

United Jewish Communities
Report Series on the
National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01



Nazi Victims
Residing
in the United States

Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz
Lorraine Blass
Danyelle Neuman

APRIL 2004

report **2**

NJPS Co-Chairs

Mandell L. Berman
Edward H. Kaplan

NJPS Trustees

Andrea and Charles Bronfman Philanthropies
AVI CHAI Foundation
Mandell L. Berman
Charles and Lynn Schusterman
Family Foundation
Council of Jewish Federations
Endowment Fund
Crown & Goodman Family
David & Inez Myers Foundation
William Davidson
Eugene Applebaum Family Foundation
J.E. and Z.B. Butler Foundation
Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland
Jewish Federation of Greater Washington
Endowment Fund
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit
Jewish United Fund/Jewish Federation of
Metropolitan Chicago
Edward H. Kaplan
Leonard and Tobee Kaplan
Philanthropic Fund
Mandel Supporting Foundations
Robert Russell Memorial Foundation
UJA Federation of New York
United Jewish Appeal
United Jewish Communities

UJC Professional Leadership for NJPS

Lorraine Blass, *NJPS Project Manager*
Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, *NJPS Research
Director*
Jonathon Ament, *Senior Project Director*
Debbie Bursztyn, *Database Manager*

UJC Officers

Max M. Fisher, *Honorary Chair of the Board*
Robert Goldberg, *Chair of the Board*
Morton B. Plant, *Chair of the Executive Committee*
S. Stephen Selig III, *National Campaign Chair*
Kathy Manning, *Treasurer*
Joseph Kanfer, *Assistant Treasurer*
Karen Shapira, *Secretary*

Vice Chairs
Mark Hauser
Julia Koschitzky
Judy Levin
Morris Offit
Robert M. Schrayner
Richard Wexler
Mark Wilf
Harold Zlot

Stephen H. Hoffman, *President/CEO*

—
This report was made possible in part by funding
from the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against
Germany.

Cover photo: USHMM, courtesy of Julien Engel.



INTRODUCTION

MAY 2004 marks the fifty-ninth year since the end of the Second World War in Europe. Although many years have passed, communal interest and concern for victims of the Holocaust has not diminished.

This report utilizes data from the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01 to examine Nazi victims living in the United States today, concentrating on the demographic, social and economic characteristics of victims as they age and potentially become more dependent on Jewish communal and public resources. Definitions of victims and population projections are provided first, followed by demographic profiles of victims and analysis of their potential economic and social vulnerability.

Two sets of comparisons run through the report. First, victims are compared to non-victims of the same age. Second, two segments of the victim population – those who arrived in the United States in 1965 or before, and those who came to live here after 1965 – are compared with each other.

The report's key findings include:

- An estimated 122,000 Nazi victims currently reside in the United States.
- Victims are more economically and socially vulnerable than non-victims, report poorer health and more health conditions that limit daily activities compared to non-victims, and have somewhat greater social service needs than non-victims.
- On almost all indicators of economic, social and health status, victims who arrived in the U.S. after 1965 are appreciably worse off than non-victims, demonstrating that the post-1965 arrivals are especially vulnerable to economic and social difficulties. In contrast, victims who arrived in the U.S. by 1965 enjoy parity with non-victims on many but not all of these indicators.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

THE NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION SURVEY 2000-01 is a nationally representative survey of the Jewish population living in the U.S. The survey was administered to a random sample of approximately 4500 Jews and 600 people with Jewish background. Interviewing for NJPS took place from August 21, 2000 to August 30, 2001 and was conducted by telephone. The sample of telephone numbers called was selected by a computer through a Random Digit Dialing (RDD) procedure, thus permitting access to both listed and unlisted numbers in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The margin of error when the entire sample is used for analysis is +/- 2%. The margin of error for subsamples is larger.

The NJPS questionnaire included over 300 questions on a wide variety of topics, including household characteristics, demographic subjects, health and social service needs, economic characteristics, and Jewish background, behavior and attitudes.

The questionnaire was divided into long-form and short-form versions. The long-form version was administered to respondents whose responses to selective early questions indicated stronger Jewish connections; these respondents represent 4.3 million Jews, or over 80% of all U.S. Jews. The short-form version, which omitted many questions on Jewish topics, was given to respondents whose answers on the same selective early questions indicated Jewish connections that are not as strong; they represent an additional 800,000 Jews. People of Jewish background received either the short or long-form version depending on their early answers to the selective questions; they were subsequently not defined as part of the Jewish population estimates because they acknowledged practicing another monotheistic religion (i.e., Christianity or in rare cases Islam).

Questions used to define Nazi victims were on the long-form version of the questionnaire. The 146 respondents identified as victims in this report were originally classified and interviewed as part of the population with stronger Jewish connections; 2 were subsequently re-classified to the less engaged part of the Jewish population and 2 as people of Jewish background. In order to be maximally inclusive in defining the victim population, this report utilizes answers from all 146 respondents, and for stylistic purposes refers to all of them as Jews.

For further methodological information, see the Methodological Appendix in *The National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01: Strength, Challenge and Diversity in the American Jewish Population*, A United Jewish Communities Report (available at www.ujc.org/njps.)

DEFINITIONS AND POPULATION ESTIMATES OF NAZI VICTIMS

IN THE NJPS QUESTIONNAIRE, three questions were used to identify Nazi victims. These questions were asked only of respondents who reported earlier in the interview that they were 55 years of age or older (at the time of the survey in 2000-01) and were born in Europe or the former Soviet Union (FSU). The first of these questions asked respondents if they were living in a country that was under Nazi control from 1933-1945. If the respondent answered yes, a second question determined whether they had been in a labor or concentration camp. The third question, which asked if the respondent left a country between 1933-1945 because it was occupied by the Nazis, was administered to respondents who answered “no” to either of the two prior questions. Thus the NJPS 2000-01 questionnaire divided victims into two categories: those who were living in a country under Nazi control between 1933-1945, and those who were flight cases. For the purposes of this analysis, the two groups are combined into one that is collectively referred to as “victims.” The NJPS questions follow standards for defining Nazi victims established in previous studies.

Based on age and place of birth, a total of 240 NJPS respondents qualified to answer the first question used to identify Nazi victims. Of these, 107 claimed to have lived in a country that was under Nazi occupation, and of these, 27 people responded that they were in a concentration camp and 21 people reported that they were in a labor camp. An additional 39 respondents said that they left the country in which they were living because of the Nazis. Thus, a total of 146 (107 + 39 = 146) Nazi victims were identified in NJPS.

NJPS data are weighted to produce population estimates. The 146 NJPS respondents who were identified as victims represent a total victim population of 122,000 people, including 87,000 who lived in a country under Nazi control and 35,000 flight cases. Among the 87,000 who lived in a country under Nazi control, 21,000 (24%) were in concentration camps and 16,000 (18%) were in labor camps. The 122,000 victims represent 7% of all U.S. Jews over the age of 55.

COMPARISONS: VICTIMS AND NON-VICTIMS

IN THE ANALYSES THAT FOLLOW, the 122,000 victims as a whole are first compared to all other American Jews over the age of 55, who comprise nearly 1.6 million people. Then, comparisons are made within the victim population according to year of arrival in the United States. The victim population is divided into two groups, those who immigrated to the U.S. in 1965 or before, and those who arrived here after 1965. Since all victims by definition are immigrants to this country, year of immigration provides analytically useful indications of how long victims have had to adjust to living in a new society and potential economic and social needs that are associated with recency of arrival. Among all victims, 63,000 arrived in 1965 or earlier, and 58,000 have arrived in the post-1965 period (3 respondents representing over 1,500 victims did not reveal to survey interviewers when they arrived in the U.S.).

For the sake of brevity, victims who arrived in 1965 or before are termed “pre-1965 victims,” though they include approximately 1,300 people who arrived during 1965. victims who arrived after 1965 are called “post-1965 victims.” In both cases, of course, “pre-1965” and “post-1965” refer to year of arrival in the United States, not to the years when victims suffered directly under the Nazi regime.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF VICTIMS

THIS SECTION OF THE REPORT provides comparative information on victims’ and non-victims’ demographic characteristics, including country of origin, age, gender, region, length of time in current residence, housing tenure, marital status, education, employment status and occupation. Demographic variables often provide important information about social and economic status and stability, and consequently the potential for social and economic vulnerability and distress.

Country of origin

By definition, all victims were born in Europe or the former Soviet Union (FSU), but among non-victims over the age of 55, just over 12% were born outside the U.S. The plurality of non-victim immigrants was born in Russia (15%) followed by Israel/Palestine (9%), Ukraine (9%), Germany (8%), Great Britain (8%), Canada (7%) and Poland (5%).

Pre-1965 and post-1965 victims are from distinctive sets of countries. Among pre-1965 victims, a plurality was born in Germany (41%), with others from Poland (21%), Austria (11%), Czechoslovakia/Czech Republic (6%) and Hungary (6%). Still smaller percentages of pre-1965 victims are from other countries in central, southern and western Europe, and less than 1% are from the FSU.

In contrast, post-1965 victims are overwhelmingly from the FSU. Indeed, 93% of victims who immigrated to this country after 1965 are originally from the FSU, with the clear majority having been born in Ukraine (66%), followed by smaller percentages born in Belarus (11%) and Russia (10%). The largest percentages of post-1965 victims from outside the FSU are from Poland (3%) and Romania (3%).

Age

Victims tend to be older than non-victims. The median age of all victims is 71, compared to 68 for non-victims (who by definition for these analyses

are all over the age of 55). The proportion of young elderly (age 65-74) and old elderly (age 75 and above) varies across the groups as well. The young elderly comprise 48% of victims and 36% of non-victims, while the old elderly are 33% of victims and 27% of non-victims.

In turn, pre-1965 victims are older on average than post-1965 victims. The median age of pre-1965 victims is 75, compared to 68 for post-1965 victims. The proportion of young elderly (age 65-74) and old elderly (age 75 and older) also varies across the two groups of victims. The young elderly comprise 41% of pre-1965 victims and 56% of post-1965 victims. In contrast, 48% of pre-1965 victims and just 17% of post-1965 victims are 75 or over.

Gender

The victim population is disproportionately female. Women are 62% of all victims, and 62% of both pre-1965 and post-1965 victim groups. In comparison, 54% of non-victims are women.

Region

A majority of victims (53%) live in the Northeast region of the U.S., but only a plurality of non-victims (35%) do so. The other region of the country where the two groups are differently distributed is the South, where 13% of victims and 31% of non-victims reside. In contrast, the two groups have similar proportions residing in the Midwest (8% victims, 12% non-victims) and West (26% victims, 22% non-victims).

The geographic distribution of the two victim populations also differs. Among pre-1965 victims, 47% live in the Northeast, 6% live in the Midwest, 18% live in the South, and 29% live in the West. By contrast, among post-1965 victims, a full 60% live in the Northeast and 10% in the Midwest, while only 8% reside in the South and 23% in the West.

Length of time in current residence

Victims are more likely to have moved to their primary residence in the five years prior to the study (39%) than non-victims (30%). In addition, consistent with their more recent international migration, a significantly

larger percentage of post-1965 victims than pre-1965 victims report moving to their current primary residence since 1995. In fact, a majority (56%) of post-1965 victims has settled into their current residence since 1995, compared to 23% of pre-1965 victims.

Housing tenure

Victims differ from non-victims in terms of their housing tenure, that is, whether they own or rent their residence, or live in an institutional setting. Victims display potentially less residential stability than non-victims. Fifty percent of victims own their home, compared to 78% of non-victims. Conversely, 37% of victims and 21% of non-victims rent their home. Importantly, 10% of all victims live in retirement or assisted living facilities, compared to less than 1% of non-victims.

Much of the discrepancy between victims and non-victims in terms of housing tenure is due to post-1965 victims. Significantly, just 10% of post-1965 victims own their own residence, 68% are renting, and 19% live in a retirement or assisted living facility. In contrast, the pre-1965 victim population compares favorably to non-victims. Eighty-seven percent of pre-1965 victims own their home, only 8% rent, and less than 2% reside in retirement or assisted living facilities.

Marital status

Differences exist between victims and non-victims regarding marital status. Seventy percent of all victims are married, compared to 62% of non-victims. In contrast, non-victims are more likely to be divorced than victims (13% to 7%). In contrast, very similar percentages of people in each group are widowed: 19% among non-victims and 17% among victims.

Differences in marital status are also evident across the two victim groups when compared to each other. Post-1965 victims are more likely to be married, at 75%, compared to 66% among pre-1965 victims. Pre-1965 victims, in turn, are more likely to be widowed, at 24%, compared to 17% among post-1965 victims. Lastly, pre-1965 victims are more likely to be divorced (9%) than post-1965 victims (4%), but both of these percentages are less than the 13% for non-victims.

Education

The educational profile of victims is somewhat different than non-victims, but not in any way that indicates a significant educational disadvantage.

Among victims, 48% report their highest degree being a high school diploma or less, while 52% report some kind of degree from a college or university (including 3% with an associate's degree, 36% with a bachelor's degree, and 13% with a graduate degree). In comparison, 45% of non-victims have a high school diploma or less and 54% have a degree from a college or university (including 7% with an associate's degree, 26% with a bachelor's degree, and 21% with a graduate degree).

The educational profiles of the two victim groups are different from each other, with post-1965 victims displaying an educational advantage over pre-1965 victims. One-third (33%) of post-1965 victims say their highest degree is a high school diploma or less, while 66% report obtaining a college or university degree (including 4% with an associate's degree, an absolute majority of 53% with a bachelor's degree, and 9% with a graduate degree). In contrast, high school or less is the highest degree for 60% of pre-1965 victims, and just 41% of pre-1965 victims earned a college or university degree (including 2% with an associate's degree, 22% with a bachelor's degree, and 17% with a graduate degree). These percentages suggest that post-1965 victims had significant access to educational opportunities in the FSU despite World War II, while the formal educational opportunities of pre-1965 victims were more often restricted by their wartime and post-war immigrant experiences.

Employment Status

Non-victims are more than twice as likely as victims to be working. A third of non-victims (33%) are still employed, compared to 14% of victims. The majority of both non-victims (55%) and victims (59%) are retired. The most distinguishing factor about employment status concerns disabilities. Twenty-three percent of all victims are disabled and unable to work, compared to 5% of non-victims.

While similar proportions of pre-1965 (16%) and post-1965 (12%)

victims are employed, the victim subgroups differ in two important ways in terms of their employment status. First, 79% of pre-1965 victims but only 35% of post-1965 victims are retired from their jobs. Second, most of the victims who cannot work due to a disability are post-1965 victims. In fact, 49% of post-1965 victims are disabled and unable to work, compared to just 1% of pre-1965 victims.

Occupation

Among those who are working, the distribution of job categories is quite similar between victims and non-victims. Fifty-seven percent of each group is employed in the three highest-status job categories (management/executive, business and finance, and professional/technical). Thirty-one percent of non-victims and 29% of victims are in middle status jobs (service, sales, and office and administrative support). Victims, in turn, are slightly more likely to be in the lowest status occupations: 12% of victims and 7% of non-victims are foremen, skilled or unskilled workers.

Distinguishing between pre-1965 and post-1965 victims reveals that the subgroups tend to hold different types of jobs. For example, 70% of pre-1965 victims report they are in the three highest-status job categories (management/executive, business and finance, and professional/technical), compared to 35% of post-1965 victims. Similar percentages of both groups are in middle status jobs (service, sales, and office and administrative support): 30% of pre-1965 victims and 26% of post-1965 victims. In contrast, nearly a third (32%) of post-1965 victims are foremen, skilled or unskilled workers, while hardly any pre-1965 victims hold these types of jobs.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL VULNERABILITY

THIS SECTION OF THE REPORT directly examines issues of economic and social vulnerability among Nazi victims, including evaluations of their financial situation, measures of household income and poverty, and reports on receipt of Social Security payments. It then addresses social isolation, health problems and social service needs in the victim population. In general, it shows that victims are more economically and socially vulnerable, report poorer health and more health problems, and have somewhat greater social service needs. Within the victim population, post-1965 victims are more vulnerable than pre-1965 victims.

Table 1, attached at the end of this report, provides population estimates for all victims combined and the two victim subgroups, for selected economic and social characteristics discussed in this section of the report. Table 2, also attached to the end of this report, summarizes the percentages presented in the text of this section.

Financial evaluations

NJPS respondents were asked to evaluate their household's financial situation, and were given the following options as answers: can't make ends meet, just managing, comfortable, very comfortable and wealthy. A majority of both victims (52%) and non-victims (56%) replied "comfortable." However, proportionally more victims (35%) than non-victims (23%) said they were "just managing," and proportionally fewer victims (9%) than non-victims (16%) said they were "very comfortable." Few members of either group gave answers at one extreme (can't make ends meet) or the other (wealthy), with no significant difference between the groups.

Examining the victim population more closely reveals that post-1965 victims provide more negative evaluations about their financial situation than pre-1965 victims. Majorities of both pre-1965 victims (52%) and post-1965 victims (53%) said they are "comfortable," but 43% of post-1965 victims reported that they are "just managing," compared to 27% of

pre-1965 victims. In contrast, just 2% of post-1965 victims said they were "very comfortable," significantly less than the 15% of pre-1965 victims who selected this answer.

Income

All respondents were asked to report their total household income for 1999. As is typical in survey research, many respondents refused to answer the question on income, including 34% of victims (39% of pre-1965 victims and 27% of post-1965 immigrant victims) and 31% of non-victims.

Among those who did answer the question, victims report lower incomes than non-victims. Two-thirds (67%) of victims report income below \$35,000, compared to 45% of non-victims. Conversely, proportionally more non-victims than victims report income in the middle and high ranges. Among non-victims, 30% have incomes between \$35,000 and \$75,000, and another 25% have incomes above \$75,000. The comparable percentages for victims are 19% and 14%. Median household incomes confirm the discrepancy between victims and non-victims. The median income for victims is \$15,700, and for non-victims it is \$40,800.

Differences in income between the victim subgroups are notable. Nearly 89% of post-1965 victims report household incomes below \$35,000, and most of these report incomes below \$15,000. Among pre-1965 victims, 42% report household incomes below \$35,000, which is similar to non-victims. Middle-income earners are similarly skewed: 31% of pre-1965 victims and 8% of post-1965 victims take home between \$35,000 and \$75,000. At the top of the income scale, 27% of pre-1965 victims say their income is \$75,000 or more, again similar to non-victims, compared to just under 3% of post-1965 victims.

Median household incomes verify the discrepancy in income level between the two victim subgroups. The median household income of pre-1965 victims is \$41,500, similar to non-victims, while post-1965 victims have a median household income of just \$8,600.

Poverty

The U.S. government defines household poverty in terms of both income level and the number of people living in a household, and in some cases by age.¹ NJPS 2000-01 used the U.S. government criteria in measuring household poverty among Jews. Overall, victims are five times more likely to be living below the poverty line than non-victims. A quarter of all victims (25%) fall under the federal poverty threshold, compared to 5% of non-victims.

As with other measures of economic vulnerability, a major distinction in poverty exists between pre-1965 and post-1965 victims. Most poverty in the victim population occurs among post-1965 arrivals, among whom over half (51%) report household income falling below the federal poverty line. In contrast, less than 1% of pre-1965 victims are living below the poverty line, even lower than the rate for non-victims.

Social Security payments

Nearly all victims (93%) and non-victims (92%) who are 62 years of age or older receive Social Security payments. However, pre-1965 victims (99%) are more likely than post-1965 victims (84%) to receive Social Security.

For those receiving Social Security payments, the role the payments play in overall income is similar for victims and non-victims. Sixty-two percent of all victims and 54% of non-victims say the payments account for one-third or more of their household income. However, the victim population is sharply divided regarding the importance of Social Security payments for overall income. Among post-1965 victims, 94% of Social Security recipients say the payments account for one-third or more of their household income, compared to 38% of pre-1965 victims. These

percentages are consistent with the poorer financial evaluations, lower incomes and higher poverty rates of post-1965 victims.

Potential social isolation

People living alone, especially as they age, are an issue of concern to the Jewish community because living alone may lead to social isolation and contribute to health-related problems. Interestingly, proportionally fewer victims (25%) live by themselves than non-victims (31%). Furthermore, within the victim population, post-1965 victims (20%) are less likely to be living alone than pre-1965 victims (30%). These figures are consistent with higher marital rates among victims than non-victims, and among post-1965 than pre-1965 victims. Nonetheless, the fact that a quarter of all victims reside by themselves, especially in combination with other indicators of economic and social vulnerability, may be a cause for concern.

Health assessments

NJPS respondents were asked to evaluate their health and were given the following options as answers: poor, fair, good and excellent. Victims provide more negative assessments of their health than non-victims. Twenty-seven percent of victims, compared to just 8% of non-victims, described their health as poor. Similarly, 33% of victims and 21% of non-victims said their health is fair. Conversely, 30% of victims said their health is good, lower than the 44% of non-victims who report good health. Only ten percent of victims but 28% of non-victims described their health as excellent.

Post-1965 victims evaluate their health even less positively than pre-1965 victims. For example, 34% of post-1965 victims and 18% of pre-1965 victims reported poor health (both percentages for “poor” are higher than non-victims), while 46% of post-1965 victims and 22% of pre-1965 victims said their health is fair. On the other side of the evaluation scale, 18% of post-1965 victims and 42% of pre-1965 victims described their health as good, while 3% of post-1965 victims and 18% of pre-1965 victims reported excellent health (both percentages for “excellent” are lower than non-victims).

1. For example, during the period that NJPS interviewing was being conducted, the federal poverty line for an elderly person (65 years of age or older) living alone was income of \$8,000/year, and for a non-elderly person living alone the poverty line was income of \$9,000/year. The federal poverty threshold for two-person households was income of \$10,000 or \$11,000/year, for elderly and non-elderly persons respectively. For three-person households, the federal poverty line was income of \$13,000/year, regardless of the age of household members.

These numbers indicate a substantial discrepancy in the way in which all victims and non-victims evaluate their own health, as well as significant differences between pre-1965 and post-1965 victims in assessing their health.

Health conditions

Victims are more likely than non-victims to report that they or someone else in their household has a physical, mental or other health condition that limits employment, education or other daily activities. Thirty-six percent of all victims say they or someone in their household struggles with a health condition that limits activities, compared to 23% of non-victims. For those with a health condition, victims and those in their homes appear to have more severe limitations than non-victims and their household members. Eighty-three percent of victims who report someone in their household has a health condition say the person with the condition requires supervision or assistance daily or several times a week, compared to 50% of non-victims who make the same claim.

Regarding payment for supervision or assistance for health conditions, victims are much more dependent on government funding and personal savings than non-victims. Seventy-one percent of victims who report someone in their household having a health condition say a government program such as Medicare is paying for the supervision or assistance, compared to 54% of non-victims. In addition, 19% of victims rely on personal savings compared to just 6% of non-victims. Conversely, proportionally more non-victims (22%) report their personal insurance covers the cost of supervision or assistance for the condition than victims do (5%).

A higher proportion of pre-1965 victims (39%) than post-1965 victims (32%) report they or someone else in their home has a health condition that limits activities. However, post-1965 victims and those living with them appear to have more serious conditions: 95% of post-1965 victims and 76% of pre-1965 victims say the person with a health condition needs supervision or assistance daily or several times a week. In addition, 86% of

post-1965 victims rely on government programs like Medicare to pay for assistance, compared to 59% of pre-1965 victims. Conversely, 9% of pre-1965 victims have private insurance that covers the cost of assistance, compared to nearly no post-1965 victims. Twenty-seven percent of pre-1965 victims use personal savings to cover the costs of supervision, while only 9% of post-1965 victims do so.

Social service needs

NJPS respondents were asked which social services they or someone else in their house felt they could have benefited from in the past year, regardless of whether or not they received the service. Proportionally more victims (20%) than non-victims (14%) indicated a need for home health care. Among victims, post-1965 arrivals indicated a slightly greater need for home health care (23%) than pre-1965 arrivals (18%). In contrast, very similar percentages of victims (6%) and non-victims (5%) reported the need for home nursing care, though pre-1965 victims reported even higher levels (10%) compared to post-1965 victims (2%), perhaps a reflection of the pre-1965 victims being older on average than post-1965 victims.

The NJPS question on English as a Second Language was asked only of people who conducted the interview in Russian. Among all post-1965 victims – those who were and were not asked the question – 13% indicated a need for ESL instruction, a rate consistent with the fact that many victims and their spouses have only come to the U.S. in the past decade since the fall of the former Soviet Union. In contrast, less than 1% of all non-victims – again, those both asked and not asked the ESL question – indicated a need for the service. No pre-1965 victims were asked the question on ESL, indicating all were able to conduct the NJPS interview in English and did not require ESL classes.

CONCLUSIONS

COMPARISONS OF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS and direct measures of economic status, health problems and social service needs demonstrate that Nazi victims are more socially and economically vulnerable than non-victims. Importantly, many indicators of economic and social vulnerability and health problems are especially concentrated in the post-1965 victim population. This includes demographic factors like age, employment and occupation that point to the potential for social insecurity, and direct measures of income and disabilities, evaluations of financial situations and overall health.

Demographic characteristics often provide useful information about potential social and economic status and stability. Several demographic characteristics would appear to help victims in terms of social stability. Victims are more likely to be married and less likely to live alone, factors that counter social isolation. In addition, victims are just as well educated as non-victims.

However, other demographic characteristics of victims point in the direction of social instability and problems. Among all Jews 55 years of age or above, victims are older on average than non-victims. In addition, victims are more likely to be unable to work due to a disability, and they are more likely to be in lower status occupations if they are employed. Furthermore, proportionally fewer victims own their homes, more rent and more live in assisted living facilities than non-victims, an indication of social insecurity.

More importantly, direct measures of economic status, health problems and social service needs clearly indicate that victims are more economically and socially vulnerable than non-victims. Relative to non-victims, victims provide more pessimistic financial evaluations, have lower incomes and higher poverty rates, and are more dependent on Social Security payments for at least one-third of their total income.

In addition to economic vulnerability, victims display significant health problems and social service needs relative to non-victims. Victims assess their health more negatively; have proportionally more health conditions among the people in the homes; and describe those conditions as more serious in terms of the frequency of assistance required to care for them. Victims are also more dependent than non-victims on government programs to cover the costs of assistance and less able to rely on private insurance to do so, and have greater needs for home health care. In addition, pre-1965 victims report greater needs for home nursing care and post-1965 victims report greater needs for ESL instruction.

In conclusion, while immigration to the United States no doubt provided new opportunities and freedoms for many Nazi victims following the Second World War and, decades later, the fall of the Soviet Union, victims continue to experience significant social and economic problems in the U.S. Those hardships remain of primary concern to the Jewish communal system, which is committed to alleviating the difficulties of victims in their later years of life and providing them with basic social and economic security.

TABLE I.

Population estimates for all, pre-1965 and post-1965 Nazi victims on selected social and economic characteristics.

Source: National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01 weighted estimates.

* Discrepancy between “All victims” and the sum of “Pre-1965 victims” and “Post-1965 victims” is due to 3 respondents, representing approximately 1,500 people, who did not reveal to survey interviewers when they arrived in the United States.

Discrepancies between victim totals in the first row of the table and sum of weighted estimates in any specific variable are due to respondent non-response (ie., refusing to answer a question or claiming not to know the answer to a question).

	All Victims	Pre-1965 Victims	Post-1965 Victims
TOTAL	122,000*	62,700	57,800
Financial evaluations			
Can't make ends meet	2,100	900	1,200
Just managing	39,800	16,000	23,800
Comfortable	59,400	30,400	29,000
Very comfortable	9,800	8,800	1,000
Wealthy	2,200	2,200	0
Income (household, per year)			
< \$35,000	53,200	15,800	37,400
\$35,000 - \$75,000	15,500	11,900	3,600
> \$75,000	11,400	10,200	1,200
Unreported	40,300	24,700	15,600
Poverty: below U.S. federal poverty line	29,800	400	29,400
Social Security payments are at least 1/3 of total household income	50,090	17,500	33,400
Social isolation: living alone	30,300	18,700	11,600
Health assessments			
Poor	30,700	11,200	19,500
Fair	39,800	13,600	26,200
Good	36,200	26,100	10,100
Excellent	12,400	10,800	1,600
Health conditions			
Someone in household has health condition that limits activities	41,300	23,700	17,600
Condition requires assistance or supervision daily or several times per week	29,000	16,000	13,000
Government program covers cost of assistance	20,500	9,400	11,100
Personal savings cover cost of assistance	5,500	4,300	1,200
Social service needs			
Home health care	19,800	9,600	10,200
Home nursing care	6,000	5,300	700
English as a Second Language (ESL)	7,300	0	7,300

TABLE 2.

Percentages for non-victims, all Nazi victims, and pre-1965 and post-1965 Nazi victims on selected social and economic characteristics.

	Non-victims	All Victims	Pre-1965 Victims	Post-1965 Victims
	%	%	%	%
Financial evaluations				
Can't make ends meet	3	2	2	2
Just managing	23	35	27	43
Comfortable	56	52	52	53
Very comfortable	16	9	15	2
Wealthy	2	2	4	0
Income (household, per year)				
< \$35,000	45	67	42	89
\$35,000 - \$75,000	30	19	31	8
> \$75,000	25	14	27	3
Poverty: below U.S. federal poverty line	5	25	1	51
Social Security payments are at least 1/3 of total household income	54	62	38	94
Social isolation: living alone	31	25	30	20
Health assessments				
Poor	8	27	18	34
Fair	21	33	22	46
Good	44	30	42	18
Excellent	28	10	18	3
Health conditions				
Someone in household has health condition that limits activities	23	36	39	32
Condition requires assistance or supervision daily or several times/week	50	83	76	95
Government program covers cost of assistance	54	71	59	86
Personal savings cover cost of assistance	6	19	27	9
Social service needs				
Home health care	14	20	18	23
Home nursing care	5	6	10	2
English as a Second Language (ESL)	1	6	0	13

Source: National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01 weighted estimates.



111 Eighth Avenue, Suite 11E, New York, NY 10011

www.ujc.org/njps