During the decade of the 1960's a clear trend toward annual increases in aliya from the United States was established. Between 1961 and 1971 there was almost a fourfold increase in the number of Americans arriving in Israel as "immigrants", "potential immigrants" or "temporary residents" (2). The contribution of American olim to total aliya also increased significantly during this period: for every 1,000 olim in 1961, 35 were Americans; in 1971, 18 per cent of all olim were from the United States. This pattern was reversed in 1972 as the number of Americans immigrating to Israel dropped by a full 25 per cent. In one year the number of declared olim from the United States declined from 1,049 to 805 and the number of potential olim fell from 6,315 to 4,710. Moreover, American immigrants represented less than 10 per cent of all those immigrating to Israel in 1972 - lower than any proportion recorded since 1965 and breaking a trend line extending back to the 1950's (see Table 1).

What is the significance of this decline in American aliya? Has immigration from the United States reached its climax and, hence, the sharp decline 1971-1972 evidences the beginning of the end of large-scale American aliya? Perhaps reduction in American aliya merely reflects a temporary lull in American Jewish immigration to Israel that is the consequence of the noticeable increase in Russian immigration and the shift in priorities to the encouragement and absorption of these olim? To what extent are changing conditions in Israel and in the United States factors in the shifting volume of American aliya? Tied to these questions is the central issue: what is the most likely course of aliya from the United States in the near future?

While questions about the future cannot be answered with scientific precision, lessons from the past and analysis of the present

(1) The data reported in this paper were adapted from published and unpublished official statistics in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel, and from the Survey on Absorption of Immigrants carried out by the Central Bureau of Statistics and the Ministry of Absorption. Details on the data, sources and limitations, may be found in Goldscheider, Calvin. "American Aliya: Sociological and Demographic Perspectives". In: Sklare, N. (ed.). The Sociology of the American Jew. New York, Behrman House, 1974. p. 335-384.


(2) Formal definitions and general descriptions of olim and potential olim may be found in Israel Central Bureau of Statistics. Survey on Absorption of Immigrants. Special Series No. 381. Jerusalem, 1972.
provide working parameters in evaluating the most likely contours of future American aliya. A brief review of the changing volume of American immigration to Israel and of the selectivity of American olim provide the necessary background to evaluate the quantitative and qualitative potential aliya of American Jews.

Table 1. Number of American Olim and Rate per 1,000 Total Olim, 1961-1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>American(a) Olim</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrants(b)</td>
<td>Temporary Residents(c)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per 1,000 Total Olim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>42,890</td>
<td>52,868</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>3,282</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>5,284</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>5,068</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>5,789</td>
<td>6,882</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>7,364</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) American by place of last residence.
(b) Includes tourists settling.
(c) After 1969 these are defined officially as "potential immigrants".

Sources: Data on American olim are from official data in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics. Data on total olim were derived from the Statistical Abstract of Israel, 1971. No. 22, tables D/1, E/1 and from unpublished data in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel.
The Quantitative Question

Despite annual fluctuations and a general tendency toward an increasing volume, American aliyah has never been a mass migration. The number of annual arrivals from the United States has been small not only in absolute size but has been quantitatively insignificant relative to the size of the American Jewish population and to the volume of total aliyah. Even by the most generous and inclusive definitions of "American" and "aliyah" the annual volume of American migrants to Israel has never reached 8,000—a figure that would include Americans defined by place of last residence (not birth or citizenship) arriving (not necessarily remaining) as "immigrants", "temporary residents", "potential immigrants", and "tourists settling". The total annual number of declared American "immigrants" has never exceeded 1,100 and reached an annual of 1,000 immigrants only three times (1964, 1970, 1971). If we consider rates of return migration to the United States (yeridah) estimated conservatively at 30 per cent of arrivals—the smallness of American aliyah becomes readily apparent.

Up to 1965, annual American aliyah represented substantially less than 10 per cent of all aliyah; during the more recent period (1966-1972), the proportion of all olim who were American increased to 16 per cent per year, on the average. Nevertheless, American olim have always been a minority segment of aliyah streams, representing during the 12 year period, 1961-72, between 53 and 192 per 1,000 total olim, per year.

Relative to the American Jewish population, American aliyah must be viewed as minuscule. The number of American olim arriving since 1967 represents the movement of far less than 1 per 1,000, per year, of the estimated United States Jewish population.

Taken together the American aliyah picture in strictly quantitative terms is bleak. Nor are there indications that any major alterations are to be expected in the near future. Nevertheless, several important points should not be obscured by the smallness of the aliyah from the United States.

First, within the context of the low level of American aliyah an unmistakable pattern may be discerned. The small continuous stream of American migrants to Israel, beginning in the mid-19th century and gaining momentum after the establishment of the State of Israel, began to change in the early 1960's. Indeed, the period 1961-1966 witnessed several significant developments in the history of American aliyah that have been ignored or overlooked because of the more conspicuous changes following the Six-Day War of 1967. During the early 1960's, the number of American immigrants increased noticeably, averaging about twice the annual volume 1948-60. To these declared "olim" must be added those Americans who arrived as "temporary residents". This ambiguous status was selected by many Americans not eager to risk the possible loss of their American citizenship by declaring formal "immigrant" status. (Before a May 1967 American Supreme Court decision, it was not clear that Americans could hold dual citizenship. Since immigrant status in Israel confirms citizenship automatically, many American olim opted...
for "temporary resident" status(3). To be sure, a large number, perhaps a majority, of Americans who were "temporary residents" stayed only for the purpose of temporary work or study. Clearly, however, these Americans were not tourists and a significant, if only a minority, proportion settled. Between 1961 and 1966 over 12,000 Americans were registered as temporary residents, averaging more than 2,000 annually.

As part of the increase in the numbers of American olim (including temporary residents), and some slowdown in the aliyah of other Jews, the relative proportion of American olim of the total aliyah increased noticeably in these six years. In 1961, 35 out of every 1,000 olim to Israel was an American; by 1966, 13.6 per cent of all olim were Americans. In no period prior to 1961 was the rate of American aliyah as high.

Clearly, the increase in American aliyah, in absolute volume and in the rate per 1,000 total olim had its roots before the events of June, 1967; the Six Day War accelerated a phenomenon that had already started. This is not to minimize the importance of the Six Day War, through its impact on American Jewish life and on the shape and character of Israeli society, in stimulating American aliyah. Indeed, between 1967 and 1972, the number of Americans who formally declared themselves "olim" averaged close to 900 per year, totalling over 5,000 for the six-year period; the number of "temporary residents" (referred to after June, 1969 as "potential immigrants") averaged over 5,000 per year and totalled over 30,000. Adding these categories together, a total of over 35,000 Americans immigrated to Israel during the period 1967-1972.

In addition to the increasing trend in aliyah from the United States, the smallness of numbers should not obscure the truly revolutionary changes in the normative acceptability of aliyah within the American Jewish community. It is clear that since 1967 aliyah has become within the American Jewish community one institutionalized response to the dilemmas of Jewish life in American society; undoubtedly, aliyah has become the master symbol of the intricate web of interdependencies between Israel and the American Jewish community. No longer is aliyah an idiosyncratic or isolated event. No one could write in the 1970's what had been written in the 1950's - that even American Zionists expressed opposition to the idea of American aliyah; that the thought of his own aliyah never was considered seriously while the idea of aliyah on the part of his children struck him as fundamentally absurd in theory and entirely to be rejected in practice(4).

Although the relative volume of American aliyah has increased in the last several years beyond all realistic expectations and aliyah has become a legitimate response of American Jewry, it seems reasonable to conclude that mass aliyah of the magnitude of the numbers of aliyah since the Six Day War can be expected for the same reasons that drove the same numbers from the United States during the 1950's - concern for Jewish survival and genuine inalienable right of American Jewry to Holy Land fantasy.

While it accelerated the aliyah of those preparing to emigrate to Israel pre-1967 conditioned by the two more last minute political, economic, and psychological Six Day War in Israel, in particular, this American Jewish condition of factors, in short, the interdependence of this new flow of streams, aliyah - particularly aliyah through the route of the United States - among Americans.

The question then is: (1) the relative volume of numbers (2) the degree of acceptance within the American Jewish community of the rate of American Jewish immigration after the Six Day War, whether a simple trend, the United States and the United States? - and (3) varying in American Jewish allegiances, the United States.

Americans here and there differ in their allegiances. They differ in the United States. Of these, some are of American aliya
conclude that, barring unforeseen and unpredictable circumstances, no mass aliyah of Jewish Americans (mass either in the sense of large absolute numbers or in the sense of significant proportions of American Jews) can be expected to occur within the near future. In large part this is for the same reason that large-scale permanent aliyah has never occurred from the United States. Alongside the nearly universal American Jewish concern for Israel is the almost unanimous Jewish commitment to America and genuine indifference to aliyah. Hence, for the overwhelming majority of American Jews, aliyah will most likely remain in the realm of fantasy.

While it is clear that the events surrounding the Six Day War accelerated the tempo of American aliyah, it appears that the factors operating to encourage recent aliyah from the United States were rooted in pre-1967 conditions. Whereas some American aliyah must have been precipitated by the "crisis of 1967", it seems reasonable to argue that two more lasting factors were at work: (1) the radical political, economic, and psychological changes that followed in the wake of the Six Day War in Israeli society and (2) the changing relationship of Jews, particularly among the young third generation, to America and the American Jewish community that had in fact begun before 1967. These two sets of factors, in combination, were powerful elements in reinforcing the interdependence between American Jews and Israel and in channeling some of this new interdependence into aliyah. Moreover, as in other migratory streams, aliyah tends to feed on itself - through chain migration and through the recognition, acceptance and institutionalization of aliyah among American Jews.

The question of the future volume of aliyah, therefore, revolves around (1) the continuance of social changes within Israeli society; (2) the degree to which aliyah from the United States has reached its climax, having already drawn those American Jews who have not found American society conducive to their Jewish identity; and (3) the continuance of selected disenchantment among Jewish youth of America and American Jewish society. It is obviously too soon to gauge whether the decline in American aliyah 1971-1972 is the beginning of a trend or rather a simple fluctuation around a fairly steady but small migration stream. Based on past patterns and trends, my guess is that aliyah from the United States will continue to fluctuate around "several thousand per year" - around 1,000 olim and 4,000 - 5,000 potential olim - varying in conjunction with relative conditions in Israel and the United States.

The Qualitative Question

Americans immigrating to Israel are clearly not a representative cross-section of the American Jewish population; as might be expected, they differ as well from other olim and from the Jewish population of Israel. Of no less importance is the heterogeneity of aliyah from the United States. Whether the objective is to understand the determinants of American aliyah or the integration of American olim, or American
yeridah, or the future of American aliya, American olim cannot be treated as a uniform, homogeneous sub-group reflecting American Jewish community structure and values. The degree to which American olim differ from their brethren who remain in the United States is complemented by the variety of types of American Jews who end up as olim. The heterogeneity of American aliya in the post-1967 period makes general- ities about American olim stereotypical and imprecise and reduces uniform plans for the socio-economic-cultural integration of American olim to theoretical exercises that are empirical failures.

For illustrative purposes, some of the more conspicuous differ- ences between American olim and the American Jewish population and some of the major axes along which may be located the heterogeneity of American olim will be outlined below (5).

(1) American aliya in the 1970's is selective of the young and of the native-born of native-born parents. About half of American olim are below age 25 and are about 10 years younger, on the average, than the estimated Jewish population of the United States. In large part, the concentration of the young is not at the expense of the oldest age category; about 10 per cent of American olim and of the American Jewish population is over the age of 65. Rather, the age distortion is most conspicuous in the middle years: about 4 out of 10 American olim are 20-34 years of age and only 2 out of 10 are aged 35-64; the reverse proportions characterize the American Jewish population - 40 per cent are 35-64 years of age and 20 per cent are 20-34 years of age.

(2) Partly reflecting this age distortion is the fact that about twice as many American olim are single when compared to U.S. Jewry and the contrast is stronger for women. For example, about 70 per cent of Jewish males and 90 per cent of Jewish females in the United States, aged 25-34 are married; among American olim only about half of both sexes are married in this age group.

(3) In the younger ages, American aliya is overselective of females: approximately 60 per cent of American olim between the ages 20-29 are females. At the older end of the age scale the sex ratio favors more males than females.

(4) American olim represent an educated elite not only by the standards of other olim and the Jewish population of Israel but relative to the high standards achieved by the American Jewish population as well. Over 40 per cent of American olim had 4 or more years of college compared to 6 per cent of the Jewish population of Israel (1970), 18 per cent of all olim (1969-70) and 17 per cent of the U.S. Jewish population (1957).

(5) Occupational selectivity of American olim is most pronounced. Over 60 per cent of American male olim arrived in Israel with previous occupation listed as professional and only 4 per cent were managers;
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among the American Jewish population over a third of the males are

managers and 20 per cent are professionals. Within the professional

category over half of the American olim listed themselves as teachers

or engineers.

These features of the selectivity of American aZiya suggest that

two sets of facilitating factors in the immigration of Americans to

Israel relate to the extent of life-cycle attachments and economic-

occupational ties. Young and single are two life cycle characteristics

providing for the greatest freedom of movement; widowhood, for men,

appears to operate in similar ways. Moreover, the unusually high pro-

portion of young American women olim who are unmarried suggests that

at least for some, Israel is perceived as a potentially attractive mar-

riage market. (It may also be expected that the highest rates of

yeridah among American olim will characterize precisely those groups

who have the greatest freedom to move, i.e., the young and unmarried.)

The selectivity by education and in particular by occupation re-

fects in part the greater mobility among the educated and the greater

ease in transferring professional skills from one labor market to

another. In contrast, managerial positions are much more localized and
difficult to transfer between cultures. This is particularly true for

those types of managerial positions that are dependent on personal con-
tact and/or represent proprietorship and equipment investments - posi-
tions that are prevalent among a significant segment of the American

Jewish population.

A final point relates to the types of professionals immigrating

from the United States to Israel. These, we noted earlier, are very

much concentrated in two categories - teachers and engineers. Although

it would require more intensive analysis with more detailed data than

now available, it seems reasonable to postulate that some Jewish

teachers have responded to the personal, social and professional prob-
lems of urban-racial conflict in the school systems by deciding on

aZiya. Similarly, it is not unlikely that the over-concentration of

engineers among American olim reflects the tight, over-supplied market

for engineers in the United States. Hence, "push" factors may be play-

ing an important role in the selective movement of American teachers

and engineers to Israel. If this speculation is correct, it follows

that the occupational composition of future American aZiya will reflect

variations in occupational opportunities for Jews in the United States

as well as in Israel. Perhaps, changes in the volume of American aZiya

beginning in 1972 are first indications of changes in the economic

situation in the United States and in particular changing demands for
certain skills that affect the attractiveness of some types of Jewish

migrants to Israel.

The fact that a significant proportion of American olim have come
to Israel searching for youthful adventure, quiet retirement, a job or

a mate does not necessarily reduce the significance of the "ideological"
component of American aZiya. For every oleh who is a frustrated teacher,
an unemployed engineer, an unmarried woman, or a retired widower, hun-
dreds, more likely thousands, of American Jews in similar positions
have sought alternative solutions to these situations within the American context. Hence, the ideological components of aliya must be analyzed for all olim from the United States not only for those American olim who have given up excellent jobs, homes, and incomes to settle as a family in Israel or for those who explicitly immigrate to Israel for ideological reasons.

An analysis of the evidence available points unmistakably to the conclusion that ideology, at least those components that are more conspicuous and measurable, plays an important, if not critical, role in shaping the amount and type of American aliya. Summary data presented in Table 2 on selected religio-ideological characteristics of American olim point to the following:

(1) Formal membership in Zionist organizations is not a necessary prerequisite for aliya: only about half of the American olim were members of any Zionist organization before aliya. Although comparative


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Generation Status(a)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion members of Zionist organizations</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion with Hebrew Day School education</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion with 6 or more years of Jewish education</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion &quot;Orthodox&quot;</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion &quot;religious&quot; or &quot;very religious&quot;</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion attending synagogue once a week or more</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion observing dietary regulations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Generation status refers to place of birth and relates to length of residence in the United States.

Source: Special tabulations of sample survey data on immigrant absorption in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel.
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data are not available, it seems reasonable to argue that American olim are perhaps more likely to be affiliated with Zionist organizations than are non-olim but that such affiliation is a consequence rather than a causal factor in the chain of aliyah determinants.

(2) American olim are characterized by a fairly intensive back-
ground of Jewish education relative to the American Jewish population. Fully one-third were exposed to a Hebrew Day school education and almost two-thirds have six or more years of Jewish education. The relative stability of these levels by generation status among American olim is clearly exceptional given the general trends among American Jews.

(3) Patterns of religious identification, levels of synagogue at-
tendance and observances of religious dietary regulations are clearly overweighted, relative to patterns among the American Jewish population, in the direction of the more religious. Over a third of American olim define themselves as "Orthodox" (close to 30 per cent of the third generation are so identified), 46 rate themselves as "religious" or "very religious", 38 per cent attend synagogue services once a week or more, and over half observe religious dietary regulations. While there are some expected patterns of variation between generations, unquestionably the remarkable feature of the data by generation are the very high levels of religious identification and observance among the young, third generation American Jews.

Given a basic ideological thrust behind all aliyah, several over-
lapping types of olim may be identified: (1) young men and women search-
ing for adventure, education, religious and ethnic identity, or mar-
riage; (2) older men and women settling in Israel after retirement;
(3) educated and technically trained Jews who are in greater demand within Israel than in America; (4) Jews in search of Jewishness and Judaism who see Israeli society as a rich, natural environment for the expression of their own Jewish identity and that of their children.

While these types of American olim undoubtedly appeared in the past, one critical change in recent aliyah lies in the broad area of religious identity. In the past, aliyah was viewed by a select handful as a religious duty in the narrowest sense; contemporary aliyah appears to be more a reflection of Jewish consciousness in the broadest sense.

The preliminary evidence available suggests quite clearly that it is unacceptable analytically to treat American olim as a homogeneous group with respect to background social characteristics, reasons for aliyah, or requirements for social integration and absorption. A more intensive examination of the degrees of integration and the levels of return migration among American olim must await the collection of addi-
tional empirical materials. We may conclude, however, that aliyah from the United States in the post-1967 era does not imply the severance of ties to America. American aliyah must be viewed as an extension of the unique American Jewish dilemma. The slow but steady trickle of American immigrants to Israel will remain the firmest bond in the complex web of interrelationships between Israel and American Jewry.