

T-P

TOWARD A BUREAU FOR JEWISH DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Prepared by

SOPHIA M. ROBISON

New York

Committee of the Conference on Jewish Demography

September 20, 1948

317.3j
C

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
The Reasons for the Memorandum	1
Recognition of the Need for the New Organization	1
Plans for the 1937 Census	2
Jewish War Records	2
The 1944 Proposal	3
Conference on Jewish Demography 1945-1946	3
Discontinuance of the 1947 Census of Religious Bodies	4

II. METHODS OF ESTIMATING JEWISH POPULATIONS

Death Rate Method	6
School Attendance Method	9
Synagogue Attendance - Correspondence Method	11
Interpolation from Census Data	13
The Jewish Name Method	14
Voters' List	15
Master List	16
New Sampling Methods of Bureau of the Census	19

III. WHAT IS WANTED

Organizations Interested in the Proposed Bureau	23
---	----

IV. PROPOSALS FOR THE ORGANIZATION'S SET UP

Statement of Purpose	27
Procedure	27
Auspices	28
Governing Board	30
Advisory Committees	30
Individual Membership	31
Finances	31
Sources of Income	32
Staff	33
Tentative Budget	35

APPENDICES

A. Persons Interviewed in Preparation for the Memorandum	37
B. Persons Suggested as Interested in the Organization	38
C. Suggestions for Staff	40
D. Communities Contemplating Surveys	41

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

The Reasons for the Memorandum

On October 22, 1947, at a meeting of several national Jewish organizations concerned with Jewish demographic problems, Mr. Harry Lurie, Executive Director of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and Chairman of the Population Committee of the Conference on Jewish Relations, proposed that a prospectus be prepared which would (1) explore and evaluate methods for conducting Jewish statistical research, with particular reference to the population field, and (2) outline an initial plan of operation for an organization.¹ Upon completion of the memorandum and its acceptance by the Committee, it was proposed that a meeting be called for all organizations interested in participating in the launching and support of an organization for Jewish demographic statistics.

Recognition of the Need for the New Organization²

More than fifteen years ago dissatisfaction was expressed with the state of Jewish demography. Because plans have been discussed so long and so many persons

-
1. Supervision of the prospectus was delegated to a sub-committee consisting of Dr. Alexander Dushkin of the Jewish Education Committee; Dr. Uriah Z. Engelman of the American Association for Jewish Education; Mr. Morris Fine of the American Jewish Committee; Mr. Harry Lurie of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds and Dr. Max Weinreich, Director of the Yiddish Scientific Institute.
 2. Sources for discussion: (a) Minutes of the Joint Committee of the Conference of Jewish Relations, American Jewish Committee, Council of Federations and Welfare Funds and the Jewish Welfare Board, which at various times discussed the problem. (b) Correspondence between members of the various organizations with each other and with the representatives of the Bureau of the Census. (c) Special Memoranda prepared at the request of the Committee.

and points of view have been involved, the main threads of the two opposing points of view have not always stood out clearly. It seems appropriate, therefore, to review briefly the discussion and the decisions since 1934 when the Conference on Jewish Relations proposed a joining of forces for better Jewish demographic studies.

Plans for the 1937 Census

A committee of experts¹ appointed by the American Jewish Committee at the time that the 1937 Census of Religious Bodies was in preparation was asked to devise methods to supplement synagogue figures. It was suggested that data on age and other demographic characteristics would provide a basis not only for predicting changes in the total number of Jews, but also for social planning of welfare facilities.

Although the statistician in charge of the Jewish Census claims to have been grateful to the committee for its help, the 1937 Census of Religious Bodies produced no evidence of the use of methods other than those previously employed in estimating Jewish populations.²

Jewish War Records

Shortly after the United States entered World War II, the Jewish Welfare Board re-established its Jewish War Records project to account for the number of Jews in the armed forces in relation to the number of eligible Jewish and non-Jewish youths in the various communities. The orientation to the public relations implications was designed to meet both implicit and explicit criticism of the role of the Jews in the armed forces.

Dr. Samuel S. Kohs, who developed manuals and instructions for the Jewish Welfare Board studies in various communities, claims only limited utility for these data, however, in answering the broader population questions left unanswered also by the statistics in the American Jewish Year Book based on the Census of Religious Bodies.

1. Morris R. Cohen, Dr. Louis I. Dublin, Dr. Harry G. Friedman, Dr. Alvin Johnson.
2. See "Jewish Social Studies" July 1941, article by Morris R. Cohen commenting on the results of the 1937 Census.

The 1944 Proposal

In 1943, following the publication of the volume, "Jewish Population Studies"¹, Dr. Salo W. Baron undertook to implement the interests of such organizations as the Jewish Occupational Council, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the Jewish Education Committee, the American Jewish Committee and the Bureau of War Records of the Jewish Welfare Board in coordinating work in the field of Jewish population studies.

The work of a sub-committee appointed to investigate the possibilities of enlarging the sphere of work of the Jewish Statistical Bureau was interrupted by the untimely death of Mr. David Rosenblum of the American Jewish Committee. In the meantime, the head of the Jewish Statistical Bureau circulated a memorandum reiterating "ideological" objections to and criticism of the studies stimulated by the Conference on Jewish Relations and at its efforts at coordinating the interests of non-synagogue agencies in Jewish demography.²

A fresh attempt to meet the needs was made by circulating a new memorandum among the members of the Conference Committee. In spite of several meetings which were arranged to discuss the proposal, no action was taken. Subsequently, the Conference Committee decided to call a meeting of the representatives of the various national agencies to discuss what might still be done to secure the needed Jewish demographic data.

Conference on Jewish Demography - 1945 - 1946

This conference was held on December 3, 1945 at the Men's Faculty Club at Columbia University and closed with a resolution that the Chairman appoint a

-
1. Robison, S.M., "Jewish Population Studies", Conference on Jewish Relations, New York, 1943.
 2. Correspondence July 29, 1943 between Prof. Morris R. Cohen and Theodore Gaster, Exec. Dir., Conference on Jewish Relations.

committee¹ to study and report within two months on:

1. The need for and desirability of obtaining, by whatever means, Jewish population statistics not currently available.
2. Means whereby the Census of Religious Bodies, scheduled for 1946, may be improved to yield more reliable and more significant data.
3. Means whereby other government census may be made use of to obtain Jewish demographic data.
4. What Jewish organizations might do, independently of government, to obtain better Jewish population statistics or to supplement those available from government sources.

This committee made the following proposals:

1. Incorporate the Jewish Statistical Bureau under the new Bureau.
2. Appoint a top-flight economist or statistician to whom the Jewish representative of the Census would be responsible.
3. Appoint a strong technical committee to advise him in his work.
4. Withdraw the annual subvention which had been made for a considerable number of years to the Jewish Statistical Bureau by the American Jewish Committee.
5. Instead of a special agent for the Jewish Statistical Bureau, turn over of the task to the local communities which would work under the supervision of a national committee.

These proposals were not acceptable to the director of the Jewish Statistical Bureau, who was also the special Agent of the Census of Religious Bodies for the Census of Jewish Congregations, on the grounds that they were dangerous to the Jewish group in that they would inevitably result in placing the Jews in a "racial" rather than "religious" classification in the Census reports.

Discontinuance of the 1947 Census of Religious Bodies

On July 28, 1947 the Bureau of the Census announced that work on the Census of Religious Bodies was being discontinued since no provision for its completion had been made in the funds appropriated by Congress for the fiscal year

-
1. For a list of the persons attending the Conference see Appendix.
Persons asked to serve on the committee were: Mr. J.X. Cohen, Dr. A. Dushkin, Mr. Eisendrath, Dr. Engelman, Mr. Gordis, Dr. Kohs, Mr. Lurie, Dr. Maller, Mr. Pekelis, Dr. Slawson and Dr. Weinreich.

1947-48. Since the original mailing of schedules and the follow-up notices had resulted in little more than 60 percent returns, some of them incomplete, no summary statistics of any value could be derived from the available schedules. The Census Bureau therefore notified the churches which had not yet replied not to submit their returns.

In the light of the discontinuance of the Census of Religious Bodies the non-synagogue agencies interested in more comprehensive Jewish demographic data felt that the time was opportune for carrying out previously considered plans for the establishment of a Jewish communal demographic Bureau, independent of government efforts.

This review of the negotiations which led up to the meeting of October 22, 1947 shows the slow and uneven process of crystallizing ideas, overcoming objections and finally mobilizing for action to secure comparable, continuous and country-wide Jewish demographic data useful for communal planning as a basis for important Jewish sociological studies.

Opposition to the undertaking has been expressed in various forms. When changes in the type of statistics included in the Census of Religious Bodies were proposed, or the need expressed for additional statistics on characteristics of the Jewish population, it was argued that (1) this was not possible, (2) was too costly, (3) was not advisable, or would be harmful to the best interests of the Jewish people, if Jewish statistics were made available in a more detailed form than that used in the Census of Religious Bodies.

On the other side of the proposition, are the still unmet needs of local Jewish communities in their planning for cultural, educational and welfare programs and facilities. Spasmodic efforts to meet these needs have resulted sometimes in wasteful duplication and almost always in inadequate, non-comparable and discontinuous data on the characteristics of the Jewish population locally and nationally.

Consequently, the committee appointed at the October 1947 meeting, was charged with preparing the prospectus for the new organization, and with a review and evaluation of the methods for conducting Jewish statistical research, especially in the population field.

METHODS OF ESTIMATING JEWISH POPULATIONS

Lacking an official census, many methods have been used to arrive at estimates of Jewish population. Among the simpler devices, in larger cities in which enumeration would be obviously a costly procedure, the death rate, and school absences have been used as indices.

Death Rate Method¹

London - in 1885, Lionel Alexander applied the number of burials in Jewish cemeteries, assumed to equal the number of Jewish deaths, to an estimated Jewish death rate. In 1890, Dr. Adler used the marriage rate to correct the death rate, since the two rates affect an immigrant population in opposite directions.

In 1902, Rev. Isidore Harris² estimated London's Jewish population on the basis of a Jewish death rate estimated as a compromise between the general death rate in 1902 of 19.4 and the death rate of 22.6 in the East End of London, where it was presumed that 70% of the Jews lived. Since Jews are not subject to some of the causes of high death rates, alcoholism, etc., Dr. Harris thought it was fair to place their death rate at 20.

Baltimore - In the same year, George E. Barnett³ refined the death rate technique by differentiating German from Russian Jews. He separated the decedents into immigrants and non-immigrants (Germans) and applied the two rates to the two figures and estimated the Jewish population in Baltimore in 1902 as 25,000.

New York City - The death rate method has been most often used in estimating New York City's Jewish population - specifically - Dr. Joseph Jacobs adjusted

-
1. Memo in the files of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research, New York, undated and unsigned is the source of references to studies before 1930. For the purposes of the memo, no check has been made as to whether there may have been other studies than those listed.
 2. Jewish Chronicle, February 14, 1902.
 3. Publication of the American Jewish Historical Society in 1902, pp. 37-45, and the American Jewish Year Book for 5663.

the official mortality rates of predominately Jewish Wards for the years 1897-1899. Assuming a Jewish death rate of 15 and applying it to the number of burials in Jewish cemeteries in 1901, he checked the results with a marriage rate which he assumed to be 10, with immigration figures, with figures on foreign white stock and with estimates of the Federation of Churches. He arrived at a figure of 600,000 Jews in 1901 and 820,000 in 1910.

Professor Chalmers of Cornell University takes issue with Jacobs.¹ On the basis of the increase in the number of foreign born persons from Austria and Russia, changes in the number of persons reporting Yiddish as their mother tongue and decreases in the death rate, he considered Jacobs 1901 estimate of 600,000 and 1910 estimate of 820,000 as too low. Based on the revised death rate of 10.8, Chalmers arrived at a total of 1,100,800 Jews in New York City in 1910.

In 1925, Dr. Charles Bernheimer² fixed the Jewish death rate at 8, a compromise between the rates in the 1890 Billings Study of 7.1, the 1902 Barnett Study, Dr. Louis I. Dublin's mortality rate for Russians in New York City in 1910 - 7.5 for males and 6.6 for females, and the 1920 City Census Tract Committee rate of 6.34 in the health district bounded by 9th and 3rd Streets between Avenues B and D, assumed to be predominately Jewish.

The Jewish Communal Survey of Greater New York also used "specific" death rates of Jews as an index to the size of Jewish population. On the basis of the New York State Census of 1925, (later shown to be unreliable), statistics were taken for sixteen tracts chosen as representative of the Jewish population in each of the five boroughs in New York City. The death certificates of Jews for the year 1935 for those sixteen tracts were identified on the basis of the internal evidence on name of deceased, place of birth, mother's name, place of birth of parents, place of burial, and undertaker's name.

1. American Statistical Assn. Publication XIV, pp 68-75. (See Footnote 1, Page 11 for source)

2. Jewish Social Service Quarterly, December 1945, and Journal of Social Forces 3:67780. (See Footnote 1, Page 11 for source)

Chicago - In a 1930 estimate of Chicago's Jewish population, Mr. A.J. Jaffe extended the death rate technique used in the London studies of Jewish population in 1929¹ and 1929-1933² and in W.A. Goldberg's Jewish Population of Chicago 1931. He had available also P.M. Hauser's Ph.D.thesis on "Differential Fertility, Mortality and Net Reproduction in Chicago, 1930." Mr. Jaffe estimated Chicago's Jewish population in 1930 as 265,000, in 1940 as 282,000 and in 1950 as 285,000.

In discussing his method, the author points out that while it is relatively inexpensive, because it does not require enumerations or interviews, the net results are not entirely reliable in spite of the precautions and mathematical checks applied to the use of the net reproduction rates and the death rates assumed to be applicable to the Jewish population.³

Criticism of Death Rate Method

This method has several obvious shortcomings; (1) there is no way of establishing once and for all a Jewish death rate. It needs to be reestablished under changing conditions. One of the major shortcomings of the method is that it would be valid at best for only a very short period because as populations age their death rates change.

Using the statistics for an area that is predominately Jewish is obviously a makeshift in that it is not an ipso facto characteristic of all the sections of the city in which Jews live nor can the effect on the rate of the non-Jewish population in the area be ascertained. The validity of the estimates depends on the

-
1. See Trachtenberg, H.I., "Estimate of the Jewish Population of London in 1929", in the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Vol. XCVI (1933), pp. 87-98
 2. Kantorowitsch, M., "Estimate of the Jewish Population of London in 1929-1933."
 3. For a detailed description of the method of the Chicago study see "Jewish Population Studies," Robison, S.M., Conference on Jewish Relations, New York, 1943.

soundness of the assumptions that the areas chosen contain a representative sample of the Jewish population.

There is no certainty that the data on the death certificates are reliable clues for identifying Jews.

In addition, the death certificates give no clues to family size, occupation, employment status, length of time in the country, citizenship and a wide variety of other facts needed in communal planning.

A second device which also does not require enumeration, and which, like the death rate method, has been used in large cities, is the School Attendance Method.

School Attendance Method

London - The first application of this method appears to be that by Llewellyn Smith in 1892¹. Mr. Smith multiplied by six a figure which represented the number of Jewish children, according to a parliamentary report, who attended school in London. This procedure was based on the custom of the London Education Department in estimating total population.

New York City and Philadelphia - In 1904, Dr. Charles Bernheimer used this device, designated in the United States as the Yom Kippur Method, in estimating the Jewish population for sections of Philadelphia and New York. Since unlike England, in the United States there is no official count of Jewish school children, the number of Jewish children in school was calculated as the difference between the number of children in attendance on Yom Kippur and on a normal school day. Multiplying this by the ratio of the age groups 6 to 14 in the total population was assumed to give the total Jewish population.

In 1915, an elaboration of this method was applied by Dr. Alexander Dushkin to New York City. To check the possibility that not all of the 40.5 percent of children absent on Yom Kippur were Jewish, a sample of 4,215 from the

1. See Booth's "Life and Labor of the People in London -III", pp 105-6.

1,500,000 cards with the family names of New York City's school children was chosen and reviewed by two individuals, who agreed that one-third of the families on sample were Jewish. On this basis, Dr. Dushkin assumed that one-third of the city's total population, 5 - to 14 years of age in 1915-16, or 307,148 were Jewish.

The two percentages, 40.5% and 33.3% were submitted to twelve "competent" men whose combined judgment suggested that the correct Jewish proportion was 38%. Applying the 38% to the total school population yielded 277,687 Jewish children. Adding 20,000 Jewish children assumed to attend private schools gave a Jewish school population of 297,687, or 3% lower than the number arrived at by the Yom Kippur count. Since the 5 to 14 age group represents 18% of the total population, that ratio was applied to the number of Jewish children to yield the total Jewish population.

Revision of the Yom Kippur Method - The Jewish Communal Survey of Greater New York - Studies in New York Population, describes an attempt to revise the Yom Kippur method by assembling the age grade distribution of children in public schools in neighborhoods known to be predominately Jewish. Comparison of the proportion of children in each age group in the schools in these neighborhoods with those of children in non-Jewish districts, was directed to settling the question of the extent to which the two age distributions were alike.

Unfortunately, however, the available data did not yield authoritative answers. Children in attendance at any one school in New York City do not all live in the same health area as that in which the school is located. As a matter of fact, only a small proportion of children attended public schools located in the same area as that in which they resided.¹ Thus, it is impossible to calculate the total Jewish population in any health area in New York City on the basis of the number of children attending schools located in that area.

1. See "Manhattan Children in Day Schools in 1935", Research Bureau, Welfare Council of New York City, (1938).

Criticism of the School Attendance Method

1. The actual number of non-Jewish children who stay away from school on Yom Kippur is not known.
2. The proportion of Jewish children to the Jewish population is not known, i.e., the number of children in Jewish families is not known.
3. The number of Jewish children in private schools is not known. This may not, however, be important because the total number is small.
4. The census age group, 5 to 14, does not coincide exactly with the compulsory school age group, and to establish a ratio for a school age group, which shifts with changes in the compulsory age limits, involves estimates which will in turn affect general population figures.
5. The present method of keeping the school census cards in alphabetical and not by district, as was the case in 1915, so that it is no longer possible to estimate the population by districts. It usually takes from three to four years to get a complete census and in the interval many families move.
6. The figures are not specific for age, and since they are for a group of schools, are not specific for neighborhood. They are also not as good for the peripheral areas of Jewish population as for the densely populated.

Synagogue Attendance - Correspondence Method

Census of Religious Bodies - The main purpose of the Census of Religious Bodies, taken every ten years since 1850, is not to enumerate individually the members of any sect, but to reveal the number of congregations and churches, capital investments, value of church property and, for some churches, the number of members and Sunday School registration. The figures for the Jewish portion of this official United States Census have been assembled in a variety of ways.

In 1906 inquiries were addressed to individuals or organizations in various localities asking them to estimate the number of Jews in their towns. In cases in which the estimates conflicted, there was a "gauge" applied which endeavored to account for the number and the character of the possible duplications.¹

In 1916 Joseph Jacobs modified the correspondence method by using the figures of the Industrial Removal Office correspondents in the chief centers of

1. Szold, Henrietta - American Jewish Year Book 5668 - 1907-8.

Jewish population of 1912.¹

In 1926 and 1936, Dr. H.S. Linfield, the statistician in charge of the enumeration of Jewish religious bodies, endeavored to make this census serve the purpose of a general census which would cover all the Jews living in communities in which congregations were situated. The obvious shortcomings of these attempts are outlined below.

Criticism of Synagogue Attendance - Correspondence Method

1. It is obviously difficult to use the correspondence method in a city of any considerable size because of the overlapping in Jewish organizational life and it can hardly be used in a place where there is no Jewish communal life. It is difficult to determine a sample which can safely represent the distribution of Jews in such towns.
2. Church membership is a variable concept. If actual congregation membership is equated with the total Jewish population on the assumption that all Jews in a community are "ideologically" members of the Jewish community and in that sense congregants, the Census of Religious Bodies figures for Jews are not comparable to those for Catholics and Protestants.

Apart from these methodological shortcomings, the inadequacy of figures on Jewish congregants, as presented in the Census of Religious Bodies, have been clearly pointed out and documented by Dr. Uriah Z. Engelman on three counts: (1) comparability of definitions; (2) omission of data on sex and age required by the United States Census of Religious Bodies; and (3) low degree of coverage by Jewish congregations of the items on the Census schedule.² The Bureau of the Census report likewise comments on the incomparability and the lack of data for the Jewish group.

And even if the data were reliable for the individual cities, they lack the detail and the specificity needed for communal planning or special studies.

-
1. Jacobs, Joseph - American Jewish Year Book 5675 - 1914-15.
 2. February 8, 1946 Memorandum by Dr. U.Z. Engelman, Head of the Department of Research and Information of the American Assn. for Jewish Education outlining and documenting the criticisms of the Census of Jewish Religious Bodies.

Interpolation from Census Data¹

Interpolation from Census data has been used at various times. This device is used most often to reveal the characteristics of the Jewish population, assumed in general to be synonymous with the census figures in the densely populated Jewish areas.

In cities in which it is known that the Russian-born population is predominantly Jewish, it has been possible to make some assumptions for the Jewish population on the basis of the characteristics of the Russian-born. As, however, the proportion of foreign born decreases with the cutting off of immigration, this method becomes less feasible.

In estimating New York City Jewish population in 1920 and in 1930, a special application of interpolation from census data was used by Dr. Walter Laidlaw. The 120,000 foreign white stock residents in Manhattan, Bronx and Brooklyn according to the 1910 census were questioned as to their religious affiliation. The proportions of Catholics, Protestants and Jews found in that sample were applied to the 1920 and 1930 population statistics of the five boroughs.

When Dr. Laidlaw's estimates are compared with those derived from the Yom Kippur Method employed by the Jewish Education Association, the totals, 1,877,000 and 2,025,000 differ by less than 150,000. Within the boroughs, however, the variations range from an under-estimation in Laidlaw's figures in comparison with the Yom Kippur figures in the Bronx Jewish population of 150,000 and in Brooklyn of 155,000. The Laidlaw figures overestimate Queens Jewish population by 121,000 and Richmond by almost 30,000.

One fallacy is that the sampling on which Dr. Laidlaw's estimates were based did not include families of the various nativity groups from the boroughs of

1. The use of census data for estimating religious affiliations of the population is discussed in, "Can Delinquency Be Measured" by Robison, S.M., New York (1936), Appendix B, p 222.

Queens and Richmond in which obviously the proportions of the various ethnic stocks were different from those of the other boroughs.

Neither Dr. Laidlaw's method nor the Yom Kippur method, however, regardless of the lack of consistency, serves the purpose of those who wish to obtain figures on Jewish population for particular neighborhoods within the city.

The Jewish Name Method

Several of the methods described above involve the identification of Jewish names either on membership lists, death certificates, war records, or in various directories.

As a part of its war records study, a sample list of typical Jewish names was prepared by the Jewish Welfare Board. The incidence of these names in any roster or sample is assumed to be an index to the proportion which Jews are in a given universe.

Detroit - The 1935 study of the Detroit Jewish population, by Henry J. Meyer, used the 1935 Michigan Census of Population and Unemployment - itself a sample study of every fifth resident. The schedules of Jewish families, identified by family name and given names of household members, resulted in the author's opinion, in a sample which contained only Jews since all doubtful names were excluded. An informal check was made of the Jewish names with those on the membership lists of diverse Jewish organizations.

"The number of Jews in the various categories was calculated by applying the sample percentages of the estimated total Jewish population of Detroit in 1935. This estimate of the total Jewish population was based on the assumption that the number of Jewish cases on the Detroit Public Welfare rolls represented the same ratio to the true total of the Jewish population as the proportion of persons receiving relief in the Jewish sample to the total number constituting the sample."¹

Like Mr. Jaffe's study of the estimate of the Jewish population of

1. Jewish Social Studies, Publications No. 3, Robison, S.M. (1943), p 7

Chicago by the use of death certificates, the data from the unemployment schedules fail to provide data on many items of concern to persons interested in social or communal planning. Both authors state the limitations of their data in building up the estimated number of Jews in various occupational and industrial groups, as well as those of sex and age on the basis of calculations from percentages found among the schedules of those found to be Jewish.

New York - In connection with the building fund campaign of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in New York, the Jewish Welfare Board was asked to make an estimate of the 1945 Jewish population. The method used was (1) to assign the 3,000 New York City Selective Service registrants who had reached their 18th birthday in June 1945 according to residence in the ninety-two areas demarcated by the Jewish Education Committee, (2) to pick out the Jewish names from this list, and (3) to use the ratio of 18 year-old Jewish males in a sample survey of 28,000 Jews in New York City to the 18 year-old Selective Service Jewish males as a basis for estimating the total Jewish population.

What is not known is how these 28,000 Jews in the sample survey were selected, how good the choice of Jewish names was and whether or not the 3,000 names included 18 year-old men in the service who enlisted prior to their 18th birthday.

Although this procedure yielded totals for boroughs and sub-districts, there is no assurance that they are correct. In addition they fail to provide demographic details necessary for specific communal planning.

Voters' List

The voters' list employed by Mr. Eric Rosenthal in 1947 in a Doctor's dissertation at the University of Chicago, is actually a special case of the name method. The purpose of the study was specifically to trace the size and movement of Jewish populations, using the voters' list as a clue to its spatial distribution within a given city.

The author lists three sets of factors which determine the size of a voters' list in any area, (1) citizenship, registration system, legal residence requirements, (2) personal factors such as patterns of political behavior of individuals, and (3) variations in the pull of special political issues.

In applying the Jewish name technique to identifying Jews among voters, Mr. Rosenthal claims that the pattern of segregated occupancy of dwellings, i.e. that the Jews and non-Jews do not occupy the same dwelling structure, makes it likely that if some residents of a dwelling have distinct Jewish names and the others do not, both are Jewish. He claims that the configuration of distinctive Jewish names, disguised and neutral names of occupants of a building and of a block, make it relatively easy to pick out Jewish names from voters' lists. In his opinion the process results in an error of 10 percent or less.

Since voters' lists are arranged by house numbers, the segregated pattern of occupancy stands out more clearly and since they are also arranged for each precinct separately, areas known to have sizeable Jewish populations can be surveyed.

Master List

A method which has supplanted to some extent both the death rate and the Yom Kippur methods and Interpolation from Census data is the Master List as a basis for interviewing.¹

A master list was the starting point for the census of Jewish population by means of interviews in the 1936 Minneapolis and 1937 Passaic and Trenton studies. A house to house canvas was made in those sections of the city in which the street files of the master list indicated a concentration of Jews. In those areas in which, according to the lists, few Jews resided, inquiries were made at each Jewish household for Jewish neighbors. In addition, one or more households were visited on each side of the street and inquiries made at neighborhood stores to check or to add the names of their customers to the enumerated list of Jews in that neighborhood.

1. See Robison, S.M., "Jewish Population Studies", Conference on Jewish Relations, New York 1943, for details.

In New London and Norwich 1938 studies, the entire master list was first canvassed by mail. The 75 percent who did not reply were visited and asked to furnish names to the enumerators. The entire list was checked against the names of families obtained through a school survey then underway in the two communities. According to the author of these two studies, Dr. Bessie B. Wessel, the school canvas furnished as good an estimate of the Jewish population as did the master list.

Use of the master list as a check, rather than a starting point, is illustrated by Dr. U.Z. Engelman's 1938 survey of Jewish population in Buffalo. The city was divided into groups of census tracts, ranging from two to six blocks each, known as enumeration districts. In districts known to be densely populated by Jews, every household on each block was canvassed. In the outlying districts in which Jewish population was assumed to be sparse, three households on each side of the street and all shopkeepers were canvassed for additional Jewish residents in those areas. The results of the canvas were checked against the combined membership lists of Jewish organizations in Buffalo and showed ninety-two households which were not listed. It was estimated that two hundred fifty families were missed in the incomplete canvas of the outlying districts.

Sampling from Master List

Another variation of the use of the Master List is found in studies of large cities where it is not practical to canvas all names on a master list. In these instances, some method of sampling from the list is usually employed.

In San Francisco, 1938 and Pittsburgh 1938, the master lists were sampled in various ways and a variety of checks were used to determine the extent of coverage.

The main objection to the master list, either entire or sampled, is that there is no way of accounting for the extent to which the master list includes all Jewish households. There are some Jews who are not affiliated with Jewish organizations and there is a possibility that their characteristics may be different from those of Jews who are affiliated.

Stratified Sampling from Master List-1947

In the Essex County, N.J., study, a master list of approximately 20,000 names furnished a sample of 2700 households, stratified by election districts in inverse ratio to the assumed density of the Jewish population. The sampling factors ranged from one in one to one in thirty. The coverage of the master list was tested by a check with names listed in the 1946 Polk City Directory and a canvas of the new names on a sample basis. The results showed that the proportion missed ranged from 6 percent in the most densely populated Ward to 60 percent in the very sparsely settled uptown district.¹

While internal checks suggest the general reasonableness of the adjusted estimates for Newark proper, it remains to be seen in how far the breakdowns within the small areas correspond to the actual distribution.²

According to Dr. Hauser, there are tentatively three limiting factors in this procedure: (1) the preliminary determination that Newark proper should have two-thirds of the sample, (2) that the effect of the "not-at-homes" was not mathematically accounted for and (3) that the sample was chosen from the list rather than from a series of "N" stratified areas.

Other Sampling Procedures

A sampling procedure, similar to that used in the United States Public Health Survey in New York City, 1935, was the 1935 Youth Survey of New York City.

A canvas of every hundredth residential unit from the street files of the 1934 Real Property Inventory (approximately 21,000 households) yielded 19,000 households, 9,000 of which stated they had young persons between the ages of 16 and 24. On this basis, it was estimated that in the total population of New York City in 1935, Catholics accounted for 50 percent Protestants for 20 percent and Jews for 30 percent.

-
1. The Jewish Population of Essex County, S.M. Robison, April 1948.
 2. Gershenson, Charles - Master's Essay, Teacher's College, Columbia University. (In Preparation).

Within the individual boroughs, the proportions of Jewish persons between the ages of 16 and 24 varied from less than 1 percent in Richmond to almost 50 percent in the Bronx.¹

Although the sample in each of these estimates for Jewish, Catholic and Protestant checks in a variety of ways with the general distribution of the population of New York City, it cannot be inferred that the proportion of households with youths between the ages of 16 and 24 is the same as the proportion of all families for each religious affiliation in the population and the city as a whole. The focus of this study was on the recreational and leisure time interests of these youths and it, therefore, gave little additional data which would have been of interest in Jewish demographic studies.

New Sampling Methods of Bureau of the Census

Dr. Philip Hauser, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Census, says that the sampling procedures developed in the last five years by the United States Bureau of the Census make it possible to obtain reliable population figures within a pre-determined degree of precision.

The spurt to this development came with the publication about ten years ago in the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society of an article describing an application of new sampling methods by Dr. J. Neyman. The statisticians in the United States Bureau of the Census extended the application of these theories in connection with sampling in the 1940 census in which a 5 percent sample was used.²

Because of the need to figure costs closely, the Bureau statisticians developed and tested other methods of sampling for problems connected with war

-
1. McGill, N.P., "Some Characteristics of Jewish Youth in New York City", in Jewish Social Service Quarterly, Vol. XLV (1937) pp 251-72.
McGill, N.P. and Matthews, E.N., "Youth of New York City" (New York 1940).
 2. Stephan, F., Deming, W.E. and Hansen, M.H., "The Sampling Procedure of the 1940 Population Census" - Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 35, pp 615-630 (1940).
Stephan, F., and Deming, W.E., "On the Sampling Methods in the 1940 Population Census", Bureau of the Census, March, 1941.

production, labor supply, housing congestion, etc. The problem set was to assure the optimum results within a given degree of precision in a count of a total population at the least possible cost.

The Bureau has maps for cities of various sizes which it uses as a basis for selecting the appropriate groups of blocks and sub-groups of dwelling units within blocks. The choice of blocks and dwelling units within the blocks to be sampled is simplified by the Sandstrom large-scaled detailed maps which show not only every single dwelling place, but sometimes also show the material of which the dwelling is constructed.

When a structure has more than four dwelling units, every single dwelling unit is listed and a random sample is picked according to the pre-determined ratio. Sometimes the picking is done by Tippits - Random Numbers, or by numbers which end in certain digits. In determining the ratio of blocks and of households within the blocks, the general principle is that the greater the variability, the larger the sample necessary.

The Bureau of the Census techniques consider very carefully the problem of schedules which are not filled out. Because it has been demonstrated that the "unknowns" and the "not reported" have different characteristics from the known - in general they represent smaller households, larger numbers of working persons and smaller numbers of children. It is important, to arrange for actually obtaining a sufficient number of returns on the non-reports. Since they are more expensive to secure than the schedules which can be immediately filled out, cost calculations should allow for a sufficient number of revisits to include an adequate proportion of the "not reported" in the census. To accomplish this within a given budget, the number of cases should be cut in direct relation to the amount of money which remains after a given sum had been allocated to those difficult to get.¹

1. Hansen, M., "Sampling of Human Populations", prepared for meeting of the International Statistical Conferences, Sept. 1947.

While the general pattern for the application of this sampling plan is described in a bulletin written by Mr. William Horowitz along with the instructions for selecting an appropriate sample which will meet the limitations of the funds available, the time and the degree of precision desired by the administrator, it cannot be immediately applied in any study.¹ It is necessary to know the distribution of the population in each community, the appropriate stratification of areas and the density of the Jewish population. The design of each sample has to be custom made for each city.

Clearly an obvious task of the proposed Bureau for Jewish Demography would be to experiment with the application of these sampling principles for Jewish communities where size warrants their use. In smaller communities, alternative methods would need to be developed and tested for cost and precision.² Some consideration would need to be given also to the use of street directories as well as to maps in sampling procedures.

-
1. A description of the method and of a manual for applying it is now in manuscript form in the possession of Dr. H.S. Linfield who engaged Mr. William Horowitz of the Census Bureau to prepare it.
 2. "A chapter in Population Sampling" by the Sampling Staff, Bureau of the Census, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., Price \$1.00.

III

WHAT IS WANTED

A recapitulation of the available sources of Jewish demographic data provides an appropriate background for comparison with the statements of needs made by the various Jewish organizations. The list is as follows:

1. The American Jewish Year Book for 1948.
 - a. An alphabetical list of the latest population estimates of approximately 700 Jewish communities of 100 or more persons in cities throughout the United States.
 - b. A regional, state, county and city listing of Jewish communities with estimated populations of 1,000 or more.¹
2. Occasional studies and surveys of various communities under various auspices, geared to different problems.
3. "Jewish Population Studies", published by the Conference on Jewish Relations in 1943, surveys in ten cities dating from 1935 through 1938. It includes a critique of methods employed.
4. Series of estimates of Jewish population for New York City, based on a Yom Kippur absence from 1918 to data.

The obvious dissatisfactions with this material are:

1. Incomplete coverage for Jewish communities in the United States.
2. For those cities in which there have been estimates at various times, the data are often lacking in many basic items and are incomparable and discontinuous.
3. Methods used in arriving at the estimates vary to such an extent that there is no feeling of certainty as to which estimates are reliable. There is rarely any indication of the margin of error.
4. For the larger cities which account for two-thirds of the total Jewish population in the United States, the data are probably even more unreliable.

1. These two lists are based upon returns from a questionnaire circulated by the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds. There is also available at the Federation office an unpublished alphabetical list of approximately 500 Jewish communities estimated to have less than 100 Jews each.

For example, in spite of the many efforts at estimating New York City's Jewish population from 1902 to the present, the results from the various methods provide neither a basis for estimating total growth, or change, or any firm basis for detailed, comparable knowledge of specific characteristics by neighborhoods.

Organizations Interested in the Proposed Bureau¹

The many organizations under Jewish auspices which have expressed interest in the proposed Bureau, both in the past and in the present, may be roughly classified first as national or local and then according to their various fields. There is some overlap in this classification, and some multi-functional organizations will have interests in more than one area. On the national level there are:

1. Agencies Concerned with Social Planning

Jewish Welfare Board
Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds

Communities which are affiliated with the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds in their concern with social planning need data on population characteristics in sufficient detail to plan for the setting up and the distribution of local services to meet local problems.

Advice on such studies is at present usually provided by staff members of the Council upon request from the local communities.

The Jewish Welfare Board, though specifically geared to study group work organizations, needs background data on the distribution of the population as well as on its characteristics.

At present the national agencies cooperate when surveys for special interests are proposed since relevant background data is a common concern.

If a Bureau were set up, uniform procedures could be worked out with much more assurance that not only the local needs, but those on a national scale would be more adequately and more expeditiously met than is at present the case.

2. Service to Special Groups

American Association for Jewish Education
Jewish Labor Committee
Jewish Occupational Council
United Service for New Americans

1. See Appendix A for list of persons interviewed

This group of agencies has a general interest in the type of data assembled in community studies.

The American Association for Jewish Education is concerned specifically with data which reflect Jewish interest in and support for Jewish education, such as:

- a. changes in the number and distribution by neighborhoods of the child population
- b. attitudes of parents toward their own Jewish educational backgrounds
- c. Parents plans for Jewish education for their children.

The Jewish Labor Committee has a general concern with the trends in Jewish employment, similar to that of the Jewish Occupational Council, but more general in the sense that they use it for better public relations rather than for vocational or training programs.

Specifically, the Jewish Labor Committee would use the data on occupational distribution, proportions of wage earners to self-employed, and if available, the number of non-Jews employed by Jews, in dealing with problems in public relations.

In addition, the Jewish Occupational Council wishes data on occupation and income level for Jews in various cities as background for studies in trends in the Jewish, as related to the general field of employment opportunities, discrimination, etc.

The United Service for New Americans, in determining quotas in its resettlement program, particularly in the smaller Jewish communities, is interested not only in the community, but also in the types of congregations and Landsmanshaft organizations, the proportion of Yiddish speaking persons, of Sabbath observers, and the possibility for employment in certain types of industry, in their new resettlement program.

It is, of course, possible that some of these interests might be met from other sources. On the other hand, if such data were generally available, they might well be a starting point for a wider distribution of persons in the resettlement program.

3. Public Relations and Fund Raising

American Jewish Committee
American Jewish Congress
National Community Relations Advisory Council
United Jewish Appeal

Organizations specializing in public relations can make general use of the details of the population data collected in local community studies on population, health, welfare and service organizations.

They are obviously concerned with comparisons between the Jewish and non-Jewish community as reflected in the movement of populations, etc.

The American Jewish Committee has several interests. One is to provide information to supplement the unsatisfactory previous estimates. Another is in connection with its special research on the amount and character of anti-Semitic activities in various communities. A third is for use in the American Jewish Year Book, which it edits.

The problem of sampling population is particularly important in its opinion surveys related to action programs.

The American Jewish Congress, like the American Jewish Committee, has many interests in population data. For example, it is concerned with general information for its constituents¹, as well as with background information for its legislative program and for the community surveys undertaken in the CCI studies.

Fund raising organizations use population data in establishing community quotas or in setting up committees by business or industry.

For example, the National Community Relations Advisory Council sets dues for its members on the basis of the size of the community and at present considers no community with fewer than 8,000 Jews eligible for membership.

4. Research

Conference on Jewish Relations
Yiddish Scientific Institute
World Jewish Statistical Bureau

Research organizations are interested in general estimates of the size and geographic distribution of Jewish population in the United States by regions, cities and communities; a time series which would show (a) increases and decreases in total Jewish population; (b) changes in sex ratios; (c) age groups; (d) family size; (e) occupational distribution; (f) highest grade of school completed; and (g) mobility.

The Yiddish Scientific Institute would be interested in a background for the special studies of tensions and attitudes. It is concerned with the national origins of Jews and their roots in other countries. The proportions of Jews speaking and reading Yiddish are also important factors in the behavior patterns of the American Jewish communities.

Research on such subjects as the incidence of divorce, intermarriage, dependency, mental illness, specific diseases, is now not satisfactory to the Jewish group because the necessary background data are almost completely lacking. Studies of specific sociological and psychological patterns in Jewish community behavior are also handicapped by this lack.²

-
1. See Jewish Public Affairs Pamphlets by Dr. Nathan Goldberg.
 2. Special concern of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

And finally, if the proposed World Jewish Statistical Bureau is to function properly, there must be an American organization to supply the data for the largest Jewish settlement in the world.

Local Agencies

It is quite evident that in obtaining the necessary data for the national agency, the local agency or community is a primary source. There need be no conflict of interest however. Nation-wide figures will be forthcoming if there is planning and joint consultation to incorporate the concern of both. Local Federations have found many profitable ways to use data by neighborhoods, not only for distribution of services, but for fund raising efforts.

Local communities with specific problems to settle often need population data broken down by area or neighborhood. Within these areas, sub-classifications by family size, income level, educational status, home ownership, organization affiliation, synagogue attendance and other factors can be secured, if the study is properly designed and the specific focus is clearly stated.

A central bureau would make possible the planning and designing of local studies to serve both local and national purposes.

IV

PROPOSALS FOR THE ORGANIZATION'S SET UP

Statement of Purpose

The statement of purposes finally formulated by the members of the committee functioning for the Interim Committee of the Conference on Jewish Demography, and accepted at the October 22, 1947 meeting, reads as follows:

"To gather population and other statistical data on the Jews of the United States to provide such data to Jewish communal agencies requiring statistical information for their programs and to the general public; to render professional advice and assistance to Jewish national and local groups undertaking studies in this field; to explore and evaluate methods for conducting population and other statistical research; to serve as a clearing house and coordinating body in the planning and conducting of such studies; to stimulate national interest in Jewish population research through publications and other appropriate media."

Procedure

Assuming that the participating organizations agree to set up a Bureau for Jewish population research, the initial steps would be:

1. To circularize Jewish communities in the United States offering service and advice on planning and carrying out local population surveys.
2. While waiting for requests from local communities for advice or assistance, initiate a study of a nearby, medium sized Jewish community as a demonstration of the use of the best available techniques.

An appropriate community for such a study would be Trenton, New Jersey.¹ Such a study could be completed fairly quickly and the circulation of the report would be the best advertisement for the work of the new Bureau.²

3. Set up a central file and library of (a) available studies, and (b) schedules, manuals, instruction sheets and codes which have been used.³

-
1. It is reported that Trenton has been considering a new study and no doubt the community would finance it.
 2. This was the suggestion of Dr. Ralph Hurlin of the Russell Sage Foundation.
 3. Cooperation has been offered by Dr. Kingsley Davis of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, and would no doubt be offered by the national agencies in connection with their own libraries.

4. Plan a program of special studies:

a. On the distribution nationally of Jewish communities as a preliminary to outlining a series of surveys in:

- (1) Regions in which the Jewish population appears to be growing on the basis of the available data.
- (2) Regions which appear to be losing Jewish population.
- (3) States in which the Jewish population is widely scattered in small communities.
- (4) Areas in which the Jewish population is very sparse.

It would be interesting to contrast the characteristics of the Jews in each of these types of settlements with those of the Jews in the larger urban Jewish centers.

b. In the field of vital statistics, for example:

- (1) Jewish birth and death rates.
- (2) Incidence of specific physical and mental illnesses.
- (3) Incidence of intermarriage and divorce.
- (4) Patterns of segregation or dispersion with the general community.
- (5) Organization affiliations, both Jewish and non-Jewish.

5. Inform all universities and research organizations of the proposed advisory and technical services and suggest appropriate topics for research in the Jewish population field to encourage graduate study in this area.¹

Auspices

The alternatives for auspices proposed at the October 22nd meeting were:

1. A body representing all the national agencies concerned with Jewish population problems, with those agencies participating directly in the formulation of the program.
2. An entirely independent agency with a Board of Officers selected from the general community.

1. Dr. Kingsley Davis, who is teaching population courses at Columbia Univ., believes that more and better personnel will be available in this field to undertake additional studies.

In the course of interviews with the interested persons, three additional proposals were made:

1. The Bureau should be set up under the auspices of a university. The advantage would be the prestige of a university connection, as for example, the Population Center at Princeton University, or the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia.

A possible disadvantage is that the academic orientation might interfere with the practical program.¹

2. The Bureau should be set up under the aegis of the Conference on Jewish Relations which has no action program, is focused entirely on research, and originally proposed joint efforts on population research.
3. The Bureau should be set up under the aegis of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds as the agency through which the largest number of requests for studies is likely to come.

This proposal by Dr. Dushkin was echoed by Mr. Picheny of the Jewish Welfare Board as an expedient until 1950, the year of the next decennial census. Both Dr. Dushkin and Mr. Picheny believed that the interests of their organizations would not in any way be hampered by such auspices, since they are already cooperating in various community surveys.

Mr. Lurie, in later discussions, stated that in his opinion, the Council auspices would not be an advantage either to the Federations or to the proposed Bureau.

Arguments For and Against a Representative Organization

On the Positive Side - It would assure the budget and would leave the staff free to devote itself to the problems of research.

It would also assure clearance of the proposed projects and consultation with all agencies interested in meeting the needs of the local communities.

On the Negative Side - It is possible that the interests, philosophy or the point of view of any one organization might dictate the program and influence the publication and the use of the data.

Arguments For and Against an Independent Organization

On the Negative Side - Fear that the Bureau would compete with the existing organizations for funds.

The possible tendency to spread its field of interest from population research into other fields, and so run up against the specialized research interests of organizations already in the field. For example, the Yiddish Scientific Institute, American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish

-
1. It would be interesting to investigate the actual relationship of the Institute of Applied Social Research of which Dr. Lazarsfeld is Director, and Columbia Univ., in regard to the amount of supervision which the University exercises over the program.

Congress, each of which conduct research programs oriented to studies of opinions and attitudes as well as modes of attack in tension areas in Jewish communities.

In reply to these objections, it was pointed out that all these negative factors could be controlled by simply delineating areas of functions in the initial statement of the agency's scope and role.

On the Positive Side - It would assure a non-partisan set up in which the interests of the various organizations could be served without any one of them exercising control over the general use of the data.

It would insure objectivity in shaping policies, deciding on priorities for research projects, and the publication of findings. An independent agency would attract scholars who might hesitate to participate in a partisan set up.

Governing Board

Suggestions for the Governing Board included the following proposals:

1. That the Board members be designated by the cooperating national organizations as their representatives.
2. That persons be chosen independently of their organization connections and on the basis of their interest in the program and their ability to contribute to its operation, either financially, technically or by lending it prestige. It was suggested that they should not all be residents of New York City.
3. That it be set up as a commission similar in structure to the Atomic Energy Commission.¹ These five persons, not all of them technicians, would be responsible for formulating and carrying out the policies of the agency. They should be persons able to be close enough to the organization to know exactly what is going on and to advise and direct the professional person at the head, who would be directly responsible to them.

Advisory Committees

There were differences of opinion as to how the technicians, as well as statisticians affiliated with non-Jewish organizations, such as persons from the Bureau of the Census; scholars of known interest and reputation in the field - public health officials, sociologists, etc.; should be used. In general the opinion of persons who are connected with research organizations² was that it was wiser to use the technicians as consultants on particular problems rather than as

-
1. Suggested by Dr. Ralph Hurlin of the Russell Sage Foundation.
 2. Dr. Ralph Hurlin of the Russell Sage Foundation and Dr. Kingsley Davis of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

a committee of technical experts. This would mean that their advice would be sought at specific times in regard to specific problems. The argument against their use on committees is that they might become involved in a discussion of abstract technical problems and possibly delay the carrying out of the program.¹

Individual Membership

Individual membership was suggested by Dr. Nathan Goldberg, who thought that the organization might attract a considerable number of Jewish scholars, interested either directly in population research or in peripheral studies. His comment was that the membership would in a sense parallel that of the Conference on Jewish Relations.

Dr. Bachi, of the Hebrew University, offered a list of persons, some of whom he knew were definitely interested and others whom he thought would probably be interested in the organization.² He did not, however, specify whether they should be invited to be members or how they might serve.

Finances

Various annual sums were suggested as necessary in setting up such a Bureau. Current proposals range from \$25,000 to \$100,000, suggested by Dr. Nathan Goldberg who stated that it was important to have sufficient money to undertake independent studies and to provide for publications. He suggested that the money should be assured for a period of from three to five years.

An argument in favor of a maximum budget was advanced by Mr. Walter Lurie of the National Advisory Relations Council with the reminder that it takes considerable time to get an organization going, and it is more realistic to set the budget fairly high to begin with, since it is always difficult to secure additional funds after the budget has once been established.

-
1. Dr. Kingsley Davis mentioned the sampler who is a perfectionist and is never satisfied with the choice of his sample.
 2. See Appendix B for list of names.

Persons who have had experience in running research organizations¹, proposed sums ranging between \$25,000 and \$35,000 as reasonable for the initial program. Each of them said that if he could see that amount of money, he would feel justified personally in going ahead.

Mr. George Rabinoff of the Training School for Jewish Executives, Mr. Eli Cohen of the Jewish Occupational Council, and Dr. Max Weinreich of YIVO, proposed \$50,000 as a reasonable sum, if it were assured for three years.

There is a possibility that persons whose experience has been in Jewish organizations may be more realistic about the cost of personnel than those whose work has been largely in non-Jewish agencies or under government or university auspices. It is also possible, that under the present inflationary situation, provisions have to be made for a larger budget than would be necessary in ordinary times.

Sources of Income

1. From Cooperating National Organizations

Among the persons interviewed who indicated the possibility of financial support, without, however, commitment as to exact amounts, were persons connected with the following organizations.

The American Jewish Committee
Conference on Jewish Relations
Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds
Jewish Education Committee
Yiddish Scientific Institute

Organizations whose staff representatives were not prepared to make even tentative commitments, but who could definitely see ways in which the data would be of service to them were:

American Association for Jewish Education
American Jewish Congress
Jewish Labor Committee
Jewish Welfare Board
United Service for New Americans

1. Drs. Davis, Dushkin, Hauser and Hurlin

2. From the Local Communities

There was general agreement that the local communities undertaking studies would probably be willing to pay not only actual costs, but a service fee as well from their Welfare Funds, if not from the treasury of the specific agency asking for the study.

The amount of money from these sources is uncertain and would not be immediately available since it takes considerable time to plan for, initiate and complete a study.

Discussion with Dr. Maurice Hexter of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropic Societies indicated that when the Bureau was set up and a proposal made for a study in New York City, he would be willing to discuss the interests of the Federation in the study and a share in the cost.

3. From Foundations

The matter of foundation support would need further exploration.

Staff

Director - It was generally agreed that if the person chosen to head the organization would not have to raise funds, he should:

1. Ideally possess a knowledge of Jewish community organization, and be familiar with research techniques.
2. Have administrative ability, be free to travel and have enough public relations skill to enlist the cooperation of the communities which are considering studies.
3. Be able to write reports.

While there might be some advantages in a person who was a sample expert¹, Drs. Davis, Hauser and Hurlin pointed out that this would be wasteful because the skill of the sampler is necessary chiefly at two points (1) in consultation in the designing of the study, and (2) after the data are in, to suggest the necessary calculations, adjustments and application of the formulas for testing the degree of reliability.

1. Dr. Hauser says there are not ten people in the country who really understand the new sampling techniques fully, and as fast as they are trained by the Bureau of the Census, they are snapped up.

Assistant Director - The assistant to the director, who would be responsible for administration in the absense of the diretor, should be competent to design the questionnaire, codes, table, forms, etc.

He should be free to occasionally travel so that he would be familiar with the problems in the field, as well as in the office.

If the Bureau had its own IBM equipment, it would be necessary for the assistant to be a production man familiar with the IBM equipment, as well as with the business of schedule making, etc.

Secretary and Library Assistant

Staff for Processing Data - There are two possibilities:

One, if the IBM equipment is installed (this would take at least eleven months), it would be necessary to have a key punch operator and sorter - a person who is primarily adaptable and intelligent in addition to being able to operate the key punch, which in a small Bureau would not keep her busy full time.

Two, If the IBM equipment is not acquired, the data can be processed through the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University, which has a key punch and sorters which it would make available at practically cost for coding, punching, sorting and tabulating, if that is desirable.

Statistical Clerks - Regardless of whether the data are processed, some clerical assistance will be needed for calculating percentages, and for setting up tables. The number would depend upon the studies currently under way and the time limit for their completion.

- 35 -
Tentative Budget

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
<u>Capital Expenditure</u>		
Office Furniture		
For 3 rooms - desks, chairs, tables, files, etc.	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,500
Typewriters - 2 (one long carriage)	150	200
Electric Calculating Machines - 2 @ \$750	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>
	\$ 2,650	\$ 3,200
 <u>Annual Budget</u>		
<u>Salaries</u>		
Director	8,500	10,500
Assistant Director	6,000	8,000
Secretary-Librarian	3,500	3,500
Librarian		3,000
Statistical Clerks (2)	4,000	4,000
Consultant Fees (\$50 a day plus expenses)	2,000	2,000
Processing Fees	<u>2,500</u>	<u>2,500</u>
	\$26,500	\$33,500
 <u>Rent</u>		
For 3 rooms - (\$3.50 to \$4.50 sq. ft.)	2,500	3,000
 <u>Travel</u>		
Per diem expenses for staff - 50 days @ \$10 day	\$500	
Railroad fare	<u>1,000</u>	1,500
	1,500	1,500
 <u>Telephone and Telegraph</u>		
	500	500
 <u>Supplies and Postage</u>		
	1,000	1,000
 <u>Publications</u>		
	3,000	3,000
 <u>Contingency Fund</u>		
	<u>2,500</u>	<u>2,500</u>
Total Annual Budget	\$37,500	\$45,000

APPENDICES

- A. Persons Interviewed in Preparation for the Memorandum
- B. Persons Suggested as Interested in the Organization
- C. Suggesions for Staff
- D. Communities Contemplating Surveys
- E. Persons Attending the 1945 Conference on Jewish Demography

A.

- 37 -

Persons Interviewed in Connection with
the Preparation of the Memorandum

Cohen, Eli - Jewish Occupational Council
Chiel, Rabbi - Anti-Defamation League
Davis, Dr. Kingsley - Bureau of Social Research, Columbia University
Engelman, Uriah Z., Dr. - American Association for Jewish Education
Dushkin, Dr. Alexander - Jewish Education Committee
Fine, Morris - American Jewish Committee
Gershenson, Charles - Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College,
Columbia University
Goldberg, Dr. Nathan - American Jewish Congress
Hauser, Dr. Philip M. - Bureau of the Census
Hexter, Dr. Maurice - Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
Hurlin, Dr. Ralph - Russell Sage Foundation
Jacobs, -- - United Service for New Americans
Loman, Ann - Bureau of Social Research, Columbia University
Lurie, Harry - Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds
Lurie, Walter - National Community Relations Advisory Council
Muravchik, Emanuel - Jewish Labor Committee
Picheny, Elias - Jewish Welfare Board
Rabinoff, George - Training School for Jewish Executives
Seligman, Ben - Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds
Schroll, Leo - Anti-Defamation League
Weiner, Herbert - United Service for New Americans
Weinreich, Dr. Max - Yiddish Scientific Institute

B.

Persons Suggested By Professor Robert Bachi, Hebrew University
As Interested In A Bureau for Jewish Demographic Studies

Persons With Whom Professor Bachi Has Spoken

Dr. Felix Bernstein

Dr. Joseph Vital De Porte, Director, Division of Vital Statistics,
New York State Dept. of Health, Albany, N.Y.

Mr. Frank, American Fund for Palestine Institutions, 267 W. 71 st., NYC

Dr. A. J. Jaffee, Bureau of the Census

Dr. Sigmund Peller, 437 E. 84 St. NYC

Mr. George Sabagh, Office of Population Research, Princeton University

Dr. Jacob Yerushalzy, recently with the U. S. Dept. of Public Health

Other Names

Dr. Bluestone, Montefiore Hospital

Dr. Louis Dublin, Sr. and Dr. Louis Dublin, Jr.

Professor Eli Ginsberg, Columbia University

Mr. Graener and Mr. Gass, Associates of Mr. Robert Nathan

Professor Oscar Janowsky, City College, New York

Professor Samuel Joseph, City College, New York

Dr. Kaliski

Professor Philip Klein, New York School of Social Work

Dr. Samuel Koenig

Professor Irving Lange

Dr. Paul Lazarsfeld, Columbia University

Dr. Isador Lubin

Mr. Robert Nathan

Dr. Karl Pribram

Dr. Nathan Riech, Joint Distribution Committee

Mr. Sapir, Joint Distribution Committee

Mr. Shapiro, Joint Distribution Committee

Professor or Louis Wirth, University of Chicago

Mr. Mark Wishnitzer

Suggestions for Staff

Recommended by Dr. Philip M. Hauser

Tepping, Dr. Benjamin - Bureau of the Census (Ideal combination
of sampling and administrative skill)

Heyman, Herbert - National Opinion Research Center

Magidoff, Harry - Survey of Current Business (?)

Provis, Severin - (Excellent in sampling; not so good as an
administrator)

Nisselson, Harold - (Good at sampling)

Wolfbein, Sidney - Bureau of Labor Statistics (Sampling would
need to be supplemented by special consultant
services)

For Consultants

Manheimer, Ralph (Worked with Stauffer in three studies preparing
a manual for the Bureau of Social Research at
Columbia University)

Stephan, Dr. Frederick - Princeton University

Wilks, Dr. Samuel - Princeton University

Horowitz, Wm. - With Bureau of the Census

Hauser, Dr. Philip M. - Bureau of the Census

D.

- 41 -

List of the Communities Which, In Reply to the Council of
Federations and Welfare Funds, Reported That They Were
Anticipating Population Surveys in the Near Future

REGION	Present Population Estimate
<u>North Eastern</u>	
Connecticut	
Hartford	26,000
Waterbury	4,000
Maine	
Portland	3,300 plus
Massachusetts	
Boston	137,345
Springfield	10,000
<u>Middle Atlantic</u>	
New Jersey	
Atlantic City	9,000
Bayonne	12,000
Elizabeth	10,000
Passiac	12,000
Patterson	20,000
Trenton	7,650
Pennsylvania	
Allentown	2,900
Eastern	1,600
Philadelphia (Study in process)	245,000
York	935 plus
<u>East North Central</u>	
Illinois	
Chicago	300,000
Peoria	1,575
Ohio	
Dayton	5,500
Canton	3,600
<u>West North Central</u>	
Iowa	
Des Moines	3,500
Cedar Rapids	500
Sioux City	3,200
<u>East South Central</u>	
Alabama	
Birmingham	4,200

REGION	Present Population Estimate
<u>South Atlantic</u>	
Florida	
Tampa	1,800
Georgia	
Savannah	4,000
Tennessee	
Knoxville	700
Nashville	3,000
Virginia	
Norfolk	7,500
Richmond	10,000
<u>West South Central</u>	
Louisiana	
New Orleans	7,500
Texas	
Dallas	10,000
<u>Mountain</u>	
Arizona	
Phoenix	3,500
<u>Pacific</u>	
California	
Stockton	1,200

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bureau of the Census Washington D.C. "The Use of Sampling in Opinion Surveys". "A Chapter in Population Sampling".
- Conference on Jewish Demography - Stenotype Report. New York, December 3, 1945.
- Hansen, M. "Sampling of Human Populations" Distributed by Joint Arrangements Committee for the International Statistical Conferences. August, 1947.
- Hansen, M. H. and Hauser, P. M. "Area Sampling -- Some Principles of Sample Design". Public Opinion Quarterly. Summer, 1945.
- Hansen, M. H. and Hurwitz, W. N.
"The Problem of Non-Response in Sample Surveys". Journal of American Statistical Association, Dec., 1946. Vol. 41. pp. 517 - 529.
"On The Theory of Sampling From Finite Populations" The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, Dec., 1943. Vol. 14. No. 4.
"Sampling Methods Applied to Census Work". Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.
- Hansen, M. H., Hurwitz, W. N., and Gurney, M. "Problems and Methods of the Sample Survey of Business". Journal of the American Statistical Association. June, 1946. Vol. 41. pp. 173 - 189.
- Hauser, P. M. and Hansen, M. H. "On Sampling In Market Surveys". Journal on Marketing, July, 1944.
- McGill, N. P. and Mathews, E.N. Youth of New York City. New York, 1940.
- Research Bureau, Welfare Council of New York City. Manhattan Children In Day Schools in 1935. 1938.
- Robison, S. M.
The Jewish Population of Essex County. Jewish Community Council of Essex County, April, 1948.
"Jewish Social Studies - Publications, No. 3". "Jewish Population Studies" - Conference on Jewish Relations New York, 1943.
- Stephan, F. F. and Deming, W. E. and Hansen, W. H. "The Sampling Procedure of the 1940 Population Census". Journal of the American Statistical Association. December, 1940. Vol. 35. pp. 615 - 630.