

THIS PUBLICATION IS PROVIDED BY THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH DATA BANK WITH PERMISSION FROM THE STUDY AUTHORS.

THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH DATA BANK IS A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT OF UNITED JEWISH COMMUNITIES AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT'S CENTER FOR JUDAIC STUDIES AND CONTEMPORARY JEWISH LIFE AND ROPER CENTER FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH. OUR MISSION IS TO:

PROVIDE EMPIRICAL SURVEY DATA SETS ABOUT THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY, FROM NATIONAL AND LOCAL SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC STUDIES AS WELL AS OTHER TYPES OF CONTEMPORARY AND HISTORICAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH.

MAKE AVAILABLE SUBSTANTIVE AND METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS ON THE JEWISH COMMUNITY, IN PARTICULAR, REPORTS BASED ON DATASETS THAT ARE PART OF THE ARCHIVE.

PROMOTE THE DATA BANK TO JEWISH FEDERATIONS, COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS, FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER GROUPS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH CONCERNING JEWISH LIFE IN NORTH AMERICA.

ENCOURAGE ACADEMICIANS, STUDENTS, COMMUNAL PROFESSIONALS AND OTHERS TO UTILIZE DATA BANK HOLDINGS AND TO MAKE THEIR STUDIES A PART OF THE ARCHIVE.

SPONSOR SEMINARS AND PROVIDE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCHERS AND PLANNERS TO DISCUSS ISSUES, IMPROVE METHODOLOGIES AND EXCHANGE IDEAS BASED ON QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH.

PREPARE PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER FORMS OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION CONCERNING SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ABOUT NORTH AMERICAN JEWRY.

PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE TO FEDERATIONS, RESEARCHERS, COMMUNAL PROFESSIONALS, JOURNALISTS AND OTHERS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH ON THE JEWISH COMMUNITY.

PLEASE NOTE THAT OUR DATA AND REPORTS ARE PROVIDED FOR NON-COMMERCIAL USE ONLY.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT  
[HTTP://WWW.JEWISHDATABANK.ORG](http://www.jewishdatabank.org)



UNITED STATES

## Socio-Economic

### CHANGES IN JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1949-50

THE ESTIMATES of the Jewish population in the major communities of the United States that were published in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Volume 50 (1948-49), were derived from a poll of over two hundred Jewish community organizations affiliated with the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), as well as from estimates obtained from the files of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) and the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB). It will be recalled that while these estimates were secured in a variety of ways, their accuracy and reliability were often uncertain, and in many instances the respondents who were supplying the information admitted that they could only guess at the number of Jews residing in their towns. Fortunately, most of the larger Jewish communities employed more efficient devices for estimating their populations. Consequently, it was possible to suggest a number of statements concerning the concentrations of American Jews with a fair degree of confidence.

That American Jews were predominantly urban was emphasized by the fact that 75 per cent of them lived in the 14 communities reporting a Jewish population of 40,000 or more—New York, Washington, Miami, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Newark, Detroit, Boston, San Francisco, and Baltimore. It was also roughly estimated that the total number of Jews in the United States was 4,500,000.

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

Communities affiliated with the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds were again polled. The questionnaire in the current survey was quite brief: Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had made any revisions in their previous population estimates; if so, to indicate the method employed for making the new estimates; and they were asked to

indicate whether or not a survey of Jewish population was being contemplated. Replies were received from 159 communities, 60 of which indicated revisions in their estimates of Jewish population. Of these, 51 respondents indicated increases in Jewish population, while 9 communities thought that they had suffered losses. All of the latter were cities with a Jewish population of less than 20,000; more than half of the increases was reported in communities with a Jewish population of under 10,000.

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

The methods utilized for estimating changes included revisions of contributors lists (reported by 22 communities), individual estimates (10 communities), inventory devices (12 communities), surveys (11 communities), the Yom Kippur method (1 community), and other methods (4 communities). It thus became clear that little progress had been made in standardizing and co-ordinating the methods for estimating Jewish populations.

The appended list of Jewish population estimates is offered with the same word of caution as was set forth in the previous volume of the YEAR BOOK.<sup>1</sup> They were derived in similar fashion: from respondents of the current survey and from the files of the CJFWF and UJA. Communities with less than 100 Jews were omitted. The communities listed, together with those in the very small towns (with a Jewish population of less than 100), comprised a total of approximately 4,700,000 Jews in the United States. This figure for the American Jewish population is offered as a rough estimate only, based on previous and current estimates as well as on what little is known about the patterns of the population growth of American Jewry.

While reasonably accurate estimates of the total Jewish population in a given community is of interest in such matters as fund raising and in gauging the demand for Jewish social services, of perhaps greater significance is a knowledge of such details as the age structure, educational background, and occupational pattern of the American Jewish community.

In the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1950, Volume 51, an effort was made to present a partial picture of these demographic characteristics based upon fifteen previously unpublished community population studies.

In order to complete the picture, six additional studies are here reviewed.

---

<sup>1</sup> AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 50 (1948-49), p. 663.

TABLE 1  
JEWISH POPULATION STUDIES

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

### Age Distribution

The data for 1948-49 indicated that the Jewish population appeared to be older on the average than the general population. Information on age and sex distribution in 1948-49 revealed population gaps in the young and teen-age groups; that the gaps extended into the older age groups; and that, in consonance with the general population, there had been a wartime spurt in the birth rate.

TABLE 2  
AGE COMPOSITION: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH POPULATION

Age group	Trenton	Nashville	Gary	Salt Lake City
0-4 . . . . .	9.0	9.0	11.0	11.1
5-9 . . . . .	8.2	6.3	6.9	5.9
10-14 . . . . .	5.4	6.3	6.9	5.3
15-19 . . . . .	5.8	6.0	7.1	4.2
20-24 . . . . .	7.0	6.7	7.6	5.1
25-29 . . . . .	8.7	7.0	7.7	9.6
30-34 . . . . .	8.7	7.7 <sup>a</sup>	7.8 <sup>a</sup>	8.9
35-39 . . . . .	9.5	7.7	7.8	10.4
40-44 . . . . .	8.9	7.6	7.8	9.5
45-49 . . . . .	7.3	7.7	7.7	5.7
50-54 . . . . .	6.8	7.8	8.0	6.3
55-59 . . . . .	4.9	7.4	7.8	6.2
60-64 (60 and over)	4.7	12.8	5.9	4.4
65-69 (65 and over)	5.1	—	—	3.8
70-74 . . . . .	—	—	—	1.6
75-79 . . . . .	—	—	—	1.5
80-84 . . . . .	—	—	—	.4
85 and over . . . . .	—	—	—	.1
MEDIAN AGE . . . . .	32.4	34.6	30.8	33.9

<sup>a</sup> Figures given for age groups of 30 and over are estimates.

Tables 2 and 3 present age distribution percentage data for Trenton (1949), Nashville, Gary, and Salt Lake City. These were derived in the same way as were the tables in AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1950, Volume 51 [see p. 5, n. 6]. The pattern they showed was not markedly different from that displayed in the earlier postwar studies. In each instance the average (median) age was over 30; gaps were shown for the 5-9 and 10-14 age

TABLE 3

AGE COMPOSITION BY SEX: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH POPULATION

Age Group	Trenton		Nashville		Gary		Salt Lake City	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
0-4.....	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4	5.6	5.4	5.8	5.3
5-9.....	3.9	4.3	3.2	3.1	3.8	3.1	2.8	3.1
10-14.....	2.8	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.8	3.1	3.0	2.3
15-19.....	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.5	2.9	1.3
20-24.....	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.8	3.8	2.5	2.6
25-29.....	4.2	4.5	3.6	3.4	3.7	4.0	5.1	4.5
30-34.....	4.1	4.6	3.6 <sup>a</sup>	4.1 <sup>a</sup>	4.1 <sup>a</sup>	3.7 <sup>a</sup>	3.6	5.3
35-39.....	4.8	4.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.5	5.9
40-44.....	4.5	4.4	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.8	5.4	4.1
45-49.....	3.9	3.4	3.6	4.1	3.9	3.8	2.5	3.2
50-54.....	3.6	3.2	3.8	4.0	4.2	3.8	2.9	3.4
55-59.....	2.4	2.5	3.5	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.4	2.8
60-64 (60 and over)	2.3	2.4	5.6	7.2	3.3	2.6	2.9	1.5
65-69 (65 and over)	2.8	2.3	—	—	—	—	1.7	2.1
70-74.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	.9	.7
75-79.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	.7	.8
80-84.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	.3	.1
85 and over.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	.1	—

<sup>a</sup> Figures given for ages 30 and over are estimates.

groups, while the 0-4 age groups exhibited a fairly broad base. The latter, the result of the high postwar birth rate, was also true of the 15 communities studies reviewed in Volume 51. It would not be inaccurate to state that the conclusions regarding age distribution suggested in Volume 51 apply with equal force and with the same qualifications to the four communities listed in Tables 2 and 3.

### Sex Ratios

The balance between males and females (sex ratios) has been emphasized as an important factor in demographic study, since it affects birth rates, death rates, marriages, and migrations. There were certain interesting features revealed in the 1948-49 review: The higher proportion of females to males in the middle-age brackets in Miami, and the higher proportion of males to females in the upper-age brackets in Miami and Worcester were noted as interesting variations from the general pattern in the United States. In the case of Miami, there were obvious social and economic factors that could explain these differences. As a resort town Miami might more readily attract as permanent residents persons in such service industries as restaurants and beauty parlors in which women were a strong element; also, retired men over 65 years of age were more apt to move from their home towns to resort areas than was the case with aged women.

Tables 4 and 5 give data on sex ratios for the six studies not previously reviewed. Trenton's data reveal a higher proportion of females in the 20-34

year age groups while the reverse is true for the age groups over 65. The reason for the latter was not determined. Nashville, on the other hand, showed a higher proportion of females for all groups of age 30 and over.

TABLE 4  
SEX RATIOS OF JEWISH POPULATIONS, 1949

<i>Community</i>	<i>Ratio</i>
Gary .....	107.5
Nashville .....	93.8
Salt Lake City .....	104.1
Trenton .....	100.8

TABLE 5  
SEX RATIOS BY AGE GROUPS OF JEWISH POPULATIONS

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>Trenton</i>	<i>Nashville</i>	<i>Gary</i>	<i>Salt Lake City</i>
0-4 .....	104.5	104.5	103.7	109.4
5-9 .....	90.7	103.2	122.6	90.3
10-14 .....	107.7	96.9	122.6	130.4
15-19 .....	100.0	100.0	102.9	223.1
20-24 .....	94.4	109.4	100.0	96.2
25-29 .....	93.3	105.9	92.5	113.3
30-34 .....	89.1	87.8 <sup>a</sup>	110.8 <sup>a</sup>	67.9
35-39 .....	102.1	92.5	105.3	76.3
40-44 .....	102.3	90.0	105.3	131.7
45-49 .....	114.7	87.8	102.6	78.1
50-54 .....	112.5	95.0	110.5	85.3
55-59 .....	96.0	89.7	105.3	121.4
60-64 (60 and over) ...	95.8	77.8	126.9	193.3
65-69 (65 and over) ...	121.7	—	—	81.0
70-74 .....	—	—	—	128.6
75-79 .....	—	—	—	87.5
80-84 .....	—	—	—	300.0
85 and over .....	—	—	—	—

<sup>a</sup> Figures given for ages 30 and over are estimates.

There, too, no reason was adduced for the higher proportion of females. Gary, on the other hand, showed a slightly higher proportion of males, but there the proximity to heavy industry may have been an explanatory factor, although this was not necessarily a contributing element.

### *Marital Status*

If the measurement of marital status were to be considered the sole criterion, one might suggest that the community population studies were improving. While previously only 4 out of 15 communities offered data on this aspect of population study, the 1949-50 questionnaire yielded information on marital status for 4 out of 6 communities. Again the greater majority of persons was classified as married, as evidenced in Table 6. The tentative

TABLE 6  
MARITAL STATUS OF JEWISH POPULATIONS

	Trenton <sup>a</sup>				Nashville <sup>b</sup>			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Single . . . . .	1,652	40.0	1,447	35.2	214	21.1	130	13.1
Married . . . . .	2,354	57.0	2,319	56.5	730	72.0	728	73.2
Divorced . . . . .	22	.6	38	.9	.5	.5	9	.9
Widowed . . . . .	96	2.3	299	7.3	65	6.4	128	12.8
Not reported	4	.1	2	.1	—	—	—	—
TOTAL . . . . .	4,128	100.0	4,105	100.0	1,014	100.0	995	100.0

  

	Gary <sup>b</sup>				Salt Lake City <sup>c</sup>			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Single . . . . .	175	25.2	105	16.0	111	23.6	46	10.1
Married . . . . .	489	70.6	487	74.5	330	70.4	342	75.0
Divorced . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Widowed . . . . .	16	2.3	51	7.8	28	6.0	68	14.9
Not reported	13	1.9	11	1.7	—	—	—	—
TOTAL . . . . .	693	100.0	654	100.0	469	100.0	456	100.0

<sup>a</sup> Age group not given.

<sup>b</sup> Ages 15 years and over.

<sup>c</sup> Ages 16 years and over.

conclusion that was offered in 1948-49, that Jewish populations conformed to the national pattern, with the possibility that the percentage of divorces was slightly smaller, can only be repeated at this time. The data in Table 6 do not provide any basis for altering this judgment.

### Family Size

It was also observed on the basis of the earlier studies that in all probability the average size of the Jewish family in America was slightly smaller than was the case with the general population. This was based on the fact that while the average (median) family size for the general population in the United States in 1940 was 2.65, virtually every Jewish community population survey showed a smaller average. Table 7, which describes family size, indicates that in Trenton, Rockville Centre, Nashville, Gary, Salt Lake City, and Elmira, the average (median) size of the Jewish family was smaller than the above-stated national average. Two-person and three-person families remained the predominant group; as in the earlier studies, however, the four-person family still represented a fair proportion of the total number of families.

TABLE 7  
FAMILY SIZE

No. of Persons	Trenton <sup>a</sup>			Rockville Centre <sup>b</sup>			Nashville <sup>a</sup>		
	No. of Households	Per Cent	No. of Individuals	No. of Families	Per Cent	No. of Children	No. of Households	Per Cent	No. of Individuals
1.....	130	4.9	130	200	26.1	200	102	11.7	102
2.....	763	28.7	1,526	455	59.3	910	229	26.3	458
3.....	796	30.0	2,388	98	12.8	294	219	25.2	657
4.....	713	26.8	2,832	13	1.7	52	190	21.8	760
5.....	256	9.6	1,280	1	.1	5	89	10.2	445
6.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	38	4.4	228
7.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	.3	21
8.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	.1	8
TOTAL.....	2,658	100.0	8,176	767	100.0	1,461	871	100.0	2,679
ARITHMETIC MEAN.....	3.1			1.9			3.1		
MEDIAN.....	2.5			1.4			2.5		

  

No. of Persons	Gary <sup>c</sup>			Salt Lake City <sup>c</sup>			Elmira <sup>a</sup>		
	No. of Families	Per Cent	No. of Individuals	No. of Families	Per Cent	No. of Individuals	No. of Households	Per Cent	No. of Individuals
1.....	38	6.7	38	83	18.6	83	43	10.9	43
2.....	153	27.0	306	159	35.6	318	110	27.9	220
3.....	164	29.0	492	86	19.2	258	102	25.9	306
4.....	150	26.5	600	89	19.9	356	92	23.4	368
5.....	49	8.6	245	24	5.4	120	35	8.9	175
6.....	10	1.8	60	6	1.3	36	12	3.0	72
7.....	1	.2	7	—	—	—	—	—	—
8.....	1	.2	8	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL.....	566	100.0	1,756	447	100.0	1,171	394	100.0	1,184
ARITHMETIC MEAN.....	3.1			2.6			3.0		
MEDIAN.....	2.6			1.9			2.4		

<sup>a</sup> Number of households.

<sup>b</sup> Number of children in family living at home — includes only families with children.

<sup>c</sup> Number of families.

This fact, together with the statistics on age compositions, again underline the conclusion that American Jewry is replenishing itself at a very slow rate. In fact, if the number of newborn males is greater than the number of newborn females in the foregoing communities, then population growth may be said to be declining, since net reproduction rates are based on the extent to which one generation of child-bearing females reproduces itself. The high proportion of two-person and three-person families therefore may be indicative of a declining reproduction rate, although a cross tabulation by age and sex groups would be necessary for a definitive statement.

### *Fertility Ratio*

As was indicated in Volume 51, very little is known of the dynamic changes in Jewish population. It was surmised, on the basis of the information on age composition, that Jewish population growth in the United States was declining. In the absence of specific birth rates and death rates, the best index of change available to us is the fertility ratio, defined either as the number of children under the age of 5 per 1,000 women of child-bearing age, or as the number of young children per 1,000 persons of procreative age. While virtually all the studies reviewed in Volume 51 exhibited fertility

TABLE 8  
FERTILITY RATIOS

	<i>Children per 1,000 Females Age 20-44</i>	<i>Children per 1,000 Person Age 20-54</i>
Trenton . . . . .	412.8	158.2
Nashville . . . . .	481.3	172.4
Gary . . . . .	575.9	202.2
Salt Lake City . . . . .	495.5	200.0

ratios below the national (white) index, the four studies listed in Table 8 exceed the national figure. This in all probability is a continuation of the postwar spurt in the birth rate. It will be interesting to observe whether or not this tendency will continue in the next few years. If it does, we may have to revise our notions concerning the dynamic changes in Jewish populations.

### *Occupation*

The influence of occupation on demography is acknowledged by all population authorities; working conditions have a marked effect on health, marital status, and, in the long run, on reproduction rates. While some broad generalizations can be made about Jewish occupational status in the United States, a detailed analysis cannot be made on the basis of the information available in the community studies. The shortcomings of the latter were indicated in the 1948-49 review.

At that time the partial data available indicated that smaller proportions of total Jewish populations were part of the labor force than was the case with the general population; that the Jewish labor force appeared to be more in the employer and self-employed class than in the employee group; that this tendency, however, was strong only in the smaller urban centers; and that Jewish representation in the "clerical," "proprietors," and "professional" groups was large, relative to the Jewish population.

An examination of the data in Tables 9, 10, and 11 does not reveal any pattern that might substantially deviate from the foregoing conclusions. In

TABLE 9

## LABOR FORCE

A. LABOR FORCE—TRENTON  
JEWISH POPULATION: AGE 15 AND OVER

	Male		Female		TOTAL	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Employed . . . . .	2,693	71.6	733	19.3	3,426	45.4
Unemployed . . . . .	89 <sup>a</sup>	2.4	70 <sup>a</sup>	1.9	159 <sup>a</sup>	2.1
Total labor force . .	2,782	74.0	803	21.2	3,585	47.5
Not in labor force . .	978	26.0	2,986	78.8	3,964	52.5
TOTAL . . . . .	3,760	100.0	3,789	100.0	7,549	100.0

B. LABOR FORCE—NASHVILLE  
JEWISH POPULATION: AGE 15 AND OVER

	Male		Female		TOTAL	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
In labor force . . . .	790	77.6	133	12.0	923	43.4
Not in labor force . .	228	22.4	978	88.0	1,206	56.6
TOTAL . . . . .	1,018	100.0	1,111	100.0	2,129	100.0

C. LABOR FORCE—GARY  
JEWISH POPULATION: AGE 19 AND OVER

	Male		Female		TOTAL	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
In labor force . . . .	514	82.9	77	13.0	591	48.7
Not in labor force . .	106	17.1	516	87.0	622	51.3
TOTAL . . . . .	620	100.0	593	100.0	1,213	100.0

D. ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF JEWISH POPULATION  
IN LABOR FORCE

<i>City</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Trenton . . . . .	47.5 <sup>b</sup>
Nashville . . . . .	43.4 <sup>b</sup>
Gary . . . . .	48.7 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Figure for unemployed includes figure for "no answer."

<sup>b</sup> Age 15 and over.

<sup>c</sup> Age 19 and over.

TABLE 10  
OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF JEWISH LABOR FORCE

	Trenton		Nashville		Gary	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Professional and semi-professional . . . . .	658	19.2	103	11.1	109	18.4
Proprietors, managers, and officials . . . . .	1480	43.2	529	57.3	260	44.0
Clerical, sales, kindred . . . . .	929	27.1	260	28.2	122	20.6
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred . . . . .	195	5.7	30	3.3	63	10.7
Operatives, kindred . . . . .	116	3.4	—	—	—	—
Service (including protective) . . . . .	38	1.1	—	—	—	—
Laborers (including farmers) . . . . .	—	—	1	.1	37	6.3
Other . . . . .	10	.3	—	—	—	—
TOTAL . . . . .	3426	100.0	923	100.0	591	100.0

TABLE 11  
OCCUPATIONAL RANK OF JEWISH LABOR FORCES

	<i>Professional and Semi-professional</i>	<i>Proprietors, Managers, and Officials</i>	<i>Clerical, Sales, Kindred</i>	<i>Craftsmen, Foremen, Kindred</i>	<i>Operatives, Kindred</i>	<i>Service</i>	<i>Laborers</i>	<i>Other</i>
Trenton . . . . .	3	1	2	4	5	6	—	7
Nashville . . . . .	3	1	2	4	—	—	5	—
Gary . . . . .	3	1	2	4	—	—	5	—

Trenton, Nashville, and Gary, the data suggest that a slightly small proportion of the Jewish population was in the labor force than was the case with Newark, San Francisco, Detroit, and Buffalo, whose studies were reviewed in 1948-49. The Trenton, Nashville, and Gary studies were conducted during a prosperous economic period. At such times there is less need to supplement a breadwinner's income; a housewife is not likely to seek work outside the home, thereby removing herself from the labor market. The information on occupational classification and rank demonstrates again that proprietorship and professional and clerical occupations are predominant in the Jewish labor forces.

### *Home Ownership*

Table 12 presents data on home ownership in Trenton, Nashville, and Salt Lake City. Home ownership is often employed as an indication of economic status; it is, however, an incomplete measure, since considerably more information than the fact of home ownership would be required to evaluate economic position. One would need to know mortgage values, rentals, size of dwellings, and other such data. It is interesting to note, how-

TABLE 12  
HOME OWNERSHIP  
JEWISH POPULATIONS

	Tenant-Occupied		Owner-Occupied		No Report	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Trenton.....	1026	38.6	1566	58.9	66	2.5
Nashville.....	343	39.4	521	59.8	7	.8
Salt Lake City.....	200	46.6	184	42.9	45	10.5

ever, that almost 60 per cent of the Jews in Trenton and Nashville were reported to own their own homes. In Salt Lake City the ratio was slightly less than half.

### Education

In the earlier studies it was noted that information on educational attainments was not gathered with the same thoroughness as was the case with data on age, sex, and occupation. The data available indicated that the average for Jewish populations appeared to fall into the high school and high-school graduate group. Table 13, showing general educational attain-

TABLE 13  
GENERAL EDUCATION: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION  
JEWISH POPULATION

	<i>Trenton</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>Nashville</i> <sup>b</sup>	<i>Gary</i> <sup>c</sup>
No formal education.....	4.8	—	—
Attended elementary school without graduation.....	9.4	1.2	2.7
Graduated from elementary school.....	7.9	10.8	6.4
Attended high school without graduation....	6.6	8.3	8.1
Graduated from high school.....	32.3	34.0	27.4
Attended college without graduation.....	8.6	19.1	21.8
Graduated from college.....	18.1	16.2	10.9
Attended post graduate or professional school.....	—	5.8	6.1
Other.....	4.4	—	5.5
No information.....	7.9	4.6	11.1
TOTAL.....	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>a</sup> 25 years of age and over.

<sup>b</sup> 18 years of age and over.

<sup>c</sup> 15 years of age and over.

ments for the Jewish populations in Trenton, Nashville, and Gary, suggests a similar conclusion. The largest group in each case is that which has been "graduated from high school," with fair-sized proportions represented in the groups that have "attended college" and have been "graduated from college."

*Jewish Education*

With respect to Jewish education, what was significant in the earlier statistics was the relatively large proportion of those who received no instruction. This observation holds true in Trenton, Nashville and Gary, as indicated in Table 14.

TABLE 14

## JEWISH EDUCATION

## A—Type of Jewish Education: Per Cent

	<i>Trenton</i>	<i>Nashville</i> <sup>b</sup>	<i>Gary</i> <sup>d</sup>
Weekday school . . .	33.6 <sup>a</sup>	37.5	63.6
Sunday school . . . .	31.2	47.9	20.2
Private instruction	9.3	—	—
Yiddish school . . . .	1.4	—	—
Other . . . . .	—	—	3.8 <sup>e</sup>
No instruction . . . .	24.5	14.6 <sup>c</sup>	12.3
TOTAL . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0

## B—Years of Instruction: Per Cent

<i>No. of Years</i>	<i>Nashville</i> <sup>b</sup>	<i>Gary</i> <sup>f</sup>
1 . . . . .	5.2	6.0
2 . . . . .	8.3	10.4
3 . . . . .	7.2	10.0
4 . . . . .	8.4	9.9
5 . . . . .	8.6	11.1
6 . . . . .	9.6	11.4
7 . . . . .	11.4	7.8
8 . . . . .	13.0	15.4
9 (9 and over)	28.3	2.6
10 (10 and over)	—	8.9
Years Unknown	—	6.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0

<sup>a</sup> Includes afternoon and all-day schools.

<sup>b</sup> Six years of age and over.

<sup>c</sup> Percentage of no instruction derived by subtracting percentages for weekday and Sunday schools from 100 per cent.

<sup>d</sup> Fifteen years of age and over.

<sup>e</sup> Foreign training.

<sup>f</sup> Five years of age and over.

*Nativity, Citizenship, and Communal Activity*

Unfortunately none of the six studies reviewed here attempted to investigate such questions as nativity and citizenship or communal activity. The earlier studies revealed that the native-born represented from two-thirds to over three-fourths of the Jewish populations and that the major areas of origin for the foreign born were Russia, Poland, and Austria. In the light of postwar immigration it would have been interesting to have had additional data to supplement these remarks, but this was not the case.

*Length of Residence*

Finally, some information was available in the more recent studies on length of residence in a community, as shown in Table 15. The average length of residence of the four studies that had such data was the highest in Nashville with a median of 31.6 years, and the lowest in Rockville Centre, N. Y., with a median of 3.6 years. These averages are in consonance with what is generally known about these communities. Both Trenton and Gary appear to be fairly stable communities, a high proportion of the Jewish residents having lived in these areas for 15 or more years.

TABLE 15  
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

	Trenton <sup>a</sup>		Rockville Centre <sup>b</sup>		Nashville <sup>c</sup>		Gary <sup>d</sup>	
	<i>Number of Households</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number of Families</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number of Household Heads</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>	<i>Number of Adults</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Less than one year	118	4.5	142	17.2	49	5.6	—	—
(under 5) 1-4	460	17.4	304	36.9	71	8.2	174	18.4
5-9	438	16.6	171	20.8	53	6.1	106	11.2
10-14	347	13.1	87	10.6	45	5.2	108	11.4
15-19	252	9.5	62	7.5	41	4.7	81	8.6
20-24	226	8.6	26	3.2	52	6.0	129	13.7
(25 and over) 25-29	244	9.2	12	1.5	98	11.3	347	36.7
30-34	173	6.6	8	1.0	78	9.0	—	—
(35 and over) 35-39	382	14.5	7	0.8	85	9.8	—	—
40-44	—	—	3	0.3	87	10.0	—	—
45-49	—	—	1	0.1	52	6.0	—	—
(50 and over) 50-54	—	—	1	0.1	66	7.6	—	—
55-59	—	—	—	—	36	4.1	—	—
60-64	—	—	—	—	20	2.3	—	—
65-69	—	—	—	—	12	1.4	—	—
70-79	—	—	—	—	11	1.3	—	—
80-89	—	—	—	—	12	1.4	—	—
TOTAL	2,640	100.0	824	100.0	868	100.0	945	100.0
MEDIAN	13.4		3.6		31.6		19.1	

<sup>a</sup> Jewish households.

<sup>b</sup> Jewish families.

<sup>c</sup> Heads of households.

<sup>d</sup> Young adults and adults. Does not include children, youth, and single young adults living with parents.

*Conclusions*

It seems clear then that the six additional community population studies offer no sufficient reason for altering the conclusions arrived at in the

AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1950, Volume 51. We may still remark that the Jewish population in the United States in 1949-50 was an aging one; that it was probably replenishing itself at a rate slower than the general population; that it was a predominantly urban people; that it exhibited a fairly high level of general education; and that the occupational pattern outside the larger urban centers tended toward the commercial and professional pursuits. It cannot be stressed too strongly, however, that the last remark applies only to perhaps one-fourth or one-third of American Jewry; three-fourths of the Jews in the United States resided in the 14 largest urban centers, and it is most probable that their economic and occupational characteristics did not differ markedly in 1949-50 from that of the general population in the United States.

BEN B. SELIGMAN

TABLE 1

COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE (ESTIMATED)

State and City	Jewish Population <sup>a</sup>	State and City	Jewish Population <sup>a</sup>	State and City	Jewish Population <sup>a</sup>
<b>ALABAMA</b>					
Bessemer	100	San Diego	5,000	<b>FLORIDA</b>	
Birmingham	4,350	San Francisco	50,000 <sup>2</sup>	Daytona Beach	800
Dothan	144	San Jose	1,300	Fort Lauderdale	560
Jasper	120	San Leandro	1,500 <sup>2</sup>	Gainesville	124
Mobile	850	San Pedro	600	Hollywood	1,500
Montgomery	1,200	Santa Ana <sup>g</sup>	693 <sup>2</sup>	Jacksonville	3,450 <sup>2</sup>
Selma	210	Santa Barbara	400	Key West	160
Tri-Cities	132	Santa Monica	5,000 <sup>2</sup>	Lakeland	127
Tuscaloosa	187	Santa Rosa <sup>h</sup>	183	Miami	45,000
<b>ARIZONA</b>					
Phoenix	4,300	Stockton	1,300	Orlando	1,000
Tucson	4,000 <sup>2</sup>	Sunnyvale <sup>l</sup>	100 <sup>2</sup>	Pensacola	800
<b>ARKANSAS</b>					
Blytheville	100	Vallejo	400	Sarasota	245
Fort Smith	370	Ventura County <sup>j</sup>	400	St. Augustine	180
Helena	177	<b>COLORADO</b>			
Hot Springs	300	Colorado Springs	400	St. Petersburg	1,800
Little Rock	1,143	Denver	16,000 <sup>2</sup>	Tallahassee	140
Pine Bluff	275	Pueblo	500	Tampa	1,800 <sup>2</sup>
Wynne	152	<b>CONNECTICUT</b>			
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>					
Alameda, Contra Costa County <sup>b</sup>	12,000 <sup>2</sup>	Ansonia	700	West Palm Beach	2,000
Alameda	350 <sup>2</sup>	Bridgeport	12,000	<b>GEORGIA</b>	
Alhambra	660 <sup>9</sup>	Bristol	250	Atlanta	10,217 <sup>2</sup>
Bakersfield	600	Colchester	540	Augusta	600 <sup>2</sup>
Belvedere	660 <sup>10</sup>	Danbury	1,000 <sup>2</sup>	Brunswick	108
Berkeley	1,800 <sup>2</sup>	Derby-Shelton	340	Columbus	550 <sup>2</sup>
El Monte	330 <sup>5</sup>	Greenwich	350	Macon	676
Elsinore	450	Hartford	26,000 <sup>2</sup>	Savannah	4,000 <sup>2</sup>
Fresno	1,200 <sup>2</sup>	Lebanon	120	Valdosta	192
Long Beach	4,500 <sup>2</sup>	Manchester	480	<b>IDAHO</b>	
Los Angeles	250,000	Meriden	1,200	Boise	170
Martinez <sup>c</sup>	250 <sup>2</sup>	Middletown	1,000	Pocatello	114
Modesto	267	Milford	800	<b>ILLINOIS</b>	
North Hollywood	2,310 <sup>9</sup>	Moodus	262	Alton	148 <sup>4</sup>
Oakland <sup>d</sup>	9,000	New Britain	2,800	Aurora	432
Ontario <sup>e</sup>	600	New Canaan	110	Belleville	165 <sup>4</sup>
Palm Springs	300	New Haven	20,000 <sup>2</sup>	Benton	150 <sup>3</sup>
Pasadena	1,800	New London	3,000	Bloomington	160
Petaluma	600	Norwalk	3,000	Champaign <sup>l</sup>	404
Redondo Beach	132 <sup>9</sup>	Norwich	2,000	Chicago <sup>m</sup>	325,000
Richmond <sup>f</sup>	600 <sup>2</sup>	Putnam	120	Chicago Heights	400
Riverside	224	Rockville	275	Danville	250
Sacramento	1,750 <sup>2</sup>	Stamford	5,500	Decatur	285
Salinas	300	Torrington	320	East St. Louis	660 <sup>4</sup>
San Bernardino	750	Wallingford	280	Elgin	480
<b>DELAWARE</b>					
		Waterbury	4,000 <sup>2</sup>	Galesburg	144
		Willimantic	425	Harvey	235
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b>					
		Wilmington	6,500	Joliet	555
		Washington <sup>k</sup>	45,000	Kankakee	272
				Mattoon	155
				Peoria	1,800
				Quincy	152

<sup>a</sup> Estimates are for 1950, except as indicated by following numbered footnotes:

- |              |              |               |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 1 . . . 1949 | 5 . . . 1945 | 9 . . . 1941  |
| 2 . . . 1948 | 6 . . . 1944 | 10 . . . 1940 |
| 3 . . . 1947 | 7 . . . 1943 | 11 . . . 1939 |
| 4 . . . 1946 | 8 . . . 1942 | 12 . . . 1938 |

<sup>b</sup> Includes Oakland and Piedmont, Berkeley, Albany, Elcirmont, Emeryville, Richmond and Rodeo, San Leandro and Hayward, Martinez, Concord and Pittsburg—which are listed separately.

<sup>c</sup> Includes Concord and Pittsburg.

<sup>d</sup> Includes Piedmont.

<sup>e</sup> Includes Pomona.

<sup>f</sup> Includes Rodeo.

<sup>g</sup> Includes Santa Ana, Anaheim, Orange, Fullerton, Laguna Beach, Huntington Beach.

<sup>h</sup> Includes Healdsburg.

<sup>i</sup> Includes Mountain View.

<sup>j</sup> Includes Ventura City, Santa Paula, Oxnard, Camarillo, Fillmore, Port Hueneme, Ojai.

<sup>k</sup> Includes Silver Springs, Chevy Chase, Bethesda, Arlington, Fairfax, Alexandria.

<sup>l</sup> Includes Urbana.

<sup>m</sup> Includes suburbs.

<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>
Rockford .....	715	Shreveport .....	2,000	Iron County .....	161
Rock Island .....	2,000 <sup>2</sup>	MAINE		Iron Mountain .....	104
Southern Illinois <sup>b</sup> .....	3,000	Aroostook County .....	120	Jackson .....	200
Springfield .....	1,250	Augusta .....	100	Kalamazoo .....	640
Tri-Cities <sup>c</sup> .....	132 <sup>4</sup>	Bangor .....	1,200	Lansing .....	550
Waukegan .....	620	Bath .....	150	Marquette County .....	175
INDIANA		Biddelford-Saco .....	232	Mt. Clemens .....	300
Anderson .....	100	Calais .....	200	Muskegon .....	400
East Chicago—		Lewiston .....	1,400	Pontiac .....	700
Indiana Harbor .....	1,000	Portland .....	3,300 <sup>2</sup>	Port Huron .....	130
Elkhart .....	140	Rockland .....	130	Saginaw .....	600
Evansville .....	1,450	Waterville .....	120	South Haven .....	450
Fort Wayne .....	1,200 <sup>2</sup>	MARYLAND		MINNESOTA	
Gary .....	2,500	Annapolis .....	1,000	Duluth .....	2,800 <sup>2</sup>
Hammond .....	1,200	Baltimore .....	75,000 <sup>2</sup>	Hibbing .....	280
Indianapolis .....	7,200 <sup>2</sup>	Cumberland .....	510	Mankato .....	154
Kokomo .....	181	Frederick .....	150	Minneapolis .....	21,000 <sup>2</sup>
Lafayette .....	416	Hagerstown .....	306	St. Paul .....	12,000 <sup>2</sup>
Marion .....	165	Havre de Grace .....	100	Virginia .....	180
Michigan City .....	320	Salisbury .....	167	MISSISSIPPI	
Muncie .....	340	MASSACHUSETTS		Clarksdale .....	380
Richmond .....	108	Athol .....	240	Cleveland .....	300
Shelbyville .....	140	Attleboro .....	180	Greenville .....	283
South Bend .....	2,500 <sup>2</sup>	Beverly .....	700	Greenwood .....	160
Terre Haute .....	600 <sup>2</sup>	Boston .....	140,000	Hattiesburg .....	184
Whiting .....	225	Brookton .....	2,500	Jackson .....	300
IOWA		Clinton .....	120	Meridian .....	250
Cedar Rapids .....	450	Fall River .....	4,500	Natchez .....	153
Council Bluffs .....	450	Framingham .....	600	Vicksburg .....	280
Davenport .....	850 <sup>2</sup>	Gardner .....	130	MISSOURI	
Des Moines .....	3,500 <sup>2</sup>	Gloucester .....	280	Hannibal .....	100
Dubuque .....	208	Great Barrington .....	132	Hayti .....	200
Fort Dodge .....	116	Greenfield .....	250	Joplin .....	350
Iowa City .....	150	Haverhill .....	2,500	Kansas City and	
Marshalltown .....	222	Holyoke .....	1,400	Kansas City,	
Mason City .....	260	Hyannis .....	250	Kan. ....	20,000 <sup>2</sup>
Muscatine .....	120	Lawrence .....	2,800 <sup>2</sup>	Springfield .....	200
Ottumwa .....	231	Leominster-		St. Joseph .....	1,125
Sioux City .....	2,800	Fitchburg .....	300	St. Louis .....	48,000
Waterloo .....	556	Lowell .....	2,000	MONTANA	
KANSAS		Lynn .....	10,000 <sup>2</sup>	Billings .....	100
Kansas City and		Medway .....	150	Butte .....	206
Kansas City,		Milford .....	450	NEBRASKA	
Mo. ....	20,000 <sup>2</sup>	Millis .....	150	Lincoln .....	950
Leavenworth .....	160	New Bedford .....	4,000	Omaha .....	8,000
Topeka .....	147	Newburyport .....	320	NEVADA	
Wichita .....	1,000	North Adams .....	560	Las Vegas .....	400
KENTUCKY		Northampton .....	300	Reno .....	350
Ashland .....	200	Peabody .....	1,200	NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Harlan Zone .....	146	Pittsfield .....	1,600	Claremont .....	200
Henderson .....	140	Plymouth .....	220	Concord .....	160
Hopkinsville .....	140	Salem .....	1,200	Dover .....	150
Lexington .....	550	Southbridge .....	204	Keene .....	137
Louisville .....	9,000 <sup>2</sup>	Springfield .....	10,000 <sup>2</sup>	Laconia .....	120
Paducah .....	150	Taunton .....	600	Manchester .....	1,485 <sup>2</sup>
LOUISIANA		Ware .....	110	Nashua .....	360
Alexandria .....	660	Webster .....	200	Portsmouth .....	480
Baton Rouge .....	750	Worcester .....	9,750 <sup>2</sup>	NEW JERSEY	
Lafayette .....	194	MICHIGAN		Arlington .....	372 <sup>2</sup>
Lake Charles .....	100	Ann Arbor .....	240	Asbury Park .....	3,200
Monroe .....	900	Battle Creek .....	160	Atlantic City .....	9,000 <sup>2</sup>
Morgan City .....	115	Bay City .....	736	Bayonne .....	10,000
New Orleans .....	7,750	Benton Harbor .....	830	Belleville .....	676 <sup>2</sup>
		Detroit .....	90,000 <sup>2</sup>	Bergenfield .....	260
		Flint .....	2,200 <sup>2</sup>	Bernardsville .....	108
		Grand Rapids .....	1,400	Bloomfield .....	1,681 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> South of Carlinville.

<sup>c</sup> Includes Venice, Granite City, Madison.

Jewish		Jewish		Jewish	
State and City	Population <sup>a</sup>	State and City	Population <sup>a</sup>	State and City	Population <sup>a</sup>
Boonton	195	Ridgefield Park	410	Livingston Manor	150
Bound Brook	350	Ridgewood	150	Lockport	100
Bridgeton	600	Riverside	136	Massena	108
Burlington	250	Roselle	1,200	Middletown	1,100
Caldwell	730 <sup>2</sup>	Rutherford	500	Monroe	350
Camden	7,500	Salem	235	Monticello	1,200
Carmel	160	Somerville	634	Mountaintdale	280
Carteret	600	South Amboy	145 <sup>3</sup>	Mount Vernon	10,000 <sup>8</sup>
Clayton	140	South River	400	Newburgh	2,500
Cliffside Park	440	Stelton	180	New Rochelle	3,960 <sup>8</sup>
Cranford	400	Summit	400	New York City	2,100,000
Dover	700	Teaneck	3,000	Manhattan	327,000
Elizabeth	11,500	Toms River	1,000	Bronx	615,000
Englewood	2,500	Trenton	8,500	Brooklyn	950,000
Englishtown	165	Union	3,200	Queens	200,000
Fair Lawn	2,000	Union City	4,000 <sup>5</sup>	Richmond	8,000
Farmingdale	800	Verona	381 <sup>2</sup>	Niagara Falls	1,100
Flemington	340	Vineland	2,000	Nyack	276
Fort Lee	150	Washington	148 <sup>2</sup>	Ogdensburg	180
Freehold	500	West New York	2,410 <sup>5</sup>	Olean	330
Hackensack	1,200	Westwood	245	Oneida	106
Hasbrouck		Wildwood	360	Oneonta	120
Heights	200	Williamstown	109	Oswego	108
Hightstown	1,100	Woodbine	350	Parkville	140
Hillside	4,087 <sup>2</sup>	Woodbridge	400	Pawling	110
Hoboken	1,300	Woodbury	162	Plattsburg	370
Irvington	7,388 <sup>2</sup>			Port Chester	2,700 <sup>2</sup>
Jersey City	18,000 <sup>2</sup>	NEW MEXICO		Port Jervis	400
Kearney	302 <sup>2</sup>	Albuquerque	850	Poughkeepsie	2,800
Keypoint	327	Santa Fe	145	Rensselaer	100 <sup>2</sup>
Lakewood	2,100			Rochester	20,500 <sup>2</sup>
Leonia	150	NEW YORK		Rockaway Park	10,400 <sup>7</sup>
Linden	2,500	Albany	9,000 <sup>2</sup>	Rockville Centre	5,176
Long Branch	2,450	Amsterdam	500	Rome	240
Lyndhurst	200	Auburn	275	Saranac Lake	100
Maplewood	2,240 <sup>2</sup>	Batavia	300	Saratoga Springs	500
Maywood	120	Beacon	525	Scarsdale	600 <sup>8</sup>
Metuchen	250	Binghamton	3,000 <sup>2</sup>	Schenectady	2,800
Millburn	579 <sup>2</sup>	Buffalo	22,000	Sharon Springs	165
Millville	260	Canandaigua	120	South Fallsburg	1,100
Montclair	890 <sup>2</sup>	Catskill	240	Spring Valley	2,100
Morristown	1,000	Cohoes	100	Suffern	544
Mount Freedom	160	Cortland	200	Syracuse	10,000 <sup>2</sup>
Mount Holly	105	Dunkirk	168	Troy	2,289
Newark	56,800 <sup>2</sup>	Ellenville	800	Utica	3,300
New Brunswick	5,000	Elmira	1,450	Walden	140
Newton	232	Far Rockaway	7,458 <sup>7</sup>	Watertown	460
North Bergen	1,980 <sup>11</sup>	Five Towns, L.I.P.	12,914 <sup>7</sup>	White Lake	300
Nutley	501 <sup>2</sup>	Geneva	120	White Plains	3,000 <sup>8</sup>
Orange	1,403 <sup>2</sup>	Glens Falls	962	Woodbourne	200
East Orange	4,585 <sup>2</sup>	Gloversville	1,300	Woodridge	400
South Orange	2,298 <sup>2</sup>	Haverstraw	420	Yonkers	6,750 <sup>8</sup>
West Orange	1,295 <sup>2</sup>	Herkimer	137		
Palisades Park	400	Highland Falls	100	NORTH CAROLINA	
Park Ridge	110	Hornell	120	Asheville	600
Passaic	12,000	Hudson	700	Charlotte	770
Paterson	20,000 <sup>2</sup>	Hurleyville-Loch		Durham	360
Perth Amboy	5,000	Sheldrake	500	Fayetteville	228
Pitman	120 <sup>2</sup>	Ithaca	400	Gastonia	130
Plainfield	4,100	Jamestown	260	Goldsboro	135
Pleasantville	120	Jeffersonville	150	Greensboro	525
Point Pleasant	100	Kerhonkson	175	High Point	215
Pompton Lakes	180	Kingston	2,400	Raleigh	350
Princeton	300	Liberty	600	Wilmington	303
Rahway	800	Little Falls	212	Winston Salem	340
Red Bank	1,200			NORTH DAKOTA	
				Bismarck	114

<sup>a</sup> Cedarhurst, Hewlett, Woodmere, Lawrence, Inwood.

<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>
Fargo	442	Connellsville	160	Woonsocket	700
Grand Forks	240	Conshohocken	100	<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>	
Minot	110	Corapolis	152	Beaufort	107
<b>OHIO</b>		Donora	160	Charleston	1,928
Akron	6,500	DuBois	240	Columbia	500
Ashtabula	160	Duquesne	230	Greenville	260
Bellaire	260	Easton	1,600	Spartanburg	260
Canton	3,500	East Pittsburgh	660 <sup>10</sup>	Sumter	250
Cincinnati	22,000 <sup>2</sup>	Ellwood City	147	<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>	
Cleveland	80,000 <sup>2</sup>	Erie	1,750 <sup>2</sup>	Aberdeen	107
Columbus	7,200 <sup>2</sup>	Glassport	120	Sioux Falls	350 <sup>2</sup>
Dayton	5,500 <sup>2</sup>	Greensburg	440	<b>TENNESSEE</b>	
East Liverpool	365	Hanover	120	Chattanooga	2,200
Elyria	360	Harrisburg	4,000	Jackson	155
Fremont	114	Hazleton	1,600	Knoxville	750
Hamilton	418	Homestead	600	Memphis	8,000
Lima	418	Honesdale-Hawly	100	Nashville	2,700
Lorain	715	Indiana	130	Oak Ridge	700
Mansfield	308	Jeannette	200	<b>TEXAS</b>	
Massillon	130	Johnstown	1,300	Amarillo	175
Middletown	310	Kennett Square	114	Austin	750
New Philadelphia	180	Kitanning-		Beaumont	625
Piqua	161	Ford City	200	Corpus Christi	1,100
Portsmouth	196	Lancaster	2,000	Corsicana	188
Sandusky	100	Lansdale	200	Dallas	12,000
Springfield	550	Latrobe	130	El Paso	2,000 <sup>2</sup>
Steubenville	780 <sup>2</sup>	Lebanon	582	Fort Worth	2,000
Toledo	6,500 <sup>2</sup>	Lewistown	250	Galveston	1,200
Warren	800	Lock Haven	350	Houston	14,000 <sup>2</sup>
Wooster	135	Mahanoy City	100	Kilgore	108
Youngstown	5,500 <sup>2</sup>	McKeesport	2,400	Laredo	184
Zanesville	300	McKees Rocks	260	Lubbock	240
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>		Monessen	250	Port Arthur	248 <sup>2</sup>
Ardmore	120	Mt. Carmel	272	Rosenberg	180
McAlester	137	New Castle	800	San Angelo	100
Muskogee	150	New Kensington	640	San Antonio	6,800
Oklahoma City <sup>a</sup>	1,600	Norristown	560	Texarkana	176
Tulsa	1,830	Oil City	360	Tyler	450 <sup>2</sup>
<b>OREGON</b>		Philadelphia	245,000 <sup>2</sup>	Waco	1,000 <sup>2</sup>
Eugene	120	Philipsburg	136	Wharton	312
Portland	6,600 <sup>2</sup>	Phoenixville	202	Wichita Falls	276
Salem	165	Pittsburgh	54,000 <sup>2</sup>	<b>UTAH</b>	
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>		Pottstown	450	Salt Lake City	1,440
Aliquippa	400	Pottsville	870	<b>VERMONT</b>	
Allentown	2,900	Reading	3,000 <sup>2</sup>	Bennington	120
Altoona	1,200 <sup>2</sup>	Sayre	132	Burlington	1,000
Ambridge	300	Scranton	5,525	Rutland	280
Beaver Valley	813	Shamokin	250	<b>VIRGINIA</b>	
Bethlehem	800	Sharon-Farrell-		Alexandria	650
Braddock	600	Greenville	1,000 <sup>2</sup>	Arlington	900 <sup>6</sup>
Bradford	416	Shenandoah	444	Charlottesville	120
Bristol	161	Stroudsburg	226	Danville	200
Brownsville	250	Sunbury	160	Hampton-Phoebus-	
Butler	500 <sup>2</sup>	Tarentum	160	Buckroe Beach	175 <sup>2</sup>
Canonsburg	240	Titusville	120	Hampton Roads	165 <sup>3</sup>
Carbon County	300	Uniontown	700	Harrisonburg	112
Carbondale	320	Washington	500	Lynchburg	204
Carnegie	268	West Chester	360	Martinsville	120
Chambersburg	205	Wilkes-Barre	5,062 <sup>2</sup>	Newport News	1,600 <sup>2</sup>
Charlroi	144	Williamsport	800	Norfolk	7,500 <sup>2</sup>
Chester	2,100	York	1,000	Petersburg	500
Clairton	120	<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>		Portsmouth	1,500
Coatesville	400	Newport	750	Richmond	7,750 <sup>2</sup>
		Pawtucket	1,300	Roanoke	650
		Providence	25,000	Suffolk	180
		Westerly	200	Winchester	131

<sup>a</sup> Excludes Oklahoma City zone.

JEWISH POPULATION ESTIMATES

<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>State and City</i>	<i>Jewish Population<sup>a</sup></i>
WASHINGTON		Morgantown . . . . .	211	La Crosse . . . . .	166
Bellingham . . . . .	148	Parkersburg . . . . .	100	Madison . . . . .	1,500
Bremerton . . . . .	175	Weirton . . . . .	300	Manitowoc . . . . .	184
Everett . . . . .	125 <sup>12</sup>	Welch . . . . .	144	Marinette . . . . .	158
Seattle . . . . .	9,500 <sup>2</sup>	Wheeling . . . . .	800	Milwaukee . . . . .	30,000 <sup>2</sup>
Spokane . . . . .	612	Williamson . . . . .	173	Oshkosh . . . . .	160
Tacoma . . . . .	550	WISCONSIN		Racine . . . . .	850
WEST VIRGINIA		Appleton . . . . .	575	Sheboygan . . . . .	600 <sup>2</sup>
Beckley . . . . .	228	Beloit . . . . .	160	Superior . . . . .	604
Bluefield . . . . .	300	Eau Claire . . . . .	158	Waukesha . . . . .	151
Charleston . . . . .	2,000	Fond du Lac . . . . .	160	Wausau . . . . .	368
Clarksburg . . . . .	270	Green Bay . . . . .	448	WYOMING	
Fairmont . . . . .	160	Kenosha . . . . .	600	Cheyenne . . . . .	500
Huntington . . . . .	700 <sup>2</sup>				