

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

DOCTOR JACOB R. MARCUS

Statement by
Referee

AUTHOR Ronald M. Goldstein

(Not Necessary
for Ph.D.
Thesis)

TITLE "The Nature, Character and Trends of Post World
War II American Jewry as Reflected in Communal Surveys"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. ☐ D.H.L. ☐ Rabbinic ☒
Master's ☐ Prize Essay ☐

1) May (with revisions) be considered for Publication

☐ ☐
yes no

2) May circulate ☒

3) Is restricted ☐

March 13, 1967
Date

[Signature]
Signature of Referee

Statement by
Author

(Please consult with Librarian if copyright protection
is desired.)

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of
my thesis for security purposes.

The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.

☒ ☐
yes no

2/28/1967
Date

Ronald M. Goldstein
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed

6/15/67
Date

[Signature]
Signature of Library Staff Member

THE NATURE, CHARACTER AND TRENDS OF POST WORLD WAR II
AMERICAN JEWRY AS REFLECTED IN COMMUNAL SURVEYS

Ronald M. Goldstein

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts in Hebrew
Letters and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1967

Referee: Professor Jacob Rader Marcus

THESIS DIGEST

The changes in American Jewish life, for example, acculturation and greater interaction with the non-Jew, have been at least partially responsible for the increasing number of self-studies conducted by local Jewish communities. By comparing these studies with one another, a more comprehensive evaluation of the American Jewish community is possible. That the following data may be taken to be highly indicative of trends and characteristics which most American Jews share is certainly the thesis of our presentation.

Nativity composition is particularly important in regard to current trends. The third and future generations are, and will continue to be, American born of American parentage. The Jews of America have also demonstrated relatively little migration from, or near, their original place of settlement. Our findings also indicate that the Jews of America are mostly, at least three-fourths of the population, married persons. The Jewish male marries later in life than the female. A corollary to this is that there is a much higher number of widows compared to widowers.

In 1957, the out marriage rate for the Jews of America was established to be 7.2 percent. Allowing for the normal increase over the past 10 years, this figure is very misleading. For an accurate estimate concerning out marriage, one must consider not only the total population, but especially the trends of the third generation. This is axiomatic from

the fact that the third generation constitutes the traffic in the marriage market. In Washington, D.C., for example, the third generation had an out marriage rate of 17.9 percent. However, as out marriage increases among the third generation, so too, does the rate of conversion. Thus, the young, non-Jewish spouse is becoming Jewish.

The majority of Jews in America are involved in two occupational groups, proprietors, managers, officials and professionals and semi-professionals. Among the Jews in the labor force, there is a significant under-representation in blue-collar positions. One half of the Jewish population in the labor force is self-employed.

In 1960, 9.4 percent of the total white population in America were college graduates or post-graduates. In many of the communities considered herein, three to five times more Jews have a higher education. Also, nearly three-fourths of the Jewish population has received some type of formal Jewish education.

Our comparison of synagogue affiliation pointed to an anomalous situation. Although there are many Jews who prefer not to affiliate with a congregation, they nevertheless identify with one of the three major branches of Judaism. Also, many of those who are affiliated with one branch identify with another. In terms of organizational life, the Jews of America are "joiners." Most belong to at least one Jewish organization, and many belong to several. One-half of America's Jews belong to at least one non-Jewish organization.

PREFACE

Historians and researchers have often expressed a desire for an accurate and complete demographic study of American Jewry. The fact that this desire has remained unfulfilled bespeaks the many difficulties and limitations of such a utopian undertaking.

The present study in no way attempts to offer such a finished and complete work. This study has intended to be, however, indicative of selected trends and characteristics of American Jews during the past twenty years. The sources utilized have been the available population studies of local Jewish communities. The limitations of such a work are axiomatic, and will be discussed in detail in the Introduction. Yet, notwithstanding the many problems, it is the writer's contention that one is able to glean many facts and characteristics from the purview of such a work.

A secondary purpose, or byproduct, also belies this presentation. The population surveys that have been conducted by individual Jewish communities have seldom been made available to the public. Thus, while attempting to illustrate certain national trends, the local demographic data for the nation as a whole is offered for the first time in one study.

There is now the pleasant task of acknowledging the many kindnesses for which the author is most appreciative. To Mr. Alvin Chenkin of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the writer expresses his sincere gratitude for many valuable suggestions and for the materials made available. To the many executive directors and secretaries of numerous Jewish Community Councils, the writer offers a profound sense of gratefulness for their patience, kindness and studies made available.

To Mr. Jacob Fink, a valued friend and staff member of the Hebrew Union College, the writer is deeply appreciative for his assistance with the statistical computations.

Finally the author offers his humble thanks to Professor Jacob Rader Marcus, scholar, teacher and friend. For the encouragement he has always given, for the valuable guidance and direction he has offered willingly and ceaselessly, for his constant friendship and support, the author extends his sincerest thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. NATIVITY	8
II. MARITAL STATUS	14
III. INTERMARRIAGE	24
IV. OCCUPATIONAL STATUS	32
V. SECULAR EDUCATION	43
VI. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	52
VII. CONGREGATIONAL AFFILIATION	59
VIII. ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION	68
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	75
FOOTNOTES	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percent of Jewish Foreign Born	9
2. Marital Status According to Percentage of Jewish Population	15
3. Married Couples by Religion Reported: Civilian Population, March 1957	25
4. Occupational Classification of Jewish and Total White Labor Forces in Percent	33
5. Comparative Educational Level Attained According to Percent	44
6. Comparison of Jewish Population of Four Communities by Educational Completion According to Percent	50
7. Educational Attainment for Total United States Urban-White Population, 1950-1960 According to Percent	51
8. Type of Jewish Education According to Percent Ever Enrolled	54
9. Denominational Affiliation According to Percent	61
10. Self-Identification According to Denomination, by Percent	63
11. Membership In Jewish and Non-Jewish Organizations According to Percent	69

INTRODUCTION

"History records many experiments in the counting of people. Among the earliest of these was God's command to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, 'Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel, by their families, by their father's houses, according to the number of names.' The reasons for taking censuses have varied historically."¹

To be sure, the size of armies, the amount of taxes, the boundaries between public and private domains have all been contingent upon the recording of demographic information in general, and the census count in particular. Similarly, the rationale for the communal surveys considered herein has also varied. Some communities have utilized surveys for planning purposes, such as the building of schools and new community centers. Other studies have been undertaken for sociological interest and information. What is of particular importance to us, however, is the fact that many of the population surveys have differed in methodology and design. The obvious result of these differences is the difficulty in comparability. Some communal surveys have employed the best available scientific methods for the compilation and interpretation of data. Unfortunately,

a few surveys are comprised of little more than crude estimates.

Often, there are also differences in the scope of inquiry among surveys. Many of the communal studies do not include data on intermarriage; several are unconcerned with religious education. It must be understood too, that the size of a community must not be overlooked when interpreting statistical data. How much more this applies when comparing this data.

Certainly the most problematic area is that of identification, that is, by what means are persons selected to be interviewed by the researchers? One technique has been the use of "master lists." Essentially, this is the compilation of membership lists from synagogues, organizations, community centers and Jewish community councils. The obvious problem with this method is that there are Jews who are not affiliated with organizations and agencies within the Jewish community. Consequently, when utilizing a communal survey based on this method, one must exercise caution regarding statistical accuracy.

Another equally precarious technique is that of "name lists." This method compiles all "typical Jewish sounding" names from telephone or city directories. The apparent fallacy is that there are, of course, Jews without the "typical Jewish names." A similar method is that of interviewing residents of an area where a large number of Jews are thought to reside.

This enigma of identification is especially important in the consideration of intermarriage. Specifically, the terms "intermarriage" and "mixed marriage" have technical meanings, for they predicate a conversion status of the non-Jewish partner. These terms are often used interchangeably and improperly in common parlance. The phenomenon per se, without predicating anything of the non-Jewish partner, is properly referred to as "out marriage" or exogamy.

Most of the population surveys have indiscriminately utilized the term "intermarriage" to refer to all aspects of the phenomenon. The upshot of this situation is that some researchers have considered an "intermarriage" to have taken place whether or not the non-Jewish spouse converted. Other researchers are of the opinion that when one of the marriage partners converts, the marriage is no longer mixed and should not be counted as an "intermarriage."

This situation, however, reaches far beyond the concept of "Jewish." The phenomenon of assimilation must be considered, for it would seem that a population survey of the Jewish community would reach only those Jews who are affiliated with, or identify with, the Jewish community. However, those Jews who have in fact assimilated into the larger community are obviously not counted in the study. On the one hand, this would seem proper, for if an individual is no longer a member of the Jewish community there would seem to be no apparent reason for him to be considered in a study of the Jewish community. On the other hand,

communal surveys are sociological in nature, and if the study is to be concerned with questions of out marriage, congregational affiliation and organizational affiliation, it would seem that these persons must be counted if the survey is to be objective and accurate.

Contemplating the definition of the term Jew, Louis Wirth stated the following: "it is my impression from the study of this problem that we cannot really define a Jew except to say that a Jew is a person who thinks of himself as a Jew and who is treated by others as if he were a Jew."² This definition would appear to be the most proper and general, for it cuts through the stereotypes and fallacies of "nationhood," "birth," "culture" and a multiplicity of other definitions.

Many of the communal surveys make this disclaimer, namely, that those individuals who were interviewed, and thus counted in the survey, were those persons whose self-identification was "Jewish."

The problems alluded to above, however, should not be understood to obviate or negate the importance of communal surveys. These problems must simply be understood when there is a desire to consider the data or the statistics as precise. That the data may be taken to be highly indicative of trends and characteristics which most American Jews share is certainly the thesis of our presentation.

One final word of caution and interest. The individual Jewish community must not be thought of as a homogeneous

entity; that is, as a group of persons with common and like attitudes, interests and modes of life. "In considering the Jewish community as an entity one must be cautioned against conceiving the Jewish group as homogeneous or compact. From any point of view that one might measure Jewish community life - their synagogue affiliations, their economic or social status, their attitudes toward religion, education and social problems, and even toward the important question of the perpetuation of their own group identity - a great range of divergence will be found."³

What is of interest then is that the dissimilarity of the Jew produces their similarity. Kaplan's statement above is an adequate analysis and description of the Jewish community. However, these differences apply to all Jewish communities, therefore a comparison of several or more Jewish communities will produce certain univocal trends.

Earlier in the Introduction, we called attention to the problem of methodological reliability. Prior to concluding, we would be remiss not to question the geographical distribution of the communities considered herein. To be sure, until there are definitive studies available from major centers of Jewish population, namely, New York and Chicago, our findings must be considered as tentative, rather than conclusive. Notwithstanding the lack of information from these cities, it is our opinion that a fair sampling is represented, in terms of both geographical regions of the United States and size of the communities.

The Northeastern portion of the United States is represented by Providence, Rhode Island; Worcester, Massachusetts; Lynn, Massachusetts and Rochester, New York. The Eastern region is represented by Port Chester, New York; Newark, New Jersey; Trenton, New Jersey; Camden, New Jersey and Passaic, New Jersey. The Middle Atlantic area is represented by Baltimore, Maryland; Washington, D.C. and Northern Delaware. The South is represented by Charleston, West Virginia; Memphis, Tennessee; New Orleans, Louisiana; Jacksonville, Florida and Miami, Florida. The Middle West is represented by Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Canton, Ohio; Youngstown, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; South Bend, Indiana and Indianapolis, Indiana. The North Central and Central regions are represented by Minneapolis, Minnesota; Des Moines, Iowa and Kansas City, Missouri. The West is represented by San Francisco, California; Los Angeles, California and Long Beach, California.

Despite the absence of studies from the Northwest, Southwest and the Rocky Mountain regions, our presentation is, nevertheless, representative of the Jewish population of the United States. In these regions from which studies are lacking, there are only several major communities; namely, Houston and Dallas, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Phoenix, Arizona and Seattle, Washington. Moreover, in terms of population, these areas are the least populated in general, and certainly they have fewer Jewish inhabitants

in particular.

It is also our opinion that we have utilized a cross section of the United States with regard to the size of the community. Eight of the cities considered herein are large, that is, they represent a Jewish population of 40,000 or more: Baltimore, Maryland; Detroit, Michigan; Newark, New Jersey; Los Angeles, California; Miami, Florida; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; San Francisco, California and Washington, D.C.

Six of the communities are small cities, representing a Jewish population of under 5,000: Canton, Ohio; Des Moines, Iowa; Jacksonville, Florida; Port Chester, New York; South Bend, Indiana and Charleston, West Virginia.

Fifteen of the communities are medium in size, having a Jewish population of 5,000 to 15,000: Camden, New Jersey; Indianapolis, Indiana; Long Beach, California; Lynn, Massachusetts; Memphis, Tennessee; New Orleans, Louisiana; Passaic, New Jersey; Trenton, New Jersey; Wilmington, Delaware; Worcester, Massachusetts and Youngstown, Ohio.

Although there are many difficulties in a study of this nature, we consider the following presentation to be demonstrative and representative of several characteristics and trends of the Jewish population of the United States.

CHAPTER I

NATIVITY

"The factor of nativity, which is ascertained by a single question on place of birth, is of vast importance in Jewish communal life. American-born Jews have had markedly different life experiences than have foreign born Jews. As a result, their personalities, values, and to a large extent objective behavior are different. For this reason, a knowledge of where persons were born is of such great importance."⁴

Table 1 illustrates beyond question that the vast majority of America's Jews are native-born. A conservative estimate based on the data would place the average somewhere between 75.0 - 80.0 percent. To be sure, it would not be unreasonable to assume that within several decades the Jews in America will be completely native-born.

The evidence from a significantly large proportion of local surveys indicates that of the small percentage of foreign-born Jews, most of these individuals are in the older age categories. In Providence, Rhode Island, where 83.1 percent of the Jews were native-born in 1964, "59.0 percent of the foreign-born persons are now concentrated in the age groups 60 years and over, and 81.0 percent are

TABLE 1

PERCENT OF JEWISH FOREIGN BORN

City, State and Year	Total Jewish Population	
	Native Born	Foreign Born
New Orleans, La.-1953	80.8	16.9
Providence, R.I.-1964	83.1	16.9
Pittsburgh, Pa.-1963	88.1	11.9
Charleston, W.Va.-1966	88.8	11.2
Rochester, N.Y.-1961	79.0	21.0
Port Chester, N.Y.-1950	74.6	25.4
San Francisco, Cal.-1959	71.8	26.3
Los Angeles, Cal.-1953	67.9	32.1
Los Angeles, Cal.-1959	75.2	24.8
Canton, Ohio-1955	77.0	23.0
Baltimore, Md.-1963	76.0	24.0
Dade County, Fla.-1961	67.0	33.0
Kansas City, Mo.-1961	72.0	28.0
Memphis, Tenn.-1959	81.0	18.0
South Bend, Ind.-1961	79.7	20.3
Washington, D.C.-1956	82.8	17.2
Camden, N.J.-1964	91.0	9.0
Jacksonville, Fla.-1964	82.7	17.3
Trenton, N.J.-1949	76.8	24.2
Trenton, N.J.-1961	85.0	15.0
Des Moines, Iowa-1956	78.0	22.0
Detroit, Mich.-1963 ^a	62.0	38.0

TABLE 1--Continued

City, State and Year	Total Jewish Population	
	Native Born	Foreign Born
Passaic, N.J.-1949	68.4	31.6
Long Beach, Lakewood, Los Alamitos, Cal.-1962	85.1	14.8

a Based on head of household.

at least 50 years of age. Just the opposite is true of the native-born population, with 81.0 percent under 50 years of age."⁵

Indicative of rapid decline of foreign-born Jews is Des Moines, Iowa. In 1937, Des Moines' total foreign-born Jewish population was 35.0 percent. In 1956, this percentage dwindled to 22.0 percent.⁶ In 1956, 51.0 percent of Detroit's total Jewish population was foreign-born. However, in 1963 the figure was 38.0 percent.⁷ Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania also is characteristic of a radical trend. 38.0 percent of Pittsburgh's Jewish community was foreign-born in 1938, compared to 11.9 percent in 1963.⁸

Sociologically, the fact that American Jewry is becoming almost totally native-born is of profound significance. This is especially true with regard to the acculturation process. "Within a very few years, as the foreign-born Jewish population becomes increasingly attenuated by age, and the next generation of American Jews at whatever class level become the native-born children of native-born parents, it seems reasonable to predict that all or nearly all differences in extrinsic culture traits between Jews and non-Jews will disappear. This prognosis could be wrong if there were a large-scale immigration to the United States of Jews from other countries, but this eventuality is unlikely."⁹

Another interesting and convincing trend may also be posited about the Jews of America in general, and the

native-born American Jews in particular. Generally, there is a high degree of stability, and, consequently, little migration, manifested with regard to living in, or near, one's birth place or original place of settlement. In New Orleans, Louisiana, nearly one-half of the total Jewish population was born there and 70.0 percent of the native-born Jewish population are from other parts of Louisiana.¹⁰ 89.0 percent of the native-born Jews of Port Chester, New York were born in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and surrounding territory. Thus, 95.0 percent of the native-born Jews are from the northeastern region.¹¹ Rochester, New York; Canton, Ohio; Charleston, West Virginia and Washington, D.C. also indicate that close to 50.0 percent or more of the native-born Jews have remained in the region of their birth. Providence, Rhode Island, which accounts for 72.0 percent of the native-born Jews being born there, also typifies this high degree of regional stability. "Well over 90 percent of the native-born population, therefore, originated in the northeastern United States, and the great majority of these were native-born Rhode Islanders."¹²

Our evidence, then, not only demonstrates the above two trends, but also illustrates that they are interrelated. Sherman has sagaciously observed that "there are indications that as the Jewish community becomes more native, its geographical stability increases. The community studies that include information on length of residence in the given

areas indicate that the bulk of the Jewish population remains in the states of birth or early settlement."¹³

CHAPTER II

MARITAL STATUS

Table 2 illustrates that the Jews as a group involve themselves in the marriage situation as a normal byproduct of adult life. Although marital status did not seem to be a major concern of the majority of communal surveys, there are several trends that emerge from a study of this area.

The most obvious fact is that at least three-fourths of the Jewish population of America is married. This figure is but slightly higher than that for the general population. There are, in addition, two aspects of sex differences which characterize almost each of the communities surveyed. The first is that there is a higher number of widows compared to widowers, and, secondly, that the average Jewish male marries latter in life than the Jewish female. "These sex differences are due to a variety of causes. For one, women have a greater life expectancy, for two, husbands are older than wives on the average (and thus on the average die earlier), and finally widowers probably remarry to a greater extent than widows."¹⁴

Lynn, Massachusetts is indicative of this situation. In 1956, only 13.0 percent of the males in the 20-24 age group were married, while for the females the respective

TABLE 2

MARITAL STATUS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGE OF JEWISH POPULATION

City, State and Year	Married	Single	Widowed	Divorced or Separated	Unknown
Canton, Ohio-1955 ^a					
Total	72.4	19.7	6.6	1.3	---
Male	73.8	22.7	2.5	1.0	---
Female	71.0	16.8	10.5	1.7	---
Lynn, Mass.-1956 ^b					
Total	74.4	18.6	5.5	0.6	1.0
Male	74.7	21.2	2.5	0.4	1.1
Female	74.1	16.0	8.4	0.7	0.8
Camden, N.J.-1964 ^b					
Total	72.0	22.0	5.0	1.0	---
Male	74.0	24.0	1.0	---	---
Female	70.0	20.0	8.0	---	---
Des Moines, Iowa-1956 ^b					
Total	71.0	20.1	8.1	0.8	---
New Orleans, La.-1953 ^c					
Total	62.6	21.8	11.3	2.4	1.9
Male	68.1	24.1	2.9	2.3	2.5
Female	57.6	19.8	18.7	2.5	1.4

TABLE 2--Continued

City, State and Year	Married	Single	Widowed	Divorced or Separated	Unknown
San Francisco, Cal.-1959^c					
Total	71.4	14.6	10.6	3.5	---
Male	79.9	12.8	5.5	1.8	---
Female	62.9	16.4	15.6	5.1	---
Los Angeles, Cal.-1953^c					
Total	63.9	29.0	4.5	2.6	---
Male	61.6	27.9	5.3	5.2	---
Female	66.1	30.1	3.8	---	---
Los Angeles, Cal.-1959^c					
Total	75.5	15.6	6.1	2.2	0.8
Male	77.6	18.4	1.9	1.6	0.5
Female	73.3	12.7	10.2	2.8	1.0
Dade County, Fla.-1961^c					
Total	85.0	1.0	12.0	2.0	---
Male	93.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	---
Female	77.0	---	20.0	3.0	---
Washington, D.C.-1956^c					
Total	77.9	14.9	5.3	1.5	0.4
Male	79.6	18.0	1.2	0.5	0.7
Female	76.1	11.8	9.5	2.4	0.2

TABLE 2--Continued

City, State and Year	Married	Single	Widowed	Divorced or Separated	Unknown
Indianapolis, Ind.-1948 ^c					
Total	70.2	21.7	7.2	0.6	0.4
Male	69.3	26.2	3.4	0.4	0.5
Female	71.0	16.8	11.3	0.8	0.1
Long Beach, Lakewood and Los Alamitos, Cal.-1962 ^c					
Total	74.9	17.1	5.8	2.3	---
Male	76.3	19.7	2.7	1.3	---
Female	73.5	14.5	8.8	3.2	---
Passaic, N.J.-1949 ^c					
Total	69.6	23.7	1.6	0.2	4.6
Male	69.8	26.2	0.9	0.1	3.0
Female	69.1	21.0	2.4	0.6	6.9
Port Chester, N.Y.-1950 ^c					
Total	70.6	21.7	5.3	0.8	1.6
Male	69.2	24.2	3.9	0.4	2.3
Female	71.9	18.9	6.9	1.3	1.0
Jacksonville, Fla.-1954 ^d					
Total	76.4	16.4	5.6	1.6	---
Trenton, N.J.-1961 ^d					
Total	81.0	19.0	----	---	---

TABLE 2--Continued

City, State and Year	Married	Single	Widowed	Divorced or Separated	Unknown
Charleston, W. Va.-1966 ^e					
Total	62.5	25.2	10.4	1.9	---
Male	31.3	15.1	1.2	---	---
Female	31.3	10.1	9.2	---	---
Baltimore, Md.-1963 ^f					
Total	91.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	---
Long Beach, Lakewood and Los Alamitos, Cal.-1962 ^g					
Total	85.5	5.5	6.6	2.5	---
Male	87.8	7.6	3.2	1.5	---
Female	83.2	3.4	10.0	3.4	---
Worcester, Mass.-1958 ^f					
Total	78.3	11.9	8.9	1.0	---
Male	80.6	14.7	4.0	0.7	---
Female	75.9	9.2	13.5	1.4	---
Northern Del.-1962 ^f					
Total	83.4	8.7	6.9	1.1	---
Male	86.6	10.3	2.3	0.8	---
Female	80.6	7.0	11.0	1.4	---
Kansas City, Mo.-1961 ^h					
Total	90.0	2.0	6.0	2.0	---

TABLE 2--Continued

City, State and Year	Married	Single	Widowed	Divorced or Separated	Unknown
Minneapolis, Minn.-1958^g					
Total	81.6	10.0	7.1	---	---
Male	85.7	12.9	0.7	---	---
Female	77.4	7.1	13.4	---	---
Providence, R.I.-1964^h					
Total	71.4	21.4	6.2	1.1	---
Male	74.0	23.2	2.2	0.5	---
Female	68.7	19.5	10.1	1.7	---
Memphis, Tenn.-1959^h					
Total	79.0	6.0	10.0	5.0	---
Male	86.0	9.0	2.0	3.0	---
Female	72.0	3.0	8.0	7.0	---
Detroit, Mich.-1963^h					
Total	70.5	21.0	7.0	1.5	---
Male	74.0	23.0	2.0	1.0	---
Female	67.0	19.0	12.0	2.0	---
South Bend, Ind.-1961^h					
Total	66.3	25.8	6.4	1.2	---
Male	67.4	29.5	2.2	0.4	---
Female	65.3	22.2	10.5	2.0	---

TABLE 2--Continued

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| a | Based on 13 years of age and over. |
| b | Based on 14 years of age and over. |
| c | Based on 15 years of age and over. |
| d | Based on 16 years of age and over. |
| e | Based on 17 years of age and over. |
| f | Based on 20 years of age and over. |
| g | Based on adult population. |
| h | Based on total population. |

figure was over 50.0 percent. Similarly, 2.5 percent of the Jewish males were widowed, compared with 8.4 percent of the females.

The Lynn survey also pointed out that the average age at which Jews, both male and female, marry is later than for the general population. Less than 1.0 percent of those under 20 years of age were married. One-third of those in the age groups 20-24 were married and 79.0 percent of those 25-29 years of age were married.¹⁵

Washington, D.C. is also characteristic of these trends among Jews. The percentage of women who are widowed is about eight times higher than for men, and, in the age group 15-19, 99.3 percent are unmarried. "The few married persons under 20 are women; and the percentage who are married between 20 and 25 is over twice as high among women as among men (64.0 percent compared to 25.7 percent). In short, the women tend to marry earlier than the men. On the other hand, if we compare the two lines showing the widowed, we find that the proportions are again higher among the women at each age."¹⁶

South Bend, Indiana had no married Jews under the age of 21, and for the ages 21-25 only 25.0 percent were married. An analysis of the sexes within this 25.0 percent indicates that only 12.0 percent of the males 21-25 years of age are married, compared with 44.0 percent of the females.¹⁷

The causal factor for women marrying earlier than men is probably due to the males postponement of marriage until certain educational and professional training is completed. This is supported by the higher percentage of males who receive more higher education than females.

Table 2 indicates that two cities, Baltimore and Kansas City, depart somewhat radically from the norm for the total percentage of married men and women. It is necessary to be cognizant of the fact that the figures for both of these communities were based on a sample of the adult population. Obviously, a survey on marital status will always produce a higher statistic from an adult sample. Furthermore, the Baltimore survey utilized affiliated lists for the sample. Thus, the figures will always be weighted in favor of the married because the total sample is weighted in favor of the affiliated.

Three cities, New Orleans, Charleston and Los Angeles, show a departure from the norm toward the lower extreme. As Table 2 illustrates, the percentage for Los Angeles in 1953 was 63.9 percent compared to 75.5 percent in 1959. New Orleans, also in 1953, accounts for a percentage of 62.6 for married men and women. There are two probable explanations for these comparatively low percentages. First, most surveys indicate that in recent years the marriage age has been declining. Consequently, surveys conducted since 1953 call attention to a decreasing

single population. Second, the Jewish populations in both New Orleans and Los Angeles have grown younger since 1953. In 1953, the median age for New Orleans was 39.8 years, compared to 34.6 years in 1958. "The change no doubt has been caused by several factors, but the most relevant seem to be an increase in the number of births, the deaths of those in the oldest age groups, and the relatively younger ages of migrants to the city in the last five years. All of these have contributed to lowering the average age level of the population."¹⁸

Similarly, the Los Angeles Jewish community is becoming more youthful. In 1951, the median age was 35.4 years. By 1959, the median age decreased to 32.7 years.¹⁹

Concerning the low percentage of marriage in the Charleston Jewish community, it is possible that Charleston represents an exception to the normal trend established by other communities. However, the Charleston study is not definitive enough to posit a cause.

CHAPTER III

INTERMARRIAGE

"Perhaps the major challenge facing the Jewish community in the United States today is its desire to fit into the social patterns of the country without losing its own group identity. The key role of Jewish education in insuring identity and avoiding complete assimilation is clear. The proportion of children currently enrolled in programs of Jewish studies affirms the positive value which Jews place on maintaining their Jewish individuality while they struggle to fit into the social patterns of the United States. Yet a consistent threat to the maintenance of identification, and, in fact, to the demographic maintenance of the Jewish population is the proportion of Jews who are lost or gained through the process of interfaith marriages. In a sense, the ultimate test of group conformity, loyalty, and cohesiveness is the degree to which the number of intermarriages is changing and the extent to which Jews are losing their identification with Judaism through intermarriage."²⁰

In March of 1957, the U.S. Census Bureau issued their findings of marriage and religion. This was the first time that national rates of intermarriage were established. Table 3 indicates that the Jewish rate was 7.2 percent.²¹

TABLE 3

MARRIED COUPLES BY RELIGION REPORTED:
CIVILIAN POPULATION, MARCH 1957

	Number of Couples	Per Cent
All married couples with husband and wife in a major religious group	36,576,000	100.0
Husband and wife in same religious group	34,223,000	93.6
Both Protestant	24,604,000	67.3
Both Roman Catholic	8,361,000	22.9
Both Jewish	1,258,000	3.4
Husband and wife in different major religious groups	2,353,000	6.4
Either or both spouses Protestant	26,916,000	100.0
Both Protestant	24,604,000	91.4
One Roman Catholic	2,255,000	8.4
One Jewish	57,000	0.2
Either or both spouses Roman Catholic	10,657,000	100.0
Both Roman Catholic	8,361,000	78.5
One Protestant	2,255,000	21.2
One Jewish	41,000	0.4
Either or both spouses Jewish	1,356,000	100.0
Both Jewish	1,258,000	92.8
One Protestant	57,000	4.2
One Roman Catholic	41,000	3.0

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau Release, Series P-20, No. 79,
Table 6.

It is paramount to note however, that the 7.2 percent figure can be extremely misleading. It may, of course, be understood to indicate the total overall intermarriage situation through 1957. And, yet, in terms of trends, it may not be considered as accurate for current and future directions. "If successive minority generations experience a significant decrease in cultural differences from the majority, a substantial weakening of identification with ethnic or religious particularity, and a sharp decline in social distance from members of other groups, then significant differences in intermarriage rates for successive generations should be observed. That is precisely what the Washington data show. For the first time-as far as this writer knows-it has become possible to demonstrate empirically the relationship between generation and intermarriage. The level of intermarriage in the first generation (the foreign-born) was 1.4 percent, the second generation (native-born of foreign parentage) had a level 10.2 percent, and the native-born of native parentage (the third and subsequent generations) had a level of 17.9 percent."²² Rosenthal has succinctly demonstrated then, that current figures must allude to the third generation for intermarriage trends to be accurate and meaningful, for it is the third generation which constitutes the traffic in the marriage market.

As the introduction states, it is often problematic to collate the findings of the intermarriage portions of

communal surveys. At the outset, there is a paucity of information regarding this area. However, when the subject is treated, the results are based on such different techniques and bases that a proper comparison cannot be made. These "differences" become manifest, for example, with the omission of conversion analysis and the improper use of the terms "intermarriage" and "mixed marriage." Very few of the communal studies have an analysis of out marriage involving conversion, either before or after the marriage. Out marriage rates, without the corollary rates of conversion, reveal very little. Concerning the proper use of terms, the marriage of a Jew to a non-Jew, without predicating anything of the non-Jewish partner, is properly referred to as "out marriage." "Intermarriage" refers to the marriage of a Jew and a non-Jew who converts. A "mixed marriage" is the marriage of a Jew and a non-Jew who maintains a different religious ideology subsequent to the marriage.

The Providence, Rhode Island survey, conducted in 1964, was based on a "head of household" interview of 5,076 household units. Of this total, 228 or 4.5 percent of the total were out marriages. The vast majority of this 4.5 percent involved a Jewish husband and a non-Jewish wife. Sidney Goldstein has poignantly noted that this situation must not mislead one into thinking that few Jewish women have out married. On the contrary, those that have are probably assimilated into the general

community so completely that they have lost total contact with the Jewish community. "The heavy predominance of husbands who are Jewish-born suggests that there is a much stronger tendency for those interfaith marriages in which the wife was born Jewish and the husband is the non-Jew to lose their identification with the Jewish community."²³ The harsh reality here is that most studies do not include the number of Jews who have out married and subsequently cease to identify themselves as Jews.

Of the 4.5 percent of the out marriages in Providence, 39.0 percent of the non-Jews by birth had converted to Judaism. Although the rate of out marriage tends to be higher among younger persons, the proportion of persons who are converted to Judaism is also higher among the younger generations. There is then, an obvious increase in the out marriage rate from the first to the third generation. While the reported rate of out marriage among the first generation was 1.0 percent, the proportion among the third generation is 6.0 percent.

During the past seven years, from March 1, 1959-1966, there have been 107 marriages involving at least one Jew in Charleston, West Virginia. Of the 53 men who have married, 52.8 percent married non-Jewish spouses. Of the 54 women who have married, 14.8 percent out married. Consequently, of all the marriages during the past seven years, there have been 33.6 percent out marriages. For all the married

couples residing in Charleston's Jewish community the percentage of out marriage is 25.5 percent. The conversion rates for these out marriages are minimal. 17.8 percent of the non-Jewish mates have converted to Judaism, compared to 82.2 percent of the non-Jewish mates who have not converted.

In 1961, the Jewish population of Rochester, New York had an out marriage rate of 8.0 percent. Of this total, 2.7 percent represent intermarriages, that is, conversions by the non-Jewish mate, and 5.3 constitute mixed marriages.

The San Francisco Jewish population survey, conducted in 1959, indicates that for San Francisco proper the out marriage rate is 17.2 percent. On the Peninsula the rate is 20.0 percent and for the suburb of Marin it is 37.0 percent. Almost 50.0 percent more of the wives are non-Jewish than the husbands. This is especially true in Marin where the differential is 33.0 percent non-Jewish wives and 4.0 percent non-Jewish husbands. Unfortunately, the San Francisco study gives no information concerning conversion rates.

In 1959, the Los Angeles Jewish population recorded 6.3 percent outmarriages. 4.2 percent of this total are marriages involving Jewish-born husbands and 2.1 percent for Jewish-born wives. This substantiates the trend in most communities for more Jewish men to out marry than women. Again, there is a lack of conversion information.

The Camden, New Jersey survey of 1964 reveals that there is an out marriage rate of 6.0 percent. Of the total out marriages, 84.0 percent involved Jewish men and 16.0 percent involved Jewish women. One-third of the non-Jewish mates converted to Judaism, and, over 90.0 percent of these converted mates were non-Jewish wives.

Jacksonville, Florida reports a 6.5 percent out marriage rate for the total Jewish population in 1954. It is interesting to note that in 1946 the total was 10.0 percent. In 1946, eight out of ten out marriages involved a non-Jewish wife. This figure increased slightly to 8.7 percent in 1954. Conversion information was not indicated.

A combined study in 1962 for the communities of Long Beach, Lakewood and Los Alamitos, California indicates a total out marriage rate of 9.0 percent for the Jewish population. The Jewish males account for 6.6 percent and the Jewish females for 2.4 percent. 7.1 percent are mixed marriages and 1.9 percent are intermarriages.

The Washington, D.C. survey of 1956 documents mixed marriages only. This mixed marriage rate was 11.3 percent. 7.8 percent involved Jewish-born males and 3.5 percent involved Jewish-born females.

One final word about our chapter. The lack of quality studies in this area, as well as quantity, is dubious in itself. Yet, from the few available endeavors, it is easily observed how difficult it is to compare these

findings. This is especially true in regard to the comparison, and understanding, of the small community with the large city. Eric Rosenthal has cogently summarized this enigma: "The level of Jewish intermarriage is lower in the large Jewish community than in the small, where acculturation is accompanied by social disintegration and a consequent disorganization of the marriage market. If residents of large Jewish communities feel impelled to draw closer together within given urban areas in order to insure group survival, how much more insecure must be the members of small Jewish communities! Awareness of the threat to Jewish survival in a small Jewish community has influenced many a Jew to maintain residence in a large community, even though it would be economically advantageous or physically more convenient for him to live in a town with few Jewish inhabitants."²⁴

CHAPTER IV

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

"Although the analysis of occupational status is primarily useful in evaluating economic status, occupation exerts so strong and varied an influence on demography that it is difficult to exclude it from consideration in a population study. The nature of work affects the social and cultural environment of a people; the occupation and industry into which a person enters may be affected by a special system of values; personality traits and, in the long run, marital status, health, and reproduction rates are influenced by working conditions."²⁵

Because there is no occupational information available from several of the large centers of Jewish population, it is difficult to draw a conclusive picture about the occupational status of American Jews. However, there are sufficient similarities among the communities analyzed in Table 4 to permit some tentative conclusions.

The two occupational groups which contain the majority of Jews in the labor force are (1) proprietors, managers and officials, and (2) professionals and semi-professionals. Apparently, these two categories account for nearly two-thirds of the Jews in most communities.

TABLE 4

OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF JEWISH AND TOTAL WHITE LABOR FORCES ACCORDING TO PERCENT

Category	JEWISH		TOTAL WHITE		JEWISH	
	Male	Female	Total	Male Female Total	Male	Female Total
<u>CANTON-1955^a</u>						
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	14.0	14.1	14.0	6.3	11.1	7.7
Managers	12.2	3.5	10.7	4.8	2.0	4.0
Proprietors	42.6	27.1	40.0	4.9	1.9	4.0
Clerical	1.5	24.7	5.5	7.0	28.8	13.0
Sales Workers	12.9	20.0	14.1	6.3	12.5	8.0
Skilled	4.7	2.9	4.4	24.0	1.8	17.9
Semi-Skilled	4.1	1.8	3.7	26.9	16.9	24.1
Unskilled	2.7	1.2	2.4	11.6	0.8	8.7
Service	---	---	---	6.0	21.4	10.3
<u>WASHINGTON-1956^b</u>						
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	37.9	15.1	31.8			
Managers	(24.5)	(7.8)	(20.1)			
Proprietors	6.8	49.9	18.3			
Clerical	14.0	9.9	12.9			
Sales Workers	7.5	0.7	5.7			
Skilled	0.9	1.6	1.0			
Semi-Skilled	---	---	---			
Unskilled	1.2	6.2	2.5			
Service						
<u>SOUTH BEND-1961^b</u>						
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	17.6	17.2	17.5	11.6	10.9	11.4
Managers, Officials,						
Proprietors	56.5	24.1	48.4	11.5	6.6	9.3
Clerical	2.4	32.6	9.9	7.3	33.7	16.3
Sales Workers	12.9	18.5	14.3	8.2	8.0	8.2
Skilled	4.6	3.0	4.2	18.9	1.5	13.0
Semi-Skilled	3.4	1.7	3.0	26.4	14.8	22.4
Unskilled	2.0	0.9	1.7	5.4	0.7	3.8
Service	---	---	---	6.1	20.8	11.0
<u>PASSAIC-1949^c</u>						
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	---	---	---	---	---	12.0
Managers, Officials,						
Proprietors	---	---	---	---	---	38.3
Clerical	---	---	---	---	---	(25.3)
Sales Workers	---	---	---	---	---	6.0
Skilled	---	---	---	---	---	6.8
Semi-Skilled	---	---	---	---	---	2.9
Unskilled	---	---	---	---	---	2.0
Service	---	---	---	---	---	---

TABLE 4--Continued

Category	JEWISH		TOTAL WHITE		JEWISH	
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	<u>NEW ORLEANS-1953^e</u>			<u>PITTSBURGH-1953^h</u>		
Professional and	23.5	14.5	21.1	10.6	15.4	12.0
Semi-Professional	46.0	25.1	40.4	17.6	6.0	14.2
Managers, Officials,	{22.0}	{53.4}	{30.5}	{21.9}	{54.2}	{31.4}
Proprietors	2.7	1.0	2.3	20.1	1.5	14.6
Clerical	1.3	1.7	1.4	15.5	11.0	14.6
Sales Workers	0.6	---	0.5	6.4	0.6	4.7
Skilled	2.3	3.3	2.6	7.0	10.1	7.9
Semi-Skilled						
Unskilled						
Services						
				14.3	17.7	15.0
				40.1	11.9	33.9
				2.3	21.8	6.5
				31.2	40.7	33.2
				3.8	3.2	3.7
				0.4	1.5	0.6
				3.7	---	2.9
				4.2	3.2	4.0
	<u>PROVIDENCE-1964^h</u>			<u>DES MOINES-1956^j</u>		
Professional and	20.7	17.9	---	9.2	10.5	---
Semi-Professional	40.7	12.7	---	10.5	2.4	---
Managers, Officials,	4.5	41.5	---	8.1	27.2	---
Proprietors	20.9	18.3	---	7.4	6.2	---
Clerical	6.8	0.4	---	21.9	2.4	---
Sales Workers	4.2	5.2	---	23.9	31.6	---
Skilled	0.3	---	---	5.1	0.7	---
Semi-Skilled	0.8	1.5	---	7.0	11.6	---
Unskilled						
Services						
				13.7	9.7	12.9
				52.8	23.6	47.1
				6.8	38.9	13.1
				16.8	16.7	16.8
				4.4	0.9	3.7
				0.7	0.5	0.6
				1.0	---	0.8
				1.3	2.8	1.5

TABLE 4--Continued

Category	JEWISH		TOTAL WHITE		JEWISH	
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<u>LOS ANGELES-1953^h</u>						
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	17.6	14.6	16.9	---	---	25.0
Managers, Officials,						
Proprietors	36.8	13.0	31.2	---	---	31.0
Clerical and Sales	24.9	50.3	30.9	---	---	24.0
Skilled	11.9	2.7	9.7	---	---	12.0
Semi-Skilled	5.3	10.9	6.6	---	---	5.0
Unskilled	1.5	0.6	1.2	---	---	1.0
Service	2.0	8.1	3.5	---	---	3.0
<u>LOS ANGELES-1959ⁱ</u>						
				---	---	
<u>DADE COUNTY-1961^f</u>						
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	---	---	24.6	---	---	27.0
Managers, Officials,						
Proprietors	---	---	41.8	---	---	33.0
Clerical	---	---	6.5	---	---	4.0
Sales Workers	---	---	19.7	---	---	23.0
Service	---	---	7.4	---	---	6.0
<u>BALTIMORE-1963^d</u>						
				---	---	

TABLE 4--Continued

Category	JEWISH		TOTAL WHITE		JEWISH	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
	<u>PORT CHESTER-1950^h</u>				<u>LONG BEACH, LAKEWOOD, LOS ALAMITOS-1962ⁱ</u>	
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	14.9	17.1	15.3	---	---	26.0
Managers	{ 56.3 }	{ 20.3 }	{ 49.5 }	---	---	14.0
Proprietors	16.1	47.8	22.1	---	---	18.0
Clerical and Sales	5.9	1.9	5.1	---	---	27.0
Skilled	3.3	9.1	4.4	---	---	8.0
Semi-Skilled	{ 2.3 }	{ 1.3 }	{ 2.1 }	---	---	5.0
Unskilled				---	---	---
Service				---	---	2.0
	<u>KANSAS CITY-1961^f</u>				<u>MEMPHIS-1959^j</u>	
Professional and						
Semi-Professional	---	---	16.0	---	---	16.1
Managers, Officials,						
Proprietors	---	---	39.0	---	---	44.3
Clerical	---	---	9.0	---	---	9.0
Sales Workers	---	---	21.0	---	---	27.5
Skilled, Semi-Skilled	---	---	2.0	---	---	3.0
Unskilled	---	---	1.0	---	---	---
Service	---	---	7.0	---	---	---

TABLE 4--Continued

Category	JEWISH		TOTAL WHITE		JEWISH	
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	<u>SAN FRANCISCO-PENINSULA-1959¹</u>			<u>SAN FRANCISCO-1959¹</u>		
Professionals	---	---	31.8	---	---	24.5
Semi-Professionals	---	---	3.4	---	---	2.0
Managers, Officials, Proprietors	---	---	26.1	---	---	29.6
Clerical and Sales	---	---	22.7	---	---	29.6
Skilled	---	---	9.1	---	---	6.6
Semi-Skilled	---	---	---	---	---	1.5
Unskilled	---	---	2.3	---	---	1.0
Service	---	---	2.3	---	---	3.1
	<u>SAN FRANCISCO-MARIN-1959¹</u>			<u>INDIANAPOLIS-1948^c</u>		
Professionals	---	---	37.5	---	---	11.0
Semi-Professionals	---	---	5.0	---	---	1.0
Managers, Officials, Proprietors	---	---	32.5	---	---	50.0
Clerical	---	---	(15.0)	---	---	9.0
Sales Workers	---	---	---	---	---	19.0
Skilled	---	---	3.8	---	---	3.0
Semi-Skilled	---	---	---	---	---	4.0
Unskilled	---	---	---	---	---	0.1
Service	---	---	5.0	---	---	1.1

TABLE 4--Continued

Category	JEWISH		TOTAL WHITE		JEWISH	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
	JACKSONVILLE-19468		JACKSONVILLE-19548			
Professional and	---	---	13.0	---	---	14.7
Semi-Professional	---	---	---	---	---	---
Managers, Officials,	---	---	48.0	---	---	59.1
Proprietors	---	---	31.0	---	---	21.9
Clerical and Sales	---	---	8.0	---	---	4.3
Skilled, Semi-Skilled	---	---	---	---	---	---

a Based on age 13 and over.

b Based on age 14 and over.

c Based on age 15 and over.

d Based on age 16 and over.

e Based on age 17 and over.

f Based on age 20 and over.

g Based on age 21 and over.

h Based on total population.

i Based on household heads.

j Based on adult population.

South Bend, Indiana indicates that 17.5 percent of the total Jews in the labor force are professionals or semi-professionals; and 48.4 percent are proprietors, managers and officials. Considering the latter category from the male population alone, this figure rises to 56.5 percent. The total white population in South Bend reports only 11.4 percent in professions and 9.3 percent as proprietors and officials. The opposite end of the occupational ladder supports very few of the Jewish population. Only 7.2 percent of the working Jews are in skilled or semi-skilled jobs, while the general community reports 35.4 percent in these occupations. There are few Jews in South Bend's labor force under the age of 20; however, over this age 54.0 percent of the Jews are employed.

Providence, Rhode Island also finds the majority of the Jews in the labor force in either professions or as managers and proprietors. These two groups account for 61.4 percent of the Jewish males, compared to 19.7 percent of the males for the total white population. For the total Jewish population of Providence, three-fourths of the males and one-fourth of the females are in the labor force. The male figure is comparable to the total white population, however, 40.0 percent of the women in the total community are in the labor force.

Over one-half of the Jewish males in the labor force of Providence are self-employed (52.8 percent). This compares

to 11.0 percent for the total white population. There is also a striking difference regarding white collar occupations. For the Jewish males in white collar jobs the percentage is 87.0, compared to 35.0 percent for the total community.

For Los Angeles, California, the largest category for the Jews in the labor force is the proprietor and manager group. This level accounts for 31.0 percent of the total Jewish population in the labor force, and for 36.8 percent of the Jewish males. "A comparison between the occupational distribution of the Jewish population and the corresponding patterns for the total population highlights the relative concentration of Jewish employment in the proprietor-manager area. Here, we note that 31.0 percent of all the Los Angeles Jewish employed find work as contrasted with 14.9 percent for the total Los Angeles population. On the other hand, there is no significant over-representation of the Jewish people in the professions. But a rather decisive under-representation is found in the crafts and operative fields."²⁶

More than one-half of the Jewish male labor force of New Orleans is self-employed. Here too, the greatest percentage of Jews are in wholesale and retail trades and the professional services. These two vocations share a combined total of 61.5 percent for the Jewish community. This compares with 16.2 percent for the general white community. "Part of the explanation for the preponderance of Jewish

employment in these two industrial groupings lies in the fact that these offer greater opportunities for self-employment. Fully 62.0 percent of the Jewish males engaged in Wholesale-Retail Trades and in Professional Services were self-employed corresponding with 38.0 percent for the remainder of the Jewish labor force. Even for females, the proportion of self-employed in these two industrial classifications was 30.0 percent, compared with 17.0 percent for all other industries."²⁷

The New Orleans survey also indicated that the foreign-born Jew tended to be found in business as owners or managers, while the native-born Jews were more prominent in the professions. Although there are 13.0 percent of the foreign-born Jews in the professional services in New Orleans, there is a larger proportion of foreign-born than native-born in business as owners and managers. As Table 4 demonstrated, almost all of New Orleans' Jews are in white collar jobs.

Generally, the trends emerging from almost each communal survey indicate that nearly one-half of the Jews are self-employed, that they are engaged primarily as proprietors, owners and managers, or as professionals, and very few occupy blue collar positions. "The effect of more education and the consequent selection of occupation is to shift the income distribution of the Jewish population toward higher incomes, with the greatest shift occurring at the upper end of the distribution."²⁸

CHAPTER V

SECULAR EDUCATION

The surveys presenting data on the level of education attained reveal an extraordinary high achievement for the Jewish population compared to the general white population. Table 5 illustrates the level of educational attainment.

The Canton, Ohio study indicates that the general school level attained is much higher for Jews than non-Jews. For persons over age 25, 18.0 percent of the Jewish population have graduated from college compared with 5.0 percent for the general population. Whereas 44.0 percent of the total white population of Canton had no higher than an elementary education, 21.0 percent of the Jews were in this category. Almost one-third of Canton's Jewish population over the age of six has had some college education.

The New Orleans Jewish community manifests a similar high educational trend. The majority of the children of New Orleans' Jews enter college. For the ages 21-40, more than seven out of ten reach at least the undergraduate level of college. There are no apparent differences between the educational attainment of males and females. There are larger numbers of males reaching the post-graduate level, however, this is of course related to vocation-

TABLE 5

COMPARATIVE EDUCATIONAL LEVER ATTAINED, JEWISH POPULATION, ACCORDING TO PERCENT

City, State and Year	Elementary Graduate or Less	High School Attendance	High School Graduate	College Attendance	College Graduate	Post- Graduate
Indianapolis, Ind.-1948 ^a	19.0	8.0	36.0	17.0	12.0	5.0
South Bend, Ind.-1961 ^b	16.9	7.7	33.4	18.3	14.6	7.7
Jewish General Population	34.5	21.4	27.9	7.8	---	8.4---
Canton, Ohio-1955 ^b	20.6	9.5	33.3	17.5	8.2	10.7
Jewish General Population	44.0	19.4	24.9	5.9	---	4.6---
Des Moines, Iowa-1956 ^b	17.9	6.6	32.1	18.9	---	18.8---
Camden, N.J.-1964 ^b	11.0	9.0	34.0	18.0	---	28.0---
Jewish General Population	50.0	23.0	18.0	4.0	---	5.0---
Trenton, N.J.-1949 ^b	22.0	6.6	32.3	8.6	---	18.1---
Trenton, N.J.-1961 ^b	14.2	7.4	32.0	19.2	---	26.7---

TABLE 5--Continued

City, State and Year	Elementary Graduate or Less	High School Attendance	High School Graduate	College Attendance	College Graduate	Post- Graduate
Washington, D.C.-1956 ^b	10.0	---	27.3	15.6	12.8	23.2
Providence, R.I.-1964 ^b						
Jewish	14.5	7.8	34.2	15.9	11.9	13.4
General Population	41.9	23.0	22.0	6.6	---	6.5---
Rochester, N.Y.-1961 ^b						
Jewish-Male	19.0	13.5	23.7	11.3	15.2	17.2
Female	23.2	10.3	35.7	17.2	8.8	4.4
General Population						
Male	34.0	22.9	21.5	9.2	---	12.5---
Female	33.4	22.8	28.1	8.9	---	6.8---
Port Chester, N.Y.-1950 ^c	18.7	8.5	24.9	9.6	9.3	4.9
Los Angeles, Cal.-1959 ^d	9.0	15.0	---	49.0---	12.0	11.0
New Orleans, La.-1953 ^d	14.7	8.3	31.1	17.2	13.7	9.5
New Orleans, La.-1958 ^d	10.3	7.7	18.1	20.1	17.5	10.2

TABLE 5--Continued

City, State and Year	Elementary Graduate or Less	High School Attendance	High School Graduate	College Attendance	College Graduate	Post- Graduate
Long Beach, Lakewood, Los Alamitos, Cal.-1962 ^d	---22.0---	---	---53.0---	---	13.0	10.0
San Francisco, Cal.-1959 ^d	26.4	---	33.6	9.6	10.4	14.8
Peninsula	14.0	---	24.0	15.0	21.0	21.0
Marin	15.0	---	37.0	4.0	19.0	23.0

a Based on age 20 and over.

b Based on age 25 and over.

c Based on total Jewish population.

d Based on head of household.

al pursuits in the professions. In 1953, 40.0 percent of New Orleans' Jews had some college education, with 23.0 percent graduating. By 1958, this figure climbed to 27.0 percent.

Table 5 demonstrates that the Jews of Camden, New Jersey had more than five times the college graduates of the total Camden population. At the lower end of the scale, 73.0 percent of the entire population had less than four years of high school, compared to 20.0 percent for the Jewish population.

Revealing the current trend of the third generation, 45.0 percent of all Jewish men between the ages of 25-34 had more than four years of college. Only 17.0 percent of Camden's Jews in this age group was without a college education.

The Jewish population of Los Angeles is characteristic of similar trends. "The shift towards greater educational attainment among the young adult members of the Los Angeles Jewish community is clearly in evidence. Among male young adults, more than one-half have completed some college work, and an additional 18.0 percent have completed some graduate work. On the other hand, among the aged, more than one-half have not gone beyond the 8th grade."²⁹ By 1959, almost one-fourth of the total adult Jewish population had graduated from college; and nearly one-half of this group obtained an advanced degree.

Similarly, the adult Jewish male group of San Francisco is composed of a remarkably high proportion of college educated males. 47.2 percent of the males between the ages of 30-44 received a college degree or post-graduate degree. For the total Jewish population of San Francisco, one-fourth are college graduates or post-graduates.

Trenton, New Jersey demonstrates the trend for the third generation to achieve higher educational goals. In 1949, 8.6 percent of the Jews over the age of 25 had some college education, and 18.1 percent either completed college or post-graduate work. By 1961, 19.2 percent achieved some college education, and 26.7 percent were graduates or post-graduates. For the Jewish males alone, 24.7 percent completed college in 1949, compared with 36.9 percent in 1961.

In Rochester, New York, the rate of college completion for the Jewish population is two to three times as high as the total white population. Of all Jewish males over 25 years of age, 43.7 percent entered college. This compares with 21.7 percent for the entire white community. Of this group who entered, 74.0 percent of the Jews completed at least four years, compared with 58.0 percent of the males of the general population. 32.4 percent of all Jewish males over 25 years of age have completed at least four years of college as compared to 12.5 percent for the total white population of Rochester. Corresponding figures for females indicate that 13.2 percent of the Jewish women

have completed four or more years of college, compared to 6.8 percent for the total white female population.

Table 6 illustrates a comparison of four communities according to educational completion rather than attainment. Table 7 is a comparison of the 1950 and 1960 United States Census for the total white urban population.

Thus, in each of the communities surveyed, the Jewish men and women have a much higher level of formal education than is true for the population at large. What is true for Providence, Rhode Island may well be indicative for the entire country: "In fact, proportionately more Jews have gone on to graduate education than have completed a college education in the total population."³⁰

Although aspects of Jewish religious practice have changed and developed throughout the long history of the Jews, there has been one aspect of Jewish life which has remained constant. Obviously, this has been the high value placed on education. In the past, Torah was the essential element for the education of the Jew. In modern times, as our data has indicated, the emphasis on education certainly includes secular learning. Our chapter on occupational status demonstrates the relationship between educational achievement and occupation. To be sure, this emphasis on education must be understood not only as a means for self-fulfillment and satisfaction, but also as a means of social mobility.

TABLE 6
COMPARISON OF JEWISH POPULATION OF FOUR COMMUNITIES
BY EDUCATIONAL COMPLETION, ACCORDING TO PERCENT

Category	Baltimore 1963	Memphis 1959	Dade County 1961	Kansas City 1961
Elementary School	17.0	11.0	18.0	14.0
High School	42.0	57.0	38.0	46.0
College	20.0	23.0	30.0	27.0
Post-Graduate	16.0	8.0	14.0	10.0

TABLE 7
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR TOTAL UNITED STATES
URBAN-WHITE POPULATION, 1950-1960,
ACCORDING TO PERCENT

Category	Total White Population 1950 Census	Total White Population 1960 Census
Elementary School or less	44.6	33.8
High School Attendance	17.3	19.7
High School Graduate	21.4	26.8
College Attendance	7.6	10.2
College Graduate	(6.4)	(9.4)
Post-Graduate	(6.4)	(9.4)

CHAPTER VI

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

"Probably no question has concerned the Jewish community in the United States as much as the education of its youth. Yet, despite the very high value placed on education, as late as World War II Jewish education in the United States remained unadjusted to the generally efficient tenor of American life. As Dr. Engleman has pointed out in an essay on the education of the Jewish child in America, it is only in the last several decades that the old world pattern of 'a multiplicity of small, independent schools, most of them poorly housed, conducted on a shoe string with inadequate staffing, casual lay leadership, and archaic curriculum' has given way in the face of an accelerated attempt to bring Jewish education to the level of efficiency of the other major institutions in the country and to bring it more closely within the general context of American life. Changes that have taken place may well account for the fact that within the limits of available statistical data and records, the evidence shows that the number of children attending Jewish schools today is proportionately much higher than it was 30 or 40 years ago."³¹

Table 8 illustrates the type of Jewish schools attended according to the percentage of those ever exposed to Jewish education.

The San Francisco survey records a community wide average of 70.8 percent for those ever receiving some type of Jewish education. Of these persons, 34.1 percent attended Sunday School and 37.0 percent attended Hebrew School. The data presented in Table 8 indicates the decline in Jewish education as the Jews have moved out into the suburbs. It is interesting to note that of the three geographic areas, Marin is the only one with a higher percentage attending Sunday School. For the community as a whole, however, nearly three-fourths of the Jewish population has received some Jewish education.

For Port Chester, New York, the outstanding conclusion to be drawn from the data on Jewish education is that 38.0 percent of the population report no exposure to any form of Jewish education or instruction.

In 1955, Canton, Ohio reports that slightly under three-fourths of the total Jewish population has had some Jewish education. For the children, ages 4-15, over 70.0 percent were receiving or had some type of Jewish instruction.

Similar trends exist in South Bend, Indiana. Four-fifths of the Jewish children ages 4-15 were receiving or had some form of Jewish education. For the total population, 17.0 percent indicated receiving no instruction.

TABLE 8
TYPE OF JEWISH EDUCATION, ACCORDING TO PERCENT EVER ENROLLED

City, State and Year	Ever Enrolled in a Jewish School	Sunday School	Sunday School and Hebrew Afternoon	Hebrew Afternoon	All Day School	Private Tutor	No Jewish Education
South Bend, Ind.-1961 ^a	83.0	28.1	23.6	18.7	2.0	---	17.0
Canton, Ohio-1955 ^a	---	29.3	14.5	27.6	---	---	---
Port Chester, N.Y.-1950 ^b	62.0	15.1	---	73.6	---	8.3	38.0
Camden, N.J.-1964 ^b	---	18.0	10.0	47.0	4.0	12.0	---
Indianapolis, Ind.-1948 ^b	78.0	30.4	---	43.9	---	1.6	22.0
Trenton, N.J.-1949 ^c	75.5	---	31.1	25.1	8.6	9.3	24.5
Trenton, N.J.-1961 ^c	79.1	19.2	26.7	17.1	4.6	11.5	20.9
New Orleans, La.-1953 ^c	89.6	55.3	---	20.8	1.3	5.5	10.4
Baltimore, Md.-1963	96.0	27.0	51.0	4.0	16.0	2.0	4.0

TABLE 8--Continued

City, State and Year	Ever Enrolled in a Jewish School	Sunday School	Sunday School and Hebrew Afternoon	Hebrew Afternoon	All Day School	Private Tutor	No Jewish Education
Dade County, Fla.-1961d	82.0	29.0	54.0	15.0	2.0	---	18.0
Kansas City, Mo.-1961d	91.0	63.0	19.0	14.0	3.0	---	9.0
San Francisco, Cal.-1959e	72.6	34.5	---	38.1	---	---	27.4
Peninsula	65.5	32.3	---	36.2	---	---	34.5
Marin	63.4	35.6	---	20.8	---	---	36.6
Washington, D.C.-1956f							
Male	84.7	28.0	---	51.4	8.0	22.4	11.0
Female	66.1	33.7	---	25.8	4.2	10.2	28.3

TABLE 8--Continued

City, State and Year	Ever Enrolled in a Jewish School	Sunday School	Sunday School and Hebrew Afternoon	Hebrew Afternoon	All Day School	Private Tutor	No Jewish Education
Providence, R.I.-1964 ^a							
Male	86.0	8.7	27.6	30.2	4.2	20.0	14.0
Female	72.0	23.1	20.2	15.2	1.9	11.0	28.0

a Based on age 4 and over.

b Based on age 5 and over.

c Based on age 6 and over.

d Based on ages 6 through 14.

e Based on age 15 and over.

f Based on age 17 and over.

g Based on total population.

Baltimore, Maryland, Kansas City, Missouri and Dade County, Florida all conducted surveys for children ages 6-14. Baltimore was high with 96.0 percent of the children involved in some type of formal Jewish education. The most solicited form, with 51.0 percent attending, was a combination of Sunday School and an afternoon Hebrew program. Dade County, Florida was the lowest of the three cities with 82.0 percent receiving some Jewish education. Dade County exhibits a similar trend for the combination Sunday School and Hebrew program with 54.0 percent in attendance. Kansas City was the median with 91.0 percent involved in Jewish educational programs. However, the most preferred program was Sunday School alone, with 63.0 percent attending.

Des Moines, Iowa records information concerning Hebrew education alone. The data reveals that 80.0 percent of the males and 50.0 percent of the females over the age of 14 have received Hebrew training.

The data for Providence, Rhode Island documents clearly the popularity of the Sunday School during the 1930-50 decades. This popularity was accompanied by the decline of the older Talmud Torah school. Indicative of this trend is the fact that less than 4.0 percent of the males 50 years of age and older ever attended a Sunday School. In contrast to Sunday School attendance, the proportion of males who were enrolled in Hebrew School declined from 40.0 percent or more of those in the age

group over 40 to only one-fourth of those in the 20-29 year age group, and to even fewer of those in the 10-19 year age group. A similar decline has been manifest in the number of males receiving their Jewish education from a private tutor. "The most significant change taking place in Jewish education has been the development of the congregational schools which have replaced the Talmud Torahs. Although organized differently in various communities, basically the congregational school involves an integrated Hebrew School and Sunday School program. Illustrative of the predominance of this form of Jewish education today is the evidence that although only 10.0 percent or less of both males and females now 50 years old and over attended such a school, 44.0 percent of the men and one-third of the women now 20-29 years of age received at least some of their Jewish education in this integrated program. Moreover, among those now 10-19 years of age, two-thirds of the males and over one-half of the females have already attended this type of school system."³²

The trends established by our data are apparently true for most Jewish communities. Enrollments have been steadily increasing and new facilities are rising to meet this development. Summarily, these trends give credence to an increasing amount of support and acceptance of Jewish education by the Jews of America.

CHAPTER VII

SYNAGOGUE AFFILIATION

"One of the ways in which people may demonstrate attitudes is through the choice of organizations or institutions with which they affiliate. So, one of the ways in which American Jews reveal some of their sense of what being Jewish means, is by choosing--or not choosing--to affiliate with a temple or synagogue, and by choosing, when they do affiliate, a particular type of synagogue."³³

To be sure, the key which unlocks the full meaning to Shapiro's observation is the phrase "some of their sense of what being Jewish means." The American Jew's concept of Jewishness is a complex and problematic matter. It not only embraces much more than a congregational choice, but the very congregational choice itself can be very misleading. Shapiro and others are wise to point out that the branch of Judaism with which the American Jew is affiliated, does not necessarily represent a doctrinal choice. Indeed, congregational affiliation is seldom based on religious beliefs and positions, but moreso on the basis of socio-economic factors, distance from immigrant generations and distance of the Jew's residence from a particular

synagogue.

Certainly the data in Tables 9 and 10 demonstrate the above to be a truism; for the percentage of the population which affiliates with a particular type of synagogue is often different than the percentage of the population which identifies with that denomination. Complicating the matter to an even greater extent is the fact that a substantial percentage of the unaffiliated population nevertheless identifies with one of the denominations. The reader is thus cautioned not to consider an external act, that of affiliating or not affiliating, as necessarily indicative of an internal decision; for apparently there are those Jews who may find the Reform position most acceptable, but do not affiliate with a Reform synagogue. Obversely, there are those who affiliate with a Reform synagogue, but who identify with Orthodoxy.

The Los Angeles communal survey of 1953 illustrates the enigmatic character of synagogue membership and religious identification. "A portrait of the Jewish community in terms of its identification with any of the major religious categories of Judaism reveals that the largest segment of L.A.'s Jewish households does not consider itself identified with Orthodoxy, Reform, Conservatism or the Sephardic group. Identification as used here is defined as an attitude, as an ideological orientation, rather than as something which is necessarily expressed in terms of synagogue or organizational membership."³⁴

TABLE 9

DENOMINATIONAL AFFILIATION, ACCORDING TO PERCENT

City, State and Year	Total		Reform	Orthodox	Conservative
	Non-Affiliated	Affiliated			
New Orleans, La.-1953 ^{a,c}	25.0	75.0	56.3	43.5	---
Memphis, Tenn.-1959 ^{a,d}	6.0	94.0	53.0	41.0	4.0
San Francisco, Cal.-1959 ^e	59.2	37.6	---	---	---
Peninsula	49.0	44.0	---	---	---
Marin	63.0	34.0	---	---	---
Lynn, Mass.-1956 ^{b,e}	21.6	76.7	5.4	31.6	38.3
South Bend, Ind.-1961 ^{b,e}	13.4	86.6	30.6	20.9	23.6
Trenton, N.J.-1949 ^{b,e}	3.3	98.5	16.1	55.0	27.4
Trenton, N.J.-1961 ^{b,e}	19.3	80.7	29.8	13.5	37.0
Los Angeles, Cal.-1951 ^e	75.3	23.7	---	---	---
Los Angeles, Cal.-1959 ^e	65.8	33.7	---	---	---
Long Beach, Lakewood, Los Alamitos, Cal.-1962 ^e	66.0	34.0	---	---	---
Worcester, Mass.-1958 ^{a,e}	14.0	86.0	43.6	29.5	16.5
Northern Delaware-1962 ^{a,e}	40.0	60.0	33.7	3.0	59.0
Baltimore, Md.-1963 ^{b,e}	11.0	89.0	32.0	38.0	15.0

TABLE 9--Continued

City, State and Year	Total		Reform	Orthodox	Conservative
	Non-Affiliated	Affiliated			
Detroit, Mich.-1956 ^e	55.0	45.0	---	---	---
Detroit, Mich.-1963 ^e	51.0	49.0	---	---	---
Washington, D.C.-1956 ^{b,e}	53.3	46.7	6.3	11.9	25.0
Jacksonville, Fla.-1954 ^{a,f}	20.0	80.0	35.0	7.0	58.0
Charleston, W.Va.-1966 ^{b,f}	22.0	78.0	28.0	---	50.0
Kansas City, Mo.-1961 ^{b,f}	22.0	78.0	31.0	20.0	27.0
Dade County, Fla.-1961 ^{a,f}	13.0	87.0	28.0	14.0	58.0
Des Moines, Iowa-1956 ^{b,f}	12.0	88.0	21.0	29.0	30.0

a Percentages of Reform, Orthodox and Conservative are based on 100.0 percent of the total affiliated.

b Percentage of Reform, Orthodox and Conservative are based on a breakdown of the total affiliated.

c Based on age 13 and over.

d Based on adult population.

e Based on head of household.

f Based on total population.

TABLE 10

SELF-IDENTIFICATION, ACCORDING TO DENOMINATION, BY PERCENT

City, State and Year	Reform	Orthodox	Conservative
Port Chester, N.Y.-1950 ^a	16.6	23.0	46.9
Memphis, Tenn.-1959 ^b	52.0	21.0	22.0
San Francisco, Cal.-1959 ^c	38.8	13.6	19.6
Peninsula	39.0	3.0	22.0
Marin	30.0	1.0	21.0
Lynn, Mass.-1956 ^c	7.0	42.0	51.0
Los Angeles, Cal.-1953 ^c	29.5	17.1	20.5
Los Angeles, Cal.-1959 ^c	28.6	12.6	35.3
Long Beach, Lakewood, Los Alamitos, Cal.-1962 ^c	30.7	4.9	41.7
Camden, N.J.-1964 ^c	22.0	8.0	6.0
Detroit, Mich.-1956 ^c	21.0	22.0	46.0
Detroit, Mich.-1963 ^c	26.0	17.0	49.0
Baltimore, Md.-1963 ^c	36.0	31.0	29.0
New Orleans, La.-1953 ^c	57.2	29.3	4.9
Providence, R.I.-1964 ^d	23.6	15.9	55.4
Des Moines, Iowa-1956 ^d	26.0	30.0	37.0
Washington, D.C.-1956 ^d	24.7	14.9	47.4

a Based on age 20 and over.

b Based on adult population.

c Based on head of household.

d Based on total population.

Thus, the largest portion of the Los Angeles Jewish population is non-identifying, 31.9 percent. Reform accounts for the next largest group, 29.5 percent and 17.1 percent represents the Orthodox response. Although there are more households identifying as Reform, this group actually has the smallest proportion of membership, 25.3 percent. Conversely, the low for identification was the Orthodox group, with 17.1 percent. However, this group represents the largest proportion of synagogue members, or 42.6 percent. In 1953, for the total Jewish households responding to the survey, 23.7 percent stated they were members of a synagogue. This is obviously a rather low proportion. By 1959, as Table 9 illustrated, this percentage climbed to 33.7 percent.

Certainly age is a significant factor in terms of religious identification and membership. It is also important to note that only a survey that contains data on the relationship of age and religion can point to current and future trends. The evidence in the Los Angeles study reveals that the largest proportion of the third generation, 37.4 percent, is non-identifying. This age group, 20-29, has its second largest segment, 27.3 percent, identifying with Reform. The Conservative response was very close with 25.3 percent and the low was 8.4 percent for Orthodox identification. For the age group of 60 and over the very opposite is true. The largest proportion identify with Orthodoxy, 37.6 percent. The non-identifying group and Reform were

the next largest preferences with 23.6 percent and 23.5 percent respectively.

Concerning synagogue membership and its relation to age, a similar pattern is demonstrated for both generations. Among the third generation, only 19.2 percent belong to synagogues. Revealing the anomalous nature of identification and membership alluded to above, we find that 8.0 percent, or the largest proportion of the third generation that maintains membership, belong to Conservative synagogues. For the earlier generation, age group 60 and over, 31.1 percent belong to synagogues. The largest proportion of this percentage, 21.1 percent, maintain membership in Orthodox synagogues.

The Detroit, Michigan Jewish community accounts for a 4.0 percent gain in affiliation from 1956 to 1963. Almost half, or 49.0 percent of the Jews in Detroit were members of a synagogue in 1963. There has been a slight shift in identification also. The significant changes occurred with the non-identifying group, from 11.0 percent in 1956 to 17.0 percent in 1963. "The reduction of religiously unidentified persons . . . probably represents not so much a switch from non-identification to identification, as it does the dying out of foreign born Jews and consequent reduction in their absolute number. The diminishing proportion of Orthodox is an expression of the same phenomenon. (The foreign born, particularly the older persons, were not often Reform or even Conservative, but either Orthodox

or nothing)."35

Similar trends emerge from the San Francisco Jewish community also. 72.0 percent of the population identify with one of the three groups, however, only 37.6 percent are actual members. Equally low proportions of San Francisco's suburban Jews are members of a synagogue. The Peninsula has a 44.0 percent membership and Marin accounts for a 34.0 percent membership of those identifying with one of the three denominations.

Dade County, Florida, which includes Miami, has a large percentage of affiliated Jews. The total figure is 87.0 percent. Of this 87.0 percent, 58.0 percent are members of the Conservative branch and 28.0 percent are Reform. What is interesting is that 30.0 percent of both the affiliated Reform and Conservative Jews consider themselves other than their affiliation. This is also true for 29.0 percent of the Jews affiliated with Orthodox synagogues.³⁶

In Providence, Rhode Island, the third generation is characteristic of those trends displayed by young adults in other communities. Two-thirds of the males 20-29 years of age are unaffiliated. For the total Jewish population of Providence, over three-fourths are affiliated.

The Jewish community of Rochester, New York demonstrates parallels to the above cities. Of those who identified themselves as Reform Jews, over 25.0 percent are not affiliated. Of those who consider themselves Orthodox, slightly more than one-half, or 50.5 percent, belong to an Orthodox

synagogue. Of those who identified themselves as Conservative, 53.2 percent are members and 21.8 percent are affiliated with Orthodox synagogues.

In almost each community surveyed, therefore, a sizeable percentage of the Jewish population consider themselves truly other than that branch of Judaism with which they are actually affiliated. Evidence that a vast percentage of American Jews consider identification to be an attitude or ideology is demonstrated by the fact of the number of persons who identify with one of the three denominations of Judaism, but maintain no organizational membership.

CHAPTER VIII

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION

"Another way in which people reveal their sense of themselves, their place in society, their aspirations and their obligations is through their choices of voluntary organizations to which they belong."³⁷ Shapiro confirms the notion that American Jews are "joiners." He states "that American Jews show a marked inclination to join organizations, both absolutely and relatively. While nine out of ten American Jews, like those in our Baltimore sample, are likely to belong to at least one organization, the figure for Americans as a whole is five out of ten."³⁸

Table 11 illustrates that an overwhelming majority of the Jewish population of the communities surveyed belong to at least one or more Jewish organizations. Close to 50.0 percent of the Jews belong, in addition, to at least one non-Jewish organization.

In almost each city studied, the most popular category of organizations is the synagogue-related group. In Providence, one-third of both the male and female population belonged to these synagogue auxiliaries. Perhaps this is indicative of the central role which the synagogue continues to play in American Jewish life.

TABLE 11

MEMBERSHIP IN JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS ACCORDING TO PERCENT

City, State and Year	None	One	One or More	Two	Three	Four	Five or More
Camden, N.J.-1964 ^a Jewish	50.0	34.0	---	10.0	4.0	---	2.0----
Indianapolis, Ind.-1948 ^b Jewish	---	34.5	---	22.3	16.0	10.8	16.5
Port Chester, N.Y.-1950 ^c Jewish	---	---	---	---	27.0	26.0	---
New Orleans, La.-1958 ^d Jewish	5.0	26.6	---	---	46.5----	---	26.9----
Rochester, N.Y.-1961 ^e Jewish	27.5	---	53.2	---	---	19.4----	---
Non-Jewish	46.1	---	40.4	---	---	13.6----	---
Memphis, Tenn.-1959 ^e Jewish	19.0	21.0	---	20.0	18.0	---	18.0----
Non-Jewish	39.0	25.0	---	12.0	7.0	---	16.0----
Providence, R.I.-1964 ^e Jewish-Male	39.2	30.8	---	14.7	6.9	---	7.0----
Jewish-Female	37.2	23.6	---	14.3	9.0	---	14.4----
Non-Jewish	66.6	---	---	---	---	---	2.6----

TABLE 11--Continued

City, State and Year	None	One	One or More	Two	Three	Four	Five or More
Passaic, N.J.-1949 ^e							
Jewish	19.4	20.9	---	21.8	17.2	12.4	8.3
Non-Jewish	---	---	10.9	---	---	---	---
San Francisco, Cal.-1959 ^f							
Jewish	---	---	37.2	---	---	---	---
Non-Jewish	---	---	46.4	---	---	---	---
Peninsula							
Jewish	---	---	46.0	---	---	---	---
Non-Jewish	---	---	62.0	---	---	---	---
Marin							
Jewish	---	---	52.0	---	---	---	---
Non-Jewish	---	---	65.0	---	---	---	---
Los Angeles, Cal.-1959 ^f							
Jewish	60.0	26.6	---	8.6	2.7	---	2.1
Non-Jewish	65.3	21.6	---	7.4	2.8	---	1.1
Baltimore, Md.-1963 ^f							
Jewish	18.0	---	---	---	61.0	---	12.0
Non-Jewish	38.0	---	---	---	42.0	---	7.0
Dade County, Fla.-1961 ^f							
Jewish	22.0	34.0	---	19.0	11.0	---	13.0
Non-Jewish	38.0	21.0	---	15.0	11.0	---	14.0
Worcester, Mass.-1961 ^f							
Jewish	---	26.7	---	20.8	16.5	11.5	24.5

TABLE 11--Continued

City, State and Year	None	One	One or More	Two	Three	Four	Five or More
Kansas City, Mo.-1961 ^f							
Jewish	17.0	28.0	---	21.0	13.0	---	21.0---
Non-Jewish	40.0	23.0	---	17.0	10.0	---	10.0---
Trenton, N.J.-1961 ^f							
Jewish	11.6	---	---	---	---	---	---
Non-Jewish	61.2	---	---	---	---	---	---
Washington, D.C.-1956 ^f							
Jewish-Male	60.9	27.1	---	5.9	---	2.4---	---
Jewish-Female	40.3	33.2	---	14.5	---	8.7---	---
Non-Jewish-Male	36.8	31.4	---	16.1	---	13.5---	---
Non-Jewish-Female	45.2	29.9	---	15.0	---	6.0---	---
Long Beach, Lakewood, Los Alamitos, Cal.-1962 ^f							
Jewish	45.0	29.7	---	14.5	6.9	---	3.9---
Non-Jewish	50.4	21.3	---	14.2	6.4	---	7.8
Des Moines, Iowa-1956 ^e							
Jewish	---	---	80.0	---	---	---	---
Non-Jewish	---	---	90.0	---	---	---	---

a Based on age 12 and over.

d Based on adult population.

b Based on age 15 and over.

e Based on total population.

c Based on age 20 and over.

f Based on head of household.

Membership in the Jewish community center ranked second to the synagogue groups in Providence. One out of every four males and one out of every five females are center members. A large proportion of the Jewish population of Providence are members of various Zionist organizations. There is, however, a significant sex differential with regard to membership in Zionist oriented groups. Slightly under 25.0 percent of the females are affiliated with Zionist groups in Providence, yet only 6.0 percent of the males choose membership in these organizations. Although the Jewish community of Providence accounts for a high proportion of Jews who served in the armed forces, the participation of the Jewish veterans in Jewish War Veterans groups is very small.

Two-thirds of the Jewish community in Providence reported no membership in non-Jewish organizations. However, memberships in these groups seemed to show a preference for the fraternal type of organization. The Masonic organization ranks highest in membership.

Baltimore Jews also prefer the synagogue auxiliary as their first choice in club membership. 25.0 percent belong to the synagogue organization. The Zionist groups maintain the second position in Baltimore, with 19.0 percent belonging. In third and fourth places were civic and community relations groups and educational and welfare clubs respectively. The highest ranking category of non-Jewish organizations was the professional or business associations.

It is interesting, however, that many of these associations are mandatory rather than voluntary. Thus, the disproportion in the tendency to join non-Jewish organizations is apparent.

Similar trends are observed in Memphis, Tennessee. The largest preference, 56.0 percent, is for the synagogue-related organization. B'nai Brith and Zionist groups were the second choice of the Jewish population. For Jewish organizations, the smallest percentage, 7.0 percent, opted membership in health, education and welfare clubs. Among the non-sectarian groups, the Jewish population preferred lodges and fraternal clubs first, and then recreational and hobby organizations.

In most cities, a larger proportion of women are members of Jewish organizations than men. The inverse relation is true of non-Jewish groups. The evidence from the Los Angeles surveys suggest this situation to be operative there also. Los Angeles reports, in addition, that two-thirds of the young people, ages 15-29, are not members of any organization.

In Des Moines, Iowa, more than 80.0 percent of the Jewish population is affiliated with at least one Jewish organization. 67.0 percent of the females and 45.0 percent of the males are affiliated with synagogue-related organizations. Des Moines has a very high percentage of Jews affiliated with non-Jewish groups. 90.0 percent of the Jewish population is affiliated with at least one

non-Jewish group.

John Dean, writing about the participation of Jews in the community and the apparent desire not to belong to mixed groups, states: "Jews, due to their common background, locale, or origin, generally mix together and form, through associational inbreeding, common interests, similar cultural traits and mutual ties of acquaintance, friendship and affection. These common, like, and mutual bonds perpetuate the associational inbreeding and cut down contacts with Gentiles."³⁹

It is questionable, however, if Dean's analysis and observations will remain true for the third and future generations. Current rates, especially among the younger Jewish population born of American parentage, do not seem to demonstrate the desire for associational inbreeding.⁴⁰

Our findings indicated then, that the vast majority of Jews belong to at least one Jewish organization, and frequently, more than one. Approximately one-half of the Jewish population belong to at least one non-Jewish organization. The synagogue auxiliary was the most popular organization in most cities, and, in many communities, the Zionist oriented groups ranked second or third. There is a substantial sex differential in Zionist group membership. A much larger percentage of women join Zionist groups than men. The fraternal type group is the most popular non-Jewish organization.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Less than a century ago, large-scale immigration from Eastern Europe was the impetus for a rapidly increasing American Jewish community. But the wave of immigration served not only as a thrust for the rise in Jewish population; indeed, it created an institutional structure to care for and support the expanding Jewish populace in America. Within a relatively short period, however, this inflated and white-crested wave began breaking up and became at most only a ripple. Consequently, the imposing structure which at one time reinforced traditional values and customs was now also breaking up. The result was greater interaction with the non-Jew and thus acculturation, if not assimilation.

It may be assumed, at least partially so, that this change in American Jewish life has been a major force behind the increasing number of self-studies conducted by local Jewish communities. By comparing these studies with one another, a more comprehensive evaluation of the American Jewish community is possible. As the Introduction stated in detail, the reader is cautioned against assuming complete accuracy regarding statistical data. Research methods often vary and certainly population figures have changed in some communities since the surveys were conduct-

ed. Nevertheless, similar trends and characteristics have emerged from our study. To be sure, these trends may be assumed to give the reader an indication of some significant generalities concerning American Jewish life.

Summary of Findings

Unquestionably, the nativity composition of the American Jewish population is undergoing change. Nearly 80.0 percent of the Jews in America are native-born. The small percentage of foreign-born Jews are found in the older age groups, while at least three-fourths of the native-born Jews are under 50 years of age.

Nativity composition is particularly important in regard to current trends. The fact that the third and future generations are, and will continue to be, American born of American parentage may well account for problems in the area of Jewish identity.

The Jews of America have also demonstrated relatively little migration from, or near, their original place of settlement. This stability has manifested itself in almost each region of the nation where the Jews have settled.

Our findings indicate that the Jews of America are mostly married persons. According to the data, at least three-fourths of the Jewish population is married. The general population is slightly under this figure. The Jewish male marries later in life than the female. This phenomenon is generally attributed to the fact that the

male receives more higher education, thus he withholds from marriage until educational and professional goals are attained.

The second sex differential with regard to marital status is that there is a much higher number of widows compared to widowers. The causal factors are two, first, that women have a greater life expectancy than men and second, that widowers tend to remarry to a greater degree than widows. The survival factor must also be understood from the view that husbands are generally older at the outset of marriage, thus accounting for more widows than widowers.

Less than 1.0 percent of the Jewish males of America are married under 20 years of age.

The U.S. Census Bureau, in 1957, issued their findings concerning the Jew and out marriage. It was established that 7.2 percent of America's Jews have out married. This figure, however, can lead one to precarious predictions, for reliable studies, such as the Washington, D.C. survey, have demonstrated that current figures are much higher. The increase is linked to marriage, or out marriage, patterns of the third generation. Since the marriage market consists primarily of the third generation, the out marriage percentage is probably much higher than most studies would indicate. In Washington, for example, the third generation had a rate of 17.9 percent out marriage.

There are two other pervasive and salient considerations that often distort an accurate view of out marriage. One is that as out marriage increases in the third generation, so too, does the rate of conversion among the younger Jewish population increase. The young, non-Jewish spouse is becoming Jewish. The second is that the studies seem to indicate that more Jewish men are marrying non-Jewish wives than Jewish women are marrying non-Jewish husbands. Generally, this a truism; yet, there can be no accuracy here for it also appears that the Jewish women who out marry lose complete contact with the Jewish community. Thus, not being considered a member of the Jewish community, or perhaps not even known to the Jewish community, these persons are never included in survey samples.

Since there are no statistics, or even surveys, on the very small communities where out marriage among Jews is known to be quite extensive, our findings have another element of confusion and possible distortion.

The large communities, such as San Francisco, indicate that suburban areas have a much higher degree of out marriage. The figure increased by 20.0 percent between San Francisco proper and one suburb.

In communities of average size, that is, where the Jewish population is from 5,000 to 15,000, the amount of out marriage ranges from 6.0 percent to 8.0 percent.

A striking difference between the Jewish population and the total white population is evident after a comparison of occupational status. The majority of Jews in America are involved in two occupational groups, proprietors, managers, officials and professionals and semi-professionals. These categories account for nearly two-thirds of the American Jews in the labor force.

Very few Jews in the labor force are found in skilled or semi-skilled jobs, while nearly one-fourth to one-third of the general white population finds employment in this area. Overall, there is a significant under representation of Jews in blue-collar positions.

Jewish women do not serve in the labor force to the extent that females from the general white population serve. Very few Jews under the age of 20 are in the labor force. Again, similar to marriage characteristics, we find that most young Jewish persons remain in school for a longer period of time than the non-Jew. This keeps the Jew out of the labor force until vocational and educational desires are satisfied.

It is also important to be cognizant that nearly one-half of the Jewish population in the labor force is self-employed. This is an obvious corollary to the Jews being employed mostly in the professions and as proprietors.

An extraordinary percentage of the Jewish population attains a university education. Current figures estimate

that nearly 80.0 percent of the young, third generation Jewish population are college graduates. Although our findings are not primarily concerned with the third generation, it is axiomatic that these persons will cause the educational trends to be affected most sharply.

Our data, based on the adult population, or persons age 20 and over, indicate that the general white population is far below the educational achievements of the Jewish population. In many cities, more Jews have reached the post-graduate level of education than have a college education among the non-Jewish community. Figures from the U.S. Census Bureau in 1960 indicate that 9.4 percent of the total white population are college graduates and/or post-graduates. Comparing this figure with Table 6, a comparison of four Jewish communities, we find that from three to five times more Jews have a higher education.

Approximately three-fourths of the Jewish population has received some form of Jewish education in the formal sense. To be sure, our findings have indicated that changes in the area of Jewish education have taken place, but these changes appear to counter-balance a positive and negative value scale. Proportionately more girls receive a formal Jewish education today than ever before, a positive change, while the boys education may be deemed less intensive, the negative change.

For children of potential school age, our studies indicate that between 80.0 and 90.0 percent are actively

involved in programs of formal Jewish education.

The popularity of the "Sunday School" and the subsequent decline of the older Talmud Torah is also apparent.

The majority of the communities surveyed indicate that a substantial number of Jews are affiliated with a synagogue. There are, however, several large cities where the percentage of affiliation is very small. An example would be San Francisco, where 59.2 percent are non-affiliated. The suburbs account for an even larger number of unaffiliated Jews. It is curious that the remaining two communities where affiliation is not preferred are also on the West Coast. Los Angeles has 65.8 percent of the Jewish population unaffiliated, and the Long Beach area accounts for 66.0 percent in this category of non-members.

Most of the East Coast cities have between 75.0 and 98.0 percent of the Jews affiliated.

Our comparison of synagogue affiliation pointed to an anomalous situation. This occurs in the area of affiliation and identification. Although there are many Jews who prefer not to affiliate with a congregation, they nevertheless identify with one of the three major branches of Judaism. Also, something of an enigma, there are many Jews who are affiliated with a synagogue of one branch, but identify with a branch of Judaism other than that with which they are affiliated.

Contrary to common belief, our findings did not indicate that the Orthodox position is diminishing rapidly.

There has been, however, a relative decline. It is possible that this is caused not so much by a change in religious beliefs, but rather by the older generations dying out.

It also appears that few Jews of the third generation maintain memberships in synagogues. One must be cautious here also, for it is likely that Jews do not affiliate until they have families. As we have demonstrated above, Jewish males marry at later ages than the general population. Thus, the small number of affiliated third generation Jews is more indicative of late marriages and family raising than dissatisfaction with religious affiliation.

Another way in which people indicate attitudes is by the voluntary organizations which they join. Generally, the Jewish population of America is a "joining" one. Most belong to at least one Jewish organization, and many belong to several. One-half of America's Jews belong to at least one non-Jewish organization.

The organizations with the greatest degree of popularity are the synagogue-related groups. Concerning non-Jewish organizations, those with the highest percentage of Jewish members are the fraternal and business or professional groups.

Jewish females belong to more organizations than do the Jewish males. This is especially true in regard to Zionist oriented groups. Although the Zionist oriented groups were high standing in terms of popularity, usually

second or third, their membership consists primarily of women.

Conclusions

What, then, are the major implications of these findings for the American Jewish community? The Jew of the future will be American born and probably deeply entrenched in the culture of America. Since assimilation is the present cultural pattern, one would be remiss not to question religious assimilation for the future. Our findings, however, indicate that Jewish identity is strong, and there is a conscious effort to maintain a Jewish survival.

Out marriage will continue to increase on the basis of the present third generation. However, conversion rates are also increasing among the non-Jewish partner to the third generation Jew. This would seem to be true at least for the non-Jewish wife married to the Jew. On the basis of the past and present, the Jewess who out marries will continue to lose contact with the Jewish community.

The Jews of tomorrow's America will more than likely be college educated professional or business people. The present desire to be self-employed will continue, for there is a greater degree of security.

Jewish education will manifest itself in some form of the integrated program, that is, a combination of Sunday School and Hebrew language education. More females will continue to be educated in things Jewish as the Sunday

School continues to increase in popularity.

The most likely change that will occur will be with the synagogue. Since current studies illustrate the dichotomy between affiliation and identification, the banner of the synagogue may very well be different in the future. This will manifest itself by a change in the programming of the synagogue, and, perhaps there may even be a perceptible change in the synagogue's raison d'etre. The rationale for these changes is the fact that there are presently many Jews whose needs are not being met by the synagogue. Apparently, there are many Jews who are not affiliated, and among those that are affiliated, there is a sizeable percentage that identify themselves other than their affiliation would indicate. Furthermore, there are many non-affiliated Jews who are obviously expressing some need by virtue of their desire to identify.

The Orthodox Jew will be harder and harder to find in the future, while the normative pattern of religious practice and belief will probably be somewhere between Reform and Conservative.

Notwithstanding the many problems and difficulties of a study based on communal surveys, for example, different research techniques, it is our opinion that a demonstrative and representative study has been presented. To a very large degree, the Jews of America, from a cross section of large and small communities, exhibit

similar trends and characteristics. Earlier in our presentation we noted the fallacy of considering the Jewish community a homogeneous entity. The persons who constitute the average Jewish community have different attitudes, interests and modes of life. However, our findings have adequately demonstrated that these differences apply to all Jewish communities. Therefore, in a very real sense, the dissimilarities of the Jews produce their similarities.

FOOTNOTES

1. Sidney Goldstein, The Greater Providence Jewish Community (Providence, Rhode Island: General Jewish Committee of Providence, Inc., 1964), p. 1.
2. Ben Kaplan, The Eternal Stranger (New York: Bookman Associates, 1957), p. 72.
3. Ibid., p. 50.
4. Albert J. Mayer, Social and Economic Characteristics of the Detroit Jewish Community: 1963 (Detroit: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1964), p. 3.
5. Goldstein, op. cit., p. 34.
6. Samuel Baum, The Jewish Population of Des Moines (Des Moines: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1956), p. 2.
7. Ibid.
8. The Jewish Community of Pittsburgh: A Population Study (Pittsburgh: United Jewish Federation of Pittsburgh, 1963), p. III.
9. Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation In American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 190.
10. Alvin Chenkin and Benjamin B. Goldman, The Jewish Population of New Orleans, La. (New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1953), p. XIX.
11. Ben B. Seligman and Walter P. Zand, The Jewish Population of Port Chester, New York (New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1950), p. 5.
12. Goldstein, op. cit., p. 43.
13. C. Bezalel Sherman, "Demographic and Social Aspects," The American Jew A Reappraisal, ed. Oscar I. Janowsky (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964), p. 35.
14. The Jewish Population of Greater Lynn, Mass. (Lynn, Mass: The Jewish Community Federation of Greater Lynn, 1956), p. XI.

15. Ibid., pp. IX-XI.

16. Stanley K. Bigman, The Jewish Population of Greater Washington in 1956 (Washington: The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, 1957), p. 13.

17. We See Ourselves: A Self Study of the Jewish Community of St. Joseph County, Indiana (South Bend, Indiana: The Jewish Community Council of St. Joseph County, 1961), p. 10.

18. Leonard Reissman, Profile of a Community; A Sociological Study of the New Orleans Jewish Community (New Orleans: The Jewish Federation of New Orleans, 1958), p. 13.

19. Fred Massarik, A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles (Los Angeles: Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles, 1959), p. 10.

20. Goldstein, op. cit., p. 184.

21. Alvin Chenkin, "Jewish Population In The United States, 1958," American Jewish Yearbook, Vol. 60 (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1959), pp. 8-10.

22. Eric Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Inter-marriage In The United States," American Jewish Yearbook, Vol. 64 (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1963), p. 19.

23. Goldstein, op. cit., p. 186.

24. Rosenthal, op. cit., p. 11.

25. Ben B. Seligman, "Some Aspects of Jewish Demography," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glenco, Ill: The Free Press, 1958), p. 69.

26. Fred Massarik, The Jewish Population of Los Angeles (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, 1953), p. 34.

27. Chenkin and Goldman, op. cit., p. XXVII.

28. The Jewish Population of Rochester, New York (Monroe County) 1961 (Rochester, New York: Jewish Community Council of Rochester, N.Y., 1961), p. 32.

29. Massarik, op. cit., p. 44.

30. Goldstein, op. cit., p. 71.

31. Ibid., p. 157.

32. Ibid., p. 165.

33. Manheim S. Shapiro, The Baltimore Survey of Jewish Attitudes (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1963), p. 12.

34. Massarik, op cit., p. 45.

35. Mayer, op. cit., p. 22.

36. Manheim S. Shapiro, The Bayville Survey of Jewish Attitudes (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1961), p. 39.

37. Manheim S. Shapiro, The Baltimore Survey of Jewish Attitudes (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1963), p. 14.

38. Ibid., p. 15.

39. John P. Dean, "Jewish Participation in the Life of Middle-Sized American Communities," The Jews, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glenco, Ill: The Free Press, 1958), p. 316.

40. cf., Goldstein, op. cit., p. 148.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Literature

- All About Us! Jacksonville, Florida: Jacksonville Jewish Community Council, 1954.
- Beckenstein, Esther. Report on Jewish Population of Metropolitan Chicago. Chicago, Illinois: Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, 1959.
- Bigman, Stanley K. The Jewish Population of Greater Washington in 1956. Washington, D.C: The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, 1957.
- Baum, Samuel. The Jewish Population of Des Moines. Des Moines: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1956.
- Chenkin, Alvin, Goldman, Benjamin B. The Jewish Population of New Orleans, La. New York: The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1953.
- Community Self-Survey of Social, Cultural and Recreational Needs and Services. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Minneapolis Federation for Jewish Service, 1958.
- Community Studies of Albany, Camden, New Britain. New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1953.
- Congregation Ohav Tzedek-Shaarei Torah Population Study. Youngstown, Ohio: The Jewish Federation of Youngstown, 1963.
- Goldstein, Dr. Sidney. The Greater Providence Jewish Community: A Population Survey. Providence, Rhode Island: The General Jewish Committee of Providence, Inc., 1964.
- The Jewish Community of Pittsburgh: A Population Study. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: United Jewish Federation of Pittsburgh, 1963.
- The Jewish Population of Rochester, New York (Monroe County) 1961. Rochester, New York: Jewish Community Council of Rochester, New York, 1961.
- The Jews of Worcester. Worcester, Massachusetts: Worcester Jewish Federation, 1958.

The Jews of Worcester. Worcester, Massachusetts: Worcester Jewish Federation, 1961.

Kaplan, Saul. Jewish Births and Jewish Population In Cook County, Illinois-1963. Chicago, Illinois: Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, 1966.

Massarik, Fred. The Jewish Population of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, 1953.

_____. A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, California: Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles, 1959.

_____. The Jewish Population of San Francisco, Marin County and The Peninsula. San Francisco, California: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1959.

_____. A Study of the Jewish Population of Long Beach, Lakewood and Los Alamitos. Long Beach, California: Jewish Community Federation, 1962.

Mayer, Dr. Albert J. The Detroit Jewish Community Geographic Mobility; 1963-1965 and Fertility-A Projection of Future Births. Detroit, Michigan: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1966.

_____. Estimate of the Numbers and Age Distribution of the Detroit Metropolitan Area; 1956. Detroit, Michigan: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1959.

_____. Income Characteristics of the Jewish Population in the Detroit Metropolitan Area; 1956. Detroit, Michigan: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1960.

_____. Jewish Population Study; 1963 Number of Persons, Age and Residential Distribution. Detroit, Michigan: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1964.

_____. Movement of the Jewish Population in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. Detroit, Michigan: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1958.

_____. Movement of the Jewish Population in the Detroit Metropolitan Area; 1949-1959. Detroit, Michigan: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1959.

_____. Social and Economic Characteristics of the Detroit Jewish Community; 1963. Detroit, Michigan: Jewish Welfare Federation, 1964.

Our Life In Our Time. Newark, New Jersey: Jewish Community Council of Essex County, 1948.

Reissman, Leonard. Profile of a Community: A Sociological Study of the New Orleans Jewish Community. New Orleans, Louisiana: The Jewish Federation of New Orleans, 1958.

Robison, Dr. Sophie M. Jewish Population Study of Trenton, New Jersey. New York: Office for Jewish Population Research, 1949.

Schmelz, O. (ed.). Jewish Demography and Statistics Bibliography for 1920-1960. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1961.

Schrieber, Albert N. Basic Facilities Study for the Seattle Jewish Community Center. Seattle, Washington: Seattle Jewish Community Center, 1963.

Self-Study of the Social, Cultural and Recreational Needs of the Jewish Community of Seattle, Washington. Seattle, Washington: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1957.

Seligman, Ben B., Zand, Walter P. The Jewish Population of Port Chester, New York. New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1950.

Seligman, Ben B. The Jewish Population of Passaic, New Jersey. New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1949.

Shapiro, Manheim S. The Baltimore, Maryland Survey of Jewish Attitudes. New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1963.

———. The Bayville (Dade County, Florida) Survey of Jewish Attitudes. New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1961.

———. The Kansas City, Missouri Survey of Jewish Attitudes. New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1961.

———. The Southville (Memphis, Tenn.) Survey of Jewish Attitudes. New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1959.

Sterne, Dr. Richard S. A Demographic Study of the Jewish Population of Trenton, New Jersey and Vicinity. Trenton, New Jersey: Jewish Federation of Trenton, 1961.

Study of the Jewish Population in Northern Delaware. Wilmington, Delaware: Jewish Community Center, 1962.

Survey for New Jewish Center Building. Toledo, Ohio:
Jewish Community Council and Jewish Community
Service Association, 1950.

Survey Report on Informal Education and Recreational
Activities of the Jewish Community of Indianapolis.
Indianapolis, Indiana: National Jewish Welfare
Board, 1948.

We See Ourselves: A Self Study of the Jewish Community
of St. Joseph County, Indiana. South Bend, Indiana:
The Jewish Community Council of St. Joseph County, 1961.

Westoff, Charles F. Population and Social Characteristics
of the Jewish Community of the Camden Area. Cherry
Hill, New Jersey: Jewish Federation of Camden
County, 1964.

Secondary Literature

Chenkin, Alvin. "Jewish Population in the United States,"
American Jewish Yearbook, Vols. LVI-LXV. New York:
The American Jewish Committee, 1955-1964.

Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc.
Jewish Population Studies by Community Federations.
Council Reports. New York: Council of Jewish
Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc., 1963.

Glazer, Nathan. American Judaism. Chicago: The University
of Chicago Press, 1957.

Gordon, Albert I. Intermarriage. Boston: Beacon Press,
1964.

_____. Jews in Suburbia. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life. New
York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Janowsky, Oscar I. (ed.). The American Jew A Reappraisal.
Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of
America, 1964.

Kaplan, Benjamin. The Eternal Stranger: A Study of
Jewish Life in the Small Community. New York:
Bookman Associates, 1957.

Kramer, Judith R., and Leventman, Seymour. Children of
the Gilded Ghetto: Conflict Resolutions of Three
Generations of American Jews. New Haven: Yale
University Press, 1961.

National Association of Jewish Center Workers and National Jewish Welfare Board. Future Direction of American Jewish Life and Their Implications for Jewish Community Centers. Proceedings of the Conference sponsored by the National Association of Jewish Center Workers and National Jewish Welfare Boards. New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1963.

Robinson, Sophia M. (ed.). Jewish Population Studies. (Jewish Social Studies Publications, No. 3) New York: Conference on Jewish Relations, 1943.

Seligman, Ben B. "Jewish Population Studies in the United States," American Jewish Yearbook, Vols. L-LI. New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1948-1950.

Sklare, Marshall. (ed.). The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.