Demographic

Jewish Population in the United States, 1976

THE ESTIMATE of the United States "Jewish population" for 1976 is 5,845,000. Major changes from the previous estimate (AJYB, 1976 [Vol. 76], p. 229) were reported by several Florida communities.

The estimate is a composite of several sources: (1) for the New York City area, the 1970 National Jewish Population Study; (2) for other member communities of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), responses to a direct inquiry; (3) for non-CJF members (usually smaller cities), previous information from National United Jewish Appeal records. The procedure for (3) is somewhat dated, and individual estimates are therefore less reliable than those for communities (1) and (2). A study is currently in preparation to reach each of these communities for updated estimates in 1977.

State totals are the sum of individual community estimates, adjusted for duplications in areas where a community spreads over state boundaries. Estimates for communities of under 100 Jewish population (excluded from the listing in Table 3) are included here.

There is a slight overstatement of the proportions between the general population figures and the Jewish population estimates in Table 1 and 2, since the former are for July 1, 1975, and the latter for 1976.

"Jewish Population," as used here, gives an estimate of the number of individuals in households in which one or more Jews reside. It, therefore, includes non-Jews living in such households as a result of intermarriage, conversion, etc. (AJYB, 1974-75 [Vol. 75], pp. 296-97).

ALVIN CHENKIN

APPENDIX

TABLE 1. JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1976

| Cana | Estimated Jewish | Total | Estimated Jewish Per Cent |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| State | Population | Population* | of Total |
| Alabama | 9,050 | 3,614,000 | 0.3 |
| Alaska | 630 | 352,000 | 0.2 |
| Arizona | 22,665 | 2,224,000 | 1.0 |
| Arkansas | 3,490 | 2,116,000 | 0.2 |
| California | 662,610 | 21,185,000 | 3.1 |
| Colorado | 31,520 | 2,534,000 | 1.2 |
| Connecticut | 97,945 | 3,095,000 | 3.2 |
| Delaware | 9,200 | 579,000 | 1.6 |
| District of Columbia | 32,500 | 716,000 | 4.5 |
| Florida | 393,815 | 8,357,000 | 4.7 |
| Georgia | 30,695 | 4,926,000 | 0.6 |
| Hawaii | 1,500 | 865,000 | 0.2 |
| Idaho | 630 | 820,000 | 0.1 |
| Illinois | 269,300 | 11,145,000 | 2.4 |
| Indiana | 26,215 | 5,311,000 | 0.5 |
| Iowa | 6,555 | 2,870,000 | 0.2 |
| Kansas | 11,095 | 2,267,000 | 0.5 |
| Kentucky | 11,525 | 3,396,000 | 0.3 |
| Louisiana | 15,630 | 3,791,000 | 0.4 |
| Maine | 7,945 | 1,059,000 | 0.8 |
| Maryland | 223,805 | 4,098,000 | 5.5 |
| Massachusetts | 270,835 | 5,828,000 | 4.6 |
| Michigan | 93,350 | 9,157,000 | 1.0 |
| Minnesota | 34,265 | 3,926,000 | 0.9 |
| Mississippi | 4,165 | 2,346,000 | 0.2 |
| Missouri | 75,425 | 4,763,000 | 1.6 |
| Montana | 545 | 748,000 | 0.1 |
| Nebraska | 8,345 | 1,546,000 | 0.5 |
| Nevada | 9,380 | 592,000 | 1.6 |
| New Hampshire | 4,580 | 818,000 | 0.6 |
| New Jersey | 429,850 | 7,316,000 | 5.9 |
| New Mexico | 6,245 | 1,147,000 | 0.5 |
| New York | 2,150,515 | 18,120,000 | 11.9 |

| State | Estimated Jewish Population | Total Population* | Estimated Jewish Per Cent of Total |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| North Carolina | 10,810 | 5,451,000 | 0.2 |
| North Dakota | 1,445 | 635,000 | 0.2 |
| Ohio | 161,350 | 10,759,000 | 1.5 |
| Oklahoma | 6,060 | 2,712,000 | 0.2 |
| Oregon | 8,685 | 2,288,000 | 0.4 |
| Pennsylvania | 469,650 | 11,827,000 | 4.0 |
| Rhode Island | 22,000 | 927,000 | 2.4 |
| South Carolina | 8,065 | 2,818,000 | 0.3 |
| South Dakota | 500 | 683,000 | 0.1 |
| Tennessee | 17,360 | 4,188,000 | 0.4 |
| Texas | 69,255 | 12,237,000 | 0.6 |
| Utah | 2,160 | 1,206,000 | 0.2 |
| Vermont | 1,855 | 471,000 | 0.4 |
| Virginia | 58,245 | 4,967,000 | 1.2 |
| Washington | 15,890 | 3,544,000 | 0.4 |
| West Virginia | 4,120 | 1,803,000 | 0.2 |
| Wisconsin | 32,070 | 4,607,000 | 0.7 |
| Wyoming | 345 | 374,000 | 0.1 |
| U.S. TOTAL | 5,845,685 | 213,121,000 | 2.7 |

^{*}July 1, 1975 resident population. Total population, including armed forces overseas, was 213,631,000; total civilian population was 211,445,000. (Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P. 25, No. 619 and No. 621.)

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. JEWISH POPULATION BY REGIONS, 1976

| Region | Total Population | Per Cent Distribution | Jewish Population | Per Cent Distribution |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Northeast: | 49,461,000 | 23.2 | 3,455,175 | 59.1 |
| New England | 12,198,000 | 5.7 | 405,160 | 6.9 |
| Middle Atlantic | 37,263,000 | 17.5 | 3,050,015 | 52.2 |
| North Central: | 57,669,000 | 27.1 | 719,915 | 12.3 |
| East North Central | 40,979,000 | 19.2 | 582,285 | 10.0 |
| West North Central | 16,690,000 | 7.8 | 137,630 | 2.4 |
| South: | 68,113,000 | 32.0 | 907,790 | 15.5 |
| South Atlantic | 33,715,000 | 15.8 | 771,255 | 13.2 |
| East South Central | 13,544,000 | 6.4 | 42,100 | 0.7 |
| West South Central | 20,855,000 | 9.8 | 94,435 | 1.6 |
| West: | 37,878,000 | 17.8 | 762,805 | 13.0 |
| Mountain | 9,644,000 | 4.5 | 73,490 | 1.3 |
| Pacific | 28,234,000 | 13.2 | 689,315 | _11.8 |
| <u>TOTALS</u> | 213,121,000 | 100.0 | 5,845,685 | 100.0 |

TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1976 (ESTIMATED)

| | | (2011122) | , | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| | Jewish | - | Jewish | | Jewish |
| State and City | Population | State and City Po | pulation | State and City 1 | Population |
| ALABAMA | | Ontario. | . 300 | Newtown. | . 275 |
| Anniston . | 145 | *Orange county. | 35,000 | *Norwalk | 5,000 |
| *Birmingham | 4,000 | *Palm Springs. | 2,400 | Norwich | 2,500 |
| Dothan . | 265 | Pasadena. | 1,600 | Putnam. | 110 |
| Gadsden | 185 | Petaluma. | 320 | Rockville. | . 525 |
| Huntsville | 650 | Pomona | 300 | *Stamford | 10,800 |
| Jasper. | . 130 | Riverside. | . 215 | Torrington . | . 400 |
| *Mobile | 1,100 | *Sacramento | 5,000 | Valley Aread | 1,300 |
| *Montgomery . | 1,700 | Salinas . | . 240 | Wallingford | . 440 |
| Selma . | 210 | San Bernardino | 1,900 | *Waterbury | 2,600 |
| Tri-Cities | 120 | *San Diego | 20,000 | Westport. | 2,800 |
| Tuscaloosa. | 315 | *San Francisco | 75,000 | Willimantic | 525 |
| | | *San Jose | 10,000 | Winsted | 110 |
| ALASKA | | San Pedro | . 300 | | |
| *Anchorage . | 420 | *Santa Barbara | 2,400 | DELAWARE | |
| *Fairbanks | 210 | Santa Cruz. | 400 | *Wilmington (inc | l. rest of |
| | | Santa Maria | . 100 | state). | 9,200 |
| ARIZONA | 15.000 | Santa Monica | 8,000 | | |
| *Phoenix | 15,000 | Santa Rosa | . 400 | DISTRICT OF COLU | |
| *Tucson | 7,500 | Stockton | 1,050 | *Greater Washin | |
| | | Sun City | 100 | ton ^e . | 112,500 |
| ARKANSAS Diveta avilla | 100 | Tulare and Kings | 155 | | |
| Blytheville Ft. Smith. | 100 200 | county Vallejo . | 400 | FLORIDA | |
| | 100 | | 410 | Brevard County | 1,200 |
| Helena Hot Springs | . 600 | Ventura county | 410 | *Clearwater | 1,500 |
| *Little Rock. | 1,625 | COLORADO | | Daytona Beach | 1,200 |
| Pine Bluff | . 300 | Colorado Springs | . 650 | *Fort Lauderdale Fort Myers. | 60,000 300 |
| Southeast Ar | | *Denver | 30,000 | Fort Pierce. | 270 |
| Wynne-Fores | | Pueblo | 375 | *Gainesville. | . 700 |
| wynne r ores | . City 110 | 1 40010 | | *Hollywood | 40,000 |
| CALIFORNIA | | CONNECTICUT | | *Jacksonville | 6,000 |
| *Alameda & C | Contra Costa | *Bridgeport . | 14,500 | Key West | 170 |
| counties | 22,000 | Bristol . | 250 | Lakeland. | 700 |
| Bakersfield (i | nc. in Kern | Colchester | . 525 | Lehigh Acres | 125 |
| county) | | *Danbury | 1,800 | *Miami | 225,000 |
| El Centro | 125 | Danielson | . 125 | *Orlando | 5,800 |
| Elsinore | 250 | Greenwich. | 1,050 | *Palm Beach | ., |
| Fontana | . 165 | *Hartford . | 22,000 | county | 33,000 |
| Fresno | 1,450 | Lebanon | 175 | Pensacola. | 800 |
| Kern county | 850 | Lower Middlesex | | Port Charlotte. | . 150 |
| Lancaster. | . 100 | county | 125 | *Sarasota | 4,800 |
| *Long Beach | | Manchester. | . 700 | St. Augustine | . 100 |
| *Los Angeles l | | Meriden | 1,315 | *St. Petersburg | 5,500 |
| Area. | 455,000 | Middletown | 1,225 | Tallahassee. | . 500 |
| Merced . | 100 | Milford. | 415 | *Tampa | 6,000 |
| Modesto | . 260 | Moodus | . 350 | | |
| Monterey. | . 1,000 | *New Britain . | 1,000 20,000 | GEORGIA | |
| *Oakland (incl | | *New Haven | 4,500 | Albany | 525 |
| | Costa coun- | *New London. New Milford. | 350 | Athens | . 210 |
| ties) | | TACM MILITORA | 330 | *Atlanta . | 21,000 |
| | | | | | |

| - | Jewish | · | Jewish | | Jewish |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|
| State and City 1 | Population | State and City | Population | State and City | Population |
| *Augusta | 1,500 | Muncie | 175 | Cumberland | 250 |
| Brunswick | . 120 | Richmond | 110 | Easton Park | 250 |
| *Columbus | 1,000 | Shelbyville | . 140 | Area'. | 100 |
| Dalton | . 235 | *South Bend | 2,800 | Frederick. | 400 |
| Fitzgerald-Corde | ele. 125 | Terre Haute | 700 | Hagerstown | 220 |
| Macon . | . 785 | | | Hartford count | |
| *Savannah. | 3,000 | IOWA | | *Montgomery | , , , |
| Valdosta | 160 | Cedar Rapids | 330 | county. | 50,000 |
| | | Council Bluffs . | 245 | *Prince Georges | 50,000 |
| HAWAII | | *Davenport (inc. | l. in Quad | county. | 15,000 |
| Honolulu. | 1,500 | cities, Ill.) | - | Salisbury | 220 |
| | | *Des Moines | 3,000 | | |
| IDAHO | | Dubuque. | 105 | MASSACHUSETTS | |
| Boise . | 120 | Fort Dodge | 115 | Amherst | 175 |
| | | Mason City | 110 | Athol. | 230 |
| ILLINOIS | | Muscatine | 120 | Attleboro. | . 260 |
| Aurora | 400 | Ottumwa. | . 150 | Beverly. | . 1.000 |
| Bloomington | | *Sioux City | 1,100 | *Boston | 180,000 |
| *Champaign-Urb | | Waterloo. | 435 | *Brockton. | 5.200 |
| *Chicago Metrop | | | | *Fall River | 3,000 |
| Area. | 253,000 | KANSAS | | Fitchburg | . 300 |
| Danville | 240 | Topeka | . 500 | *Framingham'. | 16,000 |
| Decatur | 450 | *Wichita. | 1,200 | Gardner | 10,000 |
| East St. Louis (in | nci. in So. | | | Gloucester | 210 |
| III.) | 000 | KENTUCKY | 160 | Great | 210 |
| *Elgin | 800 | Ashland . | 150 | Barrington. | 105 |
| Galesburg *Joliet | 120 | Hopkinsville | . 120 | Greenfield | . 250 |
| Kankakee | 800 245 | Lexington | 1,200 | Haverhill. | 2.275 |
| Mattoon | . 125 | *Louisville. Paducah | 9,200 175 | *Holyoke | 1,100 |
| *Peoria . | 2,100 | raducan | 173 | Hyannis | . 245 |
| *Quad cities. | 3,000 | LOUISIANA | | Lawrence. | 2,550 |
| Quincy | . 200 | *Alexandria. | . 450 | Leominster. | 1,525 |
| *Rock Island (incl | | *Baton Rouge. | 1.300 | Lowell . | 2,000 |
| cities) | i. iii Quau | Lafavette. | 600 | *Lynn (incl. | 2,000 |
| *Rockford | 950 | Lake Charles. | 125 | Peabody). | 18,800 |
| *Southern Illinois | | *Monroe. | . 360 | Medway | 140 |
| *Springfield | 1,150 | *New Orleans. | 10,500 | Milford. | 245 |
| Sterling-Dixon. | . 110 | *Shreveport . | 1,500 | Mills | . 105 |
| Waukegan | 1,200 | omeveport . | 1,500 | *New Bedford | 3,100 |
| | 1,200 | MAINE | | Newburyport. | 280 |
| INDIANA | | Augusta | . 215 | North Berkshire | |
| Anderson. | 105 | Bangor | 1,300 | Northampton | . 350 |
| *Bloomington. | 300 | Biddeford-Saco | | Peabody | 2.600 |
| Elkhart. | . 245 | Calais. | 135 | Pittsfield | 2,400 |
| *Evansville | 1,000 | *Lewiston-Aubur | | Plymouth. | . 250 |
| *Ft. Wayne | 1,250 | *Portland | 3,500 | Salem. | 1,050 |
| Gary ^h . | 6,500 | Waterville | 220 | Southbridge | . 105 |
| *Indianapolis | 11,000 | | | *Springfield | 11,000 |
| Lafayette . | 600 | MARYLAND | | Taunton | 1.200 |
| Marion | 170 | Annapolis | 1,000 | Webster | . 125 |
| Michigan City. | 350 | *Baltimore. | 92,000 | *Worcester | 10,000 |
| | | | • | Worcester | 10,000 |

| | Jewish | Je | wish | | Jewish |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|
| State and City | Population | State and City Popula | ation | State and City Pop | pulation |
| MICHIGAN | | NEBRASKA | | *Northern Middles | ex |
| Ann Arbor. | 1,150 | *Lincoln. | 1050 | County . | 15,000 |
| Battle Creek . | 245 | *Omaha . 6 | ,500 | *Passaic-Clifton. | 9,000 |
| Bay City | 700 | | | *Paterson (incl. in | North |
| Benton Harbor | | NEVADA | | Jersey) | |
| *Detroit . | 80,000 | 9 | ,000 | Paulsboro . | . 165 |
| *Flint | 2,685 | Reno | 380 | *Perth Amboy (inc | |
| Grand Rapids | | | | North Middlese | x |
| Iron county | 160 | NEW HAMPSHIRE | | county) | |
| Iron Mountain | | Claremont | 210 | *Plainfield (incl. in | Union |
| Jackson. | 360 | Concord | 175 | county) | |
| *Kalamazoo. | . 650 | Dover. | 360 | Princeton. | 1,050 |
| *Lansing | 1,200 | Keene | 105 | *Raritan Valley'. | |
| Marquette | 175 | | 160 | *Salem. | . 230 |
| county | 175 | | ,800 | *Somerset county | |
| Mt. Clemens | 420 525 | Nashua | 320 | Somerville (incl. in | Somer- |
| Muskegon | 525 300 | *Portsmouth | 700 | set county) | 1 575 |
| *Saginaw South Haven. | 315 | NEW TERGEN | | Toms River | 1,575 |
| South Haven. | 313 | *Atlantic City (incl. At | tlan. | *Trenton. | 7,200 |
| MINNESOTA | | | .800 | *Union county | 36,000 |
| Austin | . 125 | | ,500 | *Vineland* | 2,850 . 350 |
| *Duluth . | 1,000 | | ,000 | Wildwood | |
| Hibbing. | . 155 | | 375 | Willingboro (incl. | ın Cam- |
| *Minneapolis | 22,085 | | 6,000 | den) | |
| Rochester | . 110 | | 700 | NEW MEXICO | |
| *St. Paul. | 9,500 | *Elizabeth (incl. in U | | *Albuquerque. | 4,500 |
| Virginia | 175 | county) | | Las Cruces. | 100 |
| , B | | *Englewood (also inc | l. in | *Santa Fe. | 300 |
| MISSISSIPPI | | Bergen county) 10 | | Sainta I C . | |
| Clarksdale | 320 | | ,000 | NEW YORK | |
| Cleveland. | 280 | Flemington. | 875 | *Albany | 13,500 |
| Greenville | 700 | Gloucester county ⁿ | 165 | Amenia. | 140 |
| Greenwood. | 175 | Hoboken | 500 | Amsterdam | 595 |
| Hattiesburg | 175 | | ,000 | Auburn. | 435 |
| Jackson. | 420 | *Metuchen (incl. in N | orth | Batavia . | 210 |
| Meridian . | 385 | Middlesex county) | | Beacon | . 315 |
| Natchez | 140 | *Millville . | 240 | Binghamton (incl. | all |
| Vicksburg | 260 | *Monmouth | | Broome co.). | 3,960 |
| - | | | 3,000 | Brewster | . 175 |
| MISSOURI | | *Morris county (incl. | | *Buffalo | 22,250 |
| Columbia. | 200 | | 5,000 | Canandaigua. | 135 |
| Joplin | . 300 | Morristown (incl. in l | Mor- | Catskill. | 290 |
| *Kansas City | 22,000 | ris county) | | Corning | 125 |
| Kennett | 110 | | 175 | Cortland . | 440 |
| Springfield . | 230 | *Newark (incl. in E | issex | Dunkirk | . 200 |
| *St. Joseph | . 515 | county) | | Ellenville. | 1,450 |
| *St. Louis . | 60,000 | *New Brunswick (inc | ı. ın | *Elmira | 1,400 |
| | | Raritan Valley) | | Geneva | 300 |
| MONTANA | 100 | *North Hudson | , 000 | Glens Falls. | . 780 |
| Billings . | 100 | | 7,000 | Gloversville | 1,400 |
| | | *North Jersey' 28 | 3,000 | Herkimer. | 185 |

| | Jewish | | Jewish | |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| State and City P | pulation | State and City Po | Population | State and City |
| Portsmouth | 200 | Walden. | s. 105 | Highland Falls |
| Sandusky. | 100 | Warwick | 100 | Hornell. |
| Springfield | 250 | Watertown. | 470 | Hudson. |
| *Steubenville | 425 | White Lake | 960 | Ithaca |
| *Toledo | 200 | Woodbourne. | . 185 | Jamestown . |
| *Warren. | 300 | Woodridge | 2,300 | Kingston . |
| Wooster | | | 2,100 | Liberty |
| *Youngstown | | NORTH CAROLINA | | Loch Sheldrak |
| Zanesville | 1,000 | *Asheville . | 750 | Hurleyville |
| | 230 | Chapel Hill | . 140 | Massena |
| OKLAHOMA | 2,800 | *Charlotte | 2,400 | *Middletown |
| Muskogee | 350 | Durham | . 400 | Monroe. |
| *Oklahoma City | 480 | Fayetteville. | 2,400 | Monticello . |
| Oklahoma City | 140 | Gastonia . | 150 | Mountaindale |
| Zone ^y . | 120 | Goldsboro . | | Greater New |
| *Tulsa . | in N.C. | *Greensboro (incl. | 1,998,000 | York |
| | NO | Triad) | 1 220 000 | New York |
| OREGON | in N.C. | *High Point (incl. | 1,228,000 | City . |
| Corvallis | | Triad) | | Manhatta |
| Eugene . | 3 700 | *North Carolina Triad* | 514,000 143,000 | Brooklyn |
| *Portland | 2,700 | | 379,000 | Bronx . |
| Salem. | 490 | Raleigh. | and 21,000 | Queens . |
| | 110 330 | Rocky Mount Whiteville Zone | | Nassau-Suffo |
| PENNSYLVANIA | . 500 | Wilmington . | , | Westchester |
| Aliquippa | | *Winston-Salem (| 150 | New Paltz |
| *Allentown | iici. III | N.C. Triad) | 220 | Newark. |
| *Altoona | | N.C. Illau) | 4,600 | *Newburgh |
| Ambridge | | NORTH DAKOTA | 1,000 | *Niagara Falls |
| Beaver . | 700 | Fargo | 120 | Norwich |
| Beaver Falls | 100 | Grand Forks. | 135 | Ogdensburg |
| Berwick | 100 | Grand Forks. | 200 | Olean. |
| Bethlehem | | оню | 125 | Oneonta |
| Braddock. Bradford | 6,500 | *Akron | 100 | Oswego. |
| | 160 | Ashtabula | 140 | Parksville |
| Brownville . | . 120 | Bellaire. | 105 | Pawling. |
| *Butler | 2,700 | *Canton | 275 | Plattsburg |
| Carbon county. | 30,000 | *Cincinnati | 560 | Port Jervis . |
| Carbondale. Carnegie | 80,000 | *Cleveland. | . 110 | Potsdam . |
| | 14,000 | *Columbus | 6,000 | Poughkeepsie |
| Central Bucks | 6,000 | *Dayton. | 21,500 | *Rochester |
| county. Chambersburg. | 290 | East Liverpool. | | Rockland |
| Chester. | 525 | Elyria. | 25,000 | county |
| Coatesville . | 560 | Hamilton. | 210 | Rome |
| Connellsville. | . 310 | *Lima . | gs 525 | Saratoga Sprin |
| Donora. | 1,000 | Lorain | 5,400 | *Schenectady |
| *Easton | 480 | Mansfield. | 165 | Sharon Springs |
| Ellwood City. | 120 | Marion | | South |
| *Erie. | 210 | Middletown | 1,100 | Fallsburg |
| | . 140 | New Philadelphia | 11,000 | *Syracuse |
| | | | 1 200 | *Troy |
| Farrell Greensburg. | 105 | Newark. | 1,300 2,800 | *Utica |

| | | - | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------------------|-------------|
| 0 1.00 | Jewish | G . 1.6% D | Jewish | 0 1.0. | Jewish |
| State and City | Population | State and City Po | opulation | State and City | Population |
| *Harrisburg. | 4,700 | SOUTH CAROLINA | | VERMONT | |
| *Hazleton | 900 | *Charleston . | 3,000 | Bennington. | . 120 |
| Homestead . | 300 | *Columbia. | 2,500 | Burlington . | 1,225 |
| Indiana | 120 | Florence | 370 | Rutland | 280 |
| *Johnstown | 600 | Greenville | 600 | St. Johnsbury | 100 |
| Kittanning. | . 175 | Orangeburg coun | | St. Johnsoury | 100 |
| *Lancaster. | 1,700 | Spartanburg | 210 | VIRGINIA | |
| Lebanon | 650 | Sumter | 190 | *Alexandria (inc | l Falls |
| Lewistown . | 225 | Samter | 150 | Church, Arli | |
| Lock Haven | 140 | SOUTH DAKOTA | | county and u | |
| *Lower Bucks | 140 | *Sioux Falls. | 145 | Fairfax coun | |
| county | 18,000 | Sioux I alis. | 143 | Arlington (incl | |
| McKeesport | 2,100 | TENNESSEE | | andria) | . III AICA- |
| Monessen. | 100 | *Chattanooga . | 2,250 | Danville | 140 |
| Mt. Carmel | 100 | Jackson | 120 | Fredericksburg | 7 1 2 |
| Mt. Pleasant. | 120 | Johnson City | 210 | *Hampton (incl | |
| New Castle. | 400 | *Knoxville. | . 950 | port News) | . III INCW- |
| New Kensingt | | *Memphis. | 9,000 | Harrisonburg | 160 |
| *Norristown. | 2,000 | *Nashville. | 3,700 | Hopewell. | 140 |
| North Penn | 200 | Oak Ridge. | 240 | Lynchburg. | 350 |
| Oil City | . 150 | Oak Ridge . | 240 | | . 135 |
| Oxford-Kenne | | TEXAS | | Martinsville | |
| Square | 180 | Amarillo . | . 245 | *Newport News | . 2,250 |
| *Philadelphia M | | *Austin | 1.900 | Hampton) . *Norfolk (incl. | |
| Area | 350,000 | Baytown | 300 | Beach). | 11,000 |
| Phoenixville | . 300 | Beaumont | 800 | | 580 |
| *Pittsburgh | 51,000 | Brownsville . | . 160 | Petersburg | |
| Pottstown | 680 | *Corpus Christi. | 1,030 | *Portsmouth (in Suffolk) | 1,165 |
| *Pottsville. | 500 | Corsicana | . 200 | *Richmond | 10,000 |
| Punxsutawney | | *Dallas | 20.000 | Roanoke | 800 |
| *Reading | 2,800 | De Witt county | | | 120 |
| Sayre. | 100 | *El Paso. | 5,000 | Williamsburg. Winchester. | 110 |
| *Scranton . | 4,190 | *Ft. Worth | 2,850 | Willester. | 110 |
| Shamokin | 145 | *Galveston | . 630 | III A GYIYA (CTOA) | |
| *Sharon . | 470 | *Houston | 24,000 | WASHINGTON | 120 |
| Shenandoah | 230 | Kilgore. | 110 | Bellingham. | |
| State College. | 400 | *Laredo | 420 | Bremerton (inc | n. m seat- |
| Stroudsburg | 410 | Longview. | 160 | *Seattle | 13,000 |
| Sunbury | 160 | Lubbock | 230 | Spokane | 800 |
| *Uniontown. | 305 | McAllen . | . 280 | | 700 |
| Upper Beaver | 500 | North Texas Zor | | Tacoma. | /00 |
| Washington | 300 | Odessa | 150 | INTERNATION IN | |
| Wayne county | | Port Arthur | . 260 | WEST VIRGINIA | 120 |
| West Chester | 300 | *San Antonio. | 6,500 | Beckley Bluefield-Prince | |
| *Wilkes-Barre. | 4,785 | Texarkana | 100 | *Charleston . | 1,120 |
| Williamsport. | . 770 | Tyler | 480 | | 225 |
| *York | 2,120 | *Waco | 700 | Clarksburg . Fairmont . | 100 |
| TOIR | 2,120 | Wharton | 270 | *Huntington. | 350 |
| RHODE ISLAND | | ., 1101 6011 | | Morgantown. | 125 |
| *Providence (ii | nol rest of | UTAH | | | 170 |
| state). | 22.000 | Ogden . | . 100 | Parkersburg | 170 |
| siaic). | 22,000 | *Salt Lake City. | 1,950 | Weirton | 650 |
| | | care mano crey. | _,,,_ | *Wheeling. | 050 |

| State and City | Jewish Population | State and City | Jewish Population | State and City | Jewish Population |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| WISCONSIN | _ | *Madison | 3,700 | Superior | 265 |
| *Appleton | 350 | Manitowoc. | 175 | Waukesha | 135 |
| Beloit | 105 | Marinette. | . 170 | Wausau. | 265 |
| Eau Claire . | 120 | *Milwaukee . | 23,900 | | |
| Fond du Lac. | 125 | Oshkosh | 120 | WYOMING | |
| Green Bay. | 440 | *Racine | 800 | Chevenne. | 280 |
| *Kenosha | 300 | *Sheboygan . | 250 | • | |

^{*}Denotes estimate submitted within three-year period.

^{&#}x27;Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia.

^bTowns in Chicot, Desha, Drew counties.

^{&#}x27;Centerbrook, Chester, Clinton, Deep River, Essex, Killingworth, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Seabrook, Westbrook.

⁴Ansonia, Derby-Shelton, Seymour.

^{&#}x27;Greater Washington includes urbanized portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges counties, Maryland, Arlington County, Fairfax county (organized portion); Falls Church; Alexandria, Virginia.

^{&#}x27;Rock Island, Moline (Illinois); Davenport, Bettendorf (Iowa).

⁴Towns in Alexander, Bond, Clay, Clinton, Crawford, Edwards, Effingham, Fayette, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jasper, Jefferson, Jersey, Johnson, Lawrence, Mascoupin, Madison, Marion, Massac, Montgomery, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, St. Clair, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson counties.

Includes East Chicago, Hammond, Whiting.

^{&#}x27;Towns in Caroline, Kent, Queen Annes, Talbot counties.

Includes Bellingham, Franklin, Norfolk, Maynard.

^kAllendale, Elmwood Park, Fair Lawn, Franklin Lakes, Oakland, Midland Park, Rochelle Park, Saddle Brook, Wykoff also included in North Jersey estimate.

Includes Camden and Burlington counties.

[&]quot;Includes western part of Hudson county; Hillside (part), Springfield, Summit in Union county. Also Chatham, Florham Park, Madison in Morris county.

[&]quot;Includes Clayton, Paulsboro, Woodbury. Excludes Newfield, see Vineland.

^{&#}x27;Includes Belmar, Deal, Long Branch, Neptune.

Excludes Chatham, Florham Park, Madison which are included in Essex county.

⁴Includes Guttenberg, Hudson Heights, North Bergen, North Hudson, Secaucus, Union City, Weehawken, West New York, Woodcliff.

^{&#}x27;Includes Paterson, Wayne, Hawthorne in Passaic county, and nine towns in Bergen county. See footnote (k).

^{&#}x27;Includes Perth Amboy, Metuchen, Edison Township (part), Woodbridge.

Includes in Middlesex county, Cranbury, Dunellen, East Brunswick, Edison Township (part), Jamesburg, Matawan, Middlesex, Monmouth Junction, Old Bridge, Parlin, Piscatawy, South River, Spottswood; in Somerset county, Kendall Park, Somerset; in Mercer county, Hightstown.

[&]quot;Excludes Kendall Park and Somerset which are included in Raritan Valley.

'Includes in Cumberland county, Norma, Rosenheim, Vineland; in Salem county, Elmer; in Gloucester county, Newfield; in Cape May county, Woodbine.

*Greensboro, High Point, Winston-Salem.

*Burgaw, Clinton, Dunn, Elizabethtown, Fairmont, Jacksonville, Lumberton, Tabor City, Wallace, Warsaw, and Dillon, Loris, Marion, Mullins, S.C.

Towns in Alfalfa, Beckham, Cadelo, Canadian, Cleveland, Custer, Jackson, Kingfisher,

Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, Oklahoma, Payne, Roger Mills, Tillman, Washita counties. 'Bensalem Township, Bristol, Langhorne, Levittown, New Hope, Newtown, Penndel, Warington, Yardley.

"Includes Kingsport and Bristol (including the portion of Bristol in Virginia).

^{bb}Includes communities also in Colorado, Fayette, Gonzales and La Vaca counties.

"Denison, Gainesville, Greenville, Paris, Sherman.

Trends in U.S. Jewish Education: National Jewish Population Study Findings

In discussions of the future of Jewish life in the United States, frequent reference is made to Jewish education as a precondition for the Jewish community's survival. While information on the extent and types of Jewish education is provided for relatively brief time spans by current Jewish school enrollment statistics, the 1970 National Jewish Population Study data (NJPS; AJYB, 1973 [Vol. 74], pp. 264–66) make possible a systematic, long-term review of Jewish education trends in the United States. Such review must, in each instance, go beyond a simple counting of the number of students attending Jewish educational institutions. With changing birthrates, and consequent variations in the demographic character of the United States Jewish population, the potential number of children (as well as older youths and adults) who may avail themselves of Jewish education can vary significantly. Therefore, to assess qualitative changes over time, one must consider not only the total number, but also the proportion enrolled in all types of Jewish schools in a specified time period.

The findings presented here take this into account, and, for the first time, make possible the examination of appropriately adjusted relative enrollment levels in historical perspective. It further becomes feasible to compare the Jewish education patterns of adults—persons whose elementary and secondary Jewish education has been completed—with emerging profiles of Jewish schooling for younger people. Such an analysis gives an indication of parental Jewish background which, in turn, establishes the climate in the home for the education of Jewish children* in the 1970s.

Exposure to Jewish Education Defined

Based on responses of NJPS interviewees, "exposure" to Jewish education is defined here in terms of reported enrollment, either present or at any time in the past, in one or more of the following categories of Jewish education:

One-day-a-week

"Sunday School" or Saturday school
Sunday or Saturday school, augmented by mid-week meetings

^{*}For simplicity in wording, the term "Jewish children" is used interchangeably with "children in Jewish households." The terms are not synonymous, however, as Jewish households may include non-Jews, as in intermarriage. Unless otherwise noted, reference is to persons in Jewish households.

Weekday afternoon
Weekday afternoon Hebrew school
Heder
Weekday afternoon community school
Pre-school
Jewish nursery school
Jewish kindergarten
All-Day
Jewish all-day elementary school
Jewish all-day junior high school
Jewish all-day high school
All others
Yiddish school (all types)
Weekday high-school level program
Yeshivah (in part equivalent to all-day school)

Theological seminary, or equivalent

Any other Jewish education type

Adult Jewish education

Private tutor

While exposure to any "Jewish education" is a generic concept, including possible enrollment (or participation), past or present, in one or more of the Jewish education categories specified, the detailed analysis reported here is confined to the most frequently mentioned Jewish education types. Analyses reflect Jewish education exposure of "persons residing in Jewish households," including the intermarried, if one or more of the resident adults identifies as "Jewish."

Clearly. Jewish enrollment figures at any given time do not reflect past enrollment or future enrollment of some children who will eventually have the benefit of a formal Jewish educational experience, though they are not enrolled now. Others may drop out, permanently or temporarily. Thus a youngster may attend a Jewish school one year, skip the next two or three years, and may again enroll the year thereafter, perhaps in preparation for bar-mitzvah. Or a pre-school child may not be enrolled in a Jewishly-oriented kindergarten or nursery school, but may later regularly attend Sunday school or weekday afternoon Hebrew school. Whatever these "ins and outs," the data suggest that, adult Jewish education notwithstanding, an ultimate plateau of exposure to Jewish education is reached in the middle or late teens. In view of these considerations, no matter what the proportion of momentary enrollment, i.e. the number and proportion of children in Jewish schools in a given year, it is interesting to establish what proportion of children, and others, receive some Jewish education. This overview of eventual exposure to Jewish education is, of course, a mere starting point for further inquiry into the quantity and quality of that education. Issues relating to the intensity of Jewish education (number of hours, number of years, content of curriculum, etc.) will be addressed in a subsequent

article. Such follow-up study, however, must be seen in the context of exposure to Jewish education, as defined here.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Briefly, the following are the major NJPS findings on Jewish education:

- 1. More than 80 per cent of Jewish males receive some Jewish education at some time in their lives. The indication is that this percentage has slightly increased in recent years. Among the 585,800 15-through-19-year-old young men in Jewish households (1970), about 493,000 are reported to have had some Jewish education.
- 2. The proportions of Jewish females ultimately exposed to Jewish education are consistently below those of males, recently falling in the 70 per cent range. Among the 516,200 15-through-19-year-old young women in Jewish households (1970), about 370,000 are reported to have had some Jewish education.
- 3. Between 40 and 60 per cent of Jewish children in the five-through-14-year age group are receiving Jewish education. The figures rise to above 60 per cent for males near bar-mitzvah age, but are rather low, about 40 per cent for females of corresponding age. Approximately 583,000 Jewish boys (of 980,000) and 404,600 Jewish girls (of 928,000), ages five through 14, are reported enrolled in a Jewish school (1970).
- 4. For Jewish girls, one-day-a-week school is the dominant pattern from age five on. However, for boys (though one-third in the five-through-nine-year age range report one-day-a-week Jewish education), weekday afternoon Hebrew school emerges as the dominant pattern beyond age ten. There is a fair amount of exposure to both weekday afternoon Hebrew school and one-day-a-week school, particularly for Jewish boys between ages ten through 19.
- 5. Between 13 and 18 per cent of Jewish boys and young men, ages ten through 29, have at one time or another been enrolled in a Jewish all-day school. Corresponding figures for girls and young women are much lower.
- 6. For children under five years of age, Jewish pre-school enrollment is reported at about 18 per cent.
- 7. Weekday afternoon Hebrew school continues to be the most frequently reported Jewish education experience for Jewish boys. However, on a relative basis, the proportion reporting enrollment in one-day-a-week schools has grown in recent years.
- 8. Some 80 per cent of Jewish boys—about 94,000 in a recent year (1970)—become bar-mitzvah. The proportion of Jewish girls becoming bat-mitzvah has increased from very small percentages to about one in four, to approximately 28,000 per year.
- 9. Girls are more likely to be confirmed than boys, though the difference in

proportion has narrowed. About one girl in five or six is confirmed.

10. Recent intermarriage trends—particularly when the wife is the non-Jewish partner—result in a substantial increase in the proportion of non-Jewish children in Jewish households, recently about one in five. This, together with the declining Jewish birthrates in the 1970s, may reduce the near-term future potential enrollment in Jewish schools.

THE DATA

Upon detailed examination of the NJPS data, some salient facts emerge on several topics of major interest.

Exposure to Jewish Education

More than one half of Jewish children, ages five through nine, are either currently enrolled, or have previously been enrolled, in a Jewish school (Table 1). For the very young, four years of age and younger, the corresponding figure is about 18 per cent. Many children in this age range have not been enrolled, but are likely to receive a Jewish education when they reach elementary-school age.

TABLE 1. EXPOSURE TO ANY JEWISH EDUCATION

Per Cent

| Age | Male | Female |
|-------------|------|--------|
| 0-4 | 18.7 | 18.2 |
| 5–9 | 54.8 | 58.6 |
| 10-14 | 87.3 | 74.6 |
| 15-19 | 84.1 | 71.7 |
| 20-24 | 87.1 | 69.8 |
| 25-29 | 87.0 | 52.8* |
| 30-39 | 82.2 | 64.5 |
| 40-49 | 80.7 | 58.4 |
| 50-59 | 83.3 | 63.2 |
| 60-64 | 88.0 | 64.3 |
| 65-74 | 79.9 | 63.3 |
| 75 and over | 89.1 | 54.8 |

Note: Total number of sample cases: unweighted 22,259; weighted to 36,824, in accordance with NJPS sample design.

For Jewish males above customary religious-school age, a remarkably consistent pattern emerges: over-all, more than 80 per cent have had some Jewish education at some time in their lives. The differences among the various age groups, especially

^{*}A significant percentage of non-Jewish spouses in intermarriages are included in this category.

at the adult level, are minor; the percentage of exposure to Jewish education for Jewish men age 20 and up varies from 80 to 89 per cent. A Jewish education exposure figure of 87 per cent for boys in the ten-through-14-year age bracket, with further Jewish education still probable for some in the immediate pre-bar-mitzvah years and before confirmation, suggests that Jewish boys of the early 1970s may eventually exceed their older counterparts in the percentage of exposure to Jewish education by a small margin. This does not, however, speak to the issue of the intensity of Jewish education received.

While differences in Jewish education exposure between boys and girls to age nine are small, they become important at age ten and beyond. In every subsequent age category, the proportion of males who have had some Jewish education is found to exceed that of females. This follows an earlier tradition that emphasizes more extensive Jewish learning for the Jewish male and less Jewish education for the female.

Among women, age 20 and older, typically somewhere above 60 per cent have had some exposure to Jewish education, while for men the corresponding figure generally exceeds 80 per cent. Among the several 20-plus age brackets for women, the percentages of exposure to Jewish education vary within a range of about 53 to nearly 70.

For girls, including those who typically are in the midst of their Jewish education (ages ten through 14) and those who have recently completed it (ages 15 through 19), the proportions of exposure to Jewish education rise above the 70 per cent level, approaching 75 per cent. This upswing suggests that, as a result of recent changes both in Jewish community culture and educational techniques, a somewhat greater segment of younger Jewish women are being reached by Jewish schooling than in the past. On the basis of these findings—analogous to the finding for boys ten through 14 years of age—we may predict that an increasingly high proportion of young Jewish women, exceeding the comparable proportion of their parents' generation, will ultimately receive the benefit of some Jewish primary- or secondary-school experience. However, intermarriage may act as a countervailing force, depressing the proportion of Jewish school exposure as the children of intermarriages (particularly where the wife is non-Jewish) reach school age.

Jewish Education Patterns of Jewish Youth

By highlighting data in subsequent tables, we can focus particularly on the patterns of Jewish education reported for Jewish young people up to and including the age of 19 (Table 2). For each age category within this range, separate reports of findings for males and females make it possible to identify the predominant types of Jewish education exposure.

For children up to the age of four, Jewish pre-school education (kindergarten and/or nursery school conducted under Jewish auspices) is the most frequently reported education type, though scattered enrollment is found for the other educa-

tion categories. Present or past enrollment in one-day-a-week schools is most frequently reported for children in the five-through-nine-year age category, with little difference between the sexes. Percentages for weekday afternoon Hebrew school enrollment in this age group are lower, about one-half of the one-day-a-week percentages.

TABLE 2. PATTERNS OF JEWISH EDUCATION: REPORTED ENROLLMENT, PAST OR PRESENT, (EXPOSURE) BY SPECIFIED EDUCATION TYPES

Per Cont

| Type of | | | Iale Ige | | | | nale ge | |
|--|--------|--------|-------------|---------|--------------|--------|------------|--------|
| Education | 0-4 | 5_9 | 10–14 | 15–19 | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10–14 | 15–19 |
| Pre- | | | | | | | | |
| school | 16.1* | 13.7 | 10.2 | 5.6 | 16.7* | 12.7 | 7.9 | 4.0 |
| One-day- a-week Weekday | 2.2 | 33.9* | 56.3 | 52.2 | 7.9 | 34.1* | 45.2* | 50.2* |
| afternoon Hebrew | 1.0 | 17.9 | 60.5* | 61.3* | 1.8 | 18.4 | 38.5 | 32.9 |
| Jewish all-day | 1.9 | 6.5 | 13.1 | 11.1 | 2.5 | 8.1 | 7.2 | 9.1 |
| Index: Exposure to more than one Jewish education | | | | | | | | |
| type ^a Exposure to any Jewish | (21.2) | (72.0) | (140.1) | (130.2) | (28.9) | (73.3) | (98.8) | (96.2) |
| education | 18.7 | 54.8 | 87.3 | 84.1 | 18.2 | 58.6 | 74.6 | 71.7 |
| #D -1-421- | | | | | iau within u | | / | |

^{*}Relatively most frequently reported type of education within particular age/sex category.

a"Exposure" as defined, may occur for two or more Jewish education types, viz. person may have, or have had, both one-day-a-week and weekday afternoon Hebrew school. Only most frequently-reported Jewish education types included in this analysis.

The pattern changes considerably for the ten-through-14-year age category. For boys, in this age period of bar-mitzvah preparation, there is nearly 61 per cent exposure to weekday afternoon Hebrew school, making this education type the most prevalent. Further, for the one-day-a-week schools, an only slightly lower past-or-present-enrollment figure appears, at nearly 56 per cent. This indicates a fairly high level of multiple enrollment, with some children having attended, at one or another

time, both one-day-a-week and weekday afternoon Hebrew school.

For girls in the ten-through-14-year category, one-day-a-week school is the most prevalent, 45 per cent as compared to 39 per cent for weekday afternoon Hebrew school. Both figures, however, are below those shown for boys of corresponding age.

For those in the 15-through-19-year bracket—the age range which, with the rather infrequent exception of adult Jewish education, marks the conclusion of formal Jewish education—the patterns established at ages ten through 14 generally persist. For males, weekday afternoon Hebrew school continues to predominate (61 per cent), followed by one-day-a-week enrollment (52 per cent). For females, the one-day-a-week school remains the most frequently reported (50 per cent), followed by weekday afternoon Hebrew school (33 per cent).

Enrollment in Jewish all-day school, though on recent upswing for boys ages ten through 14, reaches only a modest proportion of the total Jewish child population. For males between the ages of ten through 19, it ranges from about 11 to 13 per cent of the total, while for females of corresponding age it varies narrowly, from 7 to 9 per cent. Counting *yeshivot*, the figures increase by a moderate margin.

Table 3 shows the historical trend in exposure to the specific major Jewish education types, Jewish pre-school, one-day-a-week school, weekday afternoon Hebrew school, and Jewish all-day school. For males, weekday afternoon Hebrew school has been, and continues to be, the dominant education type. However, the relative percentage gap between it and exposure to one-day-a-week school has been closing. This indicates that the one-day-a-week school and its variants representing a relatively modern American Jewish education style—one not prevalent in the education of the foreign-born or in the early stages of United States Jewish education—now reaches a higher proportion of the Jewish child population than in former times.

For females exposure to one-day-a-week school consistently exceeds that to week-day afternoon Hebrew school, except for those above age 75.

As for the Jewish all-day school, the historical analysis reveals that of males who have completed their Jewish education, those between ages ten through 29, and age 75 and over are the Jewish population groups most likely to have had some exposure to this Jewish education type, within a range of about 11 to 18 per cent.

For females, corresponding percentages range from just below 3 per cent to a high of slightly above 9 per cent. The latter is reported for the 15-through-19 age category, suggesting a rise in intensive Jewish commitment by one particular small segment of the Jewish female youth population.

Reviewing the pattern of Jewish education trends as a whole, one may conclude that for males the *relative* predominance of the afternoon Hebrew school is declining, with a proportional rise in enrollment in other (and sometimes several) types of Jewish educational institutions, particularly in the one-day-a-week school. For Jewish females, the one-day-a-week school has been, and continues to be, the principal Jewish education experience.

Intensive Jewish all-day school education never has reached more than about one

TABLE 3. EXPOSURE TO SPECIFIC MAJOR JEWISH EDUCATION TYPES (Per Cent)

| | | | | | We | ekday | | |
|-------------|-------|---------|------|--------|-------|----------|------|--------|
| | | | One- | Day-a- | Afte | ernoon | Al | l-Day |
| | Pre-S | School* | Week | School | Hebre | w School | Se | chool |
| Age | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 0-4 | 16.1 | 16.7 | 2.2 | 7.9 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.5 |
| 5–9 | 13.7 | 12.7 | 33.9 | 34.1 | 17.9 | 18.4 | 6.5 | 8.1 |
| 10–14 | 10.2 | 7.9 | 56.3 | 45.2 | 60.5 | 38.5 | 13.1 | 7.2 |
| 15–19 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 52.2 | 50.2 | 61.3 | 32.9 | 11.1 | 9.1 |
| 20-24 | 5.5 | 4.7 | 43.3 | 43.1 | 49.0 | 24.2 | 17.7 | 7.7 |
| 25-29 | 1.4 | 3.4 | 43.3 | 29.9 | 63.1 | 25.5 | 18.0 | 5.2 |
| 30-39 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 28.3 | 37.6 | 64.1 | 27.0 | 7.3 | 5.2 |
| 40-49 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 21.4 | 34.4 | 61.4 | 21.0 | 6.8 | 7.4 |
| 50-59 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 17.5 | 28.2 | 55.8 | 22.6 | 6.4 | 5.0 |
| 60–64 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 15.4 | 32.7 | 65.3 | 32.2 | 7.1 | 4.5 |
| 65–74 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 12.1 | 20.6 | 56.2 | 19.1 | 8.6 | 2.8 |
| 75 and over | 1.0 | 1.1 | 8.7 | 14.5 | 59.9 | 20.0 | 11.9 | 4.1 |

*Trends for Jewish pre-school education are not separately interpreted. It is possible that recency of this experience leads to a higher proportion of reporting, while, when considered in retrospect, it may be subsumed under more salient categories like one-day-a-week school, weekday afternoon Hebrew school, etc. Also, recent emphasis on Jewish childhood education may be reflected in the results.

in five or six Jewish males, and much smaller proportions of Jewish females. In view of past trends and recent patterns, it seems unlikely that exposure to Jewish all-day schools will increase by more than a modest number of percentage points, if at all, in the near future.

Current Enrollment in Jewish Schools

Jewish education in the United States is characterized by a certain amount of "coming and going," with young people participating in one kind of Jewish education program in one period of their school years and in some other kind (or none at all) in another. Therefore, eventual exposure to Jewish education frequently represents enrollment by any one individual in more than one type of Jewish educational institution, and is not fully reflected in school enrollment in any given year. Table 4 focuses specifically on the proportions of Jewish youth below the age of 19, whom NJPS reported as currently participating in *one or more* formal Jewish education programs.

For Jewish boys, with bar-mitzvah preparation no doubt influential, the largest current enrollment proportion falls within the ten-through-14-year age bracket, with more than 64 per cent in a Jewish school. The corresponding proportion for

boys in the five-through-nine-year group is 53 per cent. For Jewish girls, the point of maximum enrollment—above 46 per cent—is attained, perhaps surprisingly, in the younger, five-through-nine-year group, while the proportion in the ten-through-14 category declines to 42 per cent. It appears that neither bat-mitzvah nor confirmation has sufficient impact to counter an early "dropout" trend among Jewish girls.

TABLE 4. CURRENT ENROLLMENT IN JEWISH SCHOOLS

Per Cent

| Age | Male | Female | Total |
|-------|------|--------|-------|
| 0-4 | 18.1 | 17.5 | 17.8 |
| 5–9 | 52.5 | 46.3 | 47.7 |
| 10-14 | 64.1 | 41.7 | 53.0 |
| 15-19 | 15.3 | 13.1 | 14.2 |

Without exception, Jewish boys are more likely to be enrolled in a Jewish school than Jewish girls. The difference is greatest in the ten-through-14-year bracket, likely because of the emphasis on pre-bar-mitzvah education. Differences are less distinct for the youngest and oldest groups considered in Table 4. The enrollment drop-off beyond bar-mitzvah age, in the 15-through-19-year age bracket, is precipitous: for males the enrollment percentage drops from about 64 to just above 15, while for females the drop is from nearly 42 to about 13.

Bar-Mitzvah, Bat-Mitzvah, and Confirmation

The NJPS data (Table 5) indicate that typically between 75 and 80 per cent of all Jewish males become bar-mitzvah, with the lowest proportion (75 per cent) reported for the 15-through-19-year group and the relatively highest (over 87 per cent) for the 75-and-over age group.

A rather different picture emerges for females. Bat-mitzvah as a ritual observance, adopted as a result of American Jewish community efforts seeking the equalization of Jewish education for boys and girls, emerges as a fairly prevalent phenomenon of the last two decades. More particularly, a noteworthy upswing in bat-mitzvah celebration, 26 per cent, appears among the 15-through-19-year-olds, with a considerably lower figure, nearly 11 per cent, found for those between ages 20 through 24. In no instance, however, does the frequency of bat-mitzvah approach anywhere near that of the bar-mitzvah.

The situation is quite different for confirmation (Table 6), with the proportion of female celebrants consistently exceeding that of their male counterparts. Here again, however, efforts to achieve relatively equal Jewish education for the sexes reduces the difference. While in the 15-through-19-year groups, for example, 18 per cent of young women and roughly 15 per cent of young men report confirmation, the percentages for women and men in the 40-through-49-year group, respectively, are

20 and about 7. In terms of the long-term trend, at least below age 65, about one Jewish girl in five is confirmed.

TABLE 5. BAR MITZVAH AND BAT MITZVAH
Per Cent

| | Males: Bar-Mitzvah | | Females: Bat-Mitzvah | | | |
|--------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| | | Plus Con- | | | Plus Con- | |
| Age | Only | firmation | Total | Only | firmation | Total |
| 15-19 | 64.2 | 10.8 | 75.0 | 20.4 | 5.6 | 26.0 |
| 20-24 | 71.7 | 10.1 | 81.8 | 7.6 | 3.1 | 10.7 |
| 25-29 | 67.9 | 14.6 | 82.5 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 7.5 |
| 30-39 | 75.0 | 6.9 | 81.9 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 7.7 |
| 40-49 | 73.9 | 4.5 | 78.4 | 2.5 | 7.1 | 9.6 |
| 50-59 | 75.8 | 3.3 | 79.1 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 3.4 |
| 60-64 | 71.5 | 1.9 | 73.4 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 2.7 |
| 65-74 | 72.5 | 1.4 | 73.9 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 3.6 |
| 75, up | 85.0 | 2.4 | 87.4 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 2.9 |

Note: Figures at low percentage levels, particularly below 3.0 percent, may in part represent data processing error.

TABLE 6. CONFIRMATION (WHETHER OR NOT ALSO BAR/BAT-MITZVAH)

Per Cent

| Age | Males | Femaleš |
|--------|-------|---------|
| 15–19 | 14.9 | 18.2 |
| 20-24 | 14.1 | 18.3 |
| 25-29 | 16.4 | 17.3 |
| 30-39 | 9.0 | 24.5 |
| 40-49 | 6.7 | 20.0 |
| 50-59 | 6.6 | 19.2 |
| 60-64 | 3.3 | 21.0 |
| 65–74 | 4.1 | 9.4 |
| 75, up | 3.9 | 5.7 |
| | | |

Intermarriage and the Jewish Education Potential

Aside from the decline in birthrates, particularly in the early 1970s, intermarriage (AJYB, 1973 [Vol. 74], pp. 292–306; see Tables 1a and 4), especially when the wife is the non-Jewish partner, is likely to have a significant impact on the future of Jewish education in the United States (Table 7). The trend has been toward a decline in the number of children of intermarried couples who are reported to be "Jewish."

TABLE 7. RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION OF CHILDREN IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS*

Per Cent

| | | Ag | e |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Religion | 0-4 | 5_9 | All age groups |
| Non-Jewish | 21.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Don't know; no answer | 1.8 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| Total of probably non-Jewish | 22.9 | 6.6 | 6.3 |
| Jewish | <u>77.1</u> | <u>93.4</u> | 93.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

^{*}A Jewish household is one in which at least one adult identifies as Jewish (AJYB, 1974-75 [Vol. 75], pp. 297-98).

More than 20 per cent of the children in the birth-through-four-year age bracket, typically offspring of such intermarried couples, are regarded by adult respondents of their constituent household as "non-Jewish," a very large increase as compared to the five-through-nine-year age bracket (6 per cent). Overwhelmingly, this "non-Jewish" segment of the infant and pre-school population in Jewish households is defined as not ever having been Jewish and as being non-Jewish now. If the Jewish birthrate remains low and if the rate of intermarriage continues to rise, or hold at high levels, potential Jewish school enrollment may be expected to decline below corresponding levels of the 1950s and early 1960s.

FRED MASSARIK

A Reader in the Demography of American Jews

When the national jewish population study of 1970 was under way, it was described as "a benchmark, enabling us for the first time to estimate accurately the number of Jews in the United States. It will also provide a wide variety of data on all aspects of Jewish life." This statement should be viewed in light of the fact that the first Jewish population estimate appears to date back to 1818, and that from then until the most recent survey, "based on accepted principles of scientific sample selection," the American Jewish community has always sought to gather statistics and data about itself. A full record of this attempt is contained in the pages of the American Jewish Year Book, which, from its inception in 1899, has annually reported on the American Jewish population, often gathering the data itself.

A demographic recapitulation is presented here of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK (AJYB) from Volume 1 (1899–1900) to 76 (1976). Besides noting successive population estimates, it discusses methodology, local population surveys, and such matters as fertility and intermarriage.

NATIONAL AND STATE ESTIMATES

Early Techniques

Vol. 1 (1899–1900): The introductory paragraph to "Jewish Statistics: The United States" stated:

As the census of the United States has, in accordance with the spirit of American institutions, taken no heed of the religious convictions of American citizens, whether native-born or naturalized, all statements concerning the number of Jews living in this country are based upon estimate, though several of the estimates have been most conscientiously made.

Tables of all earlier national estimates, made at irregular intervals by various persons, and Jewish immigration into the United States between 1881 and 1899 followed:

¹For a presentation of methodology and findings see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vols. 74–76, 1973–1976.

| | 2 000 |
|---|------------------|
| In 1818 Mordecai M. Noah estimated the Jewish population at | |
| In 1826 Isaac C. Harby estimated | 6,000 |
| In 1840 American Almanac | 15,000 |
| In 1848 M.A. Berk | 50,000 |
| In 1880 Wm. B. Hackenburg | 230,257 |
| In 1888 Isaac Markens | 400,C00 |
| In 1897 David Sulzberger | 937,800 (p.283). |
| Immigration for 1881-1884 | 74,310 |
| | 417,010 |
| Philadelphia, 1885–1899 | 36,390 |
| Baltimore, 1885-1899 | 20,140 |
| | 547,850 (p.284). |

The author explained how he arrived at a new estimate for 1899:

If we add this immigration to the estimate of Mr. Hackenburg made in 1880, we secure a total of 778,107, without making any allowance for the natural increase in 20 years, nor for the immigration through Canada and other ports of the United States.

He therefore gave a "tentative estimate by States being based with a few modifications on the tables of Mr. D. Sulzberger," which he totaled to arrive at an estimated Jewish population of 1,043,800 in 1899 (p.284).

Volume 2 (1900-1901): The 1899 AJYB estimate was added to the earlier list. A revised "table by States" was included, which was "a modification of that given in the previous Year Book and is based upon new estimates secured from many sources. It is believed to be more accurate than any previous table" (p.623). The national total for 1900 rose to 1,058,135 (p.624).

Volume 3 (1901–1902): The introduction to a "Statistical Summary by States" (pp. 126–56) explained:

The following statistical statements concerning Jewish activity in all departments, in every State and Territory of the United States, except Arizona, Wyoming and North Dakota, purport to be nothing more than a resumé of the data collected in April-May, 1900, for the issue of 5661 [Vol.2] of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK.

The often detailed and profuse information on communal organizations for each state, culled from responses to inquiries, was presented under various categories: religious, educational; charitable; mutual benefit, loan, and social, giving the number of organizations, their auspices, membership, finances, etc. Population estimates were given for many states. The *Year Book* opted for this form, rather than tabulations, to "minimize the danger of misrepresentation by granting the opportunity of adducing modifications and explanatory circumstances when necessary."

After pointing out some of the shortcomings of the responses, the article maintained:

From the above it is evident that the opportunities for omissions, errors, and misinterpretations are not few; yet it is believed that the statistics may serve,

through their fullness, to convey a notion of the vigor and versatility of Judaism in America; and through their paucity, to demonstrate the importance of completing and perfecting them (p. 128).

However, the authors attempted a tabulated summary of the findings for the nation as a whole (pp.153-56). The entry under population reads:

Number of States, etc. furnishing estimates
(47 possible)

lowest estimates amount to
highest estimates amount to
1,288,200

As indicated, the total given in the table listing state populations, which were derived from the responses, was 1,058,135.

The preface to Volume 3 stated:

Little progress has been made in arriving at correct figures for the Jewish population of the United States, and the plan of sending out circulars and securing estimates seems well-nigh hopeless. Within the next year it is expected that a series of investigations will be entered upon which promise to yield more accurate results with regard to the Jewish population of this country than have heretofore been obtained (pp. IX-X).

Yet, the "Jewish Statistics" article declared that the current state figures were again modified; that, although "new estimates were secured from many sources,

they varied so much that the figures have been changed only where some corroborative evidence has been furnished" (p.157). A comparison of state totals in Volumes 2 and 3 showed changes in about a dozen states, only three of which were rises: Connecticut, from 8,000 to 15,000; Minnesota, from 6,000 to 10,000, and Missouri, from 35,000 to 50,000. The most drastic downward revisions were made for: Illinois, from 95,000 to 75,000; Nevada, from 2,500 to 300; North Carolina, from 12,000 to 6,000; South Carolina, from 8,200 to 2,500. No sources or explanations were given.

The sum of the estimates for all states indicated a total Jewish population of 1,045,555 in 1901 (p.158).

Death-Rate Method

Volume 4 (1902–1903): The United States Jewish population in 1902 was estimated at 1,136,240 (p.144). The author of "Jewish Statistics" explained that modifications of state listings for that year were made "by reason of changes in the estimated populations of three States, New York, Arkansas, and Maryland. The Jewish Encyclopedia estimates the population of Arkansas at 3,085, and that of Maryland has been calculated by the method of death rates to be 26,500" (p.143). This was the first effort by AJYB to obtain more exact figures for a Jewish community by a method other than questionnaire.

The use of death rates in estimating the number of Jews was first advanced by Dr. George E. Barnett of Johns Hopkins University in a paper, "A Method of

Determining the Jewish Population of Large Cities in the United States," presented to a meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society in January 1902. In his *Year Book* article, he reported on the application of this method to establish "The Jewish Population of Maryland" (pp. 46-62). Dr. Barnett explained:

The study naturally falls into two parts, (1) an estimate of the Jewish population of Baltimore City based on the number of Jewish deaths, (2) a direct enumeration of the Jews living in Maryland outside the City.

The latter was based on responses to questionnaires mailed to individuals in the area.

The procedure of establishing the Jewish death rate was as follows:

The books of the Baltimore Health Department containing a record of every person dying in the city were carefully gone through [by Miss Henrietta Szold] for the years 1899, 1900, and 1901 to ascertain the number of Jewish decedents. The chief test used for determining whether a decedent was Jewish was the burial ground in which he was interred. The enumerator was supplied with a complete list of Jewish cemeteries in Baltimore.

The average number dying each year was . 326. The death rate per 1,000 of white persons living in Baltimore for the same years was something over eighteen. If it is assumed that the Jewish mortality rate was the same . , the number of Jews living in Baltimore would be estimated at 18,000.

However, Barnett continued,

. it is quite certain that the Jewish race has a lower death rate than the people among whom it lives. If the age grouping and economic conditions of Jews and their neighbors are similar, the Jewish mortality is lower on account of racial longevity.

Barnett's premise was that the Jewish population of Baltimore, like that of other large cities in the United States, "falls into two fairly well-defined classes. Between the Jews of Portuguese and German descent, the longer-settled class, and the new immigrants of Russian and Polish origin there is a sharp differentiation both in economic condition and in age grouping." By separating the Jews into these groupings, he was able to estimate the death rate for each group. For German Jews, he adjusted the mortality rate derived from the 1889 census study, "Vital Statistics of the Jews of the United States," with that of Jews in Germany for the period 1893–1897, which was known. The mortality rate of the immigrant Jew was gotten from a study of death rates of persons of Russian nationality living in New York in June 1900. The arithmetic process of determining the population was to multiply the number of decedents in each of the two groups by the respective reciprocal of their death rates, and to add the two figures. Barnett concluded: "The entire Jewish population of Baltimore may therefore be estimated as 25,000" (p.54).

For an estimate of the number of Maryland's Jews outside of Baltimore, questionnaires were addressed to 87 individuals in various towns. Of 65 replies received, 8 reported no Jewish residents; "57 reported 960 Jewish residents, to which may be added 165 for Cumberland, as reported a year ago, and 20 for Elkton, as reported by a Jewish resident of a neighboring town in the same county, making a total of 1145 Jews reported as living in Maryland outside of Baltimore" (pp.59-60). These Dr. Barnett listed by counties and towns. From the responses, Dr. Barnett conbe a moderate estimate to assume that 1500 Jews reside in cluded, "It would the State of Maryland outside of Baltimore," making the total for the state 26,500. "Previous estimates have put the Jewish population of Maryland at 35,000. . . . The present estimate is lower than former ones by about 8500" (p.54). Other demographic information obtained from the death records included age at death, cause of death, and occupations of decedents.

Volume 5 (1903-1904): The 1903 United States Jewish population was estimated at 1,127,268, a decrease over the year before, "by reason of changes in the estimated populations of four States. . . The 'Jewish Encyclopedia' estimates the population of California at 28,000; of Colorado at 5800; of Connecticut at 5500; and of Delaware at 928" (p.162). This constituted a rise of 3,000 in California; a decrease of 2,200 in Colorado, 9,500 in Connecticut, and of almost 3,000 in Delaware. "The total Jewish immigration to the United States, through the ports of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, from 1881 to July 1, 1903, was 761,598" (p.163).

Volume 6 (1904-1905) estimated the total United States Jewish population at 1,253,213 (p. 307); Volume 7 (1905-1906), at 1,418,813 (p. 151); Volume 8 (1906-1907), at 1,418,013 (p. 128), all modified "by reason of changes in the estimated populations" of certain states, "adopted from the 'Jewish Encyclopedia.'"

Decennial Censuses

Volume 9 (1907–1908): The "Statistics" section gave two population estimates for 1907: 1,508,435 and 1,777,185, the first taken from "The Jewish Encyclopedia," the second, as each year, largely from AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK questionnaires sent to various states. The article explained:

The following table by States presents two sets of estimates. In the left-hand column is given the estimated Jewish population of each State for 1905 as it appears in the "Jewish Encyclopedia," Vol. XII, pp. 371-374, in the article "United States." In the right-hand column are the estimates made up from figures furnished by correspondents who interested themselves in the DIRECTORY OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES compiled for this issue of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK. One of the entries in the questionnaires sent to congregations and organizations of whatever sort inquired into the "Number of Jewish Residents (Souls) in the Town." By this means a series of estimates was gathered, among which choice had to be made of the one which might reasonably be supposed to be based upon a sufficient acquaintance with local conditions to make it acceptable.

In some cases there happily was complete agreement among correspondents whose positions in their communities presumably rendered them competent to judge. Thus the necessity for a further exercise of judgment seemed removed. In other cases the variations were wide, even extreme, ranging in one city from 75,000 down to 30,000. For such cases certain warranted instances suggested a gauge, not infallible, by any means, but also not without some claims to reliability, in so far as confidence can be placed in figures not the result of an actual count.

In a general way, this gauge consists in the number, the character, and the duplication of organizations,—the number of the congregations and the character and duplication of charitable societies and institutions, regardless, in a measure, of the size of the official membership of each or of all combined.

The figures provided by correspondents were for the most part, however, only from towns having organized communal life. Of the Jews scattered and isolated in country and village districts they take little account, though the few data that incidentally strayed in from small towns that had been addressed under the impression that they were Jewishly organized in one way or another, seemed to justify certain modifications, such as, for instance, the reduction of the Jewish population of Arizona to 500 from the 2000 hitherto quoted in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK.

At this point, in making up the State estimate from the aggregate of town estimates, the exercise of judgment was again necessitated, this time based upon a more or less intimate and accurate knowledge of conditions prevailing in the various States. Unfortunately, the hope of reaching a valid conclusion was removed still further, due to the fact that an appreciable number of organized towns had failed to make returns.

The above statement of the method pursued in compiling the right-hand column, headed "Est. Jew. Pop. 1907," will enable the investigator to use the figures there arrayed with the proverbial grain of salt. A limited means of testing, and either assenting to or deviating from, the results reached, is afforded in the Directory itself, in which he will find the number accepted for each town directly under the name of the town.

| | Est. Jew. Pop. 1905 | Est. Jew. Pop. 1907 |
|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | "The Jewish Encyclopedia" | Compiled from statements of |
| | Vol. XII, pp. 371–374 | Individual correspondents of the |
| STATES | Article, "United States" | American Jewish Year Book |
| Alabama | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Alaska | | • • • • • |
| Arizona | | 500 |
| Arkansas | 3,085 | 3,085 |
| California | 28,000 | 42,000 |
| Colorado | 5,800 | 6,500 |
| Connecticut | 8,500 | 22,000 |
| Delaware . | 1,500 | 1,600 |
| District of Columbia | 3,500 | 5,100 |
| Florida | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Georgia . | 7,000 | 9,300 |
| Hawaiian Islands | 100 | 100 |
| Idaho | 300 | 300 |
| Illinois | 100,000 | 110,000 |
| Indiana | 25,000 | 12,000 |
| Iowa | 5,000 | 6,000 |
| Kansas | 3,000 | 1,500 |
| Kentucky | 12,000 | 10,000 |
| Louisiana | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Maine . | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Maryland | 26,500 | 41,000 |
| Massachusetts | 60,000 | 90,000 |
| | 00,000 | 30,000 |

| Michigan | 16,000 | 16,000 |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Minnesota | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| Mississippi | 3,000 | 3,300 |
| Missouri | 50,000 | 52,000 |
| Montana | 2,500 | 1,500 |
| Nebraska | 3,800 | 6,500 |
| Nevada | 300 | 300 |
| New Hampshire | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| New Jersey | 40,000 | 70,000 |
| New Mexico | 800 | 800 |
| New York | 820,000 | 905,000 |
| North Carolina | 6,000 | 1,500 |
| North Dakota | • • • • • | 1,000 |
| Ohio | 50,000 | 85,000 |
| Oklahoma | • • • • • | 1,000 |
| Oregon . | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Pennsylvania | 115,000 | 150,000 |
| Philippine Islands | • • • • • | 100 |
| Porto Rico | • • • • • | 100 |
| Rhode Island | 1,500 | 12,000 |
| South Carolina | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| South Dakota | 250 | 300 |
| Tennessee | 7,000 | 10,000 |
| Texas | 17,500 | 16,000 |
| Utah | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Vermont | 700 | 1,000 |
| Virginia | 15,000 | 10,000 |
| Washington | 2,800 | 5,500 |
| West Virginia | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Wisconsin | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Wyoming | <u></u> | 300 |
| | 1,508,435 | 1,777,185 (pp. 431–33). |

Volumes 10-14, 1908-1913 repeated these totals, together with the table of Encyclopedia and AJYB survey estimates (pp. 67, 191, 278, 267, 265, respectively).

Volume 15 (1913-1914): Here a new estimate, 2,043,762, was added for the year 1910, with explanation:

The figure for 1910 is based on the increase in the population of fifty cities (see p. 427) shown by a comparison of their estimated population in 1907 and 1910. The data used are the figures reported in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK 5668, and estimates obtained by the Industrial Removal Office in 1910. For the fifty cities, the increase during the period was 37,220, or 15 per cent. Assuming a similar growth for the entire country, the population would have increased from 1,777,185, in 1907, to 2,043,762, in 1910 (p. 425).

The estimates for the 50 cities were listed, but no attempt was made to arrange them by size or state. The same volume carried 1911 figures for New York City:

The estimated population of New York City, January 1, 1912, was 900,000, according to a calculation by Dr. Joseph Jacobs in the Jewish Communal Directory, 1912, pp. 3-12. The estimated distribution is as follows:

| Manhattan and The Bronx | 720,000 |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Brooklyn | 175,500 |
| Staten Island | 4,500 |
| Greater New York, total | 900,000 (p. 427). |

The Jewish immigration total since 1881, brought up to date in each of the preceding volumes, was estimated at 1,850,000. "On the basis of the per cent leaving the United States since 1908, the total number departed during this period would be 150,000, leaving a net increase through immigration of 1,700,000" (p. 430).

Here, for the first time, the number of aliens leaving the United States was given:

for the six years [1908-1913] the total number of Jews returning is forty thousand. Approximately 8 per cent of the Jews admitted left the United States. This figure contrasts strikingly with the number of immigrants of other nationalities that leave the United States, over 30 per cent (pp. 429-30).

In Volume 16 (1914-1915) Dr. Joseph Jacobs summarized past problems of estimating the United States Jewish population in "Memoir of the Bureau of Jewish Statistics of the American Jewish Committee" (pp. 339-78):

However one may regret . . [the absence of an attempt to include religion in census investigations] as a statistician, one has to acquiesce as a good citizen. But, as a consequence, any attempts to ascertain the number of Jews, or of any other religious denomination, in the United States must take the form of estimates, which are notoriously untrustworthy, and as a rule overshoot the mark, because few persons are aware how large a few hundreds of human beings bulk in the real or imaginative eye. Yet, inadequate as such estimates usually prove to be, they are obviously better than nothing, or than the mere guesswork that often shoots wildly in such cases . (p. 339).

Referring to the method used in Volume 15 to arrive at the 1910 estimate, Dr. Jacobs stated:

For many reasons it is desirable to attempt a new estimate, based on a careful scrutiny of the various lines of investigation that bear upon the subject, some of which have been opened up only recently. For the number of a population is the fundamental figure on which all statistical inquiry and discussion must be based, and without some close approximation to it, it is impossible to decide such questions as the number of Jewish children of school age, the comparative rate at which Jews are becoming naturalized, their tendency to remain in this country, the number of defectives, dependents, and delinquents that may be found among them, how many of them are native-born, and what proportion have emigrated from the different European and Asiatic countries. As will be seen in the course of this memoir, close approximation to definite answers to some of these and other questions are by no means beyond the power of statistical inquiry, if once we have obtained the figure for the total population (p. 340).

Dr. Jacobs described the pertinent lines of inquiry for the best possible total United States Jewish population estimate, which indicated a total of 2,933,374 in July 1914:

In order to obtain this, it is desirable to conduct the inquiry on as many divergent lines as possible, so that the figure to which they all converge may be reasonably supposed to vary but little from the truth. These lines are, first, the number of Jewish immigrants, which have more or less been counted for the past thirty-five years. We know, besides, for the past fifteen years what proportion of those coming from the different European countries are of Jewish race and faith, and therefore the proportion of the "foreign white stock" resident in this country and recorded by the census of 1910 that is likely to be of Jewish origin. In addition to these lines of inquiry, the census of 1910 gave rather full details of the "mother tongues" of the "foreign white stock," including Yiddish, which is spoken by a large number of the Jews who have migrated to this country. Finally, the Industrial Removal Office, for its own purposes, attempts to estimate the number of Jews in the various cities to which it is thinking of forwarding immigrants, and this estimate can be made the basis of a fourth attempt to ascertain our basic figure. It will be found that the four different lines of inquiry converge about the figure two and a third millions for the census year 1910, and with that as a starting point it is fairly easy to calculate the Jewish population of the United States on July 1, 1914, as 2,933,374 (pp. 340-41).

With regard to the use of immigration statistics, he said:

We are now in a position to give our first estimate of the Jewish population in the United States in 1910, as deduced from the immigration returns, as follows:

| Original population, 1881 | 251,000 |
|--|----------------------|
| Net immigration, 1881–1910 | 1,572,936 |
| Natural increase, original and immigration | 525,818 ² |
| Total Jewish population, July 1, 1910 | 2,349,754 (p. 342). |

The second line of inquiry, according to Dr. Jacobs, was as follows:

Now we have information as to the number of Jews coming from each country, as compared with the total immigration from that country, for each year during the last fifteen years. (Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, 1899-1913.) We can thus obtain the proportion of the immigrants from any country that are Jewish, and if we apply this percentage to the number of the resident population of the United States derived from that country, as given in the census returns for 1910, we should obtain, though of course rather roughly, another independent estimate of the Jewish population of the United States in 1910. The roughness of the estimate is caused by the uncertainty as to how many from each country come to stay, and how far Jewish fecundity is superior or inferior to the fecundity of the Gentiles from the same country. There is still another difficulty; the percentage of Jews from a country like Russia during the past fifteen years, for which alone we have definite figures, may vary from what it was in the earlier years, when no returns of this kind are available. happens we have two independent checks upon this check, it is rendered somewhat more trustworthy (p. 343).

A table (p. 345) listing by countries of origin the total number of white immigrants, how many and what proportion of these were Jews, indicated a total of 2,196,023 foreign-born Jews in the United States in 1910. Said Jacobs:

²This precise figure was obtained by the use of statistical data rather than empirical projection (pp. 341-42).

To these we have to add 150,000 who might be called "native-native" Jews, or, in other words, Jews whose origin can be traced in America for the last two generations, *i. e.* themselves and their parents. This makes up a total of 2,346,023, which is close to the result reached in the previous section, though an inquirer should be warned that this result is of a much more hypothetical nature than that reached there. Its chief value is as a check upon the preceding result (pp. 345-46).

Another source for this information was the United Hebrew Charities of New York City.

Jacobs was able to make the third converging estimate because the 1910 census for the first time included a question on the mother tongue of the "foreign white stock":

The following table shows those born abroad who speak Yiddish, with the countries they come from, as well as the total number of those whose mother tongue is Yiddish, whether born abroad or native-born of foreign parentage.

YIDDISH AND HEBREW

| Foreign-born, 1910 | | Total Foreign Stock |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------|
| Country | Number | Number |
| Russia | 838,193 | 1,317,157 |
| Austria | 124,588 | 197,153 |
| Roumania | 41,342 | 56,524 |
| Hungary | 19,896 | 32,539 |
| England | 13,699 | 15,100 |
| Germany | 7,910 | 15,510 |
| Canada | 1,434 | 1,541 |
| Turkey in Asia | 834 | 1,044 |
| Turkey in Europe | 782 | 995 |
| France | 619 | 693 |
| Other countries | 2,470 | 3,138 |
| Mixed foreign | | 35,368 |
| Total | | 1,676,762 |

This table is somewhat misleading, if it really meant to imply that 619 Yiddish-speaking Jews were born in France, or that 1,434 were born in Canada. In all probability these were born in either Russia, Austria-Hungary, or Roumania, settled for some time in France or Canada, and then came to the United States, with these countries ticketed on them as those of "last residence," not necessarily of birth.

Reverting to the light thrown by these figures upon our main problem, that of determining the number of Jews existing in the United States in the year 1910, it would seem at first sight that the results reached by the Census Bureau with regard to Yiddish-speaking Jews and their children is a long way below that reached by our two previous estimates, and therefore fails to confirm them. But it must be remembered that these figures cannot include the descendants of those Jews who were here in 1877, amounting to 230,257, few, if any, of whom had Yiddish for their mother tongue. Applying the same method as before to ascertain the increase of this population in the thirty-three years between 1877 and 1910, it would, at the latter date, reach 442,554, which, added to the number of Yiddish-speaking Jews, would amount to 2,119,416. But besides these, there are a large

number of immigrant Jews for the thirty years between 1881-1910 who did not speak Yiddish, but German, English, French, and even Ladino, or Judeo-Spanish. These would probably amount with their progeny to 250,000, making a total Jewish population in 1910 of 2,369,416, again a fairly close approximation to the results reached by the two previous methods (pp. 348-49).

Dr. Jacobs further explained:

It would be also misleading to suppose that the 1,676,762 persons that are enumerated by the census as having Yiddish for their "mother tongue" all speak or even know Yiddish. . The remaining 624,995 born in this country have naturally English for their mother tongue, but the mother tongue of their parents was Yiddish, and they are, accordingly, included in the census table as of foreign parentage, with Yiddish as the mother tongue of the parents. We have here evidence of 624,995 Jews born in this country, and we can add to these the 400,000 descendants of the original quarter of a million, and at least 30,000 children of the Jewish immigrants of the last thirty years who did not speak Yiddish. We have thus close on 1,050,000 native-born American Jews in 1910, which by July 1, 1914, would have been augmented by at least 250,000 viable children, making the total number of native-born American Jews at the present time about 1,300,000, or very nearly one-half of the whole Jewish population (pp. 349-50).

Of these three estimates, and that of the Industrial Removal Office, Dr. Jacobs felt, "the one from the immigration returns (added to the original quarter of a million) is so closely confirmed by the other estimates that it may be accepted as very near the reality" (p. 357). He therefore based the estimate of the 1914 total Jewish population on that figure, i.e., 2,349,754, as indicated in the table below (p. 358):

| Population July 1, 1910 | 2,349,754 |
|---|-----------|
| Increase of same to 1914 | |
| Net Immigration July 1, 1910, to July 1, 1914 | 382,927 |
| Increase of same | |
| Total | 2.933.374 |

Jacobs' concluding remarks pointed to the large natural increase of American Jews:

If previous estimates have reached results much lower than the above, it has been because they have not sufficiently taken into consideration the natural increase, which is especially noteworthy with a population like that of the Jewish immigrants, most of them being between the ages of 15 and 45, when taking and giving in marriage is most popular. One of the most interesting results of this is the very large proportion of Jews in America who are already American Jews in every sense of the word, or in the expression of the census officials are native-born, or native-born of foreign parentage.

A very rough estimate of the items comprising the present Jewish population would bring out this condition in a very easily comprehensible form, as follows:

MOVEMENT OF JEWISH POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES 1877-1914

| | | Immigration | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| | Native 1877 | 1881–1914 | Total |
| Numbers | 250,000 | 1,900,000 | 2,150,000 |
| Births | | 1,220,000 | 1,620,000 |
| Deaths | 200,000 | 620,000 | 820,000 |
| Increase | 200,000 | 600,000 | 800,000 |
| Total | 450,000 | 2,500,000 | 2,950,000 |
| Native-born | 400,000 | 900,000 | 1,300,000 |

... By January 1, 1915, the Jews of the United States will reach the three million mark, or, in other words, at that date one out of every thirty Americans, or in the urban districts one out of every sixteen, will be a Jew (p. 358).

Volume 17 (1915–1916) and Volume 18 (1916–1917): These again cited the estimate (pp. 344 and 276, respectively) of 2,349,754 rather than Dr. Jacobs's figure of 2,933,374, with no explanation. No breakdown of Jewish population by states was given, only a listing of cities with more than 1,000 Jewish inhabitants. Both volumes brought the detailed Jewish immigration figures up to date.

Volume 19 (1917–1918): The Jewish population was estimated at 3,012,141 (p. 410), but again there was no breakdown by states. This figure evidently reflected the findings of the 1917 Census of Jewish Religious Bodies in the United States. While the analysis of data was not completed in time for publication in this volume, it discussed the background and methodology of this decennial census in "Jewish Population in the United States—Census 1917":

In March of the present year, the Bureau of Jewish Statistics and Research of the American Jewish Committee was asked by the United States Census Bureau to assist it in making a Census of Religious Bodies of the country. Such a census has, of course, nothing to do with the regular national census made every ten years, being entirely separate and distinct therefrom, and concerning itself only with certain matters connected with churches, congregations, ministers, etc. The previous Religious Census was made in 1907. What the Government wants to know for the purposes of its religious census may be seen from a perusal of the two schedules which it asks to have filled out, one schedule for the church association, whatever it is, and the other for the minister, which are here given (p. 421).

These two official schedules of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (pp. 422-25), were, however, not used for the Census of Jewish Religious Bodies. The YEAR BOOK explained:

As will readily be understood, certain questions in these schedules are not precisely suitable for a Jewish congregation or minister, some inquiries having no application to the one or the other. Accordingly it was decided that the Bureau of Jewish Statistics and Research should make for the Department of Commerce a Census of Jewish Religious Bodies, and that for the purpose of doing this, it should formulate a questionnaire of its own, which should be more appropriate for the work involved, and at the same time obtain for the Bureau of Statistics

^{&#}x27;While the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK made no mention of it, this census was evidently conducted by Henrietta Szold.

itself certain information which the Government did not care about, but which for statistical purposes, the Bureau was anxious to possess. As the Bureau had among its records the names and addresses of thousands of rabbis and congregations, it was arranged that the Director of the Bureau should be made a Special Census Agent, and that, under his supervision, copies of the questionnaire referred to should be sent to all persons from whom it seemed likely that the information desired would be obtained. Such a questionnaire was duly initiated and distributed, the Government providing the thousands of franks required (p. 426).

The first question elicited population data:

A: Information Concerning Congregation.

- The other questions paraphrased those asked by the Bureau of the Census, but were adapted to Jewish congregations. The same was true of Part B of the form which sought "Information Concerning the Rabbi." A letter sent with the questionnaire read in part:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
WASHINGTON
Office of Special Agent,
356 Second Avenue
New York

DEAR SIR:

The Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce, under authority conferred by Congress, is preparing to take a census of all Religious Bodies in the United States. The Director of the Bureau of Jewish Statistics and Research of the American Jewish Committee has been designated by the Hon. Sam. L. Rogers, Director of the Census, as the agent of the Government, to take the census of the Jewish Religious Bodies of the country. We accordingly address you, requesting that you give us your assistance in this important work by answering to the best of your ability and knowledge the questions contained in the accompanying sheet, regarding your community, congregation, etc.

Where you may be unable to give an accurate answer, possibly you can furnish an approximate estimate, in which case it might be well to indicate that the figures given are not to be regarded as exact, by placing after them the word "esti-

mated". .

We feel sure you will appreciate this opportunity afforded the Jews of America, to furnish in detail, and to secure in bulk, a volume of reliable information with regard to their religious forces; and we hope you will do everything in your power to aid us, by contributing your share of the information desired, to make a success of this investigation.

Very truly yours,

SAMSON D. OPPENHEIM,

Special Census Agent and Director of the Bureau of Jewish Statistics and Research (p. 431).

Volume 19 also contained details regarding the sample and some preliminary figures:

Altogether about 10,000 inquiries were sent out, the responses on the whole being fairly satisfactory. It is true that in many cases the questions were misunderstood, and in others the persons addressed refused to respond. But enough returns were received to enable the Bureau of Statistics to make a fairly accurate estimate of the number of Jews in every state in the Union, and of the total number in the United States, as well as to furnish to the Government a large mass of new and important information of the kind it had long been seeking.

At the present time, August 1, returns are still coming in, and it is therefore impossible to give a complete history or an adequate exhibit of the results. But the following facts and figures may prove of interest. There are to-day in the United States, at least 3,000,000 Jews, of whom nearly one half reside in the state of New York, New York City alone containing at least 1,300,000. Contrary to the general belief, the Jews of the United States are not all concentrated in the large cities. There is a sprinkling of Jews in almost every town or village in the Union, the percentage of Jews in the smaller places (those ranging from 3000 to 10,000 inhabitants) generally averaging about one per cent of the entire population. The ten largest "Jewish" cities are as follows: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Cleveland, St. Louis, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Newark. The city containing the greatest percentage of Jews is Chelsea, Mass., where between twenty-five and thirty per cent of the inhabitants are Jews. There are said to be no Jews in Guam. Porto Rico has about twenty-five, Hawaii, eighty, Alaska, sixty, Virgin Islands, seventy, the Philippines, five hundred, and the Panama Zone about two hundred.

There are in the United States about fifty cities each containing more than 100,000 inhabitants, and in most of these there is a comparatively large Jewish community, averaging (if we exclude New York City) about twenty per cent of their total population. There are in the country about sixty-five cities containing from 50,000 to 100,000 people, and, of course, there are many Jews in all of these cities. There are over 1200 cities and towns with between 5000 and 50,000 inhabitants, in nearly every one of which, if not actually in each, there is a considerable Jewish community. There are, in addition, over 700 towns, each with from 3000 to 5000 inhabitants, as well as many villages with less than 3000, and there is a little Jewish focus in nearly every one of those places likewise (pp. 432-33).

Yom Kippur Count in Urban Centers

Volume 20 (1918-1919): Samson Oppenheim reported:

The 1917 inquiry into the number of Jews in this country naturally divided itself into two parts: the one covering New York City, and the other concerning the cities and towns outside of the metropolis.

The following are the principal important estimates that were made of the Jews of New York City, prior to 1917:

| | | New York City | |
|------|---|------------------|---|
| Year | | Population | Authority |
| 1790 | | 385 | U. S. Census Bureau (for New York State) |
| 1812 | | 400 | Gershom Mendes Seixas |
| 1826 | | 950 | S. Gilman (for New York State) |
| 1846 | | 10,000 | Isaac Leeser |
| 1848 | | 12,000 to 13,000 | M. A. Berk |
| 1880 | | 60,000 | William B. Hackenburg |
| 1888 | | 125,000 | Isaac Markens |
| 1891 | | 225,250 | Charles Frank |
| 1892 | | 250,000 | Richard Wheatley |
| 1897 | | 350,000 | Jacob H. Schiff |
| 1905 | | 672,000 | Joseph Jacobs |
| 1907 | | 850,000 | Henrietta Szold |
| 1910 | • | 861,980 | U. S. Census Bureau (for Yiddish- speaking only) |
| 1911 | | 900,000 | Joseph Jacobs |
| 1912 | | 975,000 | Joseph Jacobs |
| 1912 | • | 1,250,000 | Bureau of Education (New York Kehillah) |
| 1913 | •••• | 1,330,000 | Professor Chalmers of Cornell University (pp. 31-32). |

A detailed account of the methodology of estimating the New York City Jewish population in January 1918 followed:

On account of the enormous size of the New York community, individual estimates, no matter how expert, could not be safely relied upon. Accordingly, arrangements were made, by which the co-operation of the New York Kehillah, and especially that of Dr. Alexander Dushkin, of the Bureau of Education, were secured in approaching the problem from a different angle, a new method of approximation being invented and tried. It is a well-known fact that, whatever differences of belief or of religious attitude may exist among Jews, they are almost unanimous in observing the High Holidays (New Year, the Day of Atonement, and the Passover), practically all Jewish children refraining from attending school on these days. So, if the attendance in the public schools on these holidays were ascertained and were then compared with the attendance on normal days, we should get a fairly accurate estimate of the number of Jewish children in the public schools of New York. If we could then find the proportion of Jewish children to the total Jewish population, we should be furnished with an excellent means of determining the Jewish population of the entire city (pp. 32-33).

By the Yom Kippur method, and the use of counterchecks, Dr. Oppenheim stated, "the number of Jewish children of elementary school age , in 1917, was found to be 300,000, or very close to that number, if anything a little greater" (p. 37). The proportion of elementary-school children in the total white population, which was established by the 1910 census, was then adjusted for the Jewish population on the basis of known characteristics of Jews. Said Dr. Oppenheim:

One would therefore not be far wrong in assuming that the proportion of school children among Jews is little, if anything, above eighteen per cent. It is certainly not greater than twenty per cent. then, upon the basis of its 300,000 Jewish children of elementary school age, we should have in New York City a Jewish population of 1,500,000, or over 45 per cent of the total Jewish population of the country, and in New York State approximately a half of the Jewish population of America.

As to the boroughs of New York, their Jewish quotas would seem to be as follows:

| Manhattan | 695,000 |
|-----------|--------------------|
| The Bronx | 210,000 |
| Brooklyn | 567,000 |
| Queens | 23,000 |
| Richmond | 5,000 (pp. 38-39). |

On the basis of the questionnaire returns and some counterchecks the Jewish population of the rest of the United States was estimated and enumerated by towns, cities, and states, giving a grand total of over 3,300,000 in 1917 (p. 73). Ninety per cent of the Jews were concentrated in 12 states:

| | Jewish | | Jewish |
|---------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| State | Population | | Population |
| California | 63,652 | Missouri | . 80,807 |
| Connecticut | 66,862 | New Jersey | . 149,476 |
| Illinois | 246,637 | New York | . 1,603,923 |
| Indiana | 25,833 | Ohio | . 166,361 |
| Maryland | 63,642 | Pennsylvania | . 322,406 |
| Massachusetts | 189,671 | - | |
| Michigan | 63,254 | Total | . 3,041,524 |

Volume 21 (1919–1920): "Jewish Population of the United States" recapitulated past methods of arriving at estimates, including Dr. Oppenheim's. The 1918 figure, which appeared as the total of state estimates, was 3,388,951. Estimates for cities which had not been given in the previous volume were included:

Another point of interest developed by the inquiry of the Bureau of Jewish Statistics and Research is that approximately three-quarters of the Jewish population of the United States are concentrated in only ten cities which hold only about 14 per cent of the total general population of the United States. This brings out graphically the industrial and commercial tendencies of the Jewish population of the United States.

| City | Jewish population estimated 1918 | General population estimated as of Jan. 1, 1917 | Per cent Jews to total | Per cent of total Jewish population |
|--------------|---|---|------------------------------|--|
| New York | 1,500,000 | 5,670,167 | 26.45 | 45.45 |
| Chicago | 225,000 | 2,521,822 | 8.92 | 6.81 |
| Philadelphia | 200,000 | 1,750,000 | 11.43 | 6.06 |
| Cleveland | 100,000 | 750,000 | 13.33 | 3.03 |
| Boston | 77,500 | 767,589 | 10.09 | 2.34 |
| Baltimore | 60,000 | 595,000 | 10.08 | 1.81 |
| St. Louis | 60,000 | 850,000 | 7.05 | 1.81 |
| Pittssburgh | 60,000 | 590,000 | 10.16 | 1.81 |
| Newark | 55,000 | 401,000 | 13.71 | 1.66 |
| Detroit . | 50,000 | 825,000 | 6.06 | 1.51 |
| Total . | 2,387,500 | 14,720,578 | 16.21 | 72.34 |
| | | | | (p. 607) |

A section on Jewish immigration, which indicated a total of 1,551,315 from 1899 through 1919, for the first time also indicated how many of all immigrants deported and of all persons refused admission to the United States in that period were Jews. Of a total of 282,569 "debarred," 20,000 were Jews; of a total of 36,411 deported, 2.510 were Jews.

Volumes 22 through 23 (1920-1922) reprinted the previous statistical material without change.

Volume 24 (1922–1923): Harry S. Linfield, then director of the Department of Information and Statistics of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research, stated in an "Introductory Note" to "Statistics of Jews":

The population tables for the United States have been copied, without change, from the preceding volume. It should, however, be stated that criticisms of some of the figures given have been received, and that the Bureau of Jewish Research has on its files corrected statistics for a number of cities, and is engaged in making studies for the purpose of a complete revision of the statistics for publication in a future volume of the Year Book (p. 299).

Volume 25 (1923–1924): Linfield arrived at new estimates for the United States Jewish population as a whole, and for the separate states. His total of 3,600,350 (3,602,150 including Alaska, Hawaii, the Phillipines, and Puerto Rico) was computed

... by taking the number of 1917-1918, and adding to it the natural increase of the Jewish population during January 1918-December 1919, plus the net increase of the Jewish immigration during July 1918-June 30, 1920. The natural increase was computed on the basis of the table of the natural increase of the total population of the United States as given in William S. Rossiter's *Increase of Population in the United States 1910-1920*, Census Monograph I, 1922 (p. 337).

The 1920 New York City figure, 1,643,012, was taken from Walter Laidlaw, The Religious Composition of Greater New York (1922); Linfield cautioned that it was

"probably too low" in view of the fact that "political units thickly inhabited by Jews were not canvassed" (p. 341).

New, detailed tables on Jewish immigration showed a total of 2,219,979 between 1881 and 1922, including an increase of 857,257 (admissions over departures) for 1908–1922 (pp. 343–48). There also was a breakdown of Jewish immigrants by age and sex for 1921–1922.

Volumes 26 through 29 (1924-1928) carried the previous volumes' estimates.

Volume 30 (1928–1929): Revisions of estimates based on the study conducted by Dr. Linfield appeared in a feature article (pp. 101–98). The Preface to the book pointed particularly to the wide distribution of Jews throughout the country in both urban and rural areas:

There are Jews in all cities of the country having a population of 25,000 or over. But it is interesting to note, that Jews do not live only in the large cities, for they are also to be found in over 80% of the cities of 2,500 to 25,000 population, in over 30% of incorporated villages of less than 2,500 population and in 7% of rural unincorporated areas. In all, there are over 6,000 places throughout the country which have Jewish inhabitants.

DR. LINFIELD also made a study of the Jewish congregations in the United States, as Special Agent of the United States Bureau of the Census, in connection with the Census of Religious Bodies undertaken by that Bureau (p. III).

The particulars, reported by Dr. Linfield in his article, were:

Late in 1927 material was collected with a view to determining the number of Jews of the United States and their distribution at that time. A wide canvas brought returns from 2,970 cities, towns, and villages, and 170 rural districts; and for places and districts which were not canvassed or which did not reply to inquiries, estimates were made. The canvas and the estimates showed that at the end of 1927 a total of 4,228,029 Jews lived in the country, comprising 3.58% of the entire population (p. 101).

As expected, Linfield stated, Jews were not evenly distributed over the country:

... the density of the Jewish population was found to be greatest in the northern states and in Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, the northern-most states of the South Atlantic Division. In this large region Jews comprise 5.25% of the total population. The density of the Jews is only .65% in the southern states (exclusive of Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia) and 1.66% in the western states (p. 101).

Not only do the Jews live in every state of the Union but the canvas showed that the Jews are widely distributed within the states.

The present writer found that in 1927, the Jewish dispersion in the country reached the figure of 6,420 cities, towns, and villages and of 3,292 rural unincorporated districts in Continental United States. . . every city of 25,000 or over was found to have Jewish inhabitants. Of the smaller cities it was found that there were Jews in 93.9% of cities of 25,000-10,000; in 88.2% of the places of 10,000-5,000; and in 84.86% of the places of 5,000-2,500. Even of the small

villages, those belonging to the class of rural incorporated places of 2,500 or less, 30.55% have Jewish inhabitants. In other words, ... out of every one hundred urban places nearly ninety have Jewish residents; of every one hundred rural villages only thirty have Jews; while in the country districts, only seven in every one hundred have permanent Jewish residents (p. 104).

In a footnote Dr. Linfield warns that:

No conclusion as to the actual number of places having Jews in the previous years should be drawn from the above statement, nor should comparisons be attempted, because the methods of investigation differed from one another. In 1927, in addition to the territory canvassed, estimates were made by the use of statistical methods for all such places as the canvas did not include; hence the figures for 1927, probably represent the sum total of places having Jews in that year. This procedure does not seem to have been followed in 1877, 1907, and 1917. The figures for these years represent only those places from which reports were received without making allowances for those places which failed to reply or were not canvassed (p. 104).

Dr. Linfield described the methods he used to make estimates for nonresponding localities, and to cross-check figures received. Generally, he said, "the estimates finally accepted were in every case conservative" (p. 115).

At the end of 1927, Linfield calculated, 109,000 Jews lived in rural areas. There were, he said, 2,190 small towns in the United States (with general populations between 2,500 and 25,000) which had a total Jewish population of 185,967. "Sampling" was used to determine the number of Jews in 888 of those towns which either were not canvassed or refused to report.

Of the remaining 287 cities, those having a population in excess of 25,000 (census of 1920), reports were received from every one and were furnished by the rabbis, the heads of the chief Jewish organizations and other communal workers (p. 117).

The method of estimating the Jewish populations in the cities with the largest Jewish populations was different. Linfield explained:

The class of cities of 100,000 or over comprised 68. These had in 1920 a total population of 27,429,326, which was estimated by the United States Bureau of the Census to have grown to 31,988,375 in 1927. Of these 68 cities Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Newark, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis were reported to have about 50,000 Jews or more. The number of Jews in the remaining 57 large cities and in the 219 cities of 25,000–100,000 was determined chiefly on the basis of the local estimates, examined in the light of the number of Jews that reported Yiddish and Hebrew as their mother-tongue in the census of 1920, and in the light of the number of Jewish children enrolled in the religious schools of the respective cities. The 219 cities reported a total of 378,862 Jews and the 57 larger cities, 642,600 Jews (p. 118).

The number of Jews in the eleven cities enumerated above could not be estimated in the same manner as were the numbers of the Jews in the other cities. Estimating the number of Jews on the basis of the number of Jewish children who abstained from attending school on the Day of Atonement and on the basis of

the number enumerated in the census [of 1920] as persons of foreign birth with Yiddish as their mother-tongue and their children, we found that the number of Jews of the eleven cities was approximately as follows:

| City of New York | 1,765,000 |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Baltimore | |
| Boston | 90,000 |
| Chicago | |
| Cleveland | |
| Detroit | 75,000 |
| Los Angeles | 65,000 |
| Newark | 65,000 |
| Philadelphia | |
| Pittsburgh | |
| St. Louis | |
| Total | 2,911,000 (pp. 118–19). |

Thus Linfield's estimate of the total number of Jews living in the 68 cities of 100,000 and over was 3,553,600. The distribution of the Jews throughout the United States was summed up as follows:

| 68 cities of 100,000 or over have | 3,553,600 Jews |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 219 cities of 100,000-25,000 have | 378,862 Jews |
| 461 cities of 25,000–10,000 have | 111,742 Jews |
| 721 cities of 10,000-5,000 have | 41,855 Jews |
| 1,321 cities of 5,000–2,500 have | |
| 12,908 villages of 2,500 or less have | 43,513 Jews |
| Rural unincorporated territory has | |
| Total | 4,228,029 Jews (p. 119). |

Linfield outlined his method of verifying the 4,228,029 total, and why he preferred it to earlier ones:

In 1914, the late Dr. Joseph Jacobs undertook to estimate the number of Jews on the basis of foreign stock, mother-tongue, and immigration. The former two methods offer exceptional difficulties and can, besides, be relied upon only in a census year like 1910 or 1920. The method based on immigration, however, may profitably be examined (p. 119).

He established the 1927 estimate by adding to the total number of Jews in 1917 their natural increase (births less deaths) at an annual rate of 1.5 per cent, the net immigration of Jews, and the natural increase from this immigration:

| Total number of Jews in United States, end of | |
|--|-----------|
| 1917 | 3,388,000 |
| Natural increase, 1918 to 1927 | 544,058 |
| Net immigration of Jews, 1918 to 1927 | |
| Natural increase of same | 32,746 |
| Total number of Jews in United States based on | |
| this method of computation | 4,288,788 |

The number thus arrived at is somewhat higher than the total obtained on the basis of the canvas made in 1927. The difference is comparatively small, and is probably owing to the estimate accepted in 1917, being too high. As a matter of fact, Dr. Oppenheim tacitly admitted this when he finally settled upon 3,300,000, instead of the total of his state estimates 3,388,000. (SEE AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 5679, p. 73.) (p. 121).

Volumes 31 through 40 (1929-1939) repeated Dr. Linfield's 1927 estimate of 4,228,029 Jews in the United States.

Volume 39 (1937–1938): The 1937 "Annual Report of the Executive Committee to the Members of the American Jewish Committee" announced:

In cooperation with the United States Bureau of Census, your Committee is again directing the special census of Jewish congregations . . . in conjunction with the current decennial census of religious bodies. . . Dr. Harry S. Linfield has been appointed United States Special Agent for this purpose, and Professor Morris R. Cohen of the College of the City of New York; Dr. Louis I. Dublin, . . . the chief statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company; Dr. Harry G. Friedman, statistician; and Dr. Alvin Johnson, director of the New School for Social Research, have been good enough to agree to serve as a committee of experts to assure accurate and authoritative results (p. 825).

Volume 40 (1938–1939): At the time of publication, the census conducted by Dr. Linfield had been under way for about two years. While the detailed data were not yet ready for publication, Dr. Linfield could discuss broader trends emerging from the survey in "Statistics of Jews and Jewish Organizations in the United States: An Historical Review of Ten Censuses, 1850–1937":

In this study, which is in the nature of a general introduction to the publication of the results of the census of 1936, two matters must be treated, namely, the scope of the census of 1936–1937, as an outgrowth of preceding censuses and comparable with these, and the findings of the censuses of the second half of the nineteenth century. The censuses of Jews prior to that of 1906 were never summed up adequately, and the earlier source-books are becoming rare and in many cases unavailable. If these are to be used for comparison, as they should, adequate summaries must first be prepared (p. 65).

He did so, in very brief form, for nine of the ten censuses that elicited information on religious organizations, enumerated below:

- 1850 Government census of Jewish congregations, by states and counties, supplemented by the Lyons-de Sola directory of Jewish congregations and other organizations
- 1860 Government census of Jewish congregations, by states and counties
- 1870 Government census of Jewish congregations, by states and selected counties
- 1877 Census of Jewish congregations, a directory, and a census of Jews, by states and cities
- 1890 Government census of Jewish congregations, by states, counties and cities
- 1900 Census of Jewish organizations, by states, and a directory
- 1906 Government census of Jewish congregations, supplemented by a directory of Jewish organizations, and census of Jews, by states and cities

- 1916 Same
- 1926 Government census of Jewish congregations, supplemented by a census of Jewish organizations, and a census of Jews, by states and cities and urban and rural distribution (but no directory)

1936 (in progress) (pp. 64-65).

Wrote Dr. Linfield:

Like other statistical inquiries, those on religious bodies show continuous development in their scope, the methods utilized, and the manner of publication of results of the inquiry. In the case of the periodic statistics of Jews, beginning with 1850, we find that the subject is treated under three headings: the numerical presentation of the status and of the work of the congregations and other organizations; directories of these; and finally, the number of Jews and their distribution. The 1850 census, together with the supplementary work of 1854 statistics of Jewish congregations and a directory of Jewish organizations. The Government census of 1860 was not followed by any supplementary private investigation, but five years following the census of 1870, the Board of Delegates of American Israelites and the then newly-organized Union of American Hebrew appointed a joint committee to conduct the first complete Congregations, census of Jews of our country, a remarkable piece of work. The Government census of Jewish religious bodies of 1890, conducted by a Jewish agent, no doubt represents a more complete census than those conducted previously, as far as congregations were concerned, but no supplementary publications appeared. Nine years later, the Jewish Publication Society began the publication of the American Jewish Year Book, and Dr. Cyrus Adler, editor, published in the first three volumes a directory of Jewish organizations and a statistical summary by states. This work represents a census of Jewish organizations and a directory of these, as of the close of the nineteenth century. . . . Beginning with 1906–1907, these censuses are decennial, and each of the first three covered the same scope, namely, statistics of organizations, directory of organizations (except the 1926-1927 census), and the number of Jews and their distribution (pp. 78-79).

It was in the census of 1926-1927 that an attempt was made for the first time to prepare a complete count of all the places in the United States having Jewish residents in that year; and the task of the enumeration of the Jewish population in that census was conceived as threefold: first, which cities and villages had Jewish populations and how large are these groups; second, which of the latter had congregations, how many, and what was the status of their work, and which localities have no congregations; third, what was the relation of the latter to the former, in particular the degree of the shifting of Jews from the large to the small communities. When the plans for the 1937 census were drawn, the scope was enlarged to include a sample study of the family composition of the Jews of America, by sex and age (p. 79).

... In 1926–1927, this writer used statistical formulas to estimate the Jewish population of New York City, seven other large cities, the small incorporated places, and unincorporated rural territory; and, for the first time, the totals for the states and for the United States, were made up solely on the basis of the sum totals of the figures for the localities. This procedure was adopted in the census of 1936–1937, except for the following: the small places located in the metropolitan areas of our country were singled out for a special canvass of Jews, and of the 3,000 counties of the country, over 1,000 were similarly canvassed. This

procedure, followed for the first time, resulted in an increase of the number of small places reporting Jews, nearly twice as many as in the 1926-1927 census, leaving fewer small places to be determined by estimates (p. 80).

Volume 41 (1939-1940): In "The Jews of the United States, Number and Distribution: Preliminary Figures for 1937" (pp. 181-86), Dr. Linfield cited a total Jewish population of "4,831,180, representing an increase of 603,151 over the number of Jews enumerated ten years earlier, in 1927 ... the smallest ten-year increase since 1877" (p. 181). He explained:

Already ten years ago it became evident that the growth of the American Jewish community was slowing down. This trend continued during the past ten years. The decade ending 1927 started with a Jewish population of 3,389,000 and ended with an increase of 839,100. The decade ending 1937 began with a population of 4,228,000 and closed with an increse of 603,151. The drop in the growth of the Jewish population during the past ten years was due only in part to the fact that between 1918-1927 the total Jewish immigration amounted to 321,000, whereas, during the decade of 1928–1937 it was 70,000 (p. 183).

Volume 42 (1940-1941): A revised report by Linfield, "Jewish Communities of the United States, Number and Distribution of Jews of the United States in Urban Places and in Rural Territory" (pp. 215-66) stated that data "received from 4.694 cities, villages and rural areas of Jews in these places and of their 3,728 congregations and over 25,000 other Jewish communal agencies" showed the following:

There are nearly 1,000 Jewish communities in the country, each of which has one or more permanent congregations, according to the nation-wide survey of 1937, and a total of 4.641,000 Jews reside in these communities. In addition to these independent or principal communities, a total of 130,000 Jews reside in cities, villages, or rural areas without permanent congregations (pp. 216–17).

The census indicated further changes in the distribution and density of the Jews:

^{&#}x27;In a strong critique of this report (Jewish Social Studies, Vol. 3, 1941, pp. 231-32), Professor Morris Raphael Cohen, chairman of the American Jewish Committee's advisory committee on the 1937 census, took issue particularly with estimates for metropolitan cities, where the larger part of the Jewish population of the United States are concentrated, as "only guesses with an unknown margin of error." Therefore, he said, the statement that the United States has 4,770,647 Jews "is not justified by adequate evidence and is indeed offensive to anyone with a logical or statistical sense." He explained that without sample censuses in different parts of the country to serve as checks or controls on the various estimates and indirect methods used by those reporting to Dr. Linfield—which the advisory committee had strongly recommended but which could not be funded—"the result cannot be seriously accepted as a census of the Jews in the United States." Indeed, Professor Cohen said, one such study, a house-to-house canvas, conducted in Minneapolis in 1936, showed a population of a little over 17,000 in 1936, while the estimate of 1927 was 22,000; "and there was no indication of any heavy mortality or emigration of Jews from Minneapolis between 1927 and 1936." According to Professor Cohen, studies in other American cities actually showed that in all cases, except San Francisco, Linfield's 1927 figures "were uniformly too high."

... The past ten years continued to witness the movement of Jews from the large cities to the small places and rural areas. But the increase in the Jewish population compared with the total, was greater in the large cities than in the small cities and rural areas, with the result that although the Jews are now more widely distributed in the small cities and rural areas, they are less densely populated in those regions than ten years ago (p. 221).

| | 1927 | | | 1937 | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|-------|------------|-----------|-------|
| | Population | Jews | P.C. | Population | Jew | P.C. |
| Urban Places: | - | | | _ | | |
| 100,000 or over | 31,988,375 | 3,553,600 | 11.11 | 36,325,736 | 4,096,220 | 11.27 |
| 25,000 to 100,000 | 12,191,173 | 378,862 | 3.11 | 12,917,141 | 393,129 | 3.04 |
| Incorporated | 12,191,173 | 378,862 | 3.11 | 12,710,538 | 385,524 | 3.03 |
| Unincorporated | _ | | _ | 206,603 | 7,605 | 3.68 |
| 10,000 to 25,000 | 6,942,742 | 111,742 | 1.61 | 9,097,200 | 118,555 | 1.30 |
| Incorporated | 6,942,742 | 111,742 | 1.61 | 8,730,474 | 113,299 | 1.29 |
| Unincorporated | · · · · — | _ | _ | 366,726 | 5,256 | 1.43 |
| 5,000 to 10,000 | 4,997,794 | 41,855 | 0.84 | 5,897,156 | 48,329 | 0.82 |
| 2,500 to 5,000 | 4,593,953 | 32,370 | 0.71 | 4,717,590 | 30,964 | 0.65 |
| Rural Incorporated Places | 8,969,241 | 43,513 | 0.48 | 9,183,453 | 34,896 | 0.38 |
| Rural Unincorporated | | | | \$ | | |
| Places | 42,436,776 | 66,087 | 0.15 | 44,636,770 | 48,554 | 0.11 |
| Total Unincorporated | | | | | | |
| Areas | 42,436,776 | 66,087 | 0.15 | 45,210,099 | 61,415 | 0.13 |
| | | | | ļ | (p. | 223). |

Over-all, there had been a decline in the rate of growth of the community:

... During the decade 1918–1927 the Jewish population of the United States grew from 3,389,000 to 4,228,000, an increase of 839,000. In the succeeding ten-year period, 1928–1937, the population increased by 543,000, to an approximate total of 4,771,000. The growth of the Jewish population, during the decade 1918–1927, was affected by a net Jewish immigration of over 320,000, compared with a net immigration of less than 100,000 during the decade ended in 1937 (p. 217).

The exact total given in the detailed tables was 4,770,647, a downward revision of 60,533 from the preliminary total of 4,831,180 in Volume 41. A comparison of the tables of state totals in the two volumes shows a change in all figures, in most cases downward.

Volumes 43 through 47 (1941–1946): The 1937 Linfield estimates and much of the detailed data continued to be carried in the absence of new data. The need to change the procedure of gathering demographic information was recognized by the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee, which in 1941 declared that it

... was convinced that it is desirable that work along these lines should be carried on continuously instead of being concentrated in two or three years, and that such work would most appropriately be conducted under the auspices of the Synagogue Council of America, a body which consists of the delegates from national

rabbinical and congregational bodies, which represent the religious interests of the Jewish community. At the suggestion of your Committee, the Synagogue Council agreed to set up a Statistical Department for this purpose, the Committee agreeing to contribute toward the budget of that Department (Vol. 43, p. 726).

Volume 44 (1942–1943): Dr. Linfield now prefaced the statistics derived from the 1937 study with the following caveat:

As the United States Decennial Census does not include data on religious affiliation, no comprehensive or completely accurate figures on the Jewish population of the United States are available. The Jewish population figures here presented by the writer are, therefore, to be regarded as estimates and the closest approximation to a population census which can be supplied by the methods employed at the present time (p. 419).

He added, however, that the Census of Religious Bodies from which the figures were derived gave congregational membership, and that "membership is construed in a broad sense to include all Jews in communities where there is a congregation, and the results of the census thus constitute an approximation of the total Jewish population of the country."

Volumes 45-47 (1943-1946) repeated this statement verbatim (pp. 571, 491, 641, respectively).

Volume 48 (1946–1947): "Statistics of Jews" stated that detailed tables were omitted because of "limitation of space, and the fact that the government is now making plans for the 1947 census of Religious Bodies, of which the Census of Jewish Congregations is a part" (p. 600). Two summary tables again gave the 1937 census findings (pp. 604–05).

Volume 49 (1947–1948): Here too, it was explained that since "accurate and up-to-date statistics" were not available, the two 1937 census summary tables were reprinted "for historical purposes" (p. 733).

CJFWF and Community Surveys

Volume 50 (1948–1949): Beginning with this volume, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) prepared American Jewish population data for publication in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK. In a feature article, "Jewish Population Studies in the United States," Ben B. Seligman and Harvey Swados of the CJFWF staff reported the findings of a CJFWF survey (pp. 651–90). The introductory paragraphs described past data-gathering experiences:

WHILE NUMEROUS attempts have been made to estimate the number of Jews in various localities in the United States, there has never been a nationwide census of American Jewry. The national estimates of Jewish population made by the Jewish Statistical Bureau in 1926 and 1936² in conjunction with the decennial Census of Religious Bodies of the United States Census Bureau might have been thought by some lay readers to be sufficient, but demographic experts have found it to be adequate only for purposes of rough calculation* (p. 651).

*Recent estimates by local member agencies of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and field reporters of fund-raising organizations are considerably lower in

a majority of cases than the published figures of 1937; and since there has certainly not been an absolute decline, it is apparent that the 1937 figures may have been overestimated.

They indicated, too, that "no Census of Religious Bodies was held in 1947 for lack of Congressional appropriation, with the result that there are available no estimates of Jewish population in American communities more recent than that of a decade ago" (p. 651).

Aware of the importance of reasonably accurate, up-to-date data for the work of communal organizations, the authors stated, 'the Editors of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK asked the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds to undertake a poll of its member agencies in an attempt to discover the extent and intent of population studies that have been conducted in American Jewish commities in the past decade" (p. 652). According to Seligman and Swados,

This study was not an attempt to obtain a precise count of the total Jewish population of the United States. The object. was rather to survey local censuses, with the prospect of determining the approximate validity of current population estimates, of discovering the extent to which scientific methods are being utilized in local community studies, of learning whether there is a common basis for further demographic research on Jewish population, and of collecting suggestive data that might aid in marking out a program of national population and demographic research (p. 653).

A discussion of the scope and findings of the survey followed:

At the time of the study there were 228 communities affiliated with the Council. A simple questionnaire was designed and mailed to them with the request that they return it together with a copy of any local study that might have been made. One hundred and fifty-two communities complied . . , or about 67 per cent of those polled. This may not seem like a large enough percentage on which to base a series of conclusions, but it should be borne in mind that this 67 per cent represents approximately 90 per cent of a rough total estimate of 4,500,000 American Jews.* The striking fact that 152 respondents can represent a concentration of 90 per cent of the population of the slightly more than 1,200 communities of which population estimates have been obtained, can be more easily grasped when it is understood that the 13 largest Jewish communities in the United States—those reporting populations of 40,000 and over—comprise approximately 75 per cent of the total Jewish population: Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Newark, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco (p.652).

*This rough total is based on estimates of Jewish population in 1,237 communities, obtained through the aforementined poll, files of the United Jewish Appeal, surveys conducted by the Jewish Welfare Board and the files of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

Cautioning that it would be unwise to attempt demographic surmises regarding age distribution, mobility, and growth or decline of the United States Jewish population because of lack of comparability in survey techniques, in questions asked, and in data collected, the authors concluded:

it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the common questions facing American Jewry will not be answered until a common national effort is made to amass and survey a uniform body of data through a concerted systematized effort -one which will co-ordinate the most effective techniques in order to make available to national organizations, as well as to local communities, and indeed to the individual Jews of America, an increasing body of knowledge about themselves (p.662).

Seligman and Swados appended population tables of 720 communities with a minimum of 100 Jews. The figures, they stated, were

derived from the following sources: the files of the United Jewish Appeal, the surveys conducted by the Bureau of War Records of the Jewish Welfare Board, the files and field reports of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, and 152 responses to a Questionnaire on Population Estimates mailed to the member agencies of the CJFWF. When the material from all of these sources was gathered together, it was found that 1,237 unduplicated communities were listed; however, 517 of these were recorded as having less than 100 Jews, and since the combined population of these small communities totals only approximately 22,500, they have been omitted from the following list, which totals approximately 4,500,000 (pp.662-63).

They added, however:

It should be noted that the estimates given below ought not to be added to give a total population figure, if for no other reason than that a total derived in this way would include a certain amount of duplication. No claim that the appended list is either exhaustive or precise: the figures are presented as approximate estimations in the absence of more exact data. (pp. 663-64).

And, indeed, Volumes 51 through 56 (1949-1955) gave no estimates of the United States Jewish population.

Volume 51 (1950): Ben Seligman, in "The American Jew: Some Demographic Features" (pp. 3-52), wrote: "Despite these technical problems, it seems possible to construct some comparative demographic indices, particularly for surveys in which the techniques employed provide at least a partial basis of comparability" (p. 4). The effort, he said, was to be viewed as exploratory:

In addition to reviewing here the more recent community population surveys, comparisons will be made at various points with the demographic information as set forth in Jewish Population Studies, edited by Sophia M. Robison.' It will thus be possible to compare the demographic structure of the Jewish population in the 1930's with that of the 1940's and in this way perhaps to underscore some significant changes by utilizing data directly relating to Jews rather than employing surmises derived from general population statistics (p.4).

Of the 66 Jewish population studies of various communities undertaken under various auspices, only 15, "in which the information and manner of presentation were not so disparate, were selected for detailed examination." These communities were tabulated as follows:

Published by the Conference on Jewish Relations, 1943.

| | Jewish | Year of | |
|-------------------|------------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| City | Population | Study | Auspices |
| Newark | | | |
| City | 56,800 | 1948 | Jewish Community Council |
| Suburbs | 29,500 | 1940 | Jewish Community Council |
| Miami | 40,000 | 1949 | Jewish Federation |
| Atlanta | 10,217 | 1947 | National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) |
| Worcester | 9,750 | 1942 | Jewish Community Council |
| Portland, Oregon | 7,128 | 1947 | JWB |
| Camden | 6,517 | 1948 | JWB |
| Toledo . | 6,500 | 1944 | JWB |
| Indianapolis | 6,268 | 1948 | JWB |
| Scranton | 5,610 | 1945 | JWB |
| Tucson | 3,500 | 1948 | Jewish Community Center |
| Jacksonville | 3,095 | 1945 | Jewish Community Council |
| Utica | 3,024 | 1948 | Jewish Community Center |
| Charleston, S. C. | 1,838 | 1948 | Charleston Bi-Centennial Committee |
| Erie | 1,750 | 1940 | Jewish Community Council |
| Grand Rapids | 1,300 | 1944 | JWB (p.4) |

On the basis of the local studies, augmented by other available data, Seligman computed age compositions, population distribution, sex ratios, family size, nationality and citizenship, occupational distribution, fertility and mortality, and other characteristics of Jews living in these communities. The article omitted the previous year's Jewish populations tables.

Volume 52 (1951): Seligman's "Changes in Jewish Population in the United States, 1949-50" recapitulated the methodology used to arrive at the 1948 Jewish population estimate of 4,500,000. Replying to critics of this figure, he justified the estimate, while again emphasizing the shortcomings of the sources of information:

Some readers of the YEAR BOOK subsequently raised objections to the estimate of the American Jewish population published in Volume 50. They contended that a decline in the number of American Jews was inconceivable. In an absolute sense, this of course was quite true, since both the Jewish and the general population had been exhibiting increases for several decades. Yet it is not impossible that estimates of the Jewish population in the United States made prior to 1948 were overstated, thereby accounting for what appeared to be a drop in the number of American Jews. In view of this reaction to the YEAR BOOK's figures, as well as of the need for up-to-date Jewish population data, it was thought appropriate to re-examine the community population estimates (p.3).

Therefore, CJFWF again polled its affiliates. Said Seligman:

The questionnaire in the current survey was quite brief: Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had made any revisions in their previous population estimates; if so, to indicate the method employed for making the new estimates; and they were asked to indicate whether or not a survey of Jewish population was being contemplated. Replies were received from 159 communities, 60 of which indicated revisions in their estimates of Jewish population. Of these, 51 respond-

ents indicated increases in Jewish population, while 9 communities thought that they had suffered losses. All of the latter were cities with a Jewish population of less than 20,000; more than half of the increases was reported in communities with a Jewish population of under 10,000.

Although 99 communities reported no changes in the number of Jews, it is by no means certain that the Jewish population in these communities was static. A more accurate surmise is that the respondents in this group simply had no way of determining what demographic changes had taken place in their respective communities. Moreover, interest in basic population data did not seem to be very marked, since three-fourths of the 159 respondents indicated that they were not planning any population surveys in the near future. The proportion of planned surveys in the group reporting no changes in population estimates was slightly higher than in the group reporting changes in estimates. This may indicate a somewhat greater awareness of the need for data in the former group. It might be noted that about three-fourths of this group were communities with a Jewish population of under 10,000 (pp.3-4).

From the methods used by some of the communities in arriving at an estimate— "... revisions of contributor lists (reported by 22 communities), individual estimates (10 communities), inventory devices (12 communities), surveys (11 communities), the Yom Kippur method (1 community), and other methods (4 communities)"— Seligman concluded: "It thus became clear that little progress had been made in standardizing and co-ordinating the methods for estimating Jewish populations" (p.4). A revised list of communities with at least 100 Jews, derived, as before, from CJFWF and UJA files, was included. These Seligman used to arrive at a new national estimate:

. The communities listed, together with those in the very small towns (with a Jewish population of less than 100), comprised a total of approximately 4,700,000 Jews in the United States. This figure for the American Jewish population is offered as a rough estimate only, based on previous and current estimates as well as on what little is known about the patterns of the population growth of American Jewry (p. 4).

The article also reviewed studies of the following six Jewish communities and their characteristics:

| | Jewish | Year of | |
|------------------------|------------|---------|-------------------------------|
| City | Population | Study | Auspices |
| Trenton, N.J. | 8,500 | 1949 | Jewish Community Council |
| Rockville Centre, N.Y. | 5,176 | 1949 | Jewish Community Council |
| Nashville, Tenn | 2,678 | 1949 | Jewish Community Council |
| Gary, Ind | 2,500 | 1949 | National Jewish Welfare Board |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 1,241 | 1949 | United Jewish Council |
| Elmira, N.Y | 1,199 | 1949 | Jewish Community Center |
| , | · | | (p.5). |

Volumes 53 (1952) and 54 (1953) omitted Jewish population estimates for the United States, since no revised information was available. In Volume 54, however, Seligman did summarize the population figures and characteristics obtained from studies of:

| | Jewish | Year |
|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| Community | Population | of Study |
| Passaic, N.J | 11,215 | 1949 |
| Port Chester, N.Y | 2,235 | 1950 |
| Los Angeles, Cal | 323,000 | 1950 |
| Savannah, Ga | 3,120 | 1950 |
| Sioux City, Iowa | 2,219 | 1951 (p.4). |

Volume 55 (1956): CJFWF undertook a second revision of the estimates originally published in Volume 50. A report of the results, "Jewish Population of the United States, 1953" (pp. 3–12), was prepared by Ben Seligman, now on staff of the Jewish Labor Committee, and Alvin Chenkin, director of the CJFWF statistical unit. The article stated:

At the time of writing (August 1953), the Jewish population in the United States could be estimated at over 5,000,000. There had been some guesses in the past that the American Jewish population had passed the 5,000,000 mark; but this was the first time that the compilation of estimates, from the vast majority of communities with Jewish populations, presented a basis for this belief. This over-all estimate was based on the list of Jewish populations for more than 700 communities containing the bulk of American Jewry printed as the appendix to this article as well as a projection for communities not represented on that list, either because they failed to report or because they had fewer than 100 Jews (p.3).

The data-gathering procedure had not changed. Inquiries were sent to 214 CJFWF member agencies, "which together comprised more than 90 percent of all American Jewry." UJA data were used for nonaffiliated communities and for those that failed to respond. Said the authors:

In evaluating the current estimates, it must be remembered that there simply was no other source in the United States capable at the time of writing of providing estimates that could be more accurate or up to date. In 1926 and 1936 the United States Bureau of the Census conducted decennial censuses of religious bodies. However, no such census had been taken in 1946, for lack of a Congressional appropriation.

Admittedly, though no better estimates were available, the failings of the present estimates were significant. They sprang from the lack at the time of their compilation of consistent methods or definitions and of commonly accepted goals in Jewish population research in the United States. Hence, it was difficult to compare different community population surveys, even when contemporaneous.

In addition, Jewish communities continued to employ notoriously untrustworthy methods in computing their population estimates. The largest number of respondents indicated that they relied on one form or other of a master list—fund-raising campaign rolls, synagogue memberships, local organization lists, and the like. These master lists suffered from their omission of the unattached Jew.

Chenkin has continued to prepare the annual population figures to the present time.

Again, the master lists frequently consisted of Jewish families, not individuals. To estimate the number of Jewish individuals, it was necessary to multiply the master list number by a figure representing the average family size—and many of the respondents indicated that they considered that size to be between 3.5 and 4.0. Yet Jewish community surveys had shown that the average Jewish family was smaller than the national census figure of 3.5 for the average American family; the authors, in making their computations for the suburban estimates, employed the figure of 3.1.

Several of the communities reported that they had computed their estimates by projecting past estimates into the present—admitting at the same time that they did not know how the earlier estimates had been arrived at. Obviously, such estimates were extremely fallible (pp. 4-5).

An analysis of changes in Jewish population, indicated by respondents, followed:

Sixty of the 167 replies indicated that their 1953 estimate was higher than the one made in 1950 or earlier. Only 19 respondents listed a lower estimate, while the largest number, 88, reported no change. It seemed reasonable to surmise, however, from what was known of general population trends in the United States, that the increase in the Jewish population had been more widespread than these figures indicated. Most of the "no change" replies reflected not so much a stable community as a lack of information on which to base an answer to this question. Many of the communities that reported no change would most likely have shown an increase if an actual population study had been conducted.

The lack of any comparable studies for the communities reporting a lower estimate in 1953 than in previous years made it difficult to determine the cause for this lower estimate: whether it was due to Jews actually leaving the community, or whether it reflected the deflation of previously inflated estimates.

The number of communities reporting estimates higher than their earlier ones was not limited to any one population bracket (p.6).

The article contained a new estimate of 2,294,000 for New York City, which, the authors reminded, "was particularly needed, since the accuracy of any estimate for the total American Jewish population had, in a very large measure, to depend upon the figure derived from New York, the home of some 40 per cent of American Jewry" (p. 4). In addition,

The authors also made a special effort to obtain estimates for the Jewish populations of the large number of suburban communities located adjacent to New York City in Long Island, Westchester, and northern New Jersey, that had been largely missing from the previous listings. . . . Despite the difficulty of finding responsible individuals in these new communities capable of answering these queries [estimated number of families; whether this constituted increase or decrease in the last five years; age group of average household head, and last residence of newcomers] and the lack of central community organizations, many fresh estimates were obtained. These illuminated the importance of pursuing demographic work in the suburban areas, whither urban Jews, like the rest of the population, had been moving in increasing numbers since 1947 (pp. 3-4).

With regard to New York City,

The very size of New York's Jewish community made estimating its population a most difficult undertaking. The "anonymity of big city living," about which so much had been written, extended to the Jewish community as well; in no other city were there so many Jews who were not reached by the central campaign organizations or who were not involved in the many other Jewish organizations. The task of compiling an unduplicated community master file in New York City would be so arduous and expensive as to be prohibitive, and it is to be doubted that it would be of great value for the purpose of estimating population if it were to be compiled. For these reasons, the current estimate . . was secured through use of the Yom Kippur method (p. 7).

Here Chenkin and Seligman reiterated earlier critiques of this as well as the death-record methods:

Both. . suffered from the assumption that the characteristics of the Jewish and non-Jewish populations were similar—which was precisely the question under study. It had not been established that such characteristics as the proportion of young people, or the number of aged persons, or the average size of family, were the same for the Jewish population as for the general population. Thus far, demographic studies seemed to indicate that these characteristics differed for the Jewish and the general population. Even in the largest cities, where it was believed that they were most similar, there was not sufficient evidence that this was so (p. 5).

On the basis of the Yom Kippur method,

... the authors then arrived at a total Jewish population for New York City of 2,294,000, compared with the previous (1950) estimate of 2,100,000. It was most unlikely that the Jewish population of New York City had actually increased by 10 per cent since 1950. Certainly, the answers to the suburban questionnaires testified to a Jewish migration away from the city proper; this movement had not presumably been exceeded by the natural increase in the Jewish population and by the influx of refugees who settled in New York City. It was the authors' opinion that the new estimate came closer than the old in approximating New York's Jewish population; and that most of the difference in the two estimates was due to the more up-to-date estimate of the number of Jewish children of school age (p. 7).

The United States Jewish population estimate remained at some 5,000,000 in 1954 and 1955, and was raised to 5,197,000 in 1956, to 5,255,000 in 1957, and to 5,260,000 in 1958.

HIP Survey and New York City Estimate

Volume 56 (1955): Chenkin referred to a 1952 sample study of health problems in New York City, conducted by the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York (HIP), "which obtained as collateral data the religious preferences of the heads of households interviewed" (p. 172).

Volume 57 (1956): Chenkin used the 1952 HIP survey as a basis for 1955 estimates for New York City and for each of its five boroughs:

The survey . . . reached 4,190 households (institutions and quasi-institutions were excluded) and 13,558 persons. The households were selected as part of a mathematically defined sample, thus making it possible to compute the range of error for the major characteristics sought. Estimates of the Jewish population of New York based upon this HIP study were prepared as part of a study of child care needs by the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. These estimates were first based upon the HIP findings for 1952 and were then corrected to 1955. Estimates of the in- and out-migration movements of the white (exclusive of Puerto Rican) population, the Puerto Rican population, and the Negro population, as well as estimates of the Jewish population's natural rate of increase, were all employed to bring the estimates forward to 1955. The data presented below show that the Jewish population in New York City has been declining. With immigration from Europe cut to a trickle, and the movement to the suburbs consisting largely of families in the most fertile age groups, there is every indication that this trend will continue in the immediately foreseeable future. It is necessary to point out that New York City's Jewish population still comprises an estimated 40 per cent of United States Jewry.

... The shift between 1952 and 1955 reveals that the over-all loss in the New York City Jewish population would have been even greater had not part of the suburban shift been toward newly developed areas of Queens. That borough was the only one to show an increase in the Jewish population amounting to an estimated 70,000.

| | Yom Kippur Estimate | Estimate Based Upon HIP Data | | |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--|
| | 1952 | 1952 | 1955 | |
| New York City | 2,294,000 | 2,130,000 | 2,050,000 | |
| Manhattan | 346,000 | 350,000 | 320,000 | |
| Bronx | 556,000 | 525,000 | 475,000 | |
| Brooklyn | 1,077,000 | 940,000 | 870,000 | |
| Queens | 307,000 | 305,000 | 375,000 | |
| Richmond | 8,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | |
| | | | (p. 121). | |

From the HIP survey Chenkin also derived some demographic characteristics of New York City Jews:

The 1952 HIP survey revealed that households whose heads were Jewish amounted to 26.4 per cent of all households, and 29.6 per cent of all white households. The distribution is in conformity with experience in other communities where studies of Jewish populations have been undertaken. The Jewish population in New York City was shown to be an older one, the proportion of young people, especially those under fifteen, being smaller than in the general white population. Jews constitute almost one-third of all whites over sixty-four ..., but only 27 per cent of the age grouping under fifteen. Because the movement to the suburbs is a selective one in terms of age groups, we can assert that the proportion of New York City's Jewish population which is under fifteen has decreased since 1952, and the proportion of those sixty-five and over has increased. Further data from the HIP study revealed that the average size of the Jewish household was smaller than that of the average white non-Jewish household. Data on educational and occupational levels also indicated conformity with

what had been observed in studies of Jewish populations in other large communities.

Proportions of Jewish and Non-Jewish (White) Population in New York City by Major Age Divisions, 1952

| | Jews | Non-Jews (White) |
|--------------|------------|---------------------|
| Age | (Per Cent) | (Per Cent) |
| Under 15 | 23.0 | 25.9 |
| 15-44 | 40.6 | 43.3 |
| 45–64 | 24.9 | 21.5 |
| 65 and Over | 7.6 | 6.7 |
| Not Reported | <u>3.9</u> | _2.6 |
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Derived from Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, April 1955, "The Religio-Cultural Background of New York City's Population," by Neva R. Deardorff.

(p. 122).

Among revisions in community estimates, which, however, did not affect the total Jewish population, was "a major shift downward" in the Chicago community. According to Chenkin, "that city asked Philip Hauser, formerly of the United States Census Bureau and now with the University of Chicago, to undertake a check of its Jewish population. Hauser arrived at an estimate of 262,000 in place of the previous estimate of 350,000" (p. 123).

In the meantime, new demographic studies had been conducted in New Orleans (1953), Pittsburgh (1953), Lynn, Mass. (1953), Des Moines (1956), Canton, Ohio (1956), and Washington, D.C. (1956). Chenkin tabulated the findings of the first three in Volume 58 (1957; pp. 67–76), and of the last three in Volume 59 (1957; pp. 6–17). On the basis of the various revisions of earlier community estimates, Chenkin's 1956 and 1957 estimates of the Jewish population in the United States in *Volume 58 (1957)* and *Volume 59 (1958)* were 5,200,000 and 5,255,000, respectively.

Census Bureau Religious Preference Data

Volume 60 (1959): In his "Jewish Population in the United States, 1958" Chenkin stated:

Unlike Canada, where the inclusion of a religious-identification question in the decennial census has been of great help to Jewish demographers, the United States government before 1957 did not gather statistical data on religious preference, and the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK has consequently published estimates as the results of private studies. In February 1958, however, the Census Bureau released the results of a March 1957 study of religious preference as reported by the civilian population of the United States, aged 14 and over. This makes it possible

for the first time to compare the YEAR BOOK's estimates with an official study of the Jewish population (p. 3).

¹U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 79, February 2, 1958.

The question "What is your religion?" was added to the usual ones asked in the monthly Current Population Survey of the Bureau designed primarily to obtain estimates of employment and unemployment.

This survey is conducted each month with a scientifically selected sample representing the noninstitutional civilian population of the continental United States 14 years old and over. For this sample completed interviews were obtained from approximately 35,000 households containing 80,000 persons 14 years old and over, out of a total of 42,000 dwelling units designated for interviews. While the sample is small (each household selected represents 1,380 households), it is carefully drawn so as to be representative of the entire country, in rural-urban proportions, regional densities, and the like (pp. 3–4).

Chenkin used the Bureau's figures to arrive at a total Jewish population estimate, as follows: Thus, when we add 3,868,000 (aged 14 and over), and 1,107,000 (children under 14 both of whose parents were Jewish), we have the figure of 4,975,000. This, however, does not include the Bureau's estimate of 64,000 children under 14 with only one Jewish parent. Lacking information on how many of these were being brought up as Jews, this writer made his own estimate of 20,000. In addition, in order to achieve comparability between the YEAR BOOK's and the Census Bureau's estimates, this writer also added, from other sources, 5,000 Jewish children not included in the Census Bureau's study, and 30,000 Jews in the armed forces. This brings the total based on the Census Bureau's figures to 5,030,000.

ADAPTATION OF CENSUS BUREAU DATA TO OBTAIN A TOTAL ESTIMATE

| Number of Jews aged 14 and over in civilian population ^a | 3,868,000 |
|--|-----------|
| Children under 14 with both parents (or sole head) Jewishb | 1,107,000 |
| Jewish children under 14 with one parent Jewish ^c | 20,000 |
| Jewish children under 14 in institutions or in homes where they were | |
| unrelated to head or spoused | 5,000 |
| Jews in Armed Forces (exclusive of those already listed among the | |
| 809,000 soldiers included in (1) abovee | 30,000 |
| Estimate of Total Jewish Population | 5,030,000 |

SOURCES.

^aTable 1, Census Release P-20, No. 79.

bTable 7, Census Release P-20, No. 79.

cOur estimate, based on approximately one-third of 64,000 children reported in this category in Table 7, Census Release P-20, No. 79.

^dOur estimate, based upon roughly 3,000 Jewish children in Jewish-sponsored institutions or foster homes reported in the 1958 Yearbook of Jewish Social Services, Table FC-X, and rounded to account for those in institutions not Jewish.

eOur estimate, based upon 1.5 per cent of approximately 2,000,000 in Armed Forces stationed on base in United States without family or overseas. (pp. 4-5).

This figure differs by 220,000 from the YEAR BOOK's estimate of 5,250,000 for the same year. The difference can be explained by understatement of the Census data.

Because the Census Bureau's estimate of the total Jewish civilian population was derived from a sample (or partial count) it differed from the figure that would have resulted from a census (or full count). The Census Bureau has provided estimates for the possible differences between its published sample results and the results of a census. For a group the size of the Jewish population, the difference could have been 177,000. Because the Jewish population is bulked largely in certain states and urban areas the Census Bureau feels that the difference between its sample estimate of the Jewish population and a full count may be even greater than the published approximations. It is possible to assign the cause of the discrepancy between the two sets of estimates to the chance fluctuations of the sample procedure, but it is probable that this is only one of the causes. Another cause is the probable failure of those communities which have been experiencing a drop in their Jewish populations to report these as promptly as those communities which have had sharp increases.

The Census Bureau study, Chenkin maintained, constituted "a valuable addition to the material derived from individual Jewish-community studies of the YEAR BOOK" on "such salient features as age, sex, and regional distribution for the American Jewish population as a whole." How did the age distribution of Jews compare with that of the total and the white populations?

| | Total | Per | White | Per | Jewish | Per |
|-------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|
| Age | Population | Cent | Population | Cent | Population | Cent |
| Under 14 | 48,931,000 | 29.1 | 43,177,000 | 28.3 | 1,132,000 | 22.6 |
| 14–19 | 13,960,000 | 8.3 | 12,476,000 | 8.2 | 350,000 | 7.0 |
| 20-24 | 9,743,000 | 5.8 | 8,699,000 | 5.7 | 233,000 | 4.7 |
| 25-34 | 23,437,000 | 13.9 | 21,165,000 | 13.9 | 660,000 | 13.2 |
| 35-44 | 23,113,000 | 13.7 | 21,093,000 | 13.9 | 729,000 | 14.6 |
| 45-64 | 34,399,000 | 20.4 | 31,673,000 | 20.8 | 1,393,000 | 27.8 |
| 65 and over | 14,681,000 | 8.7 | 13,750,000 | 9.0 | 503,000 | 10.1 |
| TOTAL | 168,264,000 | 100.0 | 152,033,000 | 100.0 | 5,000,000 | 100.0 |

SOURCE: Total Population adapted from Tables 4 and 7 of Census Release, Series P-20, No. 79, and Table 3 of U. S. Census Report, Institutional Population, P-E, No. 2C (1950).

Total White Population is based on the same sources given above for the total population. Protestant non-whites (approximately 88 per cent of all non-whites) were subtracted from total population figures. Other non-whites could not be subtracted because their age distributions were not reported in the Census release. However for the sake of convenience, the term white population is employed here and in later tables.

Total Jewish Population was adapted from Tables 4 and 7 of Census Release, plus additional estimates for children under 14. See Table 1 of this article. (p. 6).

Said Chenkin:

The data in . . . are in agreement with the most recent studies of individual Jewish communities in that it indicates a relatively higher proportion of Jewish population in the age groups between 45 and 64 than is found in the total population and a smaller proportion in the younger age groups. Although currently the proportion of the Jewish population 65 and over is only one per cent higher than the proportion found in the white population for the same age group, the trend in the next decade should see an increasing divergence, with the Jewish aged

(p. 6).

increasing rapidly through the aging of the proportionately large group in the 45-64 bracket.

That the Jewish population is not keeping pace with the general population is also demonstrated . . . below. Here the Jewish population by age groups . . . is shown as a proportion of total and white-population age groups. In each of the younger age groups the Jewish proportion is smaller than in the older age groups.

| | Jewish Population as | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|-------|--|--|
| | Per Cent of Population | | | |
| Age | Total | White | | |
| Under 14 | 2.3 | 2.6 | | |
| 14-19 | 2.5 | 2.8 | | |
| 20-24 | 2.4 | 2.7 | | |
| 25-34 | 2.8 | 3.1 | | |
| 35-44 | 3.2 | 3.5 | | |
| 45-64 | 4.0 | 4.4 | | |
| 65 and over | 3.4 | 3.7 | | |
| | _ | _ | | |
| TOTAL | 3.0 | 3.3 | | |

The urban-rural distribution of Jews, compared with that of total and white populations, was discussed by Chenkin:

There are few Jews in rural areas in the United States. Almost nine out of every ten Jews are found in urban areas with a population of 250,000 or more. Of the total white population in all such urbanized places, Jews make up almost nine per cent. (It must be borne in mind that more than 40 per cent of all United States Jewry still live in Metropolitan New York and that this has a strong effect on statistics like those shown [below]:

JEWISH PROPORTIONS AND NUMBERS BY URBAN-RURAL CLASSIFICATIONS (Age 14 and Over)

| | Total | Total White Je | | Jewish Population as Proportion of | |
|--------------------------------|------------|----------------|------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| | Population | Population | Population | Total | White |
| Urban: Total Urban Areas of | 76,298,000 | 69,368,000 | 3,718,000 | 4.9 | 5.4 |
| 250,000 or More | 43,671,000 | 38,999,000 | 3,380,000 | 7.7 | 8.7 |
| Other Urban | 32,627,000 | 39,369 | 338,000 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| Rural | 43,035,000 | 39,488 | 150,000 | 0.3 | 0.4 |

SOURCE: Adapted from Table 3 of Census Release. Series P-20, No. 79.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CIVILIAN TOTAL, TOTAL WHITE, AND JEWISH POPULATIONS BY URBAN-RURAL CLASSIFICATIONS (Age 14 and Over)

| Area | Total | Total White | Jewish | |
|--------------------|-------|-------------|--------|---------|
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Urban: Total | 63.9 | 63.7 | 96.1 | |
| Urbanized Areas of | | | | |
| 250,000 or More | 36.6 | 35.8 | 87.4 | |
| Other Urban | 27.3 | 27.9 | 8.7 | |
| Rural | 36.1 | 36.3 | 3.8 | (p. 7). |

From these figures Chenkin computed the per cent distribution by region:

Although the Jewish population is distributed throughout the United States, its greatest density is in the Northeast, with the West a somewhat distant second.

The Jewish population is strongest in the Northeast and weakest, proportionately, in the South. In the West it is growing. Grouping by Census Regions the 1957 state listings found in Appendix Table 2, p. 23, in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1958 [Vol. 59], we find general concurrence with these Census data, the major difference being in the Northeast region.

Percentage Distribution of Civilian Total, Total White, and Jewish Populations by Regions (Age 14 and Over)

| | Total | Total White | Jewish |
|---------------|-------|-------------|--------|
| TOTAL | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Northeast | 26.2 | 27.3 | 69.1 |
| North Central | 29.2 | 30.1 | 11.9 |
| South | 30.6 | 27.9 | 7.7 |
| West | 14.0 | 14.7 | 11.3 |

COMPARISON OF TWO STATEMENTS OF REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH POPULATION FOR 1957

| Statement | Total | Northeast | North Central | South | West |
|------------------------|-------|-----------|---------------|-------|------|
| YEAR BOOK ^a | 100.0 | 65.9 | 14.3 | 8.8 | 11.0 |
| Censusb | 100.0 | 69.1 | 11.9 | 7.7 | 11.3 |

^aAdapted from Appendix Table 2, AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1958 [Vol. 59], p. 23. Includes all age groups.

bU. S. Census Bureau Release, Series P-20, No. 79. Age 14 and over only (pp. 7-8).

For the first time, too, Chenkin continued,

... national rates of intermarriage were established as a result of the Census study. The Jewish rate was 7.2 per cent, i.e., of the 1,356,000 couples where either one or both spouses were Jewish, there were 57,000 couples (4.2 per cent) where one partner was Protestant, and 41,000 couples (3.0 per cent) where one partner was Roman Catholic (p. 8).

A table giving the number and percentages of married and intermarried couples for the three major religions included the following data for Jews:

| | Number | Per | |
|-------------------------------|------------|-------|---------|
| | of Couples | Cent | |
| Couples with | | | |
| 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 | (p. 9). |

Continued Chenkin:

This table, referring as it does only to couples, understates the number of Jewish households in which non-Jews reside. When related to a total of *individual* married Jews instead of *couples*, the data show a proportion of 3.7 per cent

intermarried. This rate is of greater significance to those concorned with trends in Jewish community development than a rate set up on the basis of couples.

There are few community studies which provide data on intermarriage rates and the basis for computing these rates was not always the same. Adapting the data found in studies of the Jewish populations of Washington, D.C., New Orleans, Jacksonville, and Canton, the following rates of intermarriage of all Jewish married individuals were established: 6.5 per cent (Washington), 7 per cent (New Orleans), 6.5 per cent (Jacksonville), and under 1 per cent (Canton).

In the light of the paucity of material it is not possible at this time to assess the reasons for the difference in intermarriage rates between the Census Bureau study and the generally higher rates given in the community studies. We can go so far as to assume that the intermarriage rate for the Jewish population is somewhere below 7 per cent. This means that for every 100 married Jews, 7 or fewer are married to non-Jews.

The reader should note that this rate is a nominal one. The Census Bureau study and the community studies are based on current religious preferences. The actual intermarriage rate is higher as a result of two offsetting forces. Those marriages reported as all-Jewish include conversions to Judaism, and some marriages listed as non-Jewish include conversions from Judaism. The 3.7 per cent figure for Jewish intermarriage, derived from the Census Bureau study, is of concern to the Jewish community as a potential loss. There are no data yet which can give us an actual rate or which measure the contrasting pulls to or away from the Jewish community as a result of such mixed marriages (pp. 9–10).

According to Chenkin very little relevant data on Jewish fertility existed before the 1957 Census study:

Even where some figures have been obtained there has been a lack of comparability with the total population, so that uncertainty remained whether a putative increase in Jewish fertility rates kept pace, exceeded, or fell behind the rate for the total population. The Census Bureau sample study obtained fertility rates for the several religious groups, using as a measure the average number of children ever born per 1,000 women who had ever married. These figures were compiled separately for women of child-bearing age (15–44 years) and for women past the child-bearing age (45 years and over). For both age groups the fertility rate for Jewish women was lower than for the Protestants, Catholics, or those not included under either of these classifications. The Jewish fertility rate in both major age groups remained constant at slightly over three-quarters of the rates for the total population. On the basis of this study, therefore, the assumption that the birth rate of Jews is increasing more rapidly than that of other segments of the population cannot be substantiated (pp. 10, 12).

Data on the number of children per 1,000 women ever married in the two age brackets, by religion, residence, years of school completed, and husband's occupation, revealed

... a lower fertility rate for certain categories where Jews are heavily represented. These include urban residence, higher school-leaving age, and certain occupational groups, particularly professional, technical, and kindred workers. As long as this situation continues Jews will have a lower fertility rate than the general population (p. 12).

Annual questionnaire surveys of CJFWF-member communities continued to yield new data for local and national Jewish population estimates. Chenkin's total figure for 1959 rose to 5,367,000 (*Volume 61 [1960]*, pp. 3–10).

Greater New York Determines National Estimate

Volume 62 (1961): The 1960 total was 5,531,500, reflecting, Chenkin reported, "higher estimates for Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk counties" (pp. 53-63). For that year, Chenkin stated, "the estimate of New York City presented unusual difficulties." He explained:

There are two ways to approach estimating New York City's Jewish population, both outgrowths of studies conducted under the auspices of the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. The first approach—that of Henry Cohen—has been the basis for the New York City Jewish population estimates carried in AJYB in recent years. It uses the data on religious affiliation from a special study by the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York (HIP) in 1952, and links those data to the non-Puerto Rican white population in each borough. The second set of estimates comes from a study by C. Morris Horowitz and Lawrence J. Kaplan, based upon the Yom Kippur method, which divided New York City into 69 statistical districts, built up from combinations of U.S. Census tracts.² Estimates of the number of Jewish school children—aged 5 to 13—were based upon Yom Kippur absences recorded in the public schools in 1958. The ratio between the children of those ages to the total population was derived from the U.S. Census Bureau's special census of New York in 1957 and was applied to the estimated number of Jewish children in order to arrive at the estimated total Jewish population. This procedure was followed for each statistical district, and the results were aggregated to give borough and city estimates (pp. 53-54).

¹Henry Cohen, Jewish Population Trends in New York City, 1940-1970, New York: Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, January 1956 (mimeo.). See also Neva R. Deardorff, "The Religio-cultural Background of New York City's Population," Millbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, April 1955, pp. 152-60.

²C. Morris Horowitz and Lawrence J. Kaplan, The Estimated Jewish Population of the New York Area, 1900-1975, New York: Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, 1959.

Data based on the HIP-survey and the Horowitz-Kaplan approaches for four different years were shown as follows:

| | | (in thousands | ;) | | |
|---------------|-----------------|--|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | 19 | <u> 50 </u> | <u> 1955</u> | <u> 1957 </u> | <u> 1958</u> |
| | (Yom Kippur- | (HIP- | (HIP- | (HIP- | (Yom Kippur- |
| | method | based | based | based | method |
| Borough | Estimate) | Estimate) | Estimate) | Estimate) | Estimate) |
| Manhattan | 331 | 350 | 320 | 293 | 339 |
| Bronx | 519 | 530 | 475 | 432 | 493 |
| Brooklyn | 920 | 940 | 870 | 794 | 854 |
| Queens | 223 | 280 | 375 | 408 | 423 |
| Staten Island | 4 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 6 |
| TOTAL* | 1,996 | 2,110 | 2,050 | 1,937 | 2,114 |
| *Rounded. | | | | | (p. 54). |

The new, higher estimates for Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk were taken from the Horowitz-Kaplan study (they had not been included in the HIP survey):

| (in thousands) | | |
|----------------|------|----------|
| County | 1958 | |
| Nassau | 329 | |
| Suffolk | 20 | |
| Westchester | 116 | |
| TOTAL | 465 | (p. 55). |

Chenkin revised the Greater New York estimate for 1960 as follows:

The total. . for New York City and the three suburban counties is 2,401,600. Last year our corresponding figure was 2,294,000, but our estimates for individual communities in Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester were admittedly incomplete and outdated (p. 56).

The figure was based on the 1957 HIP-based estimate, rather than on the 1958 estimate using the Yom Kippur method, because:

There is no evidence that the rate of growth for the Jewish population in the New York area was greater than that for the total non-Puerto Rican white population. The 1950 non-Puerto Rican white population in New York City and the 1950 white population in Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester were 97.1 per cent of the corresponding 1957 populations. If we applied the same percentage to the Jewish population of the city and three counties, which was estimated at 2,579,000 in 1958 by the Yom Kippur method, we would have to conclude that in 1950 there were 2,544,000 Jews in the city and three counties. However, the Yom Kippur estimate for New York City alone in 1950 (none was available for the three suburban counties) was 1,997,000. Deducting this from 2,544,000, we would be left with 547,000 Jews in Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester in 1950. But this is far too high, since the 1958 figure for Jews in those counties was only 465,000. Surely the Jewish population of those counties did not decline between 1950 and 1958.

There are no adequate substitutes for the 1958 Yom Kippur-method estimate for Nassau, Westchester, and Suffolk, and these have been used here. That estimate for the three counties for 1958 and our estimate for the five boroughs for 1957 show a downward trend (in comparison with 1950 or 1952) for Manhattan, the Bronx, and Brooklyn and an upward trend for Queens and the three suburban counties. We assume here that those trends continued into 1960 (pp. 55-56).

Volume 63 (1962): Chenkin lowered the Jewish population estimate for 1961 to 5,510,000, "due primarily to a lowered estimate of the number of Jews in greater New York City, based upon current data." New estimates were computed as follows:

Ratios of the Jewish population to the total non-Puerto Rican white population in each borough, developed from a 1952 Health Insurance Plan (HIP) sample study and adjusted to 1955, were applied to 1960 borough estimates of the white non-Puerto Rican populations to yield estimates of the Jewish populations. The ratio employed for Queens was adjusted upwards since in-migration, presumably from areas with a higher Jewish density, exceeded out-migration from that borough.

For each of the five boroughs, we arrived at an estimated absolute size of the Jewish population by way of an estimated ratio of Jews to the total non-Puerto Rican white population. For New York City as a whole, we arrived at an absolute figure by first adding the borough totals, and then computing the ratio.

It was more difficult to bring up to date the estimates of the Jewish populations of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester counties. For want of information, we had to assume that the ratio of Jewish to white in-migrants was the same as that of Jewish to non-Puerto Rican whites in New York City. Further, we assumed a natural rate of increase of 1.5 per cent per year for the total white population and for the Jewish population alike. (Erich Rosenthal, "Jewish Fertility in the United States," [AJYB, 1961 (Vol. 62), pp. 3-27] has shown that comparable socio-economic status lessens fertility differences between Jews and non-Jews) (p. 136).

Volume 64 (1963): For the year 1962, Chenkin's estimate of the United States Jewish population was 5,585,000. Chenkin reiterated:

This estimate of Jewish population, like previous AJYB estimates, is based upon estimates of individual communities, some recent and some of long standing. Some . . . rest upon careful scientific studies, while others were probably arrived at "intuitively" by community leaders. Changes in a given community's Jewish population from one year to the next as reflected in YEAR BOOK tables are often the product of revised statistical methods rather than of substantive changes in population. Due caution should consequently be exercised in comparing the figures of any two issues of the YEAR BOOK (p. 57).

Estimates for New York City remained the same, at 1,836,000, in keeping with the unaltered figure for the non-Puerto Rican white population. For the suburban counties of Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk, 1960 U.S. Census figures and estimates of white population changes in 1960–62 prepared by the New York State Department of Health were applied for new estimates of changes in the Jewish population:

Estimated In-migration 1960–62 (in thousands)

| | Total White ^a | Jen | vish | Estimated ^c Natural Increase of Jewish Population | | ed Jewish lation |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------|---|-------|---------------------|
| County | Number | Per Centb | Number | 1960–62 | 1960 | 1962 |
| Westchester | 20 | 31 | 6 | 2 | 121 | 129 |
| Nassua | 49 | 31 | 15 | 7 | 345 | 367 |
| Suffolk | <u>73</u> | 31 | _23_ | _1_ | _37_ | _61_ |
| TOTAL | 142 | | 44 | 10 | 503 d | 557 |

aTable 1.

bAJYB, 1962 (Vol. 63), p. 136.

cAssumes conservative rate of one per cent per year.

dAJYB, 1962 (Vol. 63), p. 138.

Chenkin felt that though "absolute accuracy cannot be claimed for these estimates, ... they are consonant with the direction of population movement" (p. 59).

Community Studies and Census Data

In Volume 64, Chenkin also reported the findings of eight community population studies conducted between 1957 and 1961, which had become available in the meantime: Rochester, N.Y.; Trenton, N.J.; South Bend, Ind.; Los Angeles and San Francisco, Cal.; New Orleans, La.; Minneapolis, Minn., and Worcester, Mass. "Unfortunately," commented Chenkin, "a comparative analysis reveals that each of the communities continued to be, insofar as Jewish demography is concerned, 'in business for itself.'" However, he did abstract data on age distribution, household size, fertility, nativity, educational attainment, occupational distribution and intermarriage "for purposes of comparison and generalization" (pp. 59-70).

Volume 65 (1964): Chenkin's 1963 estimate of the United States Jewish population was 5,600,000; and, "In absence of new data, the estimates for New York City and suburban Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester counties have been maintained at 1962 levels." The article presented data on urban-rural distribution from the U.S. Census Bureau study of March 1957, which showed the Jewish population to be "entirely urban." The data relevant to Jews is extracted here:

(Per Cent by Residence)

| Religion | | | Urban | Rural | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------|---|----------------|----------|------|
| | United States | Total | Urbanized areas of 250,000 or more | Other urban | Non-farm | Farm |
| Total, 14 years | 100.0 | 63.9 | 36.6 | 27.3 | 24.4 | 11.7 |
| Jewish | 100.0 | 96.1 | 87.4 | 8.7 | 3.6 | 0.2 |

(p. 6)

In this connection Chenkin gave the various definitions of urban area:

... 1. urban place includes all places of 2,500 inhabitants or more and the towns, townships, and counties classified as urban; 2. central city is identical with the political boundaries of the incorporated city at the core of an urban area; 3. urbanized area comprises at least one central city of 50,000 inhabitants or more as well as the closely settled surrounding area; 4. standard metropolitan statistical area comprises at least one central city of 50,000 inhabitants or more together with the county or counties which are economically and otherwise oriented to the central city; 5. standard consolidated areas are several contiguous standard metropolitan statistical areas and additional counties that appear to have strong interrelationships: the New York-Northeastern New Jersey and the Chicago-Northwestern Indiana standard consolidated areas (p. 7).

The annual estimates of the United States Jewish population, Alvin Chenkin reported, continued to be based on CJFWF inquiries to its member communities. In 1964 it was 5,660,000 (*Volume 66 [1965]*, pp. 139-54). The estimate for 1965 (*Volume 67 [1966]*, pp. 81-91) was raised to 5,720,000.

Volume 68 (1967): The 5,720,000 figure was maintained for 1966. According to Chenkin, it reflected "decreases in population estimates reported for individual communities on the basis of more current studies, as well as the elimination of duplication of community figures from several state totals" (p. 231). Figures were adjusted for three major communities for which 1965 survey data became available: A provisional estimate for Boston's population, for many years maintained at 160,000, was 185,000; Los Angeles increased its estimate from 492,000 to 500,000; Milwaukee's long-time estimate of 30,000 was reduced to 24,000 (p. 233).

Volume 69 (1968) showed a moderate rise in the Jewish population estimate to 5,800,000, largely accounted for by higher estimates established in recent community studies: in Baltimore an increase from 85,000 to 100,000; in Miami, from 100,000 to 130,000 (p. 271).

Chenkin also reported on new material derived from the 1957 Census Bureau data, as well as from the publication in 1967 by the Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine of Ethnic and Educational Data of Adults in New York City, 1963–1964. Combining these two sets of data with findings of the Boston, Milwaukee, and Springfield, Mass., studies (published in 1967, 1967, and 1968, respectively), Chenkin devised the following table on the per cent distribution of Jewish adults, by major age groupings:

| | 20–34 | 35_44 | 45–64 | 35_49 | 50-64 | Sub-Total 35–64 | 65 and Older |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|
| United States (1957) | 25 | 21 | 40 | | | 61 | 14 |
| New York City | | | | | | | |
| (1963–64) | 21 | | | 28 | 32 | 60 | 19 |
| Boston (1965) | 28 | 19 | 36 | | | 55 | 16 |
| Milwaukee (1964-65) | 22 | | | 31 | 31 | 62 | 15 |
| Springfield, Mass. (1966) | 19 | 21 | 41 | | | 62 | 18 |
| | | | | | | | (p. 272) |

It showed that:

Excluding from consideration for the moment the data derived from the Census, we find the four cities to be in relatively close agreement. Compared with the other three cities, Boston tends towards a younger population, while New York City's oldest group is slightly larger. The Census data for the adult Jewish population in the country as a whole show a smaller proportion of 65-years-and-older than do the four individual communities. However, it must be borne in mind that this study was conducted ten years ago. Since then, all available data indicate that the number of Jewish children in the 9-years-and-under age group appears to be smaller than the next older age group. It is therefore reasonable to surmise that a similar study today would find a reported larger proportion for the older age group (p. 272).

The percentage of foreign-born Jews by age groups was:

| | (P | er Cent) | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| New York City: (1963-64) Boston: (1965) | (20–34) 11 NA | (35–49) 26 NA | (50–64) 40 NA | (65 Plus) 76 NA | Total Adults 37 22 |
| Milwaukee: (1964-65) | (20–34) 1 (20–29) | (35–44) 7 (30–49) | (45–64) 34 (50–69) | (65 Plus) 79 (70 Plus) | 28 |
| Springfield, Mass.: (1966) | 1 | 5 | 30 | 74 | 21 (p. 273) |

Using the 1957 national Census figures and the later data for New York, Boston, and Springfield, Chenkin tabulated marital status (p. 274); educational levels (p. 275) and occupational distribution of Jewish adults (p. 278); major occupations of college graduates in urban areas (p. 279), and range of family incomes (p. 280).

A number of general conclusions may be cited from Chenkin's detailed analysis of the data:

1. "Ultimately, the proportion of Jews who marry is at least as great as that of other religious groups. But available data indicate that they marry at a later age, thus 'spacing' generational replacement further apart than other groups.

"The 1957 U.S. Census data reported that 3.2 per cent of Jewish females in the age group 14-19 were married. By comparison, all other religious groups in this age bracket averaged 12.8 per cent married" (p. 273).

- 2. On the national level, 17.3 per cent of Jews had at least four years of college, compared with 7.5 of the total population; in New York City, it was at least 41 per cent, compared with 26 for the total population; in Boston, the ratio was 44 to 27 per cent; in Milwaukee, 50 to 20 per cent; in Springfield, 50 to 20 per cent (pp. 276–77).
- 3. Educational achievement was reflected in occupational structure. Nationally, in 1957, the largest single grouping of Jewish men was in the category of proprietors and managers (35 per cent), followed by professionals and technical occupations (20 per cent). Skilled and semiskilled workers accounted for 19 per cent, and unskilled and service workers together for about 3 per cent. Of employed Jewish women, 58 per cent were in clerical and sales jobs.

Of Jewish college graduates, however, 58 per cent were in professional, technical and kindred occupations, and 22 per cent were employed as managers, proprietors and officers. The comparative percentages for the total population were 63 and 16. Salaried professionals represented 39 per cent of all employed Jewish college graduates, while self-employed professionals were 19 per cent. The comparable percentages for all employed college graduates were 53 and 10 (pp. 277–78).

4. The median income for the United States Jewish population in 1957 was \$6,494, compared with \$4,586 for the total population. The estimated median income of Jews in Boston was \$9,200; in Milwaukee, \$9,485; in New York City, \$8,000 (pp. 280-81).

Volume 70 (1969): Chenkin estimated the 1968 Jewish population at 5,869,000. The largest adjustment was for Miami—an increase of 10,000 since the year before. At the same time, the author presented the trend in YEAR BOOK estimates for the 15-year period, 1954-68, showing an average growth rate of 1.15 per cent a year, as compared with 1.425 per cent annually for the total United States white population. Chenkin again pointed out that these rates are not quite comparable because of differences in the method of arriving at estimates (pp. 260-61). The estimate for New York City, made in 1961 and carried without change since then, was 1,836,000. In Chenkin's view, "it appears likely that . [this] figure . is a minimum one, and that the actual population count may be as much as 300,000 higher," particularly for Manhattan and Queens (p. 272).

NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION STUDY

In the same volume, Chenkin announced that the National Jewish Population Study (NJPS), conducted under the auspices of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and directed by Dr. Fred Massarik, was underway:

It will be a probability sample, and will secure information from 10,000 to 12,000 Jewish households. The scope of this survey will go beyond the demographic—although there will be a full set of questions in this area—to try to ascertain attitudes towards the Jewish community, its institutions, and its programs. When completed, this study should serve as a bench mark, enabling us, for the first time, to estimate accurately the number of Jews in the United States. It also will provide a wide variety of data on all aspects of Jewish life (p. 263).

Volume 71 (1970): The 1969 estimate was not updated in view of the expected NJPS findings, which, Chenkin stated, would make possible "a thorough revision of the individual community and state estimates . . . using the national estimates as a reference point" (p. 344).

Volume 72 (1971): Since NJPS findings were not as yet available, this volume did not carry the annual population statistics.

Volume 73 (1972): In "Jewish Population in the United States, 1971" Chenkin reported on NJPS progress:

With field work completed, the data derived from the NJPS. are now being prepared for analysis.

While the study will not produce individual community estimates in most cases (New York City will be a noticeable exception), it will offer an independent estimate of the total United States Jewish population. In addition, it will provide some bench-mark figures on birth and death rates, conversion rates, and migration patterns. These will enable us to evaluate past estimates, as well as to project more accurate figures for the future (p. 385).

Awaiting the NJPS estimate, Chenkin used the 1968 total to arrive at a figure of 6,060,000 for 1971, representing an annual growth rate of 1.07 per cent, one "com-

parable to the growth rate of the total resident population of the United States from 1968 to 1971" (p. 384).

Household Characteristics

Volume 74 (1973): This volume contained "United States National Jewish Population Study: A First Report," by Fred Massarik and Alvin Chenkin (pp. 264–306). By way of an introduction, they stated:

The NJPS is a sampling survey based on accepted principles of scientific sample selection. A complete census count, seeking identification of every household in the United States that might be considered Jewish is, of course, neither financially feasible nor scientifically necessary. The study's methodology was geared to its basic goal of searching for representativeness in demographic description and in the study of attitudes. NJPS's purpose is to provide a picture of the Jewish population, as free as possible from bias—the overrepresentation of the Jewishly identified—and to give fundamental insights into the characteristics of the American Jew (p. 264).

The major criteria for selecting households for study purposes were:

- (1) The sample of households interviewed was drawn from every geographic region of the United States, including the Greater New York area, and generally from every Jewish community with an initially estimated Jewish population of 30,000, or more. Interviews also were conducted, in appropriate proportions, in medium-sized and small Jewish communities. Finally, a special effort was made to contact Jewish households in a sample of counties that heretofore had been assumed to contain virtually no Jewish populations.
- (2) Sample interviews reached Jewish households whose members generally were not affiliated with organized Jewish life (persons not associated with Jewish organizations, non-givers to Jewish philanthropic campaigns, etc.), as well as Jewish households actively identified with the Jewish community (persons whose names appear on fund-raising master lists, on Jewish community and congregation mailing lists, etc.).
- (3) The types of sample used were: (a) the "area probability sample," ... selected by contacting many thousands of households on a door-to-door basis without any assurance that particular household would prove to be Jewish; (b) the "list sample," the product of contacting households known to be Jewish, that appeared on lists furnished by Jewish communities or lists specially devised for Study purposes. These two sample types were cross-checked and weighted to provide the needed balance between those at the periphery of Jewish community involvement and those directly associated with activities of Jewish interest (p. 265).

A summary of NJPS topics, a listing of primary sampling areas, and an explanation of the development of the area probability sample were appended.

The article included the first of a series of selected data on household characteristics, with tables, that were to appear in consecutive YEAR BOOK volumes as analysis was completed:

Per Cent Distribution of Individuals, by Age and Sex

... First, the proportion of individuals under 5 years of age has been decreasing for the last ten years. Whereas the current 10-14 age group was 10 per cent of the total population,* the 5-9 age group dropped to 7 and the 0-4 group to 6 per cent. By the close of the five-year period ending in 1971, the number of 5-to-9year-olds has decreased approximately one-third from the number in that age group in the 1961-65 period. Taking all children under 15 into account, the decrease for this age group in 1966-71 was more than a fifth of the number in the same age group in 1961-65.

Secondly, the proportion of the age groups from 25 through 44 was relatively low—12 per cent lower than the proportion of the next 20 year age span, from

45 to 64.

Thirdly, the number of aging individuals of 65 and over was proportionately larger among Jews than in the general population. From the proportion of the population in the individual 5-year age groups beginning with age 50, it was apparent that in the next decade the number in the 65-and-over age group will increase absolutely, and, unless there is a sharp increase in births, it will increase proportionately as well (p. 270).

*Total refers to noninstitutional population, in this and all subsequent references.

Per Cent Distribution of Households, by Age and Sex of Head

Over-all, more than 5 out of every 6 households were headed by males. For households with heads under 30, the ratio of male heads to female heads was 8 to 1; by age 30 to 39, it increased to 12 to 1. However from age 40 on, the proportion of households headed by women increased, until by age 70-74 the male-head to female-head ratio was 1.4 to 1.

More than 50 per cent of all Jewish households had heads whose ages ranged between 40 and 64. Another 22 per cent of households had heads of 65 or older. Thus, while the aging (65 and over), in terms of individuals, were 1 out of 9, in terms of household heads they were more than 1 out of 5.

The distinction between these two sets of data is important. Often a statement on a household characteristic (income, congregational affiliation, etc.) is assumed to be directly transferable to a statement on the population as a whole. Since the average size of a household is related to the age of the head, any household characteristic correlated with age of head must be adjusted for this factor before making a reference to the total population. (pp. 272–73).

Per Cent Distribution of Households, by Marital Status and Age of Head Over-all, 78 per cent of all household heads were married. For all those between ages 30 through 59 the proportion married range between 86 and 90 per cent. In the 65-69 age group the proportion married decreased to 68 per cent, and continued to drop for the older age group. A seeming oddity is the fact that the proportion of the married in the 70-74 age group was 53 per cent, while in the 75-and-over group it was 58 per cent.

Per Cent Distribution of Households, by Generational Level and Age of Head The heads of households were divided roughly into 23 per cent foreign born, 58 per cent first generation born in the United States, and 19 per cent second or earlier generation United States born. . For all heads of households of 54 or younger, the proportion of foreign born was 12 per cent or less. Only in the age groups between 20 and 29 did heads of the second or earlier generation born in the United States exceed in proportion the first-generation heads. In the 65 to 69

age group of heads of households, 41 per cent were foreign born, compared to 56 per cent first-generation born, and a very small proportion—3 per cent second or earlier generation born in the United States. For the next age group, 70-74, the foreign born increased to 62 per cent; for the small group of 80 and over, the foreign born were 86 per cent of the entire age group (pp. 272-75).

A detailed breakdown of per cent distribution for level of secular education, occupation, income, and congregational membership was included.

Intermarriage

A separate section, prepared by Fred Massarik, was entitled "Explorations in Intermarriage." Defining basic intermarriage as "a marriage in which one partner describes himself or herself (or is described) as having identified with a non-Jewish religious-cultural viewpoint at the time he or she met his or her future spouse," NJPS found, among other things, that:

- 1. Of all Jewish persons now married, some 9.2 per cent are intermarried.
- 2. The proportion of Jewish persons intermarrying in the period 1966–1972 was 31.7 per cent, much higher than in any comparable earlier period.
- 3. The combination husband Jewish/wife not Jewish is about twice as prevalent as the combination wife Jewish/husband not Jewish. Some 3 per cent of the married are classified as "marginally" Jewish, a category including no religious preference by the husband or some mixed pattern as "part Jewish."
- 4. A substantial proportion—about one-fourth of all intermarrying non-Jewish females—reported conversion to Judaism; few intermarrying non-Jewish males convert.
- 5. Nearly half of marriage partners who were non-Jewish prior to marriage subsequently identify as Jewish, regardless of formal conversion.
- 6. In most cases where the wife is Jewish and, initially, the husband was not, children are or were raised as Jewish. Where the husband is Jewish and the wife is not, about one-third of the children are or were raised outside Jewish religious belief.
- 7. Belief in the Jewish religion is widely professed both in intermarried and non-intermarried households, but somewhat more prevalent among the nonintermarried. There is continuing widespread belief in one God (p. 292).

Specifically discussed were the rates of Jewish persons intermarrying for 1900-1972, types of intermarriages, and the related subjects of conversion patterns and Jewish identity; religious orientation and Jewish education of children of intermarried couples; belief in Jewish religion; Jewish organizational affiliation, and the factors leading to intermarriage.

Preliminary Population Estimate

Also in Volume 74, in the annual demographic article, Chenkin estimated the 1972 United States Jewish population at 6,115,000, representing "the summation of individual community estimates with somewhat arbitrary adjustments within states for unknown Jews. The sources for these . . . were replies to questionnaires addressed

to members of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and data supplied by the National United Jewish Appeal." It should be noted, wrote Chenkin, "that the National Jewish Population Study preliminary evaluation indicates a total of no less than 6,000,000. Unless completed computations will vary markedly, this figure does differ greatly from the 1971 total estimate of 6,060,000, based on the above procedures" (p. 307).

Volume 75 (1974-75): According to Alvin Chenkin, "The estimate of the United States 'Jewish population' for 1973, compiled in a similar manner as in previous years, is 5,732,000. This figure is some 400,000 under the 1972 estimate, chiefly because of a drop in the estimate for the New York City area" (p. 295).

Estimate Based on Definition of Jewish Households

Under the heading, "National Jewish Population Study: A New United States Estimate" (pp. 296–302), Fred Massarik reported that "the population residing in U.S. Jewish households in 1970 is estimated at 5,800,000," with Jewish household defined as "one including one or more Jewish persons" (p. 296). For a person, and therefore a household, to be considered Jewish, he or she "had to provide an affirmative reply, for himself and/or for one or more household members, to one or more of the following questions: 1) Was person born Jewish? 2) Is person Jewish now? 3) Was person's father born Jewish? 4) Was person's mother born Jewish?" (p. 298).

Massarik elaborated:

The definition takes into consideration that, particularly in view of intermarriage, not all persons in such households are Jewish. If the estimate is adjusted to exclude non-Jewish persons residing in Jewish households, such as non-Jewish spouses and children who are not being raised as Jews, the total number of Jewish residents in households is 5,370,000. Earlier AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK estimates by Alvin Chenkin did not make this distinction because NJPS, for the first time, yielded data that made possible a refinement for the over-all figure (pp. 296–97).

A breakdown of the total for Jewish residents in Jewish households yielded the following data related to intermarriage and conversion:

The average household size for all persons in Jewish households was 2.98; the figure for "Jewish persons in Jewish households" declined to 2.76. While this difference may seem of little consequence, the latter figure is about 7.4 per cent lower than the former. In other words, the total number of persons in Jewish households was some 8 per cent larger than the number of Jewish persons residing in these households. (p. 298).

It was found, too, that

A discussion of this estimate, based on the NJPS findings, appeared in Volume 76.

... nearly 95 per cent of the household heads ... indicated that they were born Jewish and are now Jewish. However, the total of responses at variance with this standard pattern was significant: some 2.6 per cent are not Jewish now and indicated that they were not born Jewish, presumably representing mainly non-Jewish household heads in intermarriages. An additional 1.2 per cent were born Jewish but are not Jewish now, indicating a drift from or conversion out of Judaism. The reverse—not born Jewish but now Jewish—accounted for 1.1 per cent of household heads. According to these figures, at least for households presently having any ties at all to the Jewish population, the Jewish population "loss" due to conversion out was nearly counterbalanced by the influx resulting from conversion into Judaism.

As we examine the apparent net effect, the figures suggest that some 96 per cent of present heads of households were born Jewish, and that a very similar percentage of such persons now identify as Jews (p. 299).

Regional Trends

The NJPS finding with regard to the geographic distribution of the Jewish population differed from AJYB estimates for 1971 (Vol. 73):

| | <u> 1971 AJ</u> | YB Data | <u>1970 NJ</u> | | |
|---------|-----------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------|
| Region | Persons | Per Cent | Persons | Per Cent | |
| East | 4,039,000 | 66.7 | 3,690,000 | 63.6 | |
| Central | 736,000 | 12.1 | 990,000 | 17.1 | |
| South | 481,000 | 7.9 | 486,000 | 8.4 | |
| West | 804,000 | 13.3 | 632,000 | 10.9 | |
| TOTAL | 6,060,000 | 100.0 | 5,798,000 | 100.0 | (p. 301) |

According to AJYB,

... slightly more than two-thirds of the United States Jewish population resided in the East. The corresponding figure obtained by NJPS was slightly smaller (63.6 per cent).

While the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK Jewish population distribution figure for the Central United States was estimated at 12 per cent, the NJPS estimate was somewhat higher (17.1 per cent). The NJPS estimate was also slightly higher for the South (8.4 per cent NJPS versus 7.9 per cent AJYB). However, a reverse trend appeared in the West (13.2 per cent AJYB versus 10.9 per cent NJPS).

In interpreting these figures it must be remembered that the data source in both instances imposed limitations. AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK data, being primarily accumulations of local estimates, did not always maintain currency and were subject to undefined assumption as well as variation in accuracy, depending on the method used. The NJPS data focused primarily on national concerns, as indicated, and conclusions drawn from them become more risky as non-national breakdowns are considered (pp. 301–02).

Having noted these limitations, Massarik outlined several regional trends emerging from NJPS:

- 1. While the East continued to be the numerically overwhelming center of the United States Jewish population, including nearly two-thirds of the United States Jewish population, this region's relative "share" of the United States Jewish population total may have declined somewhat in recent years.
- 2. The Central United States may include a somewhat larger Jewish population, in numbers and relative proportion, than previously indicated. While certain technical adjustments may narrow the difference in final computations, the incidence of a larger population than reported may in part reflect the circumstance that, particularly in many smaller and in several major mid-Western communities, no up-to-date survey-based estimates were available at the time the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK for 1971 was published. Indeed a number of estimates may have been severely outdated. Further, some inmigration trends or earlier growth (some of it going back to the 1940s and 1950s) may not have been reflected in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK figures.
- 3. The South appeared as a region of Jewish population growth. This may be due particularly to growth trends in Florida, notably in the Miami-Dade County area.
- 4. The West, a region in which—in light of prior growth—frequent Jewish population surveys were conducted particularly in the 1950s and 1960s, apparently experienced some absolute and proportional Jewish population loss by 1970. In large measure, this may reflect out-migration and Jewish population loss due to mortality and lower birth rates, especially in the Los Angeles area and in other Southern California Jewish communities, whose growth had peaked in the mid-1960s (p. 302).

Volume 76 (1976): The previous year's United States Jewish population estimate of 5,732,000 was repeated for 1974. Stated Chenkin:

The method of compilation is consistent with that of previous years. The difference between this estimate (and last year's) and previous estimates which exceeded 6,000,000 is largely due to the change in the New York City estimate, which had remained the same from 1962 to 1973. The figures for New York City and its suburbs are derived from the National Jewish Population Study conducted in 1970–71 (p. 229).

Characteristics of Greater New York Jews

Details regarding the NJPS New York City findings were reported by Fred Massarik in an accompanying article, "Basic Characteristics of the Greater New York Jewish Population":

The Jewish population of the New York area for the period 1970–71 is estimated at 1,998,000, consisting of 720,000 households considered to be Jewish in accordance with the definition of the National Jewish Population Study (NJPS). The average size of the Jewish household is just below 2.8. These figures are based principally on National Jewish Population Study survey data, and materially corroborated by supplementary current research estimates.

| ESTIMATE | OF | NEW | YORK | JEWISH | POPULATION ^a |
|----------|----|-----|------|---------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | |

| | | | | Relative Distribution | | |
|----------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------|--|
| | Numb | Number of | | (Per Cent) | | |
| County | Households | Persons | hold Size | Households | Persons | |
| Manhattan | 99,300 | 171,000 | 1.72 | 13.8 | 8.6 | |
| Brooklyn | 196,000 | 514,000 | 2.62 | 27.2 | 25.7 | |
| Bronx | 68,000 | 143,000 | 2.10 | 9.4 | 7.1 | |
| Queens | 133,000 | 379,000 | 2.85 | 18.5 | 19.0 | |
| Staten Island | 7,000 | 21,000 | 3.00 | 1.0 | 1.1 | |
| Westchester | 50,200 | 165,000 | 3.28 | 7.0 | 8.2 | |
| Nassau-Suffolk | 166,200 | 605,000 | 3.64 | 23.1 | 30.3 | |
| | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 719,700 | 1,998,000 | 2.76 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

^aPopulation in households including one or more Jewish persons, taking account of estimated smaller household sizes, for households refusing to respond and/or not reachable by survey procedures.

The largest numbers of persons in Jewish households reside in Nassau-Suffolk: 605,000 in 166,200 households.

The greatest number of Jewish households (196,000) is found in Brooklyn. However, in view of the smaller average household size here (2.62 in Brooklyn; 3.64 in Nassau-Suffolk), the total Jewish population of Brooklyn is below that of the combined Nassau-Suffolk area (514,000, compared with 605,000).

Estimates for Manhattan are complicated by the initial high refusal rate ("persons declining to be interviewed," largely overcome by follow-ups) and by the generally greater difficulty encountered in reaching persons in this unique urban area. Here, NJPS findings reveal a very small average Jewish household: about 1.7 persons. Thus, with some 99,300 Jewish households in the area, the total Jewish population for Manhattan is estimated at 171,000. (It may be noted that among these households are numerous one-person units, at lower economic and at transient locations, which are difficult to locate for purposes of interviews.)

Westchester, with 165,000 persons in some 50,200 Jewish households, is characterized by an average Jewish household size of 3.28, a figure larger than that found in the urban boroughs, but slightly below that for Nassau-Suffolk (3.64) (pp. 239-40).

Data on age distribution for the several boroughs and counties of New York showed a decline in recent years of the relative proportions of young children under five years of age—an indication of the declining birthrate. In Westchester, they constituted some 14 per cent of all Jewish residents; in Brooklyn the percentage was 8, followed by Queens with about 5 per cent.

Children between the ages of five and 14 constitute a very significant proportion, nearly 25 per cent, of the Nassau-Suffolk Jewish population. It is high also in Westchester and Queens—some 11 per cent each. As for the older teenagers, 15 to 19, they constitute somewhat more than 10 per cent of the Jewish populations in Nassau-Suffolk, Westchester, and Queens.

For Jewish aged, the proportions are by far highest in the Bronx (near 34 per cent) and in Manhattan (slightly over 27 per cent); Brooklyn follows with 19 per cent.

In summary, it is evident that young children under five years of age and children between five and 14 constitute particularly large components of the total Jewish populations in the suburban areas, notably Westchester. In Nassau-Suffolk, where the proportion of the very young is not exceptionally high, children in the five-to-14 age category are a major segment of the total population (p. 242).

NJPS findings on employment status indicated:

The proportion of gainfully employed Jewish men and women (those 16 years old and over, in accordance with U.S. Census definition) is highest in Nassau-Suffolk and Westchester, followed in order by Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx. The percentages range from a high of approximately 55 per cent to a low of 38 per cent (p. 246)

Significantly different conditions emerged in the boroughs and counties from an examination of the reasons for nonemployment. For example, in Nassau-Suffolk students were 17 per cent of nonemployed men and 11 per cent of nonemployed women. The corresponding proportions for Westchester were 11 and 14. On the other end of the age scale, retired persons constituted some 4 per cent of the nonemployed men in Nassau-Suffolk and Westchester, about 8 per cent in Queens, and 30 per cent in the Bronx (pp. 246–47).

SELECTED NONEMPLOYED POPULATIONS, NEW YORK (Per Cent)

| | | | 16 Yea | ars of Age and | d Over | |
|----------------|---------|---------|----------------------|----------------|----------|--|
| Borough/County | Ma | lesa | Females ^a | | | |
| | | | | | House- | |
| | Student | Retired | Student | Retired | wife | |
| Manhattan | 3.4 | 18.4 | 3.0 | 9.1 | 43.8 | |
| Brooklyn | 9.8 | 17.2 | 4.8 | 7.7 | 51.2 | |
| Bronx | 6.5 | 29.7 | 10.2 | 15.3 | 44.9 | |
| Queens | 10.1 | 8.0 | 6.9 | 4.0 | 41.9 | |
| Westchester | 10.9 | 4.4 | 13.6 | 4.2 | 47.9 | |
| Nassau-Suffolk | 17.2 | 4.1 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 39.0 | |
| | | | | | (p. 248) | |

^aFor each borough/county total males, 16 years old and over = 100 per cent; total females, 16 years old and over = 100 per cent.

EVALUATION OF 1957-1967 ESTIMATES

Some demographers had raised questions with regard to the techniques used before NJPS to estimate Jewish populations, and the results achieved—Alvin Chenkin himself repeatedly cautioned that both were open to doubt. The AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK therefore invited Usiel O. Schmelz, research fellow in Jewish demography at the Hebrew University's Institute of Contemporary Jewry, to evaluate the demographic data presented in its pages (Volume 70, pp. 273–88). Within the broader framework of population dynamics among Jews and of the problem of collecting data and how some of these may be solved, Schmelz questioned the plausibility of YEAR BOOK estimates of the size of the largest Jewish communities

in the world. While most of his general discussion also applies to the United States, we extract here only the section dealing specifically with the United States. It concentrates on the period from 1957 to 1967, the time when preliminary work began on the National Jewish Population Study.

Since, as Schmelz pointed out, "after a period of invariance, the estimates increased, rather irregularly, from year to year," consideration had to be given to two interrelated questions: "(1) What was, and is, the size of the United States population? (2) Is the population increase, as implied in the successive AJYB estimates, demographically plausible?" (p. 279). Schmelz argued:

In March 1957 the Monthly Current Population Survey of the U.S. Bureau of the Census asked a question on religion, to which 99 per cent of the interviewed responded.¹⁹ The inflated sample results indicated that there were in the United States 3,868,000 Jews who were 14 years old and over; 1,107,000 children in Jewish families, and 64,000 children with only one of the parents reported as Jewish.²⁰ After some slight adaptations, Chenkin arrived at a total U.S. Jewish population of 5,030,000, according to the survey. He claimed that the difference between this figure and his own countrywide estimate of about 5,250,000, arrived at by the summation of local estimates,²¹ was within a reasonable margin of sample error. Chenkin used his own, higher figure as basis for later, ever-rising yearly estimates in AJYB.

it may be pointed out that the Jewish population growth, implied in the successive estimates of the last ten years—from mid-1957 through 1967—seems rather high. They increased from . 5,255,000 to 5,800,000, or by 545,000. . . . Allowing for the positive migration balance over those years, 22 the estimates imply for the Jews living in the United States in mid-1957 an average annual growth rate of about 9 per 1,000 over ten and a half years. Over the same period, the total white population in the United States grew by 12 per 1,000 annually (again approximately correcting for the migration balance). 23 It is doubtful that the ratio of 9 per 1,000 to 12 per 1,000 sufficiently reflects the actual differential in the annual growth rates of the two groups, particularly in view of the following characteristics of the Jews:

Low fertility. The Current Population Survey of March 1957 substantiated the impression that Jewish fertility is considerably below that of the total white population (and, obviously, still further below that of the entire population, including all nonwhites).

The . . . figures show that the fertility of all Jews is much closer to the total level in the urban centers (although those contain also non-whites) than to the fertility of all whites. A large number of all whites belong to the category of small-town and rural dwellers, who are more fertile and therefore raise the over-all fertility of the whites, while Jews are quite preponderantly concentrated in the larger towns. Similarly, according to other data of the 1957 Survey, the fertility of the Jews is closer to that of couples where the husband is in a white-collar occupation or higher income bracket, than to the average fertility of the population; also, white-collar occupations and higher incomes are relatively more frequent among the Jews than in the general population.

A lower level of Jewish fertility also was indicated by local surveys, insofar as they furnished any data comparable to those for the general population of a given town. Several family planning studies showed a wider and more efficient use of birth control by Jews and their preference for smaller families.²⁴ The 1957 data

| | Average Number of Children Born to 1,000 Women | | | | Per cent Difference of Jews to | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | Urban | | | rban | oan | | Urban | |
| | Jews | Total Whites | Total Areas of 3 million plus | | Total Whites | Total | Areas of 3 mil- lion plus | |
| Women aged 15-44b All women Ever married Women aged 45 and | 1,184 1,598 | 1,637 2,130 | 1,504 2,009 | 1,302 1,820 | -27.7 -25.0 | -21.3 -20.5 | -9.1 -12.2 | |
| over, ever married | 2,218 | 2,759 | 2,514 | 2,228 | -19.6 | -11.8 | -0.4 | |

CUMULATIVE FERTILITY RATE, U.S.A., 1957^a

^aFertility data on Jews were published in U.S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958, p. 41, and in a release of the March 1957 survey, made available in 1967. The data on the general population were also published in these sources, and in U.S. Bureau of Census, "Fertility of the Population: March 1957," Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 84, August 8, 1958.

⁶Standardized for age, according to the distribution by age of all women of given marital status in the United States in 1950. This standardization reduces the cumulative fertility rate of the Jews, compared to the unstandardized rate, because of the greater proportion of women in later reproductive years among Jews (related to the aging of the Jewish population; see p. 275).

reveal, too, that Jewish women no longer in their fertile period in 1957 had fallen a little short of replacing themselves demographically. For various methodological reasons, it is difficult to get as conclusive a picture of the replacement prospects for the Jewish women below 45 years of age in 1957, who were presented as a single group in the published Survey results.

At any rate, the Survey data led two competent demographers to sum up similarly the Jewish fertility situation: Donald J. Bogue²⁶ maintained that the Jews "are scarcely reproducing themselves"; Erich Rosenthal²⁷ concluded that "the fertility of the Jewish population in the United States is barely sufficient to maintain its present size."

More recently, fertility figures published from the 1961 census in neighboring Canada²⁸ showed that the Canadian Jews had a higher fertility than the Jews of the States.²⁹ Yet, the 40 to 54 years old ever-married Jewish women in Canada in 1961 failed to reproduce themselves adequately.³⁰ It is true that the 30 to 39 years old Jewish women had already born more children than the 40 to 54 years old, according to the Canadian 1961 census. This was due to the larger participation of the younger than of the somewhat older women in the baby boom around 1950; a similar development is also known from the general Canadian and United States populations. But meanwhile there has been another decrease in Jewish births.

In the 1960s a marked decline, both in the number of births and the fertility of women of reproductive age, occurred in the general population of the United States and Canada. A downward trend in Jewish births began earlier, as revealed by the age distribution of Jewish children in the Canadian census³¹ data and several recent community surveys in the United States. There were fewer 0 to 4

than 5 to 9 years old children and, in some instances, 10 to 14 years old,³² or, analogously, there were fewer children 0 to 9 than 10 to 19 years old. This was in sharp contrast to the rise in the number of Jewish children a decade earlier, as shown in the 1951 Canadian census and in United States community surveys conducted during, or shortly after, the brief Jewish baby boom about 1950.³³

The decline in births among the Jews of the United States can be related to an unfavorable change in age composition. The 1957 Survey showed fewer 14 to 24 than 25 to 34 years old (of both sexes, but particularly women), which in time brought a decrease of Jews in the most fertile ages.

But it is not unlikely that also the fertility per se, i.e., irrespective of age structure, of the Jewish women in the United States has dropped in recent years, a trend that is documented for its general population,³⁴ and for Jewish populations elsewhere.³⁵

Aging. The Current Population Survey of 1957 reported directly on the population 14 years old and over: The Jews had the lowest proportion of 14 to 24 years old among the major religious groups in the United States. If the children are added, it is found that the Jews had the lowest proportion of 0 to 24 years old. On the other hand, according to either approach, the Jews had the highest proportion of persons aged 45 years and over. Their median age³⁶ was about 36, as compared with 30 for the total white population at that date. Also, the comparatively large proportion of Jews 45 to 64 years old in 1957 (36 per cent of the 14 years old and over, as against 29 per cent among the total population of that age), together with the low fertility of the Jews, probably have made their aging still more pronounced since 1957. As we have seen, in populations having the characteristics of United States Jews, aging increases the crude death rate and impedes population growth.

Out-marriages and Withdrawals. The actual frequency of out-marriages among United States Jews, and their recent increase, need not be discussed here. For our purposes it is enough to say that they constitute a not negligible percentage of all marriages of Jews. In all probability, they mean, on balance, demographic losses for the Jewish group. Apart from out-marriages, the unmistakable trend toward assimilation and secularization seems to make for a negative balance of withdrawals, as against adhesions.

The combined effect of lower and decreasing fertility, greater aging, out-marriages, and some withdrawals may cast doubts on whether the ratio of 9 to 12 per 1,000 of population sufficiently expresses the annual growth differential (excluding migrations) between Jews and total whites in the United States over the last decade.

For purposes of further comparison it should be mentioned that the Jews of South Africa, similar in age structure to the United States Jews, only increased 6 per 1,000 annually between the 1951 and 1960 censuses. In Canada, where the fertility of the Jews is higher than in the United States, their 1957–1959 rate of natural increase was 7.5 per 1,000. It had steadily declined from more than 12 per 1,000, at the beginning of the decade, and may have continued to drop after 1959. In Australia, the Jewish population increase between the 1961 and 1966 censuses was almost entirely accounted for by the number of new immigrants that were known to the Jewish agencies (and their records may be incomplete); therefore, it is unlikely that there was much surplus of births over deaths and withdrawals. In Israel, the recent annual natural increase of Jews of European origin (including the Israel-born) has been 7.5 per 1,000.

All these demographic considerations are based on the scanty information now available. Definitive information on the recent relative increase of the United States Jewish population, as well as on its absolute size and composition, will emerge from the forthcoming national Jewish population study (pp. 279-84).

19More than 96 per cent indicated some religion; nearly 3 per cent responded that they had no religion.

²⁰U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States: March 1957," Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 79, February 2, 1958. ²¹AJYB, 1959 (Vol. 60), p. 5. ²¹Immigration estimates were given *inter alia* in Ilya Dijour's articles "Jewish Immigration to

the United States since 1944," AJYB, 1961 (Vol. 62), pp. 63-66, and "Jewish Immigration to the United States," AJYB, 1963 (Vol. 64), pp. 77-79; and in Jack J. Diamond, "Jewish Immigration to the United States," AJYB, 1966 (Vol. 67), pp. 92-97.

23 Computation based on statistics in the U.S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the

United States, Washington, D.C., various issues.

²⁴This material is conveniently summarized in Calvin Goldscheider, "Fertility of the Jews," Demography. No. 1, 1967, pp. 196-209; Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, Jewish Ameri-

cans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968).

25Net reproduction, i.e. the number of daughters replacing women of childbearing age in the population, is assessed by deducting from the average fertility of the ever-married women the combined effects of (a) the proportion of women never married, (b) the rate of female mortality in childhood and reproductive age, (c) the sex ratio at birth, as usually somewhat

less than half of all newborn are daughters.

The average completed fertility of women must be more than two children in order to ensure net reproduction, the excess over two being necessary to offset the effects of the above-mentioned factors (a) to (c). The minimum "replacement quota" varies according to demographic circumstances, especially factors (a) and (c).—The 1957 Survey indicated 6.5 per cent never-married among the Jewish women aged 45 and over. Therefore a completed fertility of 2,218 per 1,000 ever-married Jewish women aged 45 and over fell slightly short of replacement needs, even at the recent very low mortality level (in fact, the earlier mortality, which the women aged 45 and over in 1957 survived, was higher; cf. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 84, op. cit., p. 4).

The Population of the United States (Glencoe, Ill., 1959), p. 696.

27This is Rosenthal's own summary—in "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," AJYB, 1963 (Vol. 64), p. 53—of the relevant points in his article "Jewish Fertility in the United States," AJYB, 1961 (Vol. 62), pp. 3-27.

24While both the U.S. and the Canadian data were obtained from samples, the Canadian

sample was very much larger in relation to the population (about 20 per cent), as well

as in absolute numbers.

²⁹Also, the percentage of children among Canada's Jews was higher. It should be noted that the proportion of post-World War II Jewish immigrants and, probably, of all foreign-born Jews is much larger in Canada than in the U.S.

³⁰The census gave the average number of children per 1,000 ever-married Canadian Jewish women, according to age in 1961, as; 2,106 for the 40 to 44 years old; 1,950 for the 45 to 49 years old; 1,873 for the 50 to 54 years old (see note 25).

³¹Also by changes in the birthrate of the Jews of Canada during the 1950s.
³²The Canadian census revealed the following breakdown by age (per 100 of the total Jewish population): 0 to 4 years old, 8.2; 5 to 9 years old, 9.5; 10 to 14 years old, 10.0. In the United States, similar results were obtained in Rochester (1961), Providence (1963),

Detroit (1963), Camden (1964), Springfield (1966), Los Angeles (1966-67).

33 See synopses of local Jewish age compositions in Ben B. Seligman's articles, "The American Jew: Some Demographic Features," AJYB, 1950 (Vol. 51), pp. 3-52; "Recent Demographic Changes in Some Jewish Communities," AJYB, 1953 (Vol. 54), pp. 3-24, and "Some Aspects of Jewish Demography," in Marshall Sklare, ed., The Jews (Glencoe, Ill., 1958), pp. 45-93.

¹⁴See changes in gross reproduction rate in recent issues of U.S. Bureau of Census, Statistical

Abstract of the United States

35See Usiel O. Schmelz, "Guide to Jewish Population Studies," in Schmelz and P. Glikson, eds., Jewish Population Studies, 1961-1968 (Jerusalem: Institute of Contemporary Jewry and London: Institute of Jewish Affairs, 1970).

36The median divides the population into two equal parts, one-half being of higher and the other of lower ages than the median age.

SPECIAL STUDIES

Erich Rosenthal, whose YEAR BOOK articles were cited by Dr. Schmelz, dealt with two major factors determining Jewish population growth: fertility and intermarriage.

In "Jewish Fertility in the United States" (Volume 62, 1961, pp. 3–27), Professor Rosenthal, like Schmelz, cited and analyzed data that had become available from the March 1957 U.S. Bureau of Census sample survey. A comparison of the age distribution of Jews (including only children of Jewish parents) with that of white Protestants and Roman Catholics (including nonwhites) revealed

that the Jews in the United States did not participate in the postwar "baby boom" as much as the Roman Catholics and Protestants. Children under 14 years of age constituted 27.7 per cent of Roman Catholics and 26.7 per cent of white Protestants, but only 22.2 per cent of Jews. Thus, in the 14 years between 1943 and 1957 Jewish fertility was 80.1 and 83.1 per cent of Catholic and Protestant fertility, respectively (p. 4).

It appeared that when children of mixed marriages were also included,

there is a possibility that the fertility of the Jewish population was as little as 73.6 per cent of the Roman Catholic and 79.5 per cent of the white Protestant fertilities between 1943 and 1957 (p. 4).

Enumerating the social determinants of fertility—place of residence, home owner-ship, education, occupation, and income—Rosenthal demonstrated that those making for low fertility generally applied to Jews. Most significant among these was residence:

. . In the United States urban fertility seems to have been two-thirds of rural fertility as early as 1810. By 1940 urban fertility had dropped to 56 per cent of the rural rate, but it rose to 71 per cent in 1950. . . . Within the urban category, the larger the size of a community, the lower the fertility. This inverse relationship was last observed for the United States in the 1950 population census, which found that the fertility ratio in cities with more than three million inhabitants was only 85 per cent of that in cities with fewer than 250,000.

In these respects, the most outstanding characteristic of the Jewish population and the one that distinguishes it most from the other major religious groups is its heavy concentration in cities. in 1957, 96.1 per cent of the Jews resided in cities, as compared with 78.8 per cent of the Roman Catholics and 55.2 per cent of the white Protestants. Furthermore, Jews are concentrated in the larger cities, 87.4 per cent living in "urbanized areas" of 250,000 or more persons, as compared with 53.9 per cent of the Roman Catholics and 24.5 per cent of the white Protestants. . . Further analysis . . leads to the conclusion that at least 86.6 per cent of all Jews in the United States actually reside in urbanized areas with 750,000 or more inhabitants . . . What is more, 52.3 per cent reside in the largest urban agglomeration, the New York area, and 65.8 per cent live in urbanized areas with more than three million residents (pp. 11-12).

Rosenthal showed by means of a table indicating the 1958 Jewish population in the 15 cities of highest population density that

with increasing intensity of urbanization the fertility rate declines progressively, but . . . the current Jewish fertility is 6 points below the rate that prevails in even the most intensively urbanized areas. Since about half of the Jews of the United States live in the New York area, which in 1950 had a population of over 12 million, and two-thirds live in urbanized areas of 3 million and more, one can justify the conclusion that residence is the most significant factor in the low Jewish fertility (p. 13).

According to Rosenthal, the 1957 sample survey found that "on the basis of current fertility and mortality levels, replacement of the white population required 2,130 live births per 1,000 women, single as well as married," and that "the fertility rate of 1,749 per 1,000 ever-married Jewish women of childbearing age is considerably lower." He indicated, however, that while "Jewish fertility... will be influenced primarily by urban residence and concentration in the white-collar occupations, .. [it] will be modified by three new factors: the move to the suburbs, satisfaction of the status drive, and new goals of completely planned fertility" (p. 25). Rosenthal felt that in view of the considerable move of Jews to the suburbs where child-rearing is easier and that many Jews either have already achieved, or were in the process of achieving, social and economic status "at the cost of considerable restriction of fertility," it was "conceivable that Jewish fertility will rise" (p. 26).

In "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States (Volume 64, pp. 3–53), Erich Rosenthal wrote at length on the definition and measurement of intermarriage and its causes in large and small Jewish communities and among small-town Jews. His analysis of data from an earlier Jewish community study of Greater Washington and from his own studies of Iowa and Indiana, the only two states where marriage records show the religious affiliation of brides and grooms, indicated for Washington:

. We now know that a survey of the extent of Jewish intermarriage must be so designed as to cast a net over the whole Jewish as well as non-Jewish population rather than simply those identified as members in or contributors to a Jewish organization. The survey found a rate of intermarriage of 13.1 per cent, more than twice the rate that would have been found if it had been based on a communal listing of Jewish families.

The Washington data also made it possible to study the effect of various social factors on the extent of Jewish intermarriage. Foremost among them is distance from immigration, with the result that among the native-born of native parentage (the third and subsequent generations) the intermarriage rate was about 18 per cent (pp. 31-32).

Rosenthal specified:

The . . . rate rises from about 1 per cent among the first generation—the foreignborn immigrants—to 10.2 per cent for the native-born of foreign parentage and to 17.9 per cent for the native-born of native parentage (third and subsequent generations) (p. 52). The implication for the future growth of the United States Jewish population was that "the children in at least 70 per cent of mixed marriages are lost to the Jewish group."

Rosenthal concluded from the Iowa study:

It was found that for the seven-year period 1953-59 the intermarriage rate fluctuated between 36.3 and 53.6 per cent and averaged 42.2 per cent. This high level does not come as a surprise to students of Iowa Jewish communities, who have observed that a high level of Jewish intermarriage is traditional in the state. A high correlation was found between the size of town or city where marriages were performed and the proportion of intermarriage. While in cities of 10,000 or more, the intermarriage rate was 34.2 per cent, it was almost twice as high in towns and rural areas.

The occupation of Jewish grooms was found to be the second most important factor bearing on intermarriage. In first marriages, grooms in white-collar occupations had an intermarriage level of 27.2 per cent, as compared with 46.8 per cent among blue-collar workers. In other marriages, the disparity between the two occupational groups was even higher. It should be noted that the distribution of white-collar workers is related to urban residence.

- ... It was found that in rural areas the marriage market was so poorly organized that the chances of intermarriage were as high in a first marriage as in a remarriage. In cities of more than 10,000, the marriage market for first marriages was relatively well organized, the intermarriage rate being held to 28.4 per cent. However, in remarriages the intermarriage level was 47.5.
- ... For grooms in other marriages, the level of intermarriage drops for the highest age group. The data for the Jewish brides tend to indicate an inverse relationship between age and intermarriage (pp. 51-52).

In the study, "Jewish Intermarriage in Indiana" (Volume 68, pp. 243-64), Rosenthal established that because of the state's geographic location (contiguous to Chicago and Detroit) a significant factor in the formation of Jewish intermarriages was the usual residence of the bride or groom:

- 1. Couples who had eloped from contiguous states to Indiana had the highest level of intermarriage (67.4 per cent). A detailed analysis of these extrastate marriages pointed to a causal relationship between elopement and intermarriage.
- 2. Couples with one partner usually residing in Indiana and the other outside the state had the lowest intermarriage rate (29.9 per cent). It is assumed that these interstate marriages are arranged marriages or the result of a conscious effort to find a Jewish marriage partner.
- 3. Couples with both spouses residing within the state produce an intermediate level of intermarriage (49.0 per cent). This means that a Jewish young man or woman who relies on finding a spouse close to home has a fifty-fifty chance of inmarriage (p. 263).

It also was possible to "demonstrate empirically the inverse relationship between the size of the community and the rate of intermarriage":

For the individual residing in a Jewish community in the five counties with the highest concentration of Jews, the chances for inmarriage are substantially improved (with an intermarriage rate of 38.6 per cent). In all other counties, where the Jewish population is small, the intermarriage rate is 63.5 per cent (p. 263).

In "Intermarriage in the United States" (Volume 71, pp. 101-21), Arnold Schwartz attempted to summarize and evaluate the findings of the major studies of Jewish intermarriage and pertinent data derived from general and community surveys, as well as some of the extensive literature on the subject. He compared Rosenthal's Iowa and Indiana marriage-record survey results with those of other investigations in these states (pp. 104-05) and discussed intermarriage data gathered by Jewish communities since 1960 in Los Angeles and Long Beach, Cal.; Providence, R.I.; Camden, N.J.; Boston and Springfield, Mass. and Baltimore, Md. (pp. 105-07).

None of these, according to Schwartz, could readily be assumed to be good indicators of the current national situation. Said Schwartz:

A better source . . is a large-scale national sample survey undertaken in 1961 by the National Opinion Research Council (NORC), which collected data for a study of career plans from members of the 1961 graduating class at 135 American colleges and universities. Of the 34,000 respondents in the initial survey in 1961, some 3,650 were Jews. In 1964 a follow-up questionnaire was returned by 23,000 respondents, about 10 per cent of them Jews. In the interval between the first survey and the 1964 follow-up, 60 per cent of the respondents had married; the percentage among Jewish students was 57. Since the survey instrument included questions on the religious identification and marital status of the students, the data collected are a valuable source of information on the current intermarriage situation. They reach beyond the local scope of community studies. They have drawn into their net Jews who might not be included in samples drawn from Jewish community master lists—i.e., any student who declared that he was a Jew or was willing to acknowledge that his parents were Jews-at a time when the large majority of young Jews are in college. . The data are currently being analyzed for a study of intermarriage by Fred Sherrow of Columbia University.²⁸

However... the findings of the NORC survey, too, must be regarded as underestimating the extent of current intermarriage. The data refer to a young population of whom only a portion had married; available evidence suggests that those who intermarry tend to marry at a later age than those who remain endogamous.²⁹ It is therefore likely that the intermarriage rate of the 43 per cent not yet married in 1964 will be somewhat higher than that reported for the already married population.

Sherrow derives various Jewish intermarriage rates from the NORC data, ranging from 5 to 21 per cent. Twenty-one per cent of all married couples with at least one partner a Jew by birth are intermarried couples, one spouse being a non-Jew by birth. This figure is comparable to the 20 per cent found in Boston. But when current religion, rather than religion of origin, is examined, the rate falls sharply, to 12 per cent. A considerable portion of the drop is to be attributed to conversion of non-Jewish spouses to Judaism. Another part is to be attributed to an opposite cause, the abandonment of Jewish identification by the Jewish partner.

These rates are for couples. The intermarriage rates of individuals are considerably lower. The NORC data reveal that between 10 and 12 per cent of individuals who were Jews by birth married a spouse of non-Jewish origin. With *current* religious identification, the individual rate drops to 7 per cent (pp. 108–09).

²⁸Fred Sherrow, Patterns of Intermarriage Among Recent College Graduates, Ph.D. dissertation (in process), Columbia University. We thank Mr. Sherrow for having shared his preliminary findings with us.

¹⁹The reasons for this phenomenon usually refer to the limited availability of marriage partners of one's own religion, and the loosening of ties with parents, who are a force against intermarriage, as one gets older. "After a certain number of marriageable years have passed and a Jew has been unable to find a Jewish mate, the intermarriage taboo apparently loses some of its force": Louis A. Berman, Jewish mate, the intermarriage taboo apparently and Culture (New York, 1968), pp. 94–95. See also Jerrold S. Heiss, "Premarital Characteristics of Religiously Intermarried," American Sociological Review, 1960, pp. 47–55, and Erich Rosenthal, "Jewish Intermarriage in Iowa," American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 64 (1963), pp. 46–49.

The article further discussed the losses to the Jewish community from intermarriages, and how there losses relate to the growing social acceptability of such marriages.

Data from the NORC study do not corroborate a trend toward increasing conversion among the young. They show a conversion rate in intermarriages of less than 20 per cent, far lower than that of the younger population of the community studies. Eighteen per cent of the Protestant wives of Jewish husbands, and 15 per cent of Protestant husbands of Jewish wives, converted to Judaism. Eighteen per cent of Catholic women married to Jews converted, and 13 per cent of Catholic men. Fourteen per cent of women with no religious identification who married Jews converted to Judaism, and 9 per cent of no-religion men.

The substantially lower conversion rate among the NORC respondents can be variously explained. The conversion rates found in Providence and Springfield may not be representative of the national situation. It also may be that the NORC data suggest a newly emerging conversion pattern reflecting a weakening of proscription against intermarriage (p. 111).

The study also provided data on the retention of Jewish identification among those who intermarry:

Sixty-six per cent of Jewish men married to Protestants remained Jews, and 58 per cent of Jewish girls married to Protestants. Of Jews married to Catholics, 62 per cent of the men and 53 per cent of the women remained Jews. Of Jewish men married to spouses having no religious identification, 38 per cent continued to identify as Jews; of Jewish women, 50 per cent. In sum, more than 55 per cent of all intermarried individuals retained their Jewish identification.

By considering the retention of Jewish identification and conversion to Judaism, on the one hand, and the abandonment of Jewish identification through indifference or active conversion, on the other, Sherrow has calculated from the NORC data the demographic loss to the Jewish population caused by various types of intermarriage. In intermarriages involving Protestants, the net loss for Jews was 20 per cent; in marriages involving Catholics, 26 per cent, and in marriages between Jews and those of no religious identification, 47 per cent. The net demographic loss from all Jewish intermarriages was 30 per cent of the population involved in intermarriages (p. 112).

As for the effect of intermarriage on the fertility rate,

It is sometimes suggested that intermarried couples have fewer children than intramarried couples. However, data are sparse, the only recent findings being those of Goldstein and Goldscheider in Providence.* There a significantly higher proportion of intermarried than of intramarried couples were childless, 26.1 per cent compared to 9.7 per cent among those couples where the wife was over 45, and 14.3 per cent compared to 8.0 per cent where the wife was under 45. Similarly, the mean number of children ever born to intermarried couples was lower than of those born to intramarried couples: 1.6, compared to 2.2, in the older group. Goldstein and Goldscheider speculate that the narrowing of the fertility gap among the younger intermarried couples may reflect an increase in the social acceptability of interfaith marriages (p. 114).

*Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968) p. 167ff.

Schwartz concluded the article with a discussion of the rabbinate's attitude toward intermarriage, and a note about the unpredictability of the future course of such marriages.

SUMMING UP

The opening sentence of Sidney Goldstein's "American Jewry, 1970: A Demographic Profile," (Volume 72 [1971], pp. 3–88) clearly expressed the rationale behind the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK decision, at its inception, to present an uninterrupted account of the demography of American Jews: Basic to an evaluation of the current status and future prospects of the Jewish community in the United States is an analysis of the group's demographic structure: its size, distribution, and composition, and factors affecting its future growth and character (p. 3). Goldstein's analysis has such breadth and comprehensiveness that it may serve as a summation and interpretation of the extensive data of which this reader is but an excerpt.

Two interrelated factors, said Goldstein, set into motion the social forces that determined the pattern of Jewish life in America:

First, from 1880 to the mid-1920's, the size of the Jewish population increased rapidly, from less than a quarter of a million to an estimated 4.2 million. This phenomenal growth converted the Jewish population in America from an insignificant minority, too small to establish anything more complex than localized Jewish communal life, to a substantial and vibrant national American subsociety. At the beginning of the 1970's the American Jewish community, numbering about 6 million, constitutes the largest concentration of Jews in the world. Yet

they are less than 3 per cent of the total population, and, in fact, are undergoing a continuous decline in proportion, as the total population grows at a faster rate than do the Jews.

The second major factor . . . is the source of its population growth. The tremendous increase in number was not the result of natural growth. nor was the growth evenly spread over the nine decades. Rather, the increase was primarily the consequence of the heavy immigration of East European Jews between 1870

and 1924. Before 1870, the American Jewish community was composed largely of first- and second-generation German Jews who had immigrated in the 50 preceding years. . . . By the 1920's . . . [these] no longer constituted the dominant Jewish subcommunity in America, but were submerged in the overwhelming numbers of East European immigrants, 2.5 million of whom arrived between 1870 and 1924. The immigration quota laws of the 1920's ended the mass influx of East European Jews, and since then the growth of the American-Jewish population has been remarkably slow. . . . Increasingly . . . the character of the American Jewish community is the result of internal changes among native-born American Jews. And the growing dominance of this segment of the population has set the stage for the significant social and cultural changes within the Jewish population, . . . [with] major consequences for the structure of the Jewish community and for the lives of American Jews (pp. 5-6).

An enumeration of the sources of available demographic data and their limitations was followed by discussion of the characteristics of Jews—usually in relation to the general population of the United States—based on various surveys, most of them reported in the pages of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK.

Goldstein's profile is, in essence, the demographic history of the American Jewish community. He recapitulates in a final section which assesses future development of the Jewish community in the United States:

Numbering about 6 million in 1970, after slow growth during all but the first several decades of this century, the Jewish population is likely to continue its slow increase. The low rate of growth results particularly from the low level of Jewish fertility, which is below that of Protestants and Catholics and hovers close to the minimum needed for replacement. Limited data suggest that death rates of Jews are slightly below those of the general population, but the over-all death rate of the Jewish population is likely to rise as the average age increases. This, together with possible larger losses from intermarriage, will contribute to maintenance, if not accentuation, of the slow growth rate. As a result, the Jewish population, even while growing slightly, will come to constitute an increasingly smaller proportion of the total American population, having already declined from the peak of 3.7 to less than 3 per cent by 1970.

While declining as a per cent of the total population, Jews will also become more dispersed throughout the United States. As a result of continuously higher education and changing occupations, lower levels of self-employment, weakening family ties, and reduced discrimination, Jews are likely to migrate in increasing numbers away from the major centers of Jewish population. This will operate on several levels. Regionally, it will lead to fewer Jews in the Northeast. Jews will continue to be highly concentrated in metropolitan areas; but, within the metropolitan areas, ever increasing numbers will move out of the urban centers and former ghettos into the suburbs. In doing so, the Jewish population will become much more geographically dispersed, even while distinct areas of Jewish concentration remain.

As a result of the significant reduction in Jewish immigration to the United States since the 1920's and the subsequent aging and death of the immigrants, the most striking compositional change characterizing American Jewry is the reduction in the per cent of foreign-born. Indeed, even the proportion of second-generation American Jews will increasingly diminish as third- and fourth-generation persons

become an even larger proportion of the Jewish population, with all this implies for questions of Jewish identification and assimilation. Reflecting their lower fertility, the Jewish population, already six years older on the average than the general population, is likely to undergo further aging. This will mean a considerable increase in the proportion of older persons as well as of the widowed, especially women.

Already unique in their high concentration among the more educated, high white-collar and high income groups, the Jews may undergo still further changes. College education will be an almost universal phenomenon among them, and an increasing proportion will pursue graduate studies. The high proportion of Jews who obtain specialized university training, their tendency to move out of small family businesses and into salaried employment, and their increasing willingness to seek and take positions away from their community of current residence may bring an increase in the number of Jews in technical and executive occupations within the top professional and managerial occupational categories, where they already are heavily concentrated.

These demographic changes point to a number of challenges which the American Jewish community must face. In the last three decades of the 20th century, increasing Americanization will continue, as judged by greater geographic dispersion, a higher per cent of third- and fourth-generation Americans, and narrowing of such key socio-economic differentials as education, occupation, and income. To what extent will the diminution in the distinctive population characteristics of Jews and their greater residential integration lead to behavioral convergence? The risks or opportunities for this to occur, depending on how one views the situation, are increasingly present. Recent research suggests that, while growing similarity on the behavioral level is likely, structural separation and the continuity of Jewish identification will persist. The direction of changes appears to be the adjustment of American Jews to the American way of life, creating a meaningful balance between Jewishness and Americanism (pp. 85–87).

JACK J. DIAMOND

American Jewish Year Book Estimates of Jewish Population in the United States *

| Vol. | Year | Estimate | Vol. | Year | Estimate |
|------|--------------------|---|------|-----------|--------------------------|
| 1 | 1899–1900 | 1,043,800° | 22 | 1920–1921 | 3,390,301° 3,300,000° |
| 2 | 19 00 –1901 | 1,058,135 | | | 3,390,301 |
| 3 | 1901–1902 | 1,045,555° 885,200™ | 23 | 1921–1922 | 3,300,000 ^b |
| | 1002 1002 | 1,288,200 ^{bd} | 24 | 1922–1923 | 3,390,301° 3,300,000° |
| 4 | 1902–1903 | 1,136,240 | 25 | 1923-1924 | 3,602,150 |
| 5 | 1903–1904 | 1,127,268 | 26 | 1924–1925 | 3,602,220° |
| 6 | 1904–1905 | 1,253,213* | 27 | | 3,602,220 |
| 7 | 1905–1906 | 1,418,813 ^a | | 1925–1926 | |
| 8 | 1906–1907 | 1,418,013° | 28 | 1926–1927 | 3,602,220° |
| _ | | 1,508,435* | 29 | 1927–1928 | 3,602,220° |
| 9 | 1907–1908 | 1,777,185°b | 30 | 1928–1929 | 4,228,029 |
| 10 | 1908–1909 | 1,508,435 | 31 | 1929-1930 | 4,228,029 |
| | | 1,777,185ab | 32 | 1930-1931 | 4,228,029* |
| 11 | 1909–1910 | 1,508,435° 1,777,185° | 33 | 1931–1932 | 4,228,029* |
| | | 1,508,435* | 34 | 1932–1933 | 4,228,029 |
| 12 | 1910–1911 | 1,777,185 ^{ab} 2,044,762 ^b | 35 | 1933–1934 | 4,228,029 |
| | | 1,508,435* | 36 | 1934–1935 | 4,228,029 |
| 13 | 1911–1912 | 1,777,185 ^{ab} 2,044,762 ^b | 37 | 1935–1936 | 4,228,029* |
| | | 1,508,435* | 38 | 1936–1937 | 4,228,029 |
| 14 | 1912–1913 | 1,777,185** | 39 | 1937–1938 | 4,228,029° |
| | | 2,044,762 | 40 | 1938–1939 | 4,228,029* |
| 15 | 1913–1914 | 1,508,435° 1,777,185° | 41 | 1939–1940 | 4,831,180° |
| | | 2,043,762 | 42 | 1940-1941 | 4,770,647° |
| 16 | 1914–1915 | 2,349,754 2,933,374 ^b | 43 | 1941–1942 | 4,770,647* |
| 17 | 1915–1916 | 2,349,754 | 44 | 1942-1943 | 4,770,647° |
| 18 | 1916–1917 | 2,349,754 | 45 | 1943–1944 | 4,770,647* |
| 19 | 1917–1918 | 3,012,141 | 46 | 1944–1945 | 4,770,647* |
| | | 3,390,572° | 47 | 1945-1946 | 4,770,647° |
| 20 | 1918–1919 | • | 48 | 1946–1947 | 4,770,647 |
| 21 | 1919–1920 | 3,390,301° 3,300,000° | 49 | 1947–1948 | 4,770,647 |
| | | | | | |

318 / AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1977

| Vol. | Year | Estimate | Vol. | Year | Estimate |
|------|-----------|------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 50 | 1948–1949 | 4,500,000 | 64 | 1963 | 5,586,560* |
| 51 | 1950 | 5,000,000° | 65 | 1964 | 5,599,000° |
| 52 | 1951 | 4,700,000 | 66 | 1965 | 5,669,000* |
| 53 | 1952 | 5,000,000° | 67 | 1966 | 5,721,000° |
| 54 | 1953 | 5,000,000° | 68 | 1967 | 5,720,000 |
| 55 | 1954 | 5,000,000+ | 69 | 1968 | 5,779,845 |
| 56 | 1955 | 5,000,000+ | 70 | 1969 | 5,868,555* |
| 57 | 1956 | 5,000,000 ^r | 70 71 | 1970 | 5,868,555 |
| 58 | 1957 | 5,197,000 | 72 | 1971 | 5,870,000 |
| 59 | 1958 | 5,255,000* | 73 | 1972 | 6,059,730 |
| 60 | 1959 | 5,261,550* | 74 | 1972 | 6,115,320° |
| 61 | 1960 | 5,367,200 | | | 5,731,685 |
| 62 | 1961 | 5,531,500 | 75 | 1974–1975 | 5,370,000° |
| 63 | 1962 | 5,509,730 | 76 | 1976 | 5,731,685* |
| | | | | | |

^{*}AJYB also uses Jewish calendar years from Vol. 1 to Vol. 50. Thus, Vol. 1 is 5660.

^{*}Total of breakdown by states and territories

^bAlternate estimate

^cMinimum estimate for 37 states of 47. ^dMaximum estimate for 37 states of 47.

^{&#}x27;From section on World Jewish Population.

Breakdown by states not totaled. Excludes non-Jews in "Jewish" households.

JEWISH IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES FROM 1880-81 TO 1975-76

| | Number | | Number | | Number |
|-----------|----------|---------------------|----------|---------|--------------|
| Year | Admitted | Year | Admitted | Year | Admitted |
| 1880-81 | (| 1912-13 | 101,330 | 1944-45 | 4,160 |
| 1881-82 | (| 1913–14 | 138,051 | 1945-46 | 12,774 |
| 1882-83 | (74,310 | 1914–15 | 26,497 | 1946-47 | 29,274 |
| 1883-84 | (| 1915–16 | 15,108 | 1947-48 | 17,581 |
| 1884–85 | 19,611 | 1916–17 | 17,342 | 1948-49 | 41,222 |
| 1885–86 | 29,658 | 1917–18 | 3,627 | 1949-50 | 13,057 |
| 1886–87 | 27,468 | 1918–19 | 3,055 | 1950-51 | 18,239 |
| 1887–88 | 31,363 | 1919-20 | 14,292 | 1951-52 | 7,800 |
| 1888–89 | 23,962 | 1920-21 | 119,036 | 1952-53 | 7,250(5,353) |
| 1889-90 | 34,303 | 1921-22 | 53,524 | 1953-54 | 5,000(3,933) |
| 1890-91 | 69,139 | 1922-23 | 49,719 | 1954-55 | 4,700(3,253) |
| 1891–92 | 60,325 | 1923-24 | 49,989 | 1955-56 | 3,850(6,513) |
| 1892–93 | 32,943 | 1924–25 | 10,292 | 1956-57 | 10,876 |
| 1893–94 | 22,108 | 1925-26 | 10,267 | 1957-58 | 7,160 |
| 1894–95 | 32,077 | 1926-27 | 11,483 | 1958-59 | 8,098 |
| 1895–96 | 28,118 | 1927–28 | 11,639 | 1959–60 | 6,622 |
| 1896–97 | 20,684 | 1928–29 | 12,479 | 1960-61 | 7,102 |
| 1897–98 | 27,409 | 1929–30 | 11,526 | 1961–62 | 9,325 |
| 1898–99 | 37,415 | 1930–31 | 5,692 | 1962–63 | 10,750 |
| 1899-1900 | 60,764 | 1931–32 | 2,755 | 1963–64 | 9,300 |
| 1900-01 | 58,098 | 1932–33 | 2,372 | 1964–65 | 7,800 |
| 1901–02 | 57,688 | 1933–34 | 4,134 | 1965-66 | 7,500 |
| 1902-03 | 76,203 | 1934–35 | 4,837 | 1966–67 | 6,600 |
| 1903-04 | 106,236 | 1935–36 | 6,252 | 1967–68 | 7,800 |
| 1904–05 | 129,910 | 1936–37 | 11,352 | 1968-69 | 9,300 |
| 1905–06 | 153,748 | 1937–38 | 19,736 | 1969–70 | 7,700 |
| 1906–07 | 149,182 | 1938-39 | 43,450 | 1970–71 | 5,525 |
| 1907–08 | 103,386 | 1939–40 | 36,945 | 1971–72 | 5,520 |
| 1908–09 | 57,551 | 1940-41 | 23,737 | 1972–73 | 6,625 |
| 1909-10 | 84,260 | 1941–42 | 10,608 | 1973-74 | 9,300 |
| 1910–11 | 91,223 | 1942-43 | 4,705 | 1974–75 | 11,800 |
| 1911–12 | 80,595 | 1943 -44 | 2,400 | 1975–76 | NI |

NOTE: Number of Jews arriving in United States "in steerage" compiled by private agencies for period from 1880 to 1898. Ports of New York and Philadelphia for whole period, Baltimore from 1891 on.

Beginning 1898, more complete statistics are available for immigrants admitted in reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration and used in AJYB.

Federal immigration statistics for "Hebrews" included through 1942-43.

Vol. 62(1961) p. 64 has annual estimates of Jewish immigration to 1958-59.

Vol. 60(1959) had conflicting figures for 1952-53 to 1955-56.

Figures for 1959-1960 to 1966-67 are estimates published in AJYB.

From 1967-68 on are estimates from United Hias Service Statistical Abstracts.