participate in the cooperative budget review process of LCBC; the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League began to participate in 1963. The five national operating agencies and the NCRAC received $10 million
in 1964, compared with $9.3 million in 1963. Most of the increase was secured from independent fund raising in New York City by the former JDA agencies.

Health

Living conditions of Jews arriving in the United States at the close of the last century made for a high incidence of tuberculosis and impelled the creation between 1899 and 1914 of three national tuberculosis hospitals, a sanitarium, and a home for children of TB patients (as well as a specialized arthritis hospital). An additional motivation was the theory that the climate of areas like Denver and Southern California was helpful in TB cases.

These institutions came into existence before many of the present local Jewish hospitals were organized. Improvement in the health status of Jews and medical advances in recent years in TB therapy led to a shift in emphasis by the TB hospitals to problems relating to heart, cancer, and research and treatment of asthma in adults. However, TB still continued to represent a major share of days' care provided for all ailments.

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

Income of the six agencies in 1964 was $14.9 million, compared with $13.7 million in 1963. Two of the agencies (City of Hope, near Los Angeles, and National Jewish Hospital in Denver) accounted for almost 80 per cent of the total.

The Albert Einstein Medical School, under the sponsorship of Yeshiva University in New York City, began functioning in 1955. Its receipts in 1964 were $21.8 million, out of a total of $29.5 million, for the university, and rose to $26.5 million in 1965, out of a total of $35.3 million. Its student enrolment in 1965–66 was 408. It awarded 90 M.D. degrees in 1965–66.

A new hospital was opened in 1965 by the medical school. Construction cost was $20 million.

Service Agencies

Basic services in many program areas are provided by local service agencies financed in large measure by federations and (in some fields) by community chests and united funds. These local agencies utilize national services which bring to them the experience of other communities and the results of national program planning. There are five national organizations that furnish service to local Jewish community centers, programs for the Armed Forces, Jewish education, religion, and vocational guidance. These agencies serve as coordinating and consultative bodies for their respective fields.

JWB is the largest of these agencies. It received $1,484,000 in 1964, out of a total of $1,855,000, for the five agencies. In addition to the assistance it provides to the Jewish community centers, JWB conducts a program of
service to Jews in the Armed Forces and sponsors a number of Jewish cultural projects. JWB undertook a financial plan in 1961, which was related to the magnitude of federation income for its Armed Services program, and community center budgets for its center services program. Since federations frequently provide funds to centers (as do the community chests), JWB continues to look to federations for support of both of its basic programs. JWB support from United Service Organizations (USO) for programs for the Armed Forces was sharply reduced after April 1964 as a result of a general reorganization of USO. The annual level of the JWB-USO operations was reduced from $355,000 in 1963 to $139,000 for 1965.

The American Association for Jewish Education serves local communities with studies and consultation in educational trends, stimulation of student enrolment, recruitment and placement of teachers, and pedagogic materials. It also aids the professional organization of Jewish school administrators (National Council of Jewish Education).

Other national service agencies are the Jewish Occupational Council, which serves local Jewish Vocational Services agencies and national agencies concerned with Jewish occupational adjustment; the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, which serves as a forum for exchange of experience of professional workers in all fields of Jewish communal service, and the Synagogue Council of America which represents its affiliated Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbinical and congregational associations seeking to foster intergroup cooperation and relations with corresponding Christian bodies and in relation to governmental agencies.

NCRAC also provides service to 74 affiliated local community-relations agencies.

Jewish Culture

Following a CJFWF survey, the National Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1960 as an autonomous corporation, with an associated Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies with sixteen participating agencies.

Specific activities undertaken initially included a program of awards to scholars for research, earmarked grants to existing cultural agencies for high-priority projects, provision of information on the Jewish cultural field, aid to the Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies process for joint cultural agency consultation, and information on cultural agencies to welfare funds.

The cultural field includes many small agencies. Although sixteen agencies had income of $31.4 million in 1964, Brandeis University accounted for 76 per cent; B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal for 12 per cent; and Zionist Organization of America and Delaware Valley College for three to four per cent each of the total. The remaining 12 agencies received $1.9 million in 1964.

27 It includes agencies operated under Jewish auspices with general cultural programs as well as programs with more specific Jewish content.
Four of the agencies are institutions of higher learning: Brandeis University, Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture, Dropsie College, and Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University. In addition, Yeshiva University includes university courses in the arts and sciences as well as a medical school and a theological seminary.

Research and scholarly publication programs are conducted by YIVO Institute for Jewish Research and by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies in the fields of sociology, economics, and linguistics; American Academy for Jewish Research; American Jewish Historical Society, American Jewish Archives, American Jewish History Center, and the Jewish Museum of the Jewish Theological Seminary in the fields of history and archives, and by Histadruth Ivrit and Bitzaron for Hebraism. Population studies are conducted mainly by the CJFWF and JWB. Both agencies expanded their research programs in 1965.

The Jewish Publication Society specializes in publishing books of Jewish interest. The National Conference of Jewish Communal Service publishes a journal dealing with social-work developments. Dropsie College publishes a Jewish quarterly review. CJFWF issues research reports on community organization, health, and welfare planning, campaigning and budgeting, as well as studies of specific local service agencies.

Reference yearbooks are published in a number of fields: the American Jewish Year Book (published jointly by the American Jewish Committee and Jewish Publication Society) contains specialized articles on major developments in the United States and other countries, and statistics and directories; the Yearbook of Jewish Social Service (published by CJFWF); and the JWB Center Yearbook. CJFWF also publishes an annual summary of major program and financial developments in all fields of Jewish communal service for which data are available (Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances). JWB conducts activities designed to stimulate interest in Jewish books and music, and operates a Jewish lecture bureau.

B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal (BBNYSA) (Hillel Foundations, B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, and B'nai B'rith Vocational Service) and Jewish Chautauqua Society emphasize youth activities. BBNYSA agencies conduct local operations, coordinated on a regional and national level.

**Religion**

National religious agencies provide training of rabbis, cantors, Jewish educators, shohatim, and other religious functionaries; assist programs of religious congregations, including elementary Jewish education, and encourage the enlistment of the religiously unaffiliated members of the Jewish population.

Each of the three religious wings has its own rabbinical association and congregational associations, with affiliated national associations of sisterhoods, men's clubs, and youth groups. Nationally, they attempt to help organize new congregations, and publish ritual and educational materials. The three wings are represented in the Synagogue Council of America. The Reform,
Conservative and Orthodox (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 25) had enrolled well over 200,000 families each, exclusive of ancillary sisterhoods, brotherhoods, men’s clubs, youth groups, and non-member users of synagogues.

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

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

Most Orthodox yeshivoth are located in New York City. Major yeshivoth in other cities are: the Jewish University of America, Hebrew Theological College in Chicago; the Rabbinical College of Telshe in Cleveland; the Ner Israel Rabbinical College in Baltimore; and the Chachmey Lublin Theological Seminary in Detroit.

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

Some of the programs conducted by the major seminaries involve interfaith activities designed to promote better understanding between Jews and Christians.

Yeshiva University combines a theological seminary and a school for Jewish educators with a liberal arts college, a medical school, and other graduate schools, including a social work school.

Eighteen national religious agencies received $48.1 million in 1964, compared with $41.4 million in 1963, but if the Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University is excluded, the 1964 total of $26.3 million, compared with the 1963 total of $23.0 million.

Local Services

Central communal sources (Jewish federations and chest-united funds) provided about $58.2 million for local Jewish services in 1964.

Jewish federations supplied about $39.1 million in 1964, compared with about $38.7 million in 1963, to local Jewish services in the fields of health, family and child care, refugee aid, Jewish centers, Jewish education, care of the aged, vocational services, and community relations. Federations constituted the major source of contributed income for local Jewish agencies.

Non-sectarian community chests and united funds provided an additional estimated $19.1 million in 1964, in most cases through Jewish federations, but in some cases directly to Jewish service agencies. Of this sum, $12.2

28 Includes Greater New York Fund and NYC United Hospital Fund.
million was received in the 13 largest cities in which 75 per cent of the Jewish population resides.

Community chests generally restrict their support to agencies operating in the fields of health, family and child care, care of the aged, and Jewish centers. A substantial share of contributed communal income, even in these fields, comes from Jewish federations, particularly for health and care for the aged services; federations have, in addition, the exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

Available data for 127 communities for 1963 and 1964 show how central communal funds (federation and chest income) were distributed among various fields of local service (see Table 5). Federations continued to provide roughly three-fifths and community chests two-fifths of central communal funds received by local agencies in these communities, but these totals include many services and agencies which receive no chest support. The rise in funds in 1964 was 3.7 per cent. Total allocations by Jewish federations for local services have risen dollar-wise since 1955 (see Table 6c).

Rises from 4 to 5 per cent in central community grants were experienced in 1964 in recreation, care for the aged, family and child care, Jewish education, and local community relations, and a rise of 3 per cent for employment and vocational guidance. Hospital grants rose by less than one per cent, and grants for refugee care fell by 4 per cent.

The major sources of funds for local service agencies, other than central funds, are payments for service by users and public tax funds. These funds have risen to a greater extent than community funds. A comparison of data for 1959 and 1964 shows that a group of 32 general hospitals received increases of about $72 million in patient fees and about $15 million in public tax funds, while grants from central community funds decreased by $0.5 million. Such communal grants accounted for 4.3 per cent of general hospital receipts in 1964.

A group of about 44 homes for the aged increased their income from service payments by about $5.4 million in this period. Family agencies doubled their income from service payments in this period (from $0.5 million to $1.0 million). Income from service payments and tax funds for child care agencies almost doubled (from $5.0 million to $9.1 million).

An analysis of allocations for local services by 92 communities over a five-year span (1960–1964) indicates significant changes: Both chest and federation grants rose at the same rate, 13 per cent. The Federation share of allocations was stabilized at about 60 per cent in 1960–64. There were sharp rises in allocations for care of the aged and recreational services, about 21 per cent since 1960. Allocations for Jewish education rose by 18 per cent, for family and child care by 16 per cent, and for vocational services and

29 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.
refugee service by about 10 per cent. Hospital allocations rose least of all, by one per cent.

A similar analysis for a full decade indicates that chest grants rose by 45 per cent since 1955, and federation grants by 41 per cent. The sharpest rises in the decade 1955–1964 were for care of the aged, 94 per cent; employment services, 67 per cent; centers, 71 per cent; Jewish education, 58 per cent; family and child care services, 55 per cent; and local community relations, 42 per cent. Allocations for refugee care fell by 54 per cent.

**Health**

Most local Jewish hospitals are in the largest centers of Jewish population. Fifteen of the 16 cities in the United States and Canada with more than 40,000 Jewish population have local Jewish hospitals; in the 15,000 to 40,000 population group, 8 out of 16 cities have local Jewish hospitals, with only 3 hospitals in smaller cities. As a result of this concentration of health services in the largest centers of Jewish population, local health allocations continued to average almost 30 per cent of total local allocations in these cities.

There were reports in 1964 of 19,264 beds and 1,825 bassinets in 63 general and special hospitals under local Jewish sponsorship. Federations and chests provided $13.3 million for 56 of these hospitals.

A total of 6.5 million days' care was provided in 1964 by 63 local (general and special) Jewish hospitals. Non-Jewish patients constituted 65 per cent of hospital admissions in 1964.

"Third Party" payments for service (Blue Cross, tax-support) have borne the major share of increases in recent years, while central grants from federations have been rising moderately in some communities and declining in others. Together with chest grants, they accounted for less than five per cent of operating receipts. Payments for hospital services (individual patient fees and Blue Cross insurance) and tax-support had risen to $258 million in 1964 in 56 hospitals, or about 86 per cent of operating receipts.

**Family and Child Care**

Family service agencies provide personal and family counseling, family-life education, psychiatric services, and a limited amount of economic aid. These activities are frequently conducted jointly with child-care programs and with refugee services. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most cities with a Jewish population of more than 5,000. As in the case of health programs, most services are provided on a local level, although there are several regional programs and one national home for asthmatic children.

In 1964, 76 family agencies reported a total of 64,186 open cases on their rolls. Although refugee cases constituted 18 per cent of all cases receiving financial assistance, they accounted for six per cent of all active cases. Refu-

---

30 The exception is Washington, D.C.
gee cases accounted for 34 per cent of financial assistance, with average monthly allowance of about $131 per case.

A total of 8,098 children were under care during 1964 in 47 child-care agencies for which data were available. About 31 per cent of children under care at the end of the year were in foster homes and 27 per cent in institutions; most of the remainder lived at home or with relatives.

Central communal allocations by federations and community chests for family and child-care services rose by 4.6 per cent in 1964. Such central allocations continued to account for about 80 per cent of total receipts for family agencies (including refugee service). Central allocations were 25 per cent of the receipts of child-care agencies. An additional 52 per cent was provided by public tax funds.

Refugees

These services in communities are financed locally, although they may be considered as extensions of an overseas problem. Post-war immigration to the United States began in volume late in 1946, reached its peak in 1949, and has declined since then except for brief upturns. There was a parallel decline in local refugee costs for most of these years. While refugee costs accounted for 5.4 per cent in local allocations in 1955, they accounted for only 1.7 per cent in 1964.

Because over half of the immigrants tend to settle in New York City, the largest share of refugee costs is borne by NYANA, financed by the national UJA. UHS seeks to encourage resettlement in other communities where the prospects for adjustment and self-support may be better than in New York City. When immigrants arrive in these cities, economic aid and counseling is provided through local refugee programs, generally administered by the Jewish family agencies. In such arrangements, there is a sharing of overhead costs by local agencies.

Centers, Camps, Youth Services

According to JWB, there were over 300 Jewish community centers with a membership of about 700,000 in 1963. About 32 per cent of members were under 14 years of age; 18 per cent were 14 to 24, and half were 25 years or older.

Estimated total community center expenditures in 1963 were about $30 million, compared with $28.7 million in 1962, exclusive of separate camping agencies. A decade earlier, in 1953, these expenditures had been $14.6 million, while the 1945 level had been $7.2 million for a smaller network of centers. Federation and chest allocations to centers and other recreational facilities rose by 5 per cent in 1964, and by 20 per cent in the five-year period 1960–1964 (a rise of 70 per cent since 1955).

Although center fees tend to be kept at a level judged low enough to admit all who seek to use the facilities, the share of center income derived from
fees, memberships, and other internal sources has increased in recent years. They rose from 49 per cent of center receipts in 1953 to 61 per cent in 1963, reflecting higher dues in new centers. Central community support from federations and community chests provided the balance of finances. Except for New York City (where minor chest support is secured); Baltimore, Boston, and six other important cities (where none is secured), and five other major cities (where lump-sum grants from chests do not involve earmarked center funds), chests generally provide greater support than federations.

Both sources of financing accounted for $9.9 million in 127 communities outside New York City.

**Homes for the Aged**

There were 68 homes for the aged, which reported 12,325 beds. They cared for 15,175 residents who received $4.2 million days’ care during 1964. This was a gain of 358 residents over 1963. Federations and chests provided 12 per cent of receipts, with 79 per cent secured from payments for service, including public funds. Federation allocations to homes for the aged had risen about 21 per cent between 1960 and 1964 (94 per cent since 1955), increasing steadily as the proportion of aged in the population continued to grow.

Receipts of $31.3 million were reported for 1964 by 52 homes; payments for service accounted for $20.3 million and public funds for $4.5 million. Federations and chests reported allocating $3.7 million to 52 homes (including over $2.9 million outside New York City). Fourteen homes received support from neither source.

**Jewish Education**

There was an estimated enrolment of 589,000 students in 1963,\(^{30a}\) with 90 per cent in congregational schools. Half of all students were attending Sunday schools, two-fifths were in afternoon schools, and less than 9 per cent in all-day schools. Recent estimates of the gross cost and major sources of income of the congregational schools are not available.

The AAJE *National Study of Jewish Education*, issued in 1959 (AJYB, 1960 [Vol. 61], pp. 127–149), arrived at an estimated cost of “over $60 million” in 1958 for 553,600 pupils. This estimate, in turn, was based on average costs in a number of cities totaling $46.5 million in 1956, which was increased to an estimated $60 million in 1958 on the basis of “general cost increases” and building-maintenance costs for congregational schools, which had not been included for estimates in cities outside New York City.

The exact extent of the rise in cost since 1958 is not known. However, enrolment in 1963 had risen by about 6 per cent. The consumer price index rose by another 9 per cent by the end of 1965.

On the basis of these indicators, the cost of Jewish education since 1958,

\(^{30a}\) *Jewish Education Register and Directory* (New York, American Association for Jewish Education, 1965).
when it was estimated at $60 million, may have risen more than $10 million. This estimate of "over $70 million" is of the grossest type and is advanced only in the absence of more reliable data from most of the congregational and other schools.

The major sources of support are congregational and parental. Variations in scales of tuition fees are frequently dependent on variations in benefits of congregational membership. "Scholarship" arrangements are made by both congregational and communal schools to avoid barring students from low income homes. Financing of Jewish education is inseparable from congregational financing because of joint housing, joint staffing, and the pivotal role of bar mitzvah preparation in Jewish education.

Jewish federations provide over $5.7 million annually for Jewish education. The total budgets of the agencies supported are not reported.\textsuperscript{31} Allocations to local Jewish schools and to bureaus of Jewish education, reported by Jewish federations, were $4.9 million outside New York City in 1964, a rise of 5 per cent in 1964. A gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education has occurred each year: they were 18 per cent higher in 1964 than they had been in 1959, and 58 per cent higher than in 1955. Major reliance is placed on payments by parents, either directly or through membership fees.

\textbf{Community Relations}

Organized programs designed to improve intergroup relations and to deal with specific instances of antisemitism exist primarily in the large and intermediate communities. Local activities financed by federations received about $932,000 in 1964 (outside New York City which is served mainly by national agencies)—a rise of 13 per cent since 1960 (42 per cent since 1955). Allocations in 1964 rose by 4 per cent.

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

\textbf{Employment and Vocational Services}

These programs are designed to assist Jews in finding employment and in guiding Jewish youth and others in the selection of trades and professions. Jewish vocational agencies or departments of Jewish family services operate mainly in the larger cities. Federations provided almost $2 million in 1964 (including New York City). Substantial and growing supplementary income

\textsuperscript{31} Note that it would be inaccurate to compare the Federation total of $5.7 million in allocations to the total of "over $70 million" for all costs of Jewish education since most congregational schools do not seek Federation support. Partial data for 21 cities indicate that schools with income of $4.3 million received $1.5 million from Federations. Bureaus of Jewish Education and teachers colleges received an even higher proportion of their income from Federations.
was received in recent years from government sources and service payments. Over $2.6 million in noncontributed income was identified in 1964. A complementary program is provided by a network of vocational service bureaus financed by the B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal (at a cost of almost $0.4 million in 1964).

Local allocations for vocational programs decreased by 3.0 per cent in 1963, mainly as a result of the transfer of one Jewish agency to nonsectarian auspices. The gain since 1958 was 15 per cent.

CHANGES IN FINANCING SINCE 1955

The major changes in federation and chest support of local Jewish services in the ten-year period 1955–1964 are briefly noted; only refugee costs fell by $0.7 million. The major rises were for:
- Recreational services, almost $3.9 million.
- Family and child care services, $3 million.
- Jewish education, almost $1.7 million.
- Care for the aged, almost $1.5 million.
- Hospitals, almost $0.7 million.
- Employment and vocational service, $0.5 million.
- Local community relations, almost $0.4 million.

Of total rises of about $11.1 million since 1955, chests provided about $4.7 million, and federations the balance of $6.4 million.

S. P. Goldberg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NYUJA</th>
<th>FIPNY</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$28,469</td>
<td>$6,644</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$12,644</td>
<td>$15,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>26,911</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>11,252</td>
<td>15,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28,152</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>6,364</td>
<td>11,334</td>
<td>16,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>29,249</td>
<td>4,671</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>11,745</td>
<td>17,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>34,935</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>6,628</td>
<td>13,578</td>
<td>21,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>46,984</td>
<td>9,184</td>
<td>9,673</td>
<td>18,857</td>
<td>28,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>56,898</td>
<td>12,180</td>
<td>9,778</td>
<td>21,958</td>
<td>34,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131,421</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>11,773</td>
<td>44,273</td>
<td>87,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>156,589</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>13,227</td>
<td>50,227</td>
<td>106,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200,721</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>13,157</td>
<td>65,157</td>
<td>135,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>159,330</td>
<td>40,250</td>
<td>12,118</td>
<td>52,368</td>
<td>106,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142,191</td>
<td>36,660</td>
<td>13,544</td>
<td>50,204</td>
<td>91,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136,035</td>
<td>34,562</td>
<td>13,625</td>
<td>48,187</td>
<td>87,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121,173</td>
<td>29,737</td>
<td>13,339</td>
<td>43,076</td>
<td>78,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>115,266</td>
<td>26,237</td>
<td>13,509</td>
<td>39,746</td>
<td>75,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>107,013</td>
<td>23,465</td>
<td>13,994</td>
<td>37,459</td>
<td>69,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110,127</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>15,332</td>
<td>40,532</td>
<td>69,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>130,493</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>15,584</td>
<td>47,884</td>
<td>82,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>138,078</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>15,197</td>
<td>48,197</td>
<td>89,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>123,328</td>
<td>28,078</td>
<td>16,891</td>
<td>44,969</td>
<td>78,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>130,702</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>17,211</td>
<td>47,211</td>
<td>83,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>127,679</td>
<td>28,881</td>
<td>17,458</td>
<td>46,429</td>
<td>81,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>125,613</td>
<td>28,054</td>
<td>17,705</td>
<td>45,759</td>
<td>79,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>129,436</td>
<td>27,905</td>
<td>17,304</td>
<td>45,209</td>
<td>84,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>125,487</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>17,584</td>
<td>44,584</td>
<td>80,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>126,662</td>
<td>26,062</td>
<td>18,333</td>
<td>44,395</td>
<td>82,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 1939–1965</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,920,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,033,234</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,887,708</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total 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 million in 1943, $13.5 million in 1945 and $16.5 million in 1949, and about $132 million in 1961–65 including government grants, other non-campaign income and endowment funds of beneficiary agencies. Also excludes most endowment funds and major capital fund raising by federations for local agencies outside New York City.

Provisional estimate based on incomplete results and on assumption that results for New York City will follow national trend in 1965. Excludes Israel Education Fund of the UJA with pledges of $9.6 million in 1965, of which $6.5 million was raised by NYUJA (in addition to $27.023 millions raised in 1965 by NYUJA in its annual campaign).
TABLE 1A. ESTIMATED ANNUAL LEVEL OF INCOME IN 1964 OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES IN U.S.  
(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds)</td>
<td>$126.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grants by United Funds and Community Chests</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies (including capital funds)</td>
<td>74.4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hospital Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>277.7e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Family Service Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Child Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jewish Vocational Service (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>3.0c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Aged Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Center Income (excluding 1 and 2)a</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jewish Education Income (excluding 1)b</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$680.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*a* Based on JWB estimate that 61 per cent of income comes from internal sources, and that estimated cost of all centers approximates $30.6 million.

*b* Based on revision of estimate in National Study of Jewish Education, less welfare fund allocations. See text.

*c* Understated: excludes some nonreporting hospitals and local vocational services.

*d* Major inclusions were Brandeis University $15.1 million; Hadassah $7.6 million; Einstein Medical Center $7.4 million; City of Hope $4.9 million; JTS $4.5 million; BBNYSA $2.9 million; National Jewish Hospital $2.9 million; JNF $2.6 million; American Friends of the Hebrew University $2.5 million; ADL $2.3 million, and AJCommittee $2.2 million.
### TABLE 2. STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS, 1951–1965

*(In millions of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cash Sales</th>
<th>Sales in United States</th>
<th>Sales Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incl. Conversions</td>
<td>$52.506</td>
<td>$0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951a (May 1–Dec. 31)</td>
<td>$52.647</td>
<td>$52.506</td>
<td>$0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>47.521</td>
<td>46.516</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>36.861</td>
<td>31.551</td>
<td>5.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>40.406</td>
<td>34.361</td>
<td>6.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>43.507</td>
<td>36.681</td>
<td>6.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>54.525</td>
<td>45.699</td>
<td>8.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>49.854</td>
<td>40.696</td>
<td>9.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>46.541</td>
<td>37.763</td>
<td>8.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>52.265</td>
<td>42.628</td>
<td>9.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>51.965</td>
<td>41.390</td>
<td>10.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>57.405</td>
<td>45.287</td>
<td>12.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>58.125</td>
<td>46.396</td>
<td>11.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>69.221</td>
<td>55.500</td>
<td>13.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>85.460</td>
<td>70.356</td>
<td>15.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>91.564</td>
<td>76.656</td>
<td>14.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$837.867</strong></td>
<td><strong>$703.986</strong></td>
<td><strong>$133.881</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Redemption of 12-year bonds issued in 1951 to 1955 began on May 1, 1963.*
TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION TO BENEFICIARIES OF FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS*

(ESTIMATES IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount Budgeted To BENEFICIARIES</th>
<th>1964 Total</th>
<th>1963 Total</th>
<th>New York Cityb</th>
<th>1964 Other Cities</th>
<th>1963 Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
<td>$101,944</td>
<td>$101,402</td>
<td>$32,010</td>
<td>$32,237</td>
<td>$69,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Estimates in millions of dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>58.505</td>
<td>58.360</td>
<td>16.978</td>
<td>17.148</td>
<td>41.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>55.760</td>
<td>55.618</td>
<td>16.600</td>
<td>16.800</td>
<td>39.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>2.746</td>
<td>2.743</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>2.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4.385</td>
<td>4.339</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>4.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.364</td>
<td>2.343</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

b Figures for New York include UJA of Greater New York and Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugee costs in New York City are borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of National UJA. Most overseas and domestic agencies which are normally included in welfare funds in other cities conduct their own campaigns in New York. The New York UJA included the following beneficiaries (in addition to the National UJA): UHS and JWB. Data for New York UJA based on estimates of distribution of 1963 and 1964 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash is received.

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

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

* Less than .05 of one per cent.

e NYANA is included in UJA totals.
### TABLE 3-A. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF (Excludes Total Under 5,000a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>Under 5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,933,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,164,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,559,364</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,007,117</td>
<td>3,991,212</td>
<td>487,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,363,673</td>
<td>2,342,577</td>
<td>192,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>43,878</td>
<td>50,144</td>
<td>25,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>457,884</td>
<td>460,679</td>
<td>59,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>290,660</td>
<td>308,896</td>
<td>130,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>851,022</td>
<td>828,916</td>
<td>78,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>22,042,085</td>
<td>21,820,340</td>
<td>1,267,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>667,190</td>
<td>707,885</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,684,188</td>
<td>1,430,123</td>
<td>92,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### New York City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5,000–15,000(^c)</th>
<th>15,000–40,000(^c)</th>
<th>40,000 and Over(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,714,359</td>
<td>$9,355,452</td>
<td>$9,061,355</td>
<td>$41,304,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,765,798</td>
<td>5,983,979</td>
<td>5,873,449</td>
<td>22,069,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,318,056</td>
<td>5,529,479</td>
<td>5,422,514</td>
<td>20,860,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447,742</td>
<td>454,500</td>
<td>450,935</td>
<td>1,209,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786,913</td>
<td>568,933</td>
<td>557,595</td>
<td>2,163,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417,558</td>
<td>359,126</td>
<td>352,115</td>
<td>1,394,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,642</td>
<td>3,298</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66,318</td>
<td>65,281</td>
<td>63,130</td>
<td>266,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135,787</td>
<td>17,907</td>
<td>22,815</td>
<td>5,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155,608</td>
<td>123,321</td>
<td>116,070</td>
<td>493,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,566,096</td>
<td>2,279,769</td>
<td>2,297,982</td>
<td>15,928,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64,038</td>
<td>108,934</td>
<td>88,439</td>
<td>494,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529,668</td>
<td>413,837</td>
<td>243,890</td>
<td>648,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{b}\) Includes small undistributed amounts.

\(\text{c}\) Jewish population.

\(\text{d}\) Less than .05 of one per cent.
TABLE 4. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND CHEST ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1964

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields Receiving Chest Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total                      | $43.6 | $14.5         | $29.1       |

Less: Provided by Chests (Exclusive of Administrative) | 17.3  | 2.3           | 15.0        |

Provided by Federations        | $26.3 | $12.2         | $14.1       |

Chest to Federation for Local Administration | $0.9  | $0.4          | $0.5        |

Fields Receiving Only Federation Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Services (incl. Free Loan)</th>
<th>$1.9</th>
<th>$0.6</th>
<th>$1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.8</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>Local Capital d</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                  | $56.6| $17.0| $39.6|

Provided by Federations                | $38.4| $14.3| $24.1|

Provided by Chests e                   | 18.2 | 2.7  | 15.5 |

Total a                                | $56.6| $17.0| $39.6|

* Excludes chest funds of about $0.9 million, mainly in Washington, D.C. and smaller cities; also excludes about $0.7 million in smaller cities provided by federations.

b Provided by NYANA, financed by UJA.

c Provided mainly by national agencies.

d Most capital campaigns excluded because conducted apart from annual campaign.

e Includes in N.Y.C. Greater New York Fund and Hospital Fund.
TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONSa (INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES, 1963, 1964

(Excludes New York City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,447,221</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>$7,505,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service...</td>
<td>8,160,372</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>8,539,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>9,479,139</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>9,948,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,013,832</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3,150,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1,268,778</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,304,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,667,898</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4,894,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>678,053</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>649,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>894,394</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>932,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>487,059</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>498,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for</td>
<td>485,142</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>495,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$36,581,888</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$37,917,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$21,842,862</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>$22,431,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>14,739,026</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>15,485,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of total administrative and fund-raising costs ($10,198,169 in 1963 and $10,448,139 in 1964) reported for these 127 cities. Federation allocations for administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund-raising costs cannot be segregated between local and nonlocal programs.
## TABLE 5-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS*, INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS, FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES
1963, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (127)</th>
<th>(61) Under 5,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>(40) 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>$7,447,221</td>
<td>$7,505,002</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$101,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>8,160,372</td>
<td>8,539,563</td>
<td>169,179</td>
<td>156,806</td>
<td>1,134,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>9,479,139</td>
<td>9,948,139</td>
<td>830,821</td>
<td>861,849</td>
<td>2,163,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,013,832</td>
<td>3,150,160</td>
<td>95,172</td>
<td>95,148</td>
<td>431,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,268,778</td>
<td>1,304,178</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>47,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,667,898</td>
<td>4,894,818</td>
<td>153,029</td>
<td>152,400</td>
<td>603,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>678,053</td>
<td>649,929</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>77,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>894,394</td>
<td>932,161</td>
<td>13,253</td>
<td>13,725</td>
<td>81,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>487,059</td>
<td>498,248</td>
<td>26,470</td>
<td>28,084</td>
<td>79,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local Administration&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>485,142</td>
<td>495,276</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>109,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,581,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,971,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,291,824</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,312,010</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,829,515</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$21,842,862</td>
<td>$22,431,787</td>
<td>$777,414</td>
<td>$810,786</td>
<td>$2,399,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>$14,739,026</td>
<td>$15,485,687</td>
<td>$514,410</td>
<td>$510,224</td>
<td>$2,430,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of administrative and fund-raising costs ($10,198,169 in 1963 and $10,448,139 in 1964) reported for these 127 cities. Federation allocations towards administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund-raising costs cannot be segregated between local and nonlocal programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Admin. &amp; Fund-Raising Costs</td>
<td>$10,198,169</td>
<td>$10,448,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>608,758</td>
<td>618,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–15,000</td>
<td>1,728,320</td>
<td>1,784,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000–40,000</td>
<td>1,478,385</td>
<td>1,502,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 &amp; Over</td>
<td>6,384,706</td>
<td>6,542,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>b</sup> Jewish population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (127)</th>
<th>(61) Under 5000b</th>
<th>(40) 5,000–15,000b</th>
<th>(14) 15,000–40,000b</th>
<th>(12) 40,000 and Overb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Services</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local Administration</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (127)</th>
<th>(61) Under 5000b</th>
<th>(40) 5,000–15,000b</th>
<th>(14) 15,000–40,000b</th>
<th>(12) 40,000 and Overb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 5-A, note a.

b Jewish population.
c Less than .05 of one per cent.
d Slight difference due to rounding.
TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 93 COMMUNITIES, 1960 THROUGH 1964  
(Amounts in millions of dollars)

|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                      | Amount| Per   | Amount| Per   | Amount| Per   | Amount| Per   | Amount| Per   | Index of
|                      |       | Cent  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | Change\(^d\)
| Health               | $7,441| 22.7  | $7,492| 22.1  | $7,812| 22.2  | $7,430| 20.8  | $7,488| 20.2  | 101.0  |
| Family and Child     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Service              | 7,225 | 22.1  | 7,388 | 21.8  | 7,719 | 22.0  | 7,996 | 22.4  | 8,366 | 22.6  | 116.1  |
| Centers, Camps, Youth|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Services             | 7,882 | 24.1  | 8,415 | 24.9  | 8,631 | 24.6  | 9,007 | 25.2  | 9,476 | 25.6  | 120.4  |
| Aged Care            | 2,521 | 7.7   | 2,750 | 8.1   | 2,722 | 7.8   | 2,918 | 8.2   | 3,047 | 8.2   | 121.1  |
| Employment and       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Guidance             | 1,190 | 3.6   | 1,270 | 3.7   | 1,307 | 3.7   | 1,269 | 3.5   | 1,304 | 3.5   | 109.9  |
| Jewish Education     | 4,143 | 12.7  | 4,294 | 12.7  | 4,515 | 12.9  | 4,631 | 12.9  | 4,866 | 13.1  | 117.8  |
| Refugee Care         | 0.583 | 1.8   | 0.566 | 1.7   | 0.666 | 1.9   | 0.674 | 1.9   | 0.648 | 1.7   | 111.1  |
| Community Relations  | 0.811 | 2.5   | 0.797 | 2.4   | 0.846 | 2.4   | 0.878 | 2.5   | 0.910 | 2.5   | 112.6  |
| Other                | 0.459 | 1.4   | 0.436 | 1.3   | 0.436 | 1.2   | 0.470 | 1.3   | 0.477 | 1.3   | 88.7   |
| Chest to Fed. Local  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Administration\(^b\) | 0.448 | 1.4   | 0.440 | 1.3   | 0.455 | 1.3   | 0.480 | 1.3   | 0.490 | 1.3   | 109.4  |
| **Total**            | $32,705| 100.0 | $33,847| 100.0 | $35,109| 100.0 | $35,752| 100.0 | $37,072| 100.0 | 113.4  |

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$19,414</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>$20,201</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>$21,108</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>$21,827</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>$22,005</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>13,291</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>13,646</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>14,001</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>13,925</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>15,067</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>113.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(^b\) Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs. The total chest participation in these costs represents about five per cent of total administrative costs for these cities.

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

\(^d\) During this period the United States consumer price index rose by 4.8 per cent.
### TABLE 6-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 92 COMMUNITIES, 1960, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(35) Under 5,000(^b)</th>
<th>(31) 5,000–15,000(^b)</th>
<th>(14) .15,000–40,000(^b)</th>
<th>(12) 40,000 and Over(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,441,272</td>
<td>$7,487,617</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>7,225,189</td>
<td>8,365,562</td>
<td>141,444</td>
<td>132,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td>7,882,438</td>
<td>9,476,360</td>
<td>596,961</td>
<td>689,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,520,971</td>
<td>3,047,431</td>
<td>68,596</td>
<td>81,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,190,036</td>
<td>1,304,178</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,143,399</td>
<td>4,865,735</td>
<td>144,770</td>
<td>136,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>583,011</td>
<td>647,929</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>459,040</td>
<td>476,691</td>
<td>24,672</td>
<td>25,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local</td>
<td>448,216</td>
<td>490,276</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$32,704,926</td>
<td>$37,072,194</td>
<td>$993,643</td>
<td>$1,080,337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

- **Federations**
  - $19,414,108
  - $22,005,160
  - $622,285
  - $660,241
  - $1,756,989
  - $2,062,188
  - $2,205,743
  - $2,379,453
  - $14,828,591
  - $16,903,278

- **Chests**
  - $13,290,818
  - $15,067,034
  - $370,858
  - $420,096
  - $2,015,063
  - $2,355,990
  - $2,473,467
  - $2,762,000
  - $8,431,430
  - $9,528,948

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

\(^b\) Jewish population.

\(^c\) See Table 6, note \(^b\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total (92)</th>
<th>(35)</th>
<th>(31)</th>
<th>(14)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22.7 / 20.2</td>
<td>e / e</td>
<td>2.3 / 2.0</td>
<td>12.6 / 8.2</td>
<td>29.1 / 26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>22.1 / 22.6</td>
<td>14.2 / 12.3</td>
<td>23.3 / 23.7</td>
<td>22.8 / 23.9</td>
<td>22.1 / 22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>24.1 / 25.6</td>
<td>60.1 / 63.8</td>
<td>43.4 / 44.8</td>
<td>31.4 / 33.2</td>
<td>18.0 / 19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>7.7 / 8.2</td>
<td>6.9 / 7.6</td>
<td>7.4 / 7.7</td>
<td>8.6 / 8.4</td>
<td>7.6 / 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.6 / 3.5</td>
<td>e / e</td>
<td>1.2 / 1.0</td>
<td>3.4 / 3.6</td>
<td>4.2 / 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.7 / 13.1</td>
<td>14.6 / 12.6</td>
<td>14.9 / 13.9</td>
<td>11.9 / 13.1</td>
<td>12.4 / 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.8 / 1.7</td>
<td>0.1 / 0.2</td>
<td>2.0 / 1.3</td>
<td>1.8 / 2.3</td>
<td>1.8 / 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.5 / 2.5</td>
<td>1.4 / 1.0</td>
<td>1.3 / 1.6</td>
<td>4.3 / 4.3</td>
<td>2.4 / 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4 / 1.3</td>
<td>2.5 / 2.4</td>
<td>1.6 / 1.5</td>
<td>0.4 / 0.3</td>
<td>1.5 / 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests to Fed. Local Admin.</td>
<td>1.4 / 1.3</td>
<td>0.1 / —</td>
<td>2.6 / 2.5</td>
<td>2.8 / 2.8</td>
<td>0.9 / 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0 / 100.0</td>
<td>100.0 / 100.0</td>
<td>100.0 / 100.0</td>
<td>100.0 / 100.0</td>
<td>100.0 / 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>59.4 / 59.4</td>
<td>62.7 / 61.1</td>
<td>46.6 / 46.7</td>
<td>47.1 / 46.3</td>
<td>63.8 / 63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>40.6 / 40.6</td>
<td>37.3 / 38.9</td>
<td>53.4 / 53.3</td>
<td>52.9 / 53.7</td>
<td>36.2 / 36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 6-A, note *.
* Jewish Population.
* Less than .05 of one per cent.
* See Table 6, note b.
* Slight difference due to rounding.
TABLE 6-C. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\textsuperscript{a} FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 88 COMMUNITIES, 1955, 1964

(Amounts in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Change 1955, 1964</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>1955=100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$ 6.840</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>$ 7.505</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>109.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>5.446</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>8.446</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>155.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td>5.555</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>9.475</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>170.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>193.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>166.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>4.791</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>157.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>141.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>143.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS\textsuperscript{c}</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26.049</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37.190</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>142.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

- **Federations** \textsuperscript{a} $15.610 59.9 $22.045 59.3 141.2
- **Chests** \textsuperscript{a} 10.438 40.1 15.145 40.7 145.1

\textsuperscript{a} Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.

\textsuperscript{b} Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs.

\textsuperscript{c} 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, 1964 AND 1963 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Federations and Welfare Funds* | Other Contributions | Other Income | Total |
| **United Jewish Appeal & Beneficiaries Agencies** | | | | | |
| United Jewish Appealb | $60,635,483 | $60,288,384 | $ | $ | $789,000 | $789,000 | $60,635,483 | $60,288,384 |
| American Jewish Joint Distribution Committeec | — | — | — | — | 2,306 | 1,550 | — | — |
| United Israel Appealc | — | — | — | — | 2,632,070 | 2,430,942 | — | — |
| Jewish National Fundc | — | — | — | — | 50,533 | 31,825 | — | — |
| New York Association for New Americansc | — | — | — | — | 1,457,878 | 1,370,256 | — | — |
| ORT—Women's Divisionc | — | — | — | — | 6,083 | — | — | — |
| _American ORT Federationc_ | — | — | — | — | 183,733 | 235,077 | — | — |
| **TOTAL UJA AND BENEFICIARIES** | $60,635,483 | $60,288,384 | $4,089,948 | $3,807,281 | $1,061,645 | $1,058,723 | $65,787,076 | $65,154,388 |
| **Other Overseas Agencies** | | | | | |
| American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Sciencea | $ | — | — | — | $1,087,737 | $1,035,361 | $1,090,921 | $1,348,397 |
| American Red Mogen Davide | — | — | — | — | 162,661 | 195,685 | — | — |
| University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appealf | 615,000 | 615,000 | — | — | 2,518,560 | 2,157,988 | 410,784 | 797,078 |
| American Friends of the Hebrew University | — | — | — | — | 1,181,324 | 1,543,275 | 788,345 | 531,384 |
| American Technion Societyg | — | — | — | — | 1,629,103 | 1,342,938 | 1,043 | 4,367 |
| America-Israel Cultural Foundation | 8,536 | 8,501 | 219,309 | 215,765 | 12,669 | 10,515 | 240,743 | 235,081 |
| _Federated Council of Israel Institutions_ | 94,963 | 100,731 | — | — | 50,211 | 49,236 | — | — |
| Hadassahh | 544,852 | 540,703 | 7,611,338 | 8,020,484 | 2,104,264 | 1,713,218 | 10,260,457 | 10,274,405 |
| _Jewish Telegraphic Agency_ | 142,286 | 130,148 | 10,760 | 17,354 | 174,723 | 152,454 | 327,769 | 299,956 |
| National Committee for Labor Israelk | 235,954 | 255,550 | 1,547,121 | 1,592,104 | — | — | 1,806,075 | 1,874,575 |
| National Council of Jewish Womenl | 25,000 | 25,000 | 599,470 | 593,682 | 259,979 | 260,491 | 884,449 | 879,173 |
| Pioneer Women Organization | 20,001 | 21,000 | 953,499 | 970,639 | 125,964 | 148,212 | 1,099,463 | 1,139,851 |
| United Irish Servicec, k | 993,640 | 952,729 | 153,032 | 143,659 | 639,042 | 438,417 | 1,785,714 | 1,534,805 |
| World Jewish Congressk | 2,625 | 1,515 | 102,406 | 78,653 | — | — | 105,031 | 80,168 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | $2,895,215 | $2,892,923 | $17,826,734 | $17,956,823 | $5,607,734 | $5,404,533 | $26,329,683 | $26,233,929 |
| **TOTAL OVERSEAS** | $63,530,698 | $63,180,957 | $21,916,682 | $21,764,104 | $6,669,379 | $6,463,256 | $92,116,759 | $91,408,317 |

* Including joint community appeals.

b Cash received in each calendar year.

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

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

* Excludes contributions and earnings of investment fund.

f Includes Swope endowment fund.

g Excludes grants from other organizations.

h Amounts raised for JNF are excluded. Hadassah "other income" includes membership dues, shekels and Zion youth funds.

i Excludes overseas income and income from CJMCAG, but includes UHS income for NYUJA.

j Excludes overseas income.

k CJFWF estimate.
<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>Joint Defense Appeal</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$47,468</td>
<td>$66,266</td>
<td>$588,554</td>
<td>$470,746</td>
<td>$879,658</td>
<td>$713,842</td>
<td>$1,107,266</td>
<td>78,468</td>
<td>93,4687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee</td>
<td>1,163,756</td>
<td>717,604</td>
<td>2,194,177e</td>
<td>1,806,688e</td>
<td>417,538</td>
<td>477,845</td>
<td>587,858</td>
<td>407,078</td>
<td>2,995,038</td>
<td>2,210,156</td>
<td>1,106,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
<td>1,119,600</td>
<td>690,926</td>
<td>2,342,520e</td>
<td>2,005,071e</td>
<td>246,133</td>
<td>210,156</td>
<td>378,423</td>
<td>382,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
<td>401,553</td>
<td>407,672</td>
<td>471,080</td>
<td>388,572</td>
<td>36,132</td>
<td>27,033</td>
<td>423,021</td>
<td>437,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>198,222</td>
<td>206,517</td>
<td>168,667</td>
<td>203,695</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>214,539</td>
<td>199,947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans</td>
<td>124,310</td>
<td>129,414</td>
<td>5,508</td>
<td>248,605</td>
<td>230,729</td>
<td>378,423</td>
<td>382,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Relations Advisory Council</td>
<td>175,211</td>
<td>163,835</td>
<td>9,611</td>
<td>29,717*</td>
<td>29,612*</td>
<td>214,539</td>
<td>199,947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$3,213,652</td>
<td>$2,760,968</td>
<td>$5,293,031</td>
<td>$5,075,129</td>
<td>$1,586,679</td>
<td>$1,466,121</td>
<td>$10,039,362</td>
<td>$9,302,218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare Agencies</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>American Medical Center at Denver</td>
<td>$6,883</td>
<td>$7,180</td>
<td>$1,037,319</td>
<td>$851,151</td>
<td>$526,426</td>
<td>$214,053</td>
<td>$1,570,628</td>
<td>$1,073,048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope</td>
<td>6,534</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>4,934,650</td>
<td>4,997,370</td>
<td>2,320,019</td>
<td>2,141,616</td>
<td>7,261,203</td>
<td>7,145,612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Patients Sanitarium</td>
<td>3,000e</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>90,000e</td>
<td>89,805</td>
<td>5,000e</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>98,000e</td>
<td>97,891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>42,502</td>
<td>43,058</td>
<td>249,600</td>
<td>228,624</td>
<td>292,620</td>
<td>276,921</td>
<td>584,722</td>
<td>548,603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Home for Asthmatic Children (Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital)</td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>7,843</td>
<td>739,117</td>
<td>791,339</td>
<td>394,208</td>
<td>320,344</td>
<td>1,140,020</td>
<td>1,119,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospitals</td>
<td>24,544</td>
<td>24,141</td>
<td>2,866,638</td>
<td>2,484,252</td>
<td>1,376,913</td>
<td>1,240,405</td>
<td>4,268,095</td>
<td>3,748,798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$90,158</td>
<td>$92,222</td>
<td>$9,917,324</td>
<td>$9,443,205</td>
<td>$4,915,186</td>
<td>$4,198,051</td>
<td>$14,922,668</td>
<td>$13,733,478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service Agencies</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>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$98,241</td>
<td>$90,121</td>
<td>$62,031</td>
<td>$57,675</td>
<td>$58,726</td>
<td>$67,112</td>
<td>$218,998</td>
<td>$214,908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>20,610</td>
<td>20,391</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>12,157</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>34,540</td>
<td>27,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>8,455</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>9,308</td>
<td>9,530</td>
<td>25,278</td>
<td>20,958</td>
<td>43,041</td>
<td>39,068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board</td>
<td>1,275,834</td>
<td>1,220,000</td>
<td>61,336</td>
<td>43,157</td>
<td>147,315</td>
<td>175,277</td>
<td>1,484,485</td>
<td>1,438,434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>17,827</td>
<td>13,504</td>
<td>49,393</td>
<td>49,748</td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>74,054</td>
<td>69,822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$1,420,967</td>
<td>$1,352,596</td>
<td>$183,841</td>
<td>$161,405</td>
<td>$250,310</td>
<td>$275,267</td>
<td>$1,855,118</td>
<td>$1,789,268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Agencies</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>American Academy for Jewish Research</td>
<td>$4,620</td>
<td>$3,809</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
<td>$22,391</td>
<td>$4,450</td>
<td>$4,489</td>
<td>$29,570</td>
<td>$30,689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society</td>
<td>7,290</td>
<td>9,637</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>91,290</td>
<td>89,576</td>
<td>99,601</td>
<td>100,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>5,067</td>
<td>10,772</td>
<td>10,783</td>
<td>296,436</td>
<td>285,975</td>
<td>3,721,605</td>
<td>3,593,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>15,087,907</td>
<td>9,267,536</td>
<td>8,797,652</td>
<td>7,776,144</td>
<td>23,886,859</td>
<td>17,046,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social Studies</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>5,363</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>21,398</td>
<td>17,045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>69,440</td>
<td>9,524</td>
<td>1,062,771</td>
<td>892,409</td>
<td>1,133,234</td>
<td>903,825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsee College</td>
<td>43,103</td>
<td>43,696</td>
<td>30,836</td>
<td>38,609</td>
<td>92,948</td>
<td>97,071</td>
<td>166,887</td>
<td>179,376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadrut Ivrit</td>
<td>20,906</td>
<td>19,285</td>
<td>109,462</td>
<td>114,025</td>
<td>91,010</td>
<td>97,891</td>
<td>221,378</td>
<td>231,174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>14,522</td>
<td>12,940</td>
<td>71,885</td>
<td>63,591</td>
<td>50,046</td>
<td>33,297</td>
<td>136,453</td>
<td>109,828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>252,419</td>
<td>222,256</td>
<td>20,191</td>
<td>10,967</td>
<td>281,325</td>
<td>241,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Society</td>
<td>12,699</td>
<td>15,976</td>
<td>29,852</td>
<td>26,584</td>
<td>466,808</td>
<td>600,060</td>
<td>509,359</td>
<td>642,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>45,263</td>
<td>45,189</td>
<td>30,923</td>
<td>20,084</td>
<td>79,716</td>
<td>68,638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture</td>
<td>80,463</td>
<td>86,018</td>
<td>23,595</td>
<td>36,242</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>103,810</td>
<td>122,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>40,707</td>
<td>92,095</td>
<td>101,464</td>
<td>50,318</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>185,370</td>
<td>143,367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
<td>31,278</td>
<td>31,673</td>
<td>336,963</td>
<td>340,423</td>
<td>445,784</td>
<td>494,171</td>
<td>814,025</td>
<td>866,267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** | $778,656 | $790,398 | $19,118,601 | $13,109,663 | $11,521,465 | $10,424,418 | $31,418,722 | $24,324,479 |

**Religious Agencies**

| Beth Jacob Schools and Hebrew Teachers College | $23,608 | $20,940 | $284,767 | $259,427 | $137,355 | $100,933 | $445,730 | $381,300 |
| Beth Medrash Govohal | 5,920 | 5,232 | 533,188 | 586,437 | 1,181 | — | 540,289 | 591,669 |
| Reform Jewish Appeal | 87,442 | 105,187 | 689,613 | 765,777 | 1,912,333 | 1,757,146 | 2,689,588 | 2,628,110 |
| Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion | | | | | | | | |
| Union of American Hebrew Congregations | 85,501 | 91,341 | 4,491,199 | 4,502,343 | 1,770,100 | 747,168 | 6,346,800 | 5,340,852 |
| Jewish Theological Seminary | | | | | | | | |
| United Synagogue of America | | | | | | | | |
| Jewish University of America | 24,778 | 27,770 | 218,096 | 250,683 | 149,453 | 145,614 | 392,327 | 424,067 |
| Mirra Yeshiva Central Institute | 4,089 | 4,488 | 284,309 | 223,066 | 135,717 | 66,598 | 388,115 | 293,872 |
| Mizrachi Hapoel Hamizrachi (National Council for Torah Education) | 1,341 | 1,648 | 28,292 | 22,741 | 2,039 | 1,830 | 32,309 | 26,219 |
| Rabbi Chaim Berlin, Yeshiva and Mesilta | 9,361 | 11,336 | 151,139 | 147,019 | 1,172,800 | 119,002 | 292,880 | 277,357 |
| Rabbinical College of Telechim | 8,605 | 6,886 | 473,648 | 492,313 | 1,326,313 | 1,616,652 | 292,309 | 643,905 | 781,408 |
| Rabbinical Seminary of America | 13,739 | 14,240 | 156,672 | 142,327 | 213,931 | 213,931 | 403,342 | 362,138 |
| Torah Umesorah | 6,177 | 5,035 | 140,921 | 131,831 | 28,521 | 25,545 | 175,619 | 162,411 |
| Yeshiva Torah Vodaath | 32,297 | 30,756 | 585,182 | 534,268 | 1,054,194 | 653,665 | 1,644,673 | 1,027,689 |
| Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations | 2,234 | 2,465 | 316,272 | 256,341 | 438,252 | 413,252 | 756,758 | 679,958 |
| United Lubavitch Yeshivot | 19,243 | 16,243 | 540,203 | 464,650 | 729,721 | 573,360 | 632,417 | 538,343 |
| Yeshiva University—Medical School | 68,563 | 81,525 | 744,775 | 592,354 | 21,973,567 | 18,232,050 | 7,718,888 | 5,840,538 |

**Sub-Total** | $392,898 | $424,792 | $18,025,293 | $16,350,736 | $29,726,346 | $24,592,961 | $48,144,537 | $41,368,469 |

**Total Domestic** | $5,896,331 | $5,420,976 | $52,484,090 | $44,140,138 | $47,999,896 | $40,956,818 | $106,380,407 | $90,517,932 |

**Total Overseas and Domestic** | $69,427,029 | $68,601,933 | $74,400,772 | $65,904,242 | $54,669,365 | $47,420,074 | $198,497,166 | $181,926,249 |

---

* Figures for 1964 and 1965 are not comparable.*

1. Figures are for the fiscal years ending June 30 of the years indicated.
2. Income from centers included in federation income.
3. Excludes grants from CJMCA and from National Foundation for Jewish Culture.
4. Includes independent appeals in welfare fund cities: about $400,000 annually for AJCommittee, $525,000 for ADL in 1964, and $525,000 for ADL in 1963. On allocations made, AJCommittee received $770,000 in 1963 and $775,000 in 1964; ADL received $986,000 in 1963 and $925,000 in 1964.
5. Includes overseas income.
6. Represents dues from national agencies.
7. On an allocations basis, former JDA agencies together received about $45,000 more in 1964 than in 1963. For year-to-year comparability, subtract about $425,000 from 1964 totals in welfare fund column.
8. CFJWF estimate.
9. Includes building fund.
Jewish Education in Camping

JEWISH EDUCATORS have been considering every medium of education which may further the efforts of the American Jewish community to imbue youth with creative Jewish values. For this reason the Jewish summer camp, whose potentialities as an important instrument for Jewish education have long been recognized, is now receiving increasing attention. Properly organized, financed, programmed, and staffed, they can advance Jewish educational aims. Yet only relatively few camps are sponsored by Jewish communal organizations. The vast majority of American Jewish campers attend private camps where there is little, if any, stress on Jewish living.

The American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE), cognizant of the growing demand for an emphasis on education in Jewish camping, sent a questionnaire in the summer of 1963 to more than 100 camps, not including private camps. Replies were received from 61. AAJE invited this writer (who is working on a dissertation on the subject for the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Studies and has studied intensively some 70 Jewish summer camps) to analyze the responses and to prepare a preliminary statement. It should be noted that the information gathered from the AAJE study is limited. More than anything else, it indicates the great desirability of additional data.

Need

It is estimated that over 80 per cent of American Jewish children receive some Jewish education in the course of their elementary-school attendance.* More than half of these attend a one-day-a-week school for approximately 3 hours a week, 35 weeks a year, and, if they continue through confirmation, ultimately will have had a total of approximately 840 hours of formal Jewish study. Forty per cent attend an elementary Jewish religious school for approximately 5½ hours per week, 34 weeks a year, for about 4 years. Since more than 85 per cent of this group terminate their schooling at the time of bar mitzvah or bat mitzvah, their hours of formal Jewish study come to fewer than 1,000. In this period the school provides a curriculum of 18 courses of study, including language, customs and ceremonies, history, Bible, current events, and holiday observances.

Such conditions make adequate instruction virtually impossible. But the schools are faced with still other problems, such as a shortage of trained teachers, parental apathy, increasing hours of public-school education and

homework loads, competition from music and dancing lessons, and lack of
strong motivation on the part of students. As a result, even the best of these
schools can provide only an elementary Jewish education, and the large ma-
majority of Jewish children gain but a childish understanding of themselves as
Jews and of their culture and heritage.

The importance of the Jewish-sponsored summer camp lies in the fact that
it controls the child’s environment for 24 hours a day, 8 weeks a year, and in
this time can provide more experience of Jewish living than an entire school
year of class instruction. A good camp can create a Jewish atmosphere, im-
part knowledge, motivate commitment to a Jewish way of life, and demon-
strate the relevance of Judaism to the child’s experience.

History

Jewish summer camps began to appear at the turn of the century. The 61
camps reporting to the AAJE questionnaire were founded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900 – 1929</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930 – 1939</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 – 1949</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 – 1959</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 – 1964</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The early camps were primarily philanthropic, organized to give city chil-
dren an opportunity to spend some time in the country. Several pioneer edu-
cational camps, such as Cejwin and Modin, were also organized during this
period, as were Yiddish-speaking camps (in the early 1920s). During the
depression of the 1930s some of the camps were closed and relatively few
new ones were established. The Zionist and Jewish Center camps began their
full development in the late 1930s. Hebrew-speaking camps and camps spon-
sored by the denominational groupings were established later. Fifty per cent
of the Jewish camps were organized between 1940 and 1960.

Types of Camps

Jewish camps are divided into 9 categories, according to institutional
sponsorship:

1. Federation of Jewish philanthropies
2. Jewish Center
3. Non-“denominational” educational
4. Yiddishist
5. Zionist
6. Philanthropic (sponsored by a private philanthropic organization or an
   institution set up specifically for this purpose)
7. Denominational (Orthodox, Conservative, Reform)
8. Hebrew-speaking or Hebrew-centered (duplicated in other categories)
9. Private commercial, catering to Jewish children exclusively (not included in this report).

Several camps could fit in two or more categories, e.g., some Center camps which also receive financial support from federations, and, in one case, from a B’nai B’rith region.

Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of these camps vary with the sponsoring organizations. In the main, federation camps seem to be intended primarily for children whose families cannot ordinarily pay. Typical stated aims of such camps were “to provide an experience in camping within the philosophic framework of the Jewish community Centers” and “to serve different economic, ethnic, and religious clienteles . . . [and] to help each camper become aware of his own potential and his own cultural background.”

The Yiddishist camps, organized to provide an environment in keeping with the philosophy of the parent body—Yiddish culturist or Zionist with Yiddish cultural concerns—have deviated considerably from their original purposes. Among the aims, as now stated by some of these camps, are “to give effective expression to the camper’s consciousness of Jewish belonging and transform this feeling into meaningful activities” and “to provide Zionist and American-Jewish indoctrination.” There was no mention of Yiddish.

Most of the Zionist camps try to provide an Israel-centered environment by simulating Israeli settlements. Their purpose, as one camp stated, is “to bring Jewish youth closer to their Jewish heritage and identification with Israel.” This is accomplished by giving campers a knowledge of Jewish history and contemporary Israeli culture through songs, dances, and the like.

The denominational camps, each serving almost exclusively the children of its own movement, may be described as educational and language- and religion-centered. Among their goals were to supplement the programs of their religious schools and youth groups and “to give each camper a direct personal experience in Jewish living.”

Thus it may be said that whereas philanthropic, Center, and federation camps stress the social and physical growth of the camper, denominational, Zionist, and educational camps emphasize his Jewish cultural and religious development.

Campers

Over the years hundreds of thousands of Jewish children have attended such camps. A Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) study of 115 camps under Jewish communal and organization auspices indicated that more than 54,000 children attended them some part of the summer of 1964. In the summer of 1963 more than 20,000 campers spent varying amounts of time at the 61
camps participating in the AAJE study. The campers ranged in age from 8 to 16, with most between 10 and 13—not yet bar mitzvah or bat mitzvah and in elementary or junior high school.

Most camps permitted campers to enroll for less than a full season, and in such camps the average stay was 3 weeks. However, 83 per cent of the Conservative camps insisted on the full 8 weeks; of federation camps, 40 per cent, and of Zionist camps, 37 per cent.

Facilities

Most of the Jewish summer camps were owned by their sponsoring organization. (Of the 18 Center camps, 5 were rented.) The total property value of the camps responding to the AAJE questionnaire was estimated to be in excess of $15 million. (The writer has visited camps each representing a value of more than $1.5 million.)

Almost all camps met the minimum requirements for physical facilities, camp sites, and equipment set up by the American Camping Association (ACA) in 1940. (This assumption is based on claims of ACA membership by a large proportion of the camps.) Their size depended upon their sites and their philosophy of camping. A number of smaller camps had land for expansion, but believed in principle that good group living requires limited size. The average boys' camp in the AAJE study could accommodate 141 campers and had an aggregate of 197 campers during the 1963 season; the average girls' camp, with accommodations for 139, an aggregate of 183.

Costs

Fees for the average non-philanthropic camp were high—the average minimum weekly charge was $66.67, and the maximum $71.28. The Orthodox-sponsored camps generally had the lower weekly rates, usually between $39 and $43, and the Conservative-sponsored had the highest, with an average minimum weekly charge of $72 and a maximum of $77.

Most camps offered scholarship assistance, based primarily on financial need. Ninety-two per cent provided their own scholarships, and most were also able to refer their prospective campers to additional sources of assistance. Many congregations, in particular, were generous in providing scholarships to children of members attending their own denominational camps. In some instances the congregation also subsidized its children attending educational, language, or Zionist camps.

Camps without scholarships were 50 per cent of the Yiddish, 29 per cent of the Zionist, and 20 per cent of the Reform.

Communal Support

Fifty-six per cent of the camps reported that they received communal subsidies in the form of direct allocations from federations and welfare funds
and of contributions by individuals, organizations, or institutions. These funds were used for operational costs and the improvement of facilities. None of the specifically Jewish educational, language, or religion-centered camps received any support from central communal funds. On the other hand, all federation and Orthodox camps indicated such support.

Program

For an appraisal of the extent of specifically Jewish activities in the camps, the AAJE questionnaire listed various camp activities, such as drama, films, song and dance, storytelling, discussion of current events, and group discussions. It asked the directors to indicate whether or not these activities were a part of the camp program in the "general" and/or "Jewish" area. The denominational camps indicated Jewish-oriented activities. Among these, however, the Orthodox, sponsored by yeshivot and similar traditional groups, failed to answer positively in either area, since their activities fell into the category of formal studies rather than what is generally meant by camp activities. A majority of the remaining Jewish camps answered "general" to most of the activities suggested. The Center, privately-sponsored philanthropic, and most Yiddish camps indicated more "general" than "Jewish" activities, while the federation, educational, Zionist, and denominational camps showed the reverse.

Unfortunately, the questionnaire was not detailed enough to make valid generalizations possible. (The writer's personal visits to 70 different camps in the past three years give him reason to believe that the replies to the questionnaire should not be taken at face value.) It may be true that a camp had group discussions on Jewish current events; but how often? Who was the discussion leader? Was he sufficiently versed in Jewish affairs to conduct such discussions? Again, most of the camps claimed that they taught Jewish songs; but how many; in what language; how often? Was there a staff member who knew about Jewish music? Similarly in arts and crafts: in most camps, undoubtedly, some Jewish objects were created as a part of the general art program, but, on the whole the arts-and-crafts teachers lacked the kind of Jewish background needed for a Jewish-oriented program in art education.

The writer visited a camp, a recipient of Jewish communal funds, which was doing an excellent job in general camping. The professional staff used "themes" under which various camp activities could be integrated: the dramatic groups would prepare a play; the scenery would be made in arts and crafts; the music counsellor would teach the songs; the dance instructor would prepare appropriate choreography. That summer the themes were "When Knighthood Was in Flower," "Greek Mythology," and "The American Indian." When asked why no Jewish theme was included, the director replied that his staff did not have the required knowledge. This very camp stated in the AAJE questionnaire that it was conducting Jewish activities.
Kashrut and Sabbath

Food was generally adequate and nutritious, but 29 per cent of the camps receiving communal funds did not observe kashrut. Since children from homes where kashrut is observed are unlikely to attend camps that are not kosher, non-kosher camps supported by the Jewish community discriminate against a sizable number of Jewish children. Only by recognizing the importance of serving kosher food can they assume that they are not arbitrarily turning away Jewish children who would like to attend.

And so with the Sabbath. A Jewish institution, communally supported and serving the entire community, must set certain minimum standards for observing the Sabbath. How is the Sabbath greeted? What kind of clothing does the camper wear? What kind of food is served? Are there services, and do the campers participate? Is there a study period? Is Sabbath activity distinct from that on the other days of the week? Are adults allowed to smoke in camp buildings? No Jewish child should be kept away from a communally supported camp because of his religious convictions.

Only 58 per cent of the camps in the AAJE study, including all educational and denominational camps, reported Sabbath observance. More camps (81 per cent) indicated some form of Oneg Shabbat ("Joy of the Sabbath"—usually a cultural or musical program) than Sabbath services (71 per cent). Daily services were held in 32 per cent of the camps.

Personnel

Directors often complained about a negative attitude of their staff toward Jewish matters and called it a major deterrent to introducing Jewish programming. However, the forms provided by Jewish camps for applicants for camp positions showed little interest in the Jewish background of their staff. Many of the federation and Center camps, receiving the greatest Jewish-community financial support, showed no definite standards for the Jewish education and commitment of staff: JWB did not ask for such information and only two of the 18 Center camps mentioned even the desirability of Jewish training for staff. In fact, often the counsellor is seen as a sort of baby-sitter, or major emphasis is placed on his so-called camping skills, such as swimming and baseball. As a result, high-school graduates or first-year college students make up the majority of the counsellors, and some are as young as 16 and 17. Clearly, a capacity to help in developing values, guiding emotions, and dealing with questions of human relations is rarely considered in choosing staff.

The exceptions were the denominational, Zionist, and educational camps having positive and more intensive Jewish programs. The Conservative camps required Jewish background and commitment from staff. In the educational camps the top staff usually had excellent Jewish backgrounds, and Jewish education was stressed as a requirement also for positions of counsellor or below; but commitment was not clearly defined. In Zionist camps Jewish
background and commitment were required of the director and assistant di-
rector.

Often these camps could not find qualified staff to handle their Jewish
programs. Directors repeatedly pointed to the lack of "availability of person-
nel who have the knowledge and personality to transmit the important basic
values of Judaism and who are themselves reasonably good examples of well-
adjusted human beings." Some even found "considerable evidence of Jewish
self-hatred" among staff, a feeling of discomfort "about anything Jewish,
whether it is in discussion, observance, or language," or a rejection of "any
type of Jewish programming as religious indoctrination." As a perceptive di-
rector summed it up: "The major problem in implementing the Jewish edu-
cational goals of our camp is the resistance frequently encountered among
our counsellors—young Jewish adults, many of whom have not as yet re-
solved their own attitudes and feelings regarding their Jewishness."

Hebrew teachers' colleges generally do not offer special courses in camp-
ing, though a few have brief workshops or orientation sessions. Schools of
social work and Centers and similar organizations providing staff for their
camps make almost no provision for such training. A cooperative effort is
needed for solving the problem of recruiting staff with an adequate Jewish
grounding.

Is the Jewish Camp Properly Exploited?

From the point of view of Jewish continuity and the financial investment
of the Jewish community in its educational enterprises, the salient question
is whether or not the camp is exploited as a vehicle of Jewish education. Does
the community recognize sufficiently the purposes and potentialities of Jew-
ish camping? Are camps in which the community has invested meeting their
obligation? Is there any real cooperation among the various camps and camp
directors—a sharing of knowledge, planning, facilities, and resources? Is the
parent made sufficiently aware of the important educational role the camp
can play? Is there rapport between the Jewish school and the Jewish camp?

Educational, Zionist, and denominational camps are committed to teaching
Jewish values as an integral part of a general camping program. But too
many of the other Jewish camps have no such philosophical commitment.
Some camp directors question the place of Jewish programming, asserting
that camping is intended solely for recreational, leisure-time group experi-
ences. The assumption here is that Jewish living and culture, and therefore
Jewish programming and study, are burdensome and that children (and
staff) are entitled to be "liberated" during the summer. This attitude vitiates
efforts to teach our children that being a Jew and living as one is a natural
and continuing state, and a desirable pattern of life in our American pluralis-
tic society for 365 days a year, summer as well as winter. Our children are
not or should not be fragmented human beings, Jews only on certain occa-
sions—in religious school, on the Sabbath and holidays—and something else
the rest of the time.
A second assumption is that Jewish education is narrow and is defined only in ritual terms. Clearly, the broad aims and objectives of Jewish education are unknown to those camp directors who feel that the problem does not concern them, since their aims are "not primarily toward a Jewish education." Too often, the concept of Jewish programming is reflected only in the inclusion of some sort of attenuated Sabbath service and, possibly, a kosher kitchen. This is particularly true of federation, philanthropic, and Center camps. The idea that the totality of Jewish experience, cultural as well as religious, should permeate the camp program is not recognized by many camp directors because they are themselves somewhat lacking in Jewish knowledge and commitment.

What can be done in Jewish camping is dramatically demonstrated in Cejwin, Ramah, Massad, and some of the Zionist camps, where the leadership and staff are committed. These camps fill the void between June and September, when whatever a child may have learned during the formal Hebrew-school year is usually unlearned. What is even more important, these camps fill an emotional void. A Tish'ah be-Av program in a Habonim camp like Galil, or taking part in a play with a Jewish theme in Cejwin, can be an experience that no amount of formal study duplicates. The tranquillity and repose of the Sabbath in Ramah create an atmosphere and spirit which the camper may carry with him for the entire year, and the Havdalah service near the lake demonstrates the concept of "distinguishing between Sabbath and week days."

Children who have been to these camps have been attesting to the impact of their summer experience on their lives. It has even influenced many in their choice of a vocation.

But Jewish programming should not be limited to the Hebrew, educational, or Zionist camps, since the overwhelming majority of Jewish children will be attending other camps. We are members of a pluralistic society who wish to retain our identity as Jews and promote creative Jewish living in America. To that end good camps can make an important contribution. Unfortunately, some of the best camps, such as the denominational, tend to foster unnecessary differences within the community rather than to promote unity. In general, the findings of the initial study by the American Association for Jewish Education indicate that serious planning and the utilization of all educational facilities are needed to achieve the desired results.

Daniel Isaacman
The United States, Israel, and the Middle East

Events in the Middle East during 1965 tested United States relations with several countries and forced a reappraisal of traditional American policies on arms and aid.

At the beginning of the year, it seemed that the basic American interests—preservation of peace, prevention of Communist penetration, and maintenance of United States influence—were being threatened on all sides. But in the succeeding months the United Arab Republic tempered its militant stand and a tenuous truce was reached in the Yemen civil war (p. 425). A major Arab-Israeli clash over the Jordan waters was averted, Arab marauders into Israel were curbed, and the Arab League’s plans to “liberate Palestine” deferred (p. 418). The Soviet Union’s East German protégé failed to win formal Arab diplomatic recognition (p. 417), the radical revolutionary camp lost a militant spokesman with the overthrow of Ahmed Ben Bella in Algeria, and Communist China was rebuffed. Pro-Western elements, encouraged by the successful examples of President Habib Bourguiba in Tunisia, King Hussein of Jordan, and King Faisal in Saudi Arabia, increased their relative strength within the Arab world.

At year’s end clandestine local Communist movements were being suppressed with renewed vigor even in some of the more radical Arab states. In December, 11 Communist leaders of a pro-Peking faction were indicted in Cairo for plotting to overthrow the regime of President Gamal Abdul Nasser, and the secret central committee headquarters of the Iraqi Communist party were raided and 50 of its leaders arrested. Also in December, the Sudanese parliament in Khartoum outlawed the Communist party and ousted its 11 deputies.

Faced with growing economic difficulties, the Egyptian government imposed austerity measures in October, admitted that doctrinaire Arab socialism had failed to root out bureaucratic inefficiency, and launched a campaign to attract American investment. Similar moves to encourage foreign capital and to reconsider “unwise and hasty” socialist measures were announced in Baghdad by Abdel Rahman al-Bazzaz, who in September became Iraq’s first civilian prime minister since the revolution in July 1958. In October Bazzaz took advantage of the opening of the UN General Assembly to visit the United States, where he expressed a desire for improved relations.

However, there was no improvement in unstable Syria’s attitude to the United States, which continued to be marked by insult and invective, as rival factions in the Syrian army and the Ba’ath contended for power (p. 421).

In its relations with the non-Arab states of the region, the United States showed its commitment to Israel’s independence, security, and development
in various ways, and although Washington and Jerusalem did not always agree on the practical measures required, the ongoing discussions continued in a friendly atmosphere. Iran remained pro-Western, and the Shah joined the outspoken critics of Nasser. Turkey maintained its ties to the West, but the Cyprus dispute and economic need led her to seek a rapprochement with Soviet Russia; its pace appeared to slacken after the October elections in Turkey brought the Justice party into power. Strong American diplomatic intervention in Greece and Turkey helped avert a renewal of hostilities on Cyprus.

Thus, as the year ended without any imminent crisis and the war in Vietnam became the major American concern, Washington tended to relegate the Middle East and its problems of inter-Arab rivalry and Arab-Israeli hostility to the background. Yet danger signals were beginning to appear. As the arms race continued, with ever more modern weapons, there was growing speculation over the possibility of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. Washington, at year's end, was intensifying its efforts to keep the area free of The Bomb.

Jordan Water Dispute

When the Arab League at its Cairo summit conference in January 1964 approved long-range plans to divert the sources of the Jordan River in Syria and Lebanon (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 299–300), the assessment in Washington was that this was primarily a face-saving maneuver by Nasser to counter Syria's call for an immediate attack on Israel. In the spring this view seemed confirmed, as Israel began pumping Jordan water from Lake Tiberias through its national water carrier to the Negev, without Arab interference. Nevertheless, a second summit conference, in Alexandria in September, called for "embarking on immediate work" on diversion projects. Lebanon yielded to continued Syrian and Egyptian pressures and the Lebanese parliament in January 1965 reluctantly agreed to construct a pumping station at the Wazzani spring, which would divert its flow through a canal connecting it with the Banyas River in Syria.

Although by itself only an insignificant part of the total Arab plan, the Lebanese action was regarded by Israeli officials as a potentially dangerous precedent and as contrary to the Johnston Plan for dividing the Jordan waters among the riparian states, upon which Israel's own plan was based (AJYB, 1955 [Vol. 56], p. 288; 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 287; 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 301, 451). On January 12, Prime Minister Levi Eshkol declared the waters of the Jordan to be "as precious to us as the blood in our veins," and Simeon Peres, then deputy minister of defense, warned Lebanon later in the month that by serving as a "pawn" in the Egyptian-inspired plan it might face "the dangers of punitive action by the injured party." General Isaac Rabin, Israeli chief of staff, noted pointedly on February 7 that the Wazzani spring was 2½ miles from Israel's border and the Banyas spring only one mile away.
United States Reaction

The United States government urged Israel to avoid a major military response, at least until it was clear that the diversions exceeded the quantities allotted to the Arabs under the Johnston Plan, since rash action would only increase Arab determination. There were rumors that President Johnson’s special envoy W. Averell Harriman, during his secret discussions in Israel at the end of February, had made United States arms aid contingent on Israeli agreement to refrain from “preventive action” on the water question; but Eshkol told the Tel-Aviv press in April that “no strings” were attached to the arms aid. Shortly before, King Hussein had declared that war over the Jordan water was unlikely because the Harriman mission had helped avert the danger of an imminent Israeli attack. Continuing the United States diplomatic effort, Assistant Secretary of State Phillips Talbot met with Nasser in Cairo, in April, and brought a personal message from President Johnson, reportedly urging a peaceful settlement of the water dispute along the lines of the 1955 Johnston Plan.

While Lebanon continued to procrastinate, Syria began in March to do preliminary work for the proposed diversion canal. Israeli artillery and tank fire, in a March border incident, wrecked tractors, bulldozers, and other construction equipment. The Syrians resumed work in May, but a few Israeli shells again put their equipment out of commission. Syrian Premier Amin el-Hafez berated Nasser for the failure of the Egyptian-led Unified Arab Command (UAC) to come to his defense; Nasser, in turn, charged that Syria was no more willing than Lebanon or Jordan to allow Egyptian forces on its soil on Cairo’s terms. He complained to a congress of the Palestine Liberation Organization, meeting in Cairo at the end of May: “Today each Arab state is afraid of the others. We are beset by suspicions, contradictions and distrust.” To Syria’s call for an immediate attack on Israel, Nasser replied that the Arabs were not ready; that 50,000 Egyptian troops were embattled in Yemen, and that he would not be provoked into a flight with Israel “just because it commits an aggression against Syria and hits one or two tractors.” He concluded: “If we are not able to divert the Jordan River today, then we must postpone it until we are ready to defend ourselves.” The next day Hafez called the diversion plan a “tranquilizer” and “appeasement.”

There was a further flurry of excitement in the summer, when Lebanon finally began construction. After renewed Israeli warnings and American and French diplomatic intervention, the Lebanese gave Paris and Washington assurances that no provocation was intended, that the construction was merely a demonstration of Arab solidarity, and that the water would be for Lebanon’s own use. The Beirut press later reported that work had been suspended “for lack of funds.”

The Arab summit conference in Casablanca in mid-September found Lebanon and Jordan still resisting entry of UAC troops and most other
states unenthusiastic over the diversion project. President Bourguiba of Tunisia boycotted the League meetings in protest against Nasser's attempted "hegemony" (p. 432); his view that the diversion and military plans against Israel were unrealistic was shared by other North African states.

In August the Jordanian government revealed that it had awarded an Egyptian company the contract to construct a $32-million dam at Mukheiba on the Yarmuk River, financed by contributions from the other Arab states. Although this dam on the Jordan's principal tributary had been proclaimed as part of the Arab League's diversion project, virtually all the waters of the Yarmuk had been allotted to Jordan under the Johnston Plan. And although the planned dam could eventually be used for illegal Arab Jordan headwater diversion, a series of canals and dams would first have to be constructed in Syria and Lebanon. Therefore, neither Jerusalem nor Washington raised objection to the planned construction that was to begin in January 1966. In Washington, State Department spokesman Robert McCloskey said the United States would, however, remain on guard "to ensure that withdrawals by each state respect the interests of other riparian states."

Arms Race

During 1965 the United States became more directly involved in actions to maintain a balance of arms in the Middle East, against the conflicting pressure of continuing cold-war rivalry, Arab-Israeli hostility, and inter-Arab tensions.

It was revealed in Bonn in January that the United States had secretly given West Germany permission in the fall of 1964 to supply Israel with American M-48 Patton medium tanks, as part of an $80-million German-Israeli arms deal. Official acknowledgment of this agreement came only in February, after Egyptian threats to recognize East Germany had moved Bonn to cancel the balance of the arms shipment (p. 358). Bonn offered to provide economic compensation to Israel (p. 397), but refused to become embroiled again in arms shipments "to areas of tension," even after it had agreed to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. This placed Washington in a difficult position, for the transfer of the tanks had been prompted by the United States' recognition that the new Soviet arms supplies to Egypt had placed Israel at a disadvantage. Secretary of State Dean Rusk explained on February 25 that the United States was committed to maintaining "a reasonable balance" of military power in the Middle East, but did not itself want to become a major supplier of arms. (Indeed, since the Tripartite Declaration of May 1950, the United States, together with Britain and France, had pledged to preserve an Arab-Israel arms balance. As Western and then Soviet arms reached the Arab states in the mid-50s, the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles lifted the total embargo on arms to Israel and initiated the policy of indirection under which Israel was referred to Ottawa, Paris and other Western capitals. The first significant exception to this policy occurred in 1962, when President Kennedy authorized the sale of
American Hawk anti-aircraft missiles to Israel for defense against the TU-16 bombers Cairo had received from Moscow.

After the German incident had revealed the shortcomings of the policy of indirection, there was growing sentiment in the United States for direct arms shipments to Israel. Nadav Safran of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at Harvard recommended in an April Foreign Policy Association report on Israel that Washington "shed its hesitation about becoming an arms supplier to the Middle East." Many Jewish groups, including the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the American Jewish Committee, and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, adopted resolutions calling on the United States to provide direct military assistance to Israel in order to maintain the arms balance. Senators Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N.Y.) and Robert F. Kennedy (Dem., N.Y.) and Representatives Thomas C. McGrath, Jr. (Dem., N.J.) and James Roosevelt (Dem., Calif.) were among the outspoken Congressional exponents of this view. The problem was heightened by pending requests from Jordan for United States tanks and aircraft, and from Saudi Arabia for fighter planes and air-defense equipment.

Washington found itself in a dilemma: on the one hand, United States shipments to both Israel and the Arabs could accelerate the arms race; nor was there any certainty that arms provided for defense would not be used for offense. On the other hand, the risk of undermining Middle East stability by not supplying arms appeared even greater. Nasser was urging Jordan to acquire low-priced Soviet weapons, ostensibly to help standardize all Arab equipment, and other Arab states were willing to help Jordan finance the purchases. Moreover, it was argued, King Hussein needed modern weapons to retain the loyalty of his army, and King Faisal was more concerned with defense against Nasser's forces in Yemen than with war against Israel. For the economy-minded Defense Department the balance-of-payments problem was an added consideration, since Britain and France were also bidding for Saudi and Jordanian business.

A major objective of Ambassador Harriman's February mission to Israel was to solve the arms problem. When he left Israel he would say only that discussions with top officials had been "friendly, frank and useful." The discussions were continued in Jerusalem and Washington with White House and State Department officials. In April the Department acknowledged that arms agreements were being discussed with "a number of Middle East nations," including Israel, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

The talks with Israel led to a United States agreement to supply an estimated 200 Patton tanks directly to Israel and to a commitment, in principle, to provide additional arms later if Israel proved unable to obtain weapons from its traditional European suppliers, in order to balance Arab superiority in air power or armor resulting from Soviet arms shipments to the United Arab Republic and Syria. Israel reluctantly accepted the American view that strengthening Hussein and Faisal with American weapons was prefera-
ble to the extension of Egyptian and, possibly, Soviet influence into Jordan
and Arabia.

In August the United States shipped the first of 50 to 100 Patton tanks
to Jordan under the new military assistance program. In December the
United States and Britain were reported to have agreed to sell Saudi Arabia
a $400-million air-defense system, consisting of British Lightning supersonic
fighter-interceptors, United States Hawk missiles, and radar and communica-
tions equipment. The State Department described the transactions as being
in line with the "traditional policy" of limiting arms to Middle East coun-
tries to amounts "essential for self-defense and internal security." However,
Golda Meir, then Israel's foreign minister, warned that the United States
agreements with Jordan and Saudi Arabia could trigger a new Middle East
arms race. She assured the Keneset, on December 29, that Israel would
"take all steps necessary to safeguard, nurture, and even enhance the deter-
rent strength" of its army.

**Missiles and Nuclear Proliferation**

The UAR's missile-development program was set back in 1965 with the
departure in June of Wolfgang Pilz and most of his team of West German
scientists (p. 398). The Germans had helped the Egyptians develop three
types of missiles, although their guidance system was not yet accurate. The
government-controlled *Al Ahram* reported on April 8 that President Nasser
and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai had arranged a week earlier for a group
of Egyptian atomic scientists to fly to Peking to "acquaint themselves with
various aspects of progress in the field of atomic researches achieved by
Chinese scientists." Egypt was also reported seeking Indian help.

Several weeks earlier Israel had permitted American scientists, for the sec-
ond time within a year, to inspect the atomic reactor at Dimona, to reassure
the United States that it was being used solely for peaceful purposes. Rumors
that Israel was on the verge of producing a bomb led to a categorical state-
ment in Washington, in August, that it was the considered judgment of the
United States government that neither Israel nor the Arab states were pre-
paring to develop nuclear weapons. The United States continued to press for
international inspection of all nuclear reactors and processing plants, but
Israel and the UAR had not yet agreed to do so by year's end. There were
also persistent reports, officially denied in Washington and Jerusalem, that
the United States' offer of assistance for a large-scale nuclear powered desali-
nation project (p. 399) was designed to induce Israel to accept full inspec-
tion.

**Aid to Egypt**

Early in 1965 United States relations with the UAR had sunk to their
lowest level in a decade as a result of three incidents at the end of 1964:
the burning of the United States Information Service John F. Kennedy Li-
brary in Cairo by African students; the shooting down of an unarmed United States oil company plane; and Nasser’s boast in a Port Said speech that he would continue to supply arms to the insurgents fighting the American-supported Congolese government, and that the American Ambassador could “go drink up the sea” if he did not like Egypt’s economic or political policies (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 305). Nasser’s vituperation provoked an out-pouring of editorials throughout the United States urging that aid to Nasser and other foreign ingratiates be ended. Representative Robert H. Michel (Rep., Ill.) introduced an amendment to an agricultural surplus bill specifically banning “the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic,” and the House of Representatives approved the ban on January 26 by 204 votes to 177. At stake was the balance of $37 million in surplus food still to be shipped to Egypt under a $431.8-million aid agreement concluded in October 1962.

However, the ban was relaxed by the Senate Appropriations Committee on February 1 to allow the completion of the shipments if the President determined such exports to be in the national interest. Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, urging that the President’s hands not be tied, assured the committee that aid would not be automatically restored, but that the administration would demand evidence of “a substantial effort by the UAR” to “contribute to peace and stability in the Near East and Africa.” After the full Senate approved the modified bill, President Johnson asked the House to reverse itself. At a press conference on February 5, he declared that while relations between the United States and the UAR obviously must be improved, he could not “predict whether improvement can be achieved,” and concluded, “if we are to have any degree of success in this sensitive relationship, the President must have some freedom of action” to protect “our vital interests in this part of the world where tensions are very high.”

On February 8 the House accepted the Senate compromise by a vote of 241 to 165. Many Democrats who had earlier backed the absolute ban supported the President, since the issue had been presented as a Republican challenge to his prestige and leadership in foreign affairs. The State Department was also quick to point out that neither Israel nor its American supporters had urged a complete ban on American food to the Egyptian people. Their objection had been—and continued to be—that the United States had failed to impose adequate conditions on aid so that it would not indirectly finance Nasser’s arms build-up or foreign adventures.

In 1965 the Johnson administration adopted a tougher line toward foreign aid in general, and toward Egypt in particular. The President had set the new tone in his State of the Union Message on January 12, declaring that “we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interests, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad. The community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it.”

The 1964 Cairo incidents were only symptoms of the deep “crisis in confidence,” as former United States Ambassador to Cairo John S. Badeau put
it, that had developed between the two nations. Nasser's Washington critics argued that his revolutionary zeal drove him to undercut American interests and to meddle in the affairs of his neighbors: besides supplying arms to the Congolese rebels, Nasser early in 1965 also reshipped Soviet missiles to the Greeks on Cyprus; supported the National Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen which was waging a terrorist campaign to expel the British from Aden and the rest of southern Arabia; urged Libya to force the United States and Britain to give up their military bases; continued to maintain 50,000 to 60,000 troops in Yemen in the protracted civil war that threatened to escalate into direct warfare between Egypt and Saudi Arabia; prodded Israel's neighbors to divert the Jordan and proclaimed the inevitability of war against Israel; supported Arab claims to the oil-rich province of Khuzistan in Iran, and denounced American "aggression" in Vietnam. The invitation of East German President Walter Ulbricht to Cairo was another action that ran counter to United States policy, as Secretary of State Rusk explained on February 24, because this "would seem to reinforce the division of Germany" and "undermine the authority of the Bonn government as spokesman for all the German people in international affairs."

The State Department's view was that continued United States aid offered the best hope of influencing Nasser to abandon his foreign adventures and concentrate on improving the living standard of the Egyptians. The argument was developed by Assistant Secretary Talbot on many occasions. In a letter to Representative Seymour Halpern (Rep., N.Y.) in January he called surplus-food aid one of our "few effective tools" for curbing Nasser's actions. Withholding aid would not convince Nasser to spend less on arms. He warned that such a policy would instead result in a dangerous "polarization"—the complete identification of the Soviet Union with the Arabs and the isolation of the United States in alignment with Israel. Continued American "presence" in the Arab world, Talbot told the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in March, was necessary not only to protect "the security and integrity of Israel, which is a major concern of ours, but also a whole variety of other American interests" in the Middle East. He stated that from 1955 to 1965 Egypt had received from the Soviet bloc $1,551 million in economic aid, and over $1 billion in military aid, in addition to pledges of some $700 million in credits and loans toward Egypt's second five-year plan.

Congressional critics of the administration remained unconvinced and replied that past large-scale American assistance to Nasser—a total of $1,096 million by the end of June 1965—had had little moderating effect on Egyptian policies. On the contrary, "the more generous we are," Representative Leonard Farbstein (Dem., N.Y.) wrote Secretary Rusk, "the more hostile they become."

On May 1 Nasser told his people that they must tighten their belts and make sacrifices rather than "accept giving up our independence and dignity." He confirmed that Cairo had requested a new three-year United States aid package of more than $500 million, but that Washington had been un-
responsive. In May Congress reacted by inserting in the foreign-aid authorization bill provisions restricting future surplus-food agreements with Egypt to one year at a time—if the President determined that such sales were “essential to the national interest” of the United States—and prohibiting aid to countries which, after the destruction of United States property by mob action, did not take appropriate measures to prevent a recurrence.

On June 22 President Johnson approved the release of the remaining $37 million in food under the 1962 agreement. As evidence of “a definite improvement in our relations with the UAR,” the State Department cited Nasser’s withdrawal, in April, of support for the Congolese rebels, his more moderate statement in May on Jordan water diversion and rejection of an imminent clash with Israel (p. 395), and his apology for the burning of the Kennedy Library, accompanied by an offer of a temporary rent-free building and his personal donation of a thousand books.

Another major cause of United States-Egyptian friction seemed nearer to elimination when Nasser, in August, signed an agreement with King Faisal for the withdrawal of Egyptian forces from Yemen. However, by year’s end no significant withdrawals had taken place, as squabbling among Yemeni factions prevented agreement on the form of a new government (p. 425).

But, while Nasser was asking his people to tighten their belts, evidence was presented of Egyptian violations of earlier aid agreements. In April a Department of Agriculture official revealed that $2.3 million worth of American frozen chickens, which the Egyptian government had promised to sell at a subsidized price to the poor, had in fact been sold at high prices. Cairo explained that this was done so that the proceeds could be used for “the people’s welfare.” In June it was disclosed that Egypt had in the past two years stepped up its rice exports, primarily to Communist countries in payment for arms. This was in violation of a specific Egyptian commitment that American surplus wheat, sold at bargain prices, would “not increase the availability of rice for export by the United Arab Republic.” In July a report to Congress by the Comptroller General revealed that, while the United States had granted 186,000 tons of corn worth $23.7 million to Egypt in December 1961 to avert the threat of famine resulting from alleged crop failures, Egypt had in fact had a bumper crop and had sold 80,000 tons of the corn.

In October Secretary Rusk conferred in Washington with Abdel Moneim Kaissouny, UAR deputy premier for financial and economic affairs, and in November the State Department disclosed that Egypt had agreed to purchase $6 million worth of United States corn and pay for it in dollars, to “offset” the profits derived from the unauthorized export of Egyptian rice. This was followed by an announcement, on November 30, that President Johnson had authorized negotiations for the sale of $55 million worth of American surplus food to Egypt during the first half of 1966. The amount was less than requested by Cairo and the terms less favorable than under the old agreement.
The new American policy reflected increasing congressional insistence on very rigid conditions for aid to assure that it was used to improve the lot of the Egyptian people and not to finance the arms race. Senator Abraham Ribicoff (Dem., Conn.) asked that aid be made "conditional on the fulfillment of Egypt's commitment under the UN Charter to negotiate a settlement with her neighbors." The stiffer terms also reflected such general factors as Washington's concern for the balance of payments and President Johnson's decision to make foreign aid a more effective instrument of foreign policy. "Foreign action, not promises, will be the standard of our assistance," Mr. Johnson declared on October 20, when he signed the foreign-aid appropriations bill, and added that United States money would "go to those willing not only to talk about basic social change, but who will act immediately on these reforms." The appropriations bill again specifically barred all aid to the UAR unless the President determined it essential to United States interests.

Aid to Israel

A three-year agreement under which the United States had supplied $76 million in surplus food to Israel expired on June 30, 1965. In October negotiations began on Israel's request for $70 million in additional food aid over the next two years. Israel's problem, unlike Egypt's, was not to prove that it had used the aid wisely, but rather that it needed further assistance. Administration reports frequently cited Israel as a prime example of how effective use of foreign aid could generate sustained economic growth. As a result, American grant-aid to Israel ended in 1961, technical assistance ended the following year, and interest rates on development loans were progressively raised from .75 per cent in 1962 to 3.5 per cent in 1965.

On September 16 the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in Washington approved a new $20-million 20-year loan to Israel for the purchase of United States industrial, farm, and processing machinery, and for the improvement of telephone service. In September Israel repaid the last installment of the $135-million loan that had been given by the United States Export-Import Bank in 1949.

Israeli Finance Minister Phinehas Sappir reported on his return from Washington, in December, that the United States no longer considered Israel to be in the category of a "developing country" and therefore expected payment for a larger share of surplus foods in dollars, as well as a higher interest rate on future loans. He cited the great burdens of Israel's immigrant absorption and resource development and the large trade gap as evidence that further aid was required.
The UN General Assembly’s Third Committee (for social, humanitarian, and cultural affairs) debated in October a Draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. On October 11 the United States and Brazil introduced an amendment providing that parties to the treaty specifically “condemn anti-Semitism” and pledge to take action “for its speedy eradication in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.” A Polish amendment added a reference to “nazist practices.” The following day the Saudi Arabian delegate opposed the amendments on the ground that there were many abhorrent “isms” in the world, and particular ones should not be singled out. The Lebanese and Iraqi delegates argued, conversely, that if some forms of racism were mentioned, all would have to be listed. Fawaz Sharaf of Jordan, backed by the Sudanese delegation, asked Poland to add to its amendment the words “fascist, colonialist, tribalist, and Zionist.” Judge Hadassah Ben-Ito of Israel decried the Jordanian proposal because it would “equate the persecutors with the persecuted.”

The USSR, which had previously opposed an explicit condemnation of antisemitism as intended criticism of its own treatment of Jews, on October 14 introduced a sub-amendment condemning “anti-Semitism, Zionism, Nazism, neo-Nazism and all other forms . . . of colonialism, national and race hatred, and exclusiveness.” The Soviet move aroused indignation in Israel and in the United States. A spokesman for the United States mission to the UN called it “an outrage,” and Israel’s ambassador to the UN, Michael Comay, said it was “the most scandalous proposition” ever placed before the United Nations.

A behind-the-scenes caucus of the African-Asian group produced a Greek-Hungarian resolution not to include in the Convention “any reference to specific forms of racial discrimination.” On October 20 the Third Committee voted 80 to 7, with 18 abstentions, to give priority to this resolution. Only Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, and Canada joined Israel and the United States in opposing the procedural move, which was followed by adoption of the Greek-Hungarian resolution 82 to 12, with 10 abstentions.

The success of the Soviet-Arab maneuver to defeat the condemnation of antisemitism was in large part due to the views of the Afro-Asian states and of some Western countries, including France, that the Convention should be couched in general terms, and the suspicion of some that antisemitism was being used as a cold-war issue. Also, for many Asian and African states antisemitism was a remote and theoretical problem, unlike apartheid, which to them was a burning issue, and which was specifically condemned in the Convention.
Border Incidents

In spite of several serious armed clashes and numerous lesser incidents which occurred along the Arab-Israel frontiers, neither Israel nor its Arab neighbors nor any of the great powers called for formal Security Council action in 1965. Memory was still fresh of the previous December's inconclusive Council debate when a Soviet veto had prevented the Council from adopting even a compromise resolution voicing criticism of a clash between Syria and Israel (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 302-3). Instead, Israel, Jordan, and Syria sent formal letters of protest for circulation among Council members. The UN Truce Supervision Organization continued to investigate incidents on the spot, but after Israel had protested an alarming increase in Jordanian shooting incidents since December 1964, UN Secretary-General U Thant announced on January 31 that he was sending Brigadier Indar Rikhye, his military adviser, and Pier Spinelli, UN Middle East troubleshooter, as a special two-man mission to probe "the serious deterioration in the situation" along the Jordanian-Israel frontier. Conferences with political and defense officials in Amman and Jerusalem helped reduce friction.

However, the campaign of sabotage launched in January by the quwaat el-Asifa (storm troopers) of the al-Fatah, a Syrian-backed Palestinian Arab "liberation" movement, introduced a new element in border tensions. From its headquarters in Damascus this group, operating chiefly from bases in Jordan and Lebanon, sent small bands of terrorists on nearly 40 raids into Israel in attempts to sabotage railroads, water pumps, and pipelines, and to blow up homes and public buildings. Both Jordan and Lebanon disavowed the marauders, but Israel repeatedly warned in public statements and through UN channels that it would hold responsible any Arab state which harbored the terrorists. Israeli army units crossed into Jordan in May and September and into Lebanon in October in "warning action" against al-Fatah bases, destroying water installations and other public property in border villages that had allegedly aided the terrorists. The UN mixed armistice commissions condemned the raids and the State Department on May 28 indirectly rebuked Israel in a press statement declaring: "There is an established UN machinery for dealing with disputes along the Arab-Israeli border. We, therefore, deplore the resort to force by any party." When the Department reiterated this position after an Israeli raid in October against two Lebanese villages, adding that "retaliatory raids will only increase tensions," a spokesman in Jerusalem criticized the United States for "unjustly equating continued acts of terrorism, kept up over an extended period, with the reply to these acts." He noted that Washington "did not see fit to issue words of condemnation for more than 30 acts of sabotage" committed by the Arabs. The retaliatory raid against Lebanon was also widely criticized in Israel because of the timing—four days before the general elections—and because relations with Lebanon had been relatively trouble-free since the 1949 armistice, and the Beirut government had apologized for the latest al-Fatah raid.
The number of terrorist incidents fell off sharply in November and December after King Hussein of Jordan had ordered the arrest of suspected al-Fatah saboteurs as part of a clamp-down on “disruptive elements.”

**United Nations Emergency Force**

Israel's frontier with Egypt had remained relatively quiet since 1956, when a United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) was stationed along the Gaza Strip and the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba. In view of the serious financial strain imposed on the UN by continued Soviet refusal to contribute to the force, Secretary-General Thant in 1965 instituted a review of UNEF's costs. Since both Egypt and Israel reportedly urged its continuation, the UN's administrative and budgetary committee on December 20 approved an allocation of $18.9 million for 1965 and $15 million for 1966—the saving to be achieved through a 15 per cent cut in the 4,600-man force. It also adopted a new assessment schedule under which the "more developed countries" would pay the bulk of the cost, with the United States share rising to about 40 per cent.

**ARAB REFUGEES**

**UNRWA and the Palestine Liberation Organization**

The UN General Assembly on December 15 voted to extend the UN's Arab refugee-assistance program through June 1969, in a compromise reached after nearly two months of protracted, often acrimonious, debate and behind-the-scenes negotiations. However, the UN failed to solve some basic problems affecting the functioning and financing of the United Nation Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). UNRWA Commissioner-General Laurence Michelmore, in his report for the period from July 1, 1964 to June 30, 1965 (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 303–04), concluded that "the refugee problem has not grown any less complex, or less dangerous to the peace and stability of the region." He noted that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), formed in June 1964 with the approval of the Arab League, had provided an "additional focus" for the refugees' feelings and intensified their "aspirations and hopes to return to their former homeland."

In an unsuccessful attempt to gain international recognition for the PLO, the 13 Arab UN members on October 15 formally requested that a PLO delegation, "representing the Arab people of Palestine, the principal party to the Palestine question," be heard during the UNRWA debate. After several days of procedural wrangling, the special political committee decided "to authorize the persons constituting the said delegation to speak" in the committee, but "without such authorization implying recognition" of their organization. This was in line with past UN practice of allowing individual petitioners of various interested groups to appear. On the same conditions,
the committee also granted a hearing to a spokesman of the "Palestine Arab Delegation," sponsored by the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, headed by the former Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini (p. 418). The Mufti's group in Syria denounced the PLO as a tool of "Zionist and imperialist elements," and has reportedly been backing the al-Fatah terrorists to point up the ineffectiveness of the Egyptian-supported PLO which had taken no action against Israel.

Despite growing opposition in Jordan and Lebanon, and waning support in the more distant Arab states, the PLO in 1965 continued its efforts to recruit a "Palestine Liberation Army" from among the refugees. In March the PLO announced that it would conscript all men between 28 and 35 in the Gaza Strip for service in the Liberation Army and provide summer military training for students. The Egyptian authorities in Gaza issued the necessary implementing decree on April 23. In the spring Cairo made its powerful radio transmitters available to the PLO for daily "Voice of Palestine" broadcasts. In December Shukairy announced that the PLO had opened an office in Peking; that Communist China was instructing Palestinians in guerrilla warfare; that training camps had been started in Syria and Iraq; and that the Liberation Army had already trained more than 8,000 youths in Gaza.

During the UN debate, the United States and Britain joined Israel in opposing the continuation of UNRWA rations to refugees in Gaza who were serving in the Liberation Army. United States Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, on November 9, deemed it "totally inappropriate, indeed . . . inadmissible" for any UN agency to give either direct or indirect support to this organization, "dedicated to the destruction of a Member State." On December 15 the United States again called for "firm measures" by UNRWA to insure that Liberation Army recruits did not receive refugee rations.

**UNRWA's Financial Crisis**

Michelmore reported the total number of persons registered with UNRWA to have risen in the past year by some 34,000, to 1,280,823 in June 1965; of these, 874,594 were receiving food rations. UNRWA's expenditures for 1965 were an estimated $37.8 million, of which over 47 per cent went for relief, 13 per cent went for health, and nearly 40 per cent for education and training. Estimates for 1966 projected similar expenditures for relief and health, and an increase of $0.85 million for education, to a total of $38.6 million. Michelmore stated that the annual deficit, which was $0.5 million in 1963, would climb to $4.2 million by the end of 1966, and urged the General Assembly to act immediately to prevent "the insolvency and collapse of the Agency."

UNRWA's financial difficulties have been closely linked to its inability to obtain accurate records on the number of genuine refugees and the extent of their need. Michelmore had estimated in 1964 that 40 to 60 per cent of the ration recipients were already partially or fully self-sufficient (AJYB,
The swelling of the registration lists with names of non-refugees and refugees who had died, moved away, or no longer needed relief, had forced UNRWA to set ceilings on new ration cards issued for each country. As a result, 223,391 children were on the waiting lists in June 1965.

Dissatisfaction over the relief-roll situation moved the United States, which over the years had contributed $364.5 million, or 70 per cent of UNRWA’s budget, to cut its annual contribution by $1 million in February. UN Representative Francis T. P. Plimpton explained that the reduction could be absorbed “without affecting the provision of relief to genuinely needy refugees.” In May the House Foreign Affairs Committee made a further cut of $0.8 million because little had been done to reduce the relief rolls and “to promote the absorption of these people into the normal economic life of the Near East.” The committee warned that it would urge additional cuts in United States assistance, and its “complete termination, as promptly as feasible.” Congress endorsed the cut and the United States appropriation fell from $24.7 million in each of the preceding five years to $22.9 million.

Michelmore reported that in UNRWA’s discussions at the end of 1964 with the four “host” governments—Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and the UAR—they agreed to help eliminate all ineligible persons from the rolls if UNRWA broadened criteria for relief. (Under present standards, refugees who had lived in Palestine for at least two years before 1948 and lost their homes and livelihoods are eligible for assistance, and so are their children.) The new definition would have included border villagers who had lost their livelihoods but not their homes, nomadic Bedouin tribes, persons who had lived in Palestine only briefly, and the grandchildren and subsequent “descendants” of the original refugees.

When broadening of relief eligibility was opposed in UNRWA’s advisory commission by the Western states which have been paying most of the bill, the host governments agreed, for the time being, to press only for the inclusion of refugees’ grandchildren. Michelmore favored including the grandchildren because he wished “to seize this opportunity of making a fresh, more hopeful approach to the contentious and persistent problem of rectifying the ration rolls.” However, the United States announcement of an aid cut moved the host governments to make rectification contingent upon assurance of UNRWA’s future financing. As a result, progress was made in 1965 only in the Egyptian-administered Gaza Strip, where government cooperation in the first three months enabled UNRWA to strike 9,755 ineligible persons from the rolls. To support their position, the host governments in October jointly submitted to the UN a 26-page memorandum on the commissioner-general’s report, contending that no cut in relief would be possible even after rectification, since ineligible persons would be outweighed by addition of needy persons not now aided and by rising costs.

Israel’s reaction to the Michelmore report, as stated by Ambassador Comay on October 15, was that similar requests to broaden UNRWA’s
mandate had been rejected by the UN as far back as December 1955; that Israel, too, had had economic refugees after the war, and that the Arabs could rehabilitate their refugees, as Israel had. He added that Israel opposed, on principle, the indefinite extension of refugee status, and that "the primary responsibility" for aiding refugee grandchildren fell upon the country where they were born and grew up.

Although other Arab and Moslem states and the Soviet bloc supported the host governments' demands, the consensus among Western and neutral states was that equitable and effectual relief, in view of inadequate funds even for refugee children now on the waiting list, made the extension of relief to grandchildren unrealistic and unjust. On November 9 the United States introduced a comprehensive resolution which directed the commissioner-general "to take such measures, including rectification of the relief rolls" as needed to assure equitable distribution of rations and asked "the full cooperation of the Governments concerned." On November 11 Pakistan and Somalia, on behalf of the Arab states, proposed amendments, specifically endorsing the eligibility-broadening proposals as the basis for rectification. They called for "restoration of the rights" of the refugees and deplored Israel's failure to allow their repatriation. Israel responded the next day with its own amendments, calling for direct Arab-Israel negotiations to solve the refugee problem.

The United States delegate asked that both the Arab and Israeli resolutions be withdrawn. Israel complied, but Pakistan and Somalia pressed their amendments to a vote, after removing the clause attacking Israel by name. The committee approved the amendments on November 17 by a narrow vote of 43 to 39, with 23 abstentions. The United States announced that since the amendments had destroyed the careful balance of its original resolution, it would be forced to vote against the resolution as a whole. Nevertheless, the committee adopted the amended resolution by 47 to 31, with 17 abstentions. However, since this was less than the two-thirds majority required for final Assembly approval—and without a resolution UNRWA's mandate would have expired—the United States succeeded in behind-the-scenes negotiations to remove any reference to the refugee grandchildren or other new categories.

Palestine Conciliation Commission

The final compromise resolution, introduced by Nigeria, was approved by the General Assembly on December 15 by 91 to 1, with 7 abstentions. Israel cast the sole negative vote because, Comay explained, the resolution failed to call for "Israel-Arab dialogue" and placed repeated emphasis on "paragraph 11" of a 1948 resolution, calling for refugee repatriation or resettlement with compensation, which the Arabs had "torn out of context" and made "a banner of belligerency." The resolution asked the UN Conciliation Commission for Palestine (CCP) "to intensify"—the United States draft had merely asked it "to continue"—its efforts to implement paragraph 11.
The perennial Arab request to appoint a UN Custodian to “protect and administer” Arab refugee property in Israel until paragraph 11 was fully implemented (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 238; 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 149–51) was contained in a resolution sponsored by Afghanistan and Malaysia, but was rejected in the special political committee by 38 to 34, with 23 abstentions. In 1965, this proposal was backed only by the Communist bloc and states with sizable Moslem populations, the waning support reflecting increasing international recognition of the view that this was essentially designed to undermine Israel’s sovereignty.

On December 28 the Conciliation Commission issued its Progress Report, for the period May 1964 to December 1965, concluding that it “could make no progress” in resolving basic Arab-Israel issues or “in finding a practical means, acceptable to the parties concerned,” for implementing paragraph 11. The commission announced that by July 31, 1965, it had transferred to Arab refugees $10,046,422, representing bank accounts and safe deposits which Israel had released for payment, and stated that final work on identification and valuation of refugee immovable property would be completed by April 1966.

The initial response to the General Assembly’s appeal to all governments “to make the most generous efforts possible” to meet UNRWA’s budgetary needs was disappointing. On December 20 contributions totaling $30.8 million were announced by 26 governments. With few exceptions, pledges of the major contributors were at, or below, the level of past years; the Soviet bloc continued its policy of non-support.

**ARAB ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES**

**Boycott**

The Arab anti-Israel boycott suffered several setbacks in the United States in 1965 as a result of increasingly firm opposition by Congress and successful resistance by American corporations. The ultimatum given to the Chase Manhattan Bank in July 1964 by the Arab League’s central boycott office to cease all activities with Israel by the end of the year (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 309) was withdrawn. High-level talks between the bank and Arab officials, with the behind-the-scenes support of the State Department, reportedly convinced Egypt, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia that it was against their economic interest to bar Chase Manhattan from the Arab world. Mohammed Mahmoud Mahgoub, commissioner general of the boycott office, announced on January 4, 1965, that it had decided to “suspend” the ultimatum on the basis of “certified documents” proving the “purely banking nature” of the bank’s relations with Israel. In November it was revealed that boycott regulations had been modified to exempt from blacklisting commercial banks that made higher loans to the Arabs than to Israel.
The opening of the 17-story, 440-room Tel Aviv Hilton took place on September 14 despite the warning to Conrad Hilton by the boycott committee, when construction plans were announced in 1961, that this would result in the loss of the Nile Hilton in Cairo "and the end of any plans you may have for Tunis, Baghdad, Jerusalem, or anywhere else in all Arab countries." Hilton indignantly replied that the boycott was "absolutely counter to the principles we live by." The threatened Arab retaliation failed to materialize. The Arab summit conference met at the Nile Hilton; a new Hilton hotel opened in Tunis on September 29, and the Egyptian government contracted for additional Hilton hotels in Alexandria, Aswan, and Luxor.

Anti-boycott Legislation in Congress

Although other firms, too, succeeded in defying the Arab threats or in circumventing the boycott regulations, intimidation of American firms doing business with Israel continued. Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor testified to a Senate committee in May that about 150 American companies were on the Arab blacklist and that it was impossible to tell how many firms had decided not to invest in Israel or failed to conclude technical licensing agreements with Israel for fear of Arab retaliation.

In the spring Senators Harrison A. Williams (Dem., N.J.), and Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N.Y.), led a Congressional campaign for mandatory legislation against the boycott. On February 2 they introduced an amendment to the Export Control Act which would prohibit American firms from taking any action, "including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements," which supported restrictive trade practices or boycotts directed "by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States" (p. 397). The bill was specifically designed to strike at the principal tools of the Arab boycott apparatus: questionnaires demanding that firms describe their business relations with Israel; and the various documents required by Arab states, certifying that no Israeli goods or components were included in exports to them, that no Israeli transport would be used, and the like. Williams and Javits were joined by 29 other senators as cosponsors, and 27 similar bills were introduced in the House. The bills were strongly opposed by the State and Commerce departments, and on March 18 the two sponsors were asked by the State Department to withdraw their request for public hearings on the bill. In early May the House Banking and Currency Committee decided to sidetrack hearings on the amendment until after extension of the Export Control Act—a move that would have killed the anti-boycott measure. After determined efforts by House supporters of the bill, the committee voted to defer action on the parent bill until hearings on the boycott had been held.

Mounting support for a strong boycott measure came from the Jewish community, with the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and the American-Israel Chamber of Commerce spearheading the campaign.
A delegation of business leaders headed by Irving Fain of Providence, R.I., met with Commerce Secretary Connor on May 3, and an American Jewish Committee delegation met with Assistant Secretary of State Talbot on May 19. The American Jewish Congress sent a letter to Secretary Rusk protesting the department's efforts to kill the bill. Resolutions calling for effective antiboycott legislation were adopted by these and many other Jewish organizations.

Administration witnesses led by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball on May 13 testified against the bill before the House Subcommittee on International Trade. While deploring the Arab boycott, they argued that the bill would undermine United States efforts to enlist foreign support for its “economic denial” programs against Communist China, Cuba, and North Vietnam; provoke the Arabs to intensify their boycott, and hurt United States business interests in the Arab world. A Commerce Department spokesman added that a mandatory ban would be difficult to enforce and that diplomatic assistance to affected firms was the best approach. A panel of business and organization witnesses, including Fain, challenged administration arguments in testimony on May 21. There was no analogy between United States sanctions against Communist aggressors and the Arab blackmail against American firms, they argued, and the fear of Arab retaliation was exaggerated. They charged that only large corporations could count on United States diplomatic intervention and pointed out that federal legislation was necessary because few business concerns could afford to defy a boycott threat unless their competitors were required to do likewise.

The subcommittee approved a declaration of principle against the boycott and empowered the President, at his discretion, to prohibit the furnishing of information, as well as the export of articles, materials, and supplies. However, it rejected the proposal of Representative Seymour Halpern (Rep., N.Y.) for a mandatory ban, and this action was upheld by the full committee by a vote of 14 to 11. Halpern and Abraham J. Multer (Dem., N.Y.) circulated a minority statement pledging to reintroduce the mandatory provision on the floor. When members absent during the original vote joined in endorsing this statement, it turned out that a majority of the committee, including almost all the Republicans, had subscribed to the “minority” report, making a floor fight a virtual certainty. At this point the White House agreed to a compromise instructing the government “to encourage and request” American businessmen to refuse to supply information or otherwise aid the boycott. A bill to this effect was approved by the House on June 8.

Hearings on the bill were held before the subcommittee on international finance of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on May 24 and 25, and Senators Williams and Javits reopened the fight to change the wording of the compromise bill from “encourage and request” to “require.” The mandatory ban was rejected and the House bill approved on June 17. A threatened floor fight was averted when an administration amendment making it mandatory for American businessmen to notify the Department of
Commerce whenever they received questionnaires or other boycott requests for information or action was approved without dissent. The Export Control Act was signed by the President on June 30.

Arab League Secretary-General Abdel Khalek Hassouna met with Secretaries Rusk and Connor in Washington in October to protest the anti-boycott legislation, and a Hebrew broadcast of Cairo radio reported on November 9 that Connor had noted the Administration’s successful opposition to the mandatory prohibition in the original bill. The Commerce Department declined comment on this report. By year’s end resolutions calling for compliance with the anti-boycott law had been adopted by the city councils of Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh. In November the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce announced that it would refuse to certify negative certificates of origin or other boycott documents and called on all United States chambers of commerce to “follow our lead.”

Another aspect of the Arab campaign against Israel, affecting American citizens, was highlighted by the case of Edward P. Hunt, a civilian employee of the Army and Air Force Exchange Service of the Defense Department, who had been transferred to the Wheelus Air Force base in Libya. When he arrived at European Exchange Service Headquarters in Germany, he was asked to sign a Libyan visa application acknowledging that “in case of obtaining any Israeli visa my visa to Libya will be considered invalid.” Hunt, a Roman Catholic, refused because of his “deep religious convictions concerning the Hebrew Faith and its people.” He was dismissed by Brigadier General John D. Hines of the exchange service and forced to pay for his transportation to and from Germany. Representative Richard S. Schweiker (Rep., Pa.), a member of the House Armed Services Committee, protested to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in May that it was “absolutely outrageous for any agency of the United States Government to fire an employee because he refuses to sign a declaration which he feels is anti-Semitic.” After review of the case, Hunt was reinstated with full reimbursement of back pay and travel expenses.

Propaganda

It was revealed, spring 1965, that the United Arab Republic Embassy in Washington was distributing a 32-page pamphlet, *Israel, The Enemy of Africa*, published by the UAR Information Department in Cairo. Addressed to the African states, the pamphlet accused Israel of imperialism and discrimination against Negroes and Oriental Jews and contained quotations from the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and other antisemitic canards to the effect that the Jews are commanded to cheat, rob, and even kill non-Jews, conspire to destroy Christianity and spread moral corruption, in order to gain control of the world. Kings County Surrogate Edward S. Silver in May denounced the booklet as “one of history’s most vicious anti-Semitic pamphlets” and evidence of “the falsity of Arab claims that their propaganda is only anti-Israel or anti-Zionist, and never anti-Jewish.” Morris B. Abram,
president of the American Jewish Committee, stated on May 23 that the pamphlet was part of a systematic, global “campaign of anti-Jewish hate” spread by some individual Arab countries and by the Arab League. As a recent example of Arab anti-Jewish indoctrination of their own people, he revealed the Arabic book entitled For These Reasons I Hate Israel, by Egyptian Colonel Amin Sami al-Ghamrawi, published in Cairo in 1964 and publicized in the Government-controlled press. The book, which also makes extensive use of The Protocols, was described by Abram as “a 350-page unrelieved vitriolic and nazi-like slander of the Jewish people.”

Reaction to Goldberg Appointment

By comparison, the official Arab reaction to President Johnson’s appointment on July 20 of Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg as United States Ambassador to the UN was mild and restrained despite his outspoken condemnation of Soviet antisemitism and his support of Israel and Zionism. At an AIPAC dinner in Washington on May 3, celebrating Israel’s 17th anniversary, Goldberg had declared that he was a Zionist who shared Sir Winston Churchill’s “belief in the truth of the Old Testament prophecy” that God selected the “Holy Land and set it aside for the people of Israel.” He added:

And I am a Zionist also because I am loyal to the spiritual heritage of the Jewish people. This is a loyalty which is in no way incompatible with the undivided allegiance which I together with all Americans of Jewish origin and belief owe and freely extend to our beloved America . . .

While many Arab delegates to the UN privately questioned the wisdom of selecting a Jew and a Zionist, they adopted a wait-and-see attitude and were unwilling to be quoted as opposing the appointment. The State Department took exceptional steps to forestall adverse Arab reaction. Secretary Rusk met with Egyptian Ambassador Mostafa Kamel, and Assistant Secretary G. Mennen Williams spoke with the ambassadors of the North African and other predominantly Moslem African states. In Israel, government leaders hailed the appointment, Premier Eshkol stating that it would advance “the cause of international justice and world peace.” While the press in Jordan and Lebanon denounced the appointment, Cairo at first limited itself to headlining the news with exclamation points and question marks.

Appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, before his unanimous confirmation by the Senate on July 23, Goldberg said that his sympathy for Israel would not affect his impartiality at the UN:

I shall be guided by the doctrine that in this pluralistic world, containing people of different religious beliefs and nations of differing political systems, all nations are to be treated with dignity, respect, fairness, and equality.

On July 28 the semi-official Al Goumhouria ended Cairo’s editorial silence by calling the choice “extremely logical since Zionists are the ones
who direct American policy.” The editorial suggested sarcastically that to “be more realistic” President Johnson should fill the government with Zionists and give up “his own post to a Zionist since they are the true rulers of America.”

**Action Committee on American-Arab Relations**

Mohammed T. Mehdi, founder and secretary-general of the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations, continued to concern himself with New York’s political campaigns. The Iraqi former San Francisco director of the Arab Information Office wrote New York City Comptroller Abraham D. Beame on October 12 that the Action Committee “has decided to support your election” for mayor, adding that “last November, we lent our support to Robert F. Kennedy for his election to the United States Senate.” He gave two reasons for the group’s endorsement: Beame’s personal competence, and because “it is the hope that you may employ the prestige of the office to encourage New York and American Jews to invite their kins [sic] and relatives, now in Israel, to immigrate to America.” Maintaining that the majority of Israeli Jews of European origin “would be elated, pleased, and honored” to come to America, he concluded that the immigration of a million Israelis to the United States would bring peace to the Middle East.

In November Mehdi led a “peace march” of 18 pickets to protest the 1917 Balfour Declaration and to publicize his peace plan, the emigration of Israeli Jews and the return of Arab refugees. The uneventful march began outside United Nations headquarters and ended at the American Jewish Committee’s offices.

**George E. Gruen**