

Socio-Economic Data

JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1956

1956 revisions of previous community estimates of their Jewish populations brought the current estimate for the United States to approximately 5,200,000. Major community revisions upward were recorded for Los Angeles, Calif., Miami, Fla., Newark, N. J., and Washington, D. C. The Washington revision was obtained as a result of the first sample population study ever conducted in that community. Together with these revisions, more inclusive data were developed for communities with estimated Jewish populations of less than 100.

Method of Operation

The individual community estimates listed in Table 1 of the Appendix to this article were secured in the following manner: 1. 114 members of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF) responded to a special inquiry directed to them. 2. Estimates from the files of the National United Jewish Appeal were utilized for CJFWF members not responding to 1, and for non-CJFWF member communities. 3. A questionnaire was sent to communities in the New York suburban areas (Westchester, Nassau, Suffolk, and Bergen counties).¹ 4. For lack of new data, the estimate for New York City obtained in 1955 was used (for a description of the basis for this estimate, see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 120 and f.). 5. The estimate for Washington, D. C., was derived from the preliminary results of a study to be published some time in 1957.

Reliability of Community Estimates

The individual community estimates carried in Table 1 of the Appendix vary in the degree of confidence which can be placed upon them. Most accurate would be those estimates based upon population studies using a sample or census enumeration. Even in these cases, the period when the original study was conducted and the method adopted to project the original estimate forward in time differ from community to community. In those areas where in-migration is extensive, this question is particularly pointed. For example, Los Angeles, which conducted a study in 1950, has raised its population estimate steadily since then, the latest figure of 400,000 being carried in this

¹ Replies were in terms of households; these were converted by the author to a count of individuals by using 3.5 as the average size of household. For a discussion of this procedure, see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1956 (Vol. 57), p. 120.

issue. However, this estimate was qualified as "based upon a pencil and paper" method—the community hopes to conduct field tests in the near future to more accurately establish the current figures.

When we leave those communities whose estimates were based upon actual enumerations—sample or complete—we come to a wide variety of methods. Some communities use "short-cut" methods in an endeavor to approximate results obtainable from field studies. Chicago and Detroit both conducted studies of their Jewish populations based upon the "death-records" technique. Other communities, such as St. Louis and Philadelphia, utilized the Yom Kippur method.² Some smaller communities endeavor to maintain a perpetual inventory of households, some even an inventory of individuals. Then there remains a sizable group of communities which relies on "tradition," "informed opinion," etc. This latter group undoubtedly offers the greatest opportunity for uninformed population estimates.

These comments are made not to detract from the very real value of such comparable listings, but to guard the casual user from assuming that these data are as accurate as the census figures used for the total population of the United States. Even more important, the reader must be careful *not* to take any individual community estimate for one year and compare it uncritically with the estimate for the following year. Greater Washington, D. C., is an excellent point in question. Volume 56 of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK carried that community's estimate of its Jewish population as 60,000. Based upon a study conducted in 1956, this estimate has been revised upwards to 89,000. It is extremely unlikely that this area saw an increase of almost 50 per cent in its Jewish population within the space of one year. Instead, this increase is attributable to the refinement in the technique of estimation.

Despite the inherent limitations of the data (e.g., varying bases of estimation, different levels of objectives and technical skill in conducting studies, differing dates of surveys), these figures do provide the basis, however crude, for developing a national estimate of the Jewish population in the United States, the geographical dispersion of this population, and, with a lesser degree of accuracy perhaps, a comparison of community size.

Recent Surveys

Articles in Volumes 51 (1950), 52 (1951), and 54 (1953) of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK presented demographic details of various Jewish communities based on studies conducted mainly in the 1930's and 1940's. Since the appearance of Volume 54 new demographic studies have been conducted in New Orleans (1953), Pittsburgh (1953), Lynn, Mass. (1955), Des Moines, Iowa (1956), Canton, Ohio (1956), and Washington, D. C. (1956). The major demographic characteristics of New Orleans, Pittsburgh, and Lynn are described below; Des Moines, Canton, and Washington will be reported upon

² The death records technique establishes the number of Jewish deaths in the community by referring to Jewish cemeteries and undertakers' records, or by searching health department records for "typical" Jewish names. The number of Jews is then estimated on the basis of the general ratio between deaths and population. The Yom Kippur technique estimates the number of Jewish school children in the community studied by referring to the number of children absent from school on Yom Kippur, and assuming them to be Jewish. The total Jewish population is then computed by using the known ratio between all children in the school age bracket and the general population, and assuming the same ratio to exist between the Jewish school age population and the Jewish population.

in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1958 (vol. 59). There have been other studies; their scope of investigation was more limited, and in some cases the method employed was less reliable than that employed by the communities described in this issue.

Table 1 below gives the age distributions of the Jewish populations of New Orleans, Pittsburgh, and Lynn.

TABLE 1
AGE DISTRIBUTION, NEW ORLEANS, PITTSBURGH, LYNN,
1953, 1955

Age Group	New Orleans—1953 *			Pittsburgh—1953			Lynn—1955		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
0-4	5.1	3.7	8.8	4.8	3.7	8.5	5.0	4.8	9.8
5-9	3.7	4.0	7.7	3.9	3.7	7.6	5.5	5.1	10.6
10-14.....	2.5	2.4	4.9	3.3	3.8	7.1	4.7	4.4	9.1
15-19.....	1.7	2.5	4.2	2.8	2.3	5.1	3.0	2.4	5.5
20-24.....	2.4	2.2	4.6	3.2	2.8	6.0	1.9	2.1	4.0
25-29.....	2.8	3.4	6.2	6.7	8.0	14.7	2.3	3.2	5.6
30-34.....	3.4	3.4	6.8				3.1	4.0	7.1
35-39.....	3.3	3.7	7.0	7.5	8.6	16.1	4.2	4.6	8.9
40-44.....	3.7	3.9	7.6				5.0	4.7	9.6
45-49.....	3.7	3.7	7.4	8.1	7.5	15.6	4.1	3.9	8.0
50-54.....	3.8	3.7	7.5				3.1	2.7	5.8
55-59.....	3.1	2.7	5.8	4.8	4.6	9.4	2.2	2.2	4.4
60-64.....	2.4	2.6	5.0				2.1	1.8	3.9
65-69.....	2.1	2.6	4.7	3.8	3.9	7.8	1.8	1.6	3.5
70-74.....	1.7	2.0	3.7				1.0	0.9	1.9
75+	1.4	2.9	4.3	0.8	0.8	1.5			
Age unknown	1.8	2.0	3.8	0.8	1.4	2.1	0.4	0.4	0.7
TOTAL ..	48.6	51.4	100.0	49.6	50.4	100.0	50.3	49.7	100.0

* New Orleans age groups are, on the average, six months older than those listed here. For convenience, the age groupings shown here will be used for New Orleans throughout the article.

The previous studies conducted in the late Forties showed three common characteristics: 1. small numbers in the teen-age groups; 2. an increase in the proportion of population for the youngest age groups; and 3. a relatively larger proportion of the Jewish population in the older age groups when compared with the general white population. The studies now available show the same patterns. In the 1953 studies (New Orleans and Pittsburgh) the age deficient group, or "hollow class," the age group with a markedly smaller proportion of the total population than the age groups preceding and succeeding it, was that of the 15-19-year-olds. Lynn, which conducted its study in 1955, had its "hollow class" in the age group 20-24. The genesis of these smaller age groups lies in the early years of the Depression and the resultant

sharp drop in the birth rate. Although this factor affected all groups, the Jewish population seems to have suffered more severely than the rest. Both the New Orleans and Pittsburgh studies, which made comparisons with their general community's 1950 age distributions (taken from the United States Census Bureau data on white population), point this up.

The "baby boom" of the postwar period shows up clearly in the larger proportions reported for the age group 0-4 years in New Orleans and Pittsburgh. Lynn, whose study was conducted two years later (1955), showed the largest concentration in the age group 5-9. It will be instructive to review the results of the three studies conducted in 1956 when these become available. If these repeat the Lynn experience, we may hypothesize that the high point in the Jewish birth rate for this period has been reached and passed.

The last point, that of the ageing population, is still valid insofar as the last group of studies is concerned. This does not always mean that there are proportionately more Jews over 64 than in the general white population, but rather that the average age for Jews is higher.

MEDIAN AGE

The median ages of the three communities studied follow in Table 2.

TABLE 2
MEDIAN AGE, NEW ORLEANS, PITTSBURGH, GREATER LYNN,
1953, 1955

<i>Sex</i>	<i>New Orleans—1953</i>	<i>Pittsburgh—1953</i>	<i>Lynn—1955</i>
Male	38.9	34.6	33.2
Female	41.5	35.2	32.7
TOTAL	39.8	34.9	32.9

The comparative median ages in 1950 for the general white population of New Orleans and Pittsburgh were, respectively, 31.3 and 32.9 years. The median age for the Lynn general white population in 1950 excluding the suburban towns which together with Lynn proper constitute the Greater Lynn Jewish community, was 33.5 (the comparable figure for the Jewish population in Lynn proper for 1955 was 38.5).

TABLE 3
MEDIAN AGES, JEWISH COMMUNITIES SURVEYED,
1947, 1948, 1949, 1950

<i>City</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Median Age</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Median Age</i>
Newark: (City)	1948	32.4	Charleston, S. C.....	1948	29.7
(Suburbs)...		28.4	Trenton	1949	32.4
Miami	1949	36.3	Nashville	1949	34.6
Atlanta	1947	34.1	Gary	1949	30.8
Portland, Ore.	1947	35.4	Salt Lake City	1949	33.9
Camden	1948	33.5	Passaic	1949	35.9
Indianapolis	1948	33.7	Port Chester	1950	36.0
Tucson	1948	35.5	Los Angeles	1950	36.6
Utica	1948	34.0			

That the median ages in these communities as a group were not lower than those found in the other Jewish communities may be judged by the medians indicated in Table 3.

HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The average household size for two of the three communities surveyed in this article seemed to be somewhat larger than most of the previous surveys undertaken in 1940 through 1950. For New Orleans, the average size was 2.84; for Pittsburgh, 3.23; and for Lynn, 3.30. Table 4 compares these findings concerning household size with those secured in earlier community surveys.

TABLE 4

HOUSEHOLD SIZE, COMMUNITIES STUDIED,
1940, 1942, 1944, 1945, 1948, 1949, 1950

<i>City</i>	<i>Date of Study</i>	<i>Size</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>Date of Study</i>	<i>Size</i>
Jacksonville	1945	3.50	Passaic	1949	3.04
Grand Rapids	1944	3.43	Port Chester	1950	3.04
Indianapolis	1948	3.13	Elmira	1949	3.01
Camden	1948	3.10	Los Angeles	1950	3.00
Nashville	1949	3.08	Toledo	1944	2.98
Trenton	1949	3.08	Utica	1948	2.98
Gary	1949	3.10	Tucson	1948	2.70
Erie	1940	3.07	Miami	1949	2.63
Worcester	1942	3.05	Salt Lake City	1949	2.62

Both community size and geographical location influence the average size of Jewish household, in addition to factors related to the time of the survey. By and large, the bigger communities attract the younger unattached individuals from the smaller communities. Certain of the communities which serve as a Mecca for older individuals also have smaller average household sizes. Note in the above data the low figures for Miami and Tucson, as well as the size for New Orleans.

MARITAL STATUS

The data on marital status reveal that most of the Jewish population from the ages of 15 and over (14 and over for Lynn) in the three communities under discussion is married. More males than females are reported single, reflecting mainly the fact that females marry earlier in life. Widows outnumbered widowers (at the time of the surveys) by ratios of from three to one to six to one. Although there may be an understatement in this area, the data on divorces and separations indicate that this category is somewhat smaller for the Jewish population than for the general population.

Data on marital status are particularly affected by age distribution. The New Orleans study compared the Jewish marital status with that for the general white population three years earlier, and found that there was a slightly lower Jewish proportion of single persons (21.8 per cent) than in the general white population (22.5). A comparison by five-year age groups, however, revealed that for the age group 30-34 and for each age group under it,

the range was from 77.2 per cent to 82.3 per cent. There was a wider difference among the females in the labor force: here the range was from 14.4 per cent to 29.2 per cent. The lowest figure was for Lynn, and was the result of the age distribution and the character of the in-migration. Lynn was the object of fairly heavy in-migration from surrounding areas of households with younger children. The heads of households were the only wage earners in almost all cases and the children were not yet at the age where they would enter the labor market.

OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION

Information on occupational classifications was available only for New Orleans and Pittsburgh. These two communities are of particular interest as one (New Orleans) is a relatively small community (9,200 Jewish population), and the other (Pittsburgh) is representative of the larger Jewish communities (47,000). Earlier studies had indicated that the larger the Jewish community, the closer it came to the general proportions of occupational patterns. The two studies here reviewed bear this out. New Orleans has a larger proportion than Pittsburgh in the professional and technical occupations, in managers, officials, and proprietors, while the reverse is true for the occupational classifications of clericals and sales workers, skilled craftsmen, semi-skilled workers, service, and laborers. Despite this trend, it is obvious that the occupational classifications of the Jewish populations are heavily skewed towards the professional, managerial, and entrepreneurial categories.

TABLE 7
OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS, NEW ORLEANS, PITTSBURGH

<i>Occupational Classifications</i>	<i>1953 New Orleans (17 & Over)</i>			<i>1953 Pittsburgh (17 & Over)</i>		
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
Professional and Technical . . .	23.5	14.5	21.1	14.3	17.7	15.0
Managers, Officials, Proprietors	46.0	25.1	40.4	40.1	11.9	33.9
Clerical	22.0	53.4	30.5	2.3	21.8	6.5
Sales Workers				31.2	40.7	33.2
Craftsmen (skilled)	2.7	1.0	2.3	3.8	3.2	3.7
Production (semi-skilled)	1.3	1.7	1.4	0.4	1.5	0.6
Protective Service	0.3	—	0.2	4.2	3.2	4.0
Other Service	2.0	3.3	2.4			
Laborers	0.6	—	0.5	3.7	—	2.9
Miscellaneous	1.0	1.0	1.0	<i>Classification Not Used</i>		
No Answer	0.6	—	0.2	“	“	“
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION

Just as the occupational classifications revealed sharp concentrations in certain categories, so did the industrial groups. The largest concentration of

In 1938 Pittsburgh, which was one of the eleven communities referred to above, reported that its proportion of native-born was 61.8 per cent. Within a space of fifteen years the native-born had increased 13 percentage points.

Table 10 gives the country of origin for the foreign-born reported in the New Orleans and Pittsburgh studies. As was to be expected from the previous studies, the bulk of the foreign-born come from Russia and other East European countries.

TABLE 10
COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF FOREIGN-BORN, NEW ORLEANS, PITTSBURGH

Country	New Orleans—1953			Pittsburgh—1953		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Austria	2.7	2.7	2.7	5.1	4.2	4.6
Germany	12.1	16.8	14.4	7.5	4.7	6.0
Lithuania	1.8	3.2	2.5	9.8	8.7	9.2
Poland	26.3	20.0	23.2	13.0	15.0	14.0
Rumania	8.9	9.1	9.0	8.6	9.4	9.0
Russia	35.3	34.1	34.9	36.3	42.9	39.8
Great Britain	0.9	2.7	1.8	—	—	—
Belgium	0.4	—	0.2	—	—	—
France	2.7	3.2	2.9	—	—	—
Hungary	—	—	—	5.9	5.8	5.8
Other	8.9	8.2	8.6	11.0	7.4	9.1
Country Unknown	—	—	—	2.8	1.8	2.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

The general educational attainments of the Jewish population, reported in previous studies as being considerably higher than the average white attainments, are demonstrably so again in the two recent studies for which such data were available. The level of education has been found to have a strong correlation with income levels. The vocational statistics and these educational attainment data are, as expected, quite consistent with each other.

Fertility Ratios

Since the end of World War II the United States Census Bureau has been reporting record highs in the number of births throughout the United States. This trend has also been in evidence in the Jewish communities. It has been particularly "visible" in the suburban areas to which large numbers of Jews have been moving. Various studies made of these suburban areas reveal a common pattern: the head of household in his thirties or early forties; few, if any, adults other than husband or wife in household; and one, two, or three children present.

On the basis of these data, conclusions have been drawn concerning a rise in the Jewish birth rate, and its consequence for a growth in the total Jewish

TABLE 11
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED FOR THOSE AGED 25 AND OVER,
NEW ORLEANS, PITTSBURGH

Years of School Completed	New Orleans—1953			Pittsburgh—1953			Total White Population 1950 Census
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
No Schooling	0.9	1.7	1.3	6.1	9.6	7.9	2.2
Elementary: 1-7.....	6.2	6.3	6.3	7.5	9.2	8.4	21.3
8	7.3	8.4	7.9	9.4	7.4	8.4	21.1
High School: 1-3.....	6.8	10.1	8.5	8.6	10.1	9.4	17.3
4	25.9	36.4	31.4	25.0	35.4	30.4	21.4
College: 1-3.....	15.2	17.2	16.2	12.8	11.5	12.1	7.6
4	14.8	11.9	13.3	15.2	8.5	11.7	6.4
Postgraduate	15.8	3.7	9.4	9.7	2.7	6.0	
Not Reported	7.1	4.4	5.7	5.8	5.6	5.7	2.7
TOTAL.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

population. The author of this article feels that there is insufficient data at hand to accept this hypothesis readily. The increase in births has been due partially to an acceleration in marriages. That is to say, on the average, Jews have been marrying at an earlier age, the result being that mothers have been having their first children at an earlier age. This offers the possibility that a larger average number of children will be born; however, it has not yet been significantly demonstrated—for the Jewish population at least—that this is inevitable. The very "visibility" of suburban developments has tended to obscure the characteristics of the "core" community that remains in the original urban center of concentration.

In this connection, the study of the Greater Lynn Jewish community was of particular interest, because this study covered two disparate areas of concentration: an "old" settlement, and two "new" suburban-type settlements. The over-all average household size was 3.3 for Greater Lynn. This was somewhat higher than the findings in the bulk of the studies conducted in the Forties, where average size tended to group around a figure of 3.1. Particularly interesting were the findings in the two "new" sections of Greater Lynn—Marblehead and Swampscott. In the absence of data on the total number of children ever born to the mother, an *approximation* was attempted by distributing households by age of head of household and by average size. The figures follow in Table 12.

TABLE 12
AVERAGE SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD BY SELECTED AGE GROUPS OF
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, LYNN

Age of Head	Average Household Size	
	Marblehead	Swampscott
30-34	3.9	4.1
35-39	4.1	4.2
40-44	4.2	4.1
45-49	4.2	3.9

The households whose heads were in the age group 45-49 may be assumed to represent "completed" families. It is of interest that the average size of households whose heads are in the younger age groupings are either equal to, or slightly higher than, the average size of these "completed" families. The unanswered question remains: Have the younger families completed their families but at an earlier age, or will they have more children? If the family size of the oldest group shown is approximately equivalent to its household size, there is still no basis for expecting a natural increase in the Jewish population over the long run, unless the younger families significantly increase in size over those shown.

In the absence of statistics on the total number of children born to the mother, by the age of the mother, a measure of fertility called the fertility ratio has been developed. This fertility ratio represents the number of children under five for every 1,000 women aged 20 through 44.

Previous issues of the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK have carried fertility ratios of sixteen Jewish communities studied during the 1940's. Of these, nine had ratios under 400, five between 400 and 500, and two over 500. The fertility ratios for New Orleans, Pittsburgh, and Lynn are indicated in Table 13.

TABLE 13
FERTILITY RATIOS, NEW ORLEANS, PITTSBURGH, LYNN

	<i>Jewish</i>	<i>Urban White</i> (1950)
New Orleans	496.5 (1953)	447.6
Pittsburgh	437.7 (1953)	454.8
Lynn	527.9 (1955)	NA ^a

^a NA—Not available.

The over-all census figure for the 1950 white urban population was 493.3. Since the census figure was based upon data secured three to five years earlier than the studies listed in Table 13, it is quite likely that the Jewish fertility ratios (although higher than most reported in the past) are still lower than those for the general urban white population.

Jewish Education

Previous studies varied widely in the scope of the data obtained on Jewish education. However, four studies which provided information indicated that somewhere between one-fourth to one-third of the children of Jewish school age (at the time of the survey) had not received a Jewish education. In one of the four studies, Utica, the dominant form was the weekday school; in the other three studies, Camden, Jacksonville, and Trenton, the weekday and Sunday school were about equally popular.

The Lynn study reported that about 60 per cent of children in the age group 5-12 were currently enrolled (1955). Another 17 per cent were reported as planning to enroll in the future. In New Orleans, the proportion of children in the age group 6-15 who were receiving Jewish education at the time of the study was around 60 per cent of the total age group; inclusion of

those in the age group who had received Jewish education in the past, but were not attending at the time of the study, raised the proportion to 94 per cent. Table 14 below, which gives the types of school used, reveals the wide differences between the two communities.

TABLE 14
CURRENT JEWISH EDUCATION, NEW ORLEANS, LYNN
(At Time of Study)

Type of School	1953	1955
	New Orleans ^a (6-15 Years)	Lynn (6-12 Years)
Sunday School	79.2	12.0
Weekday Hebrew School	20.0	79.2
Yiddish School	—	4.4
Other	0.8	4.4
TOTAL SCHOOL ATTENDANCE....	100.0	100.0

^a These data reflect school attendance rather than individual children, as there was overlapping between types of school.

State Estimates

The state estimates in Table 2 of the Appendix form the basis for the total United States estimate of 5,197,000.

The community data in Table 1 of the Appendix were subjected to the following procedure before they were totaled to arrive at state totals: 1. Duplications (when a smaller subdivision was also included in a larger) were subtracted; 2. Population estimates for *known* communities with under 100 Jews were added; 3. Estimates for Jews in communities of under 100 Jewish population where the exact number was not known were added (generally twice the number of the known); 4. When a Jewish community's geographical area covered more than one state, its population was distributed among the states concerned.

The Jewish population of the United States in 1956 was 3.1 per cent of the total United States population estimated by the United States Census Bureau for July 1, 1955. All but eight of the states and the District of Columbia were below this average figure. The highest concentration of Jews remained New York State, where 14.95 per cent of the state population was Jewish.

ALVIN CHENKIN

APPENDIX

TABLE I

COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE (ESTIMATED)

State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population
ALABAMA		CONNECTICUT		Savannah	3,150
Anniston	140	Ansonia	700	Valdosta	240
Bessemer	126	Bridgeport	14,000	IDAHO	
Birmingham	3,800	Bristol	250	Boise	120
Dothan	140	Colchester	600	ILLINOIS	
Gadsden	196	Danbury	1,500	Aurora	400
Huntsville	100	Danielson	120	Bloomington	150
Jasper	125	Derby-Shelton	340	Champaign	410
Mobile	1,750	Greenwich	1,050	Chicago Heights	400
Montgomery	1,500	Hartford	26,000	Chicago Metropolitan Area	282,000
Selma	297	Lebanon	140	Danville	258
Tuscaloosa	240	Lower Middlesex County	150	Decatur	343
ARIZONA		Manchester	700	East St. Louis (incl. in So. Ill.)	
Phoenix	6,000	Meriden	1,200	Elgin	480
Tucson	5,000	Middletown	1,000	Galesburg	158
ARKANSAS		Milford	800	Harvey-Blue Island	155
Blytheville	100	Moodus	262	Joliet	653
Ft. Smith	259	New Britain	3,000	Kankakee	270
Helena	204	New Canaan	110	Mattoon	125
Hot Springs	525	New Haven	20,000	Park Forest	1,400
Little Rock	1,000	New London	3,000	Peoria	1,850
Pine Bluff	275	Newtown	263	Quincy	175
Southeast Arkansas	170	Norwalk	4,000	Rock Island	2,000
CALIFORNIA		Norwich	2,200	Rockford	850
Alameda and Contra Costa Counties ^a	16,000	Putnam	120	Southern Illinois	3,000
Bakersfield	1,085	Rockville	415	Springfield	1,250
Elsinore	450	Stamford	6,000	Waukegan	1,000
Fontana	140	Torrington	360	INDIANA	
Fresno	1,500	Wallingford	300	Anderson	100
Lancaster	100	Waterbury	5,000	East Chicago	400
Long Beach	7,000	Westport	260	Elkhart	150
Los Angeles Metropolitan Area	400,000	Willimantic	425	Evansville	1,450
Modesto	267	Winsted	137	Ft. Wayne	1,200
Oakland ^b	12,000	Woodmont	250	Gary	3,000
Ontario-Pomona	600	DELAWARE		Hammond	1,200
Palm Springs	500	Wilmington	6,500	Indiana Harbor	600
Pasadena	1,800	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		Indianapolis	8,000
Petaluma	600	Greater Washington ^c	60,000	Lafayette	425
Riverside	224	FLORIDA		Marion	156
Sacramento	4,500	Clearwater	175	Michigan City	320
Salinas	300	Daytona Beach	700	Muncie	225
San Bernardino	1,194	Ft. Lauderdale	560	Richmond	108
San Diego	7,000	Gainesville	148	Shelbyville	150
San Francisco	51,000	Hollywood	2,500	South Bend	2,500
San Jose	2,500	Jacksonville	4,800	Terre Haute	875
San Pedro	500	Key West	120	Vincennes	114
Santa Ana	400	Lakeland	375	Whiting	225
Santa Barbara	400	Miami	75,000	IOWA	
Santa Cruz	140	Orlando	1,000	Cedar Rapids	420
Santa Maria ^e	147	Palm Beach County	2,300	Council Bluffs	450
Santa Monica	8,000	Pensacola	800	Davenport	850
Santa Rosa	160	Sarasota	750	Des Moines	3,500
Stockton	1,955	St. Augustine	205	Dubuque	308
Tulare ^d	146	St. Petersburg	2,300	Fort Dodge	116
Vallejo	400	Tallahassee	140	Marshalltown	222
Ventura County	400	Tampa	3,000	Mason City	210
COLORADO		GEORGIA		Muscatine	122
Colorado Springs	400	Albany	400	Ottumwa	215
Denver	18,000	Atlanta	12,000	Sioux City	2,235
Greeley	101	Augusta	800	Waterloo	450
Pueblo	375	Brunswick	108	KANSAS	
		Columbus	1,000	Leavenworth	115
		Dalton	102	Topeka	200
		Macon	800	Wichita	1,100

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE (ESTIMATED) (Continued)

State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population
KENTUCKY					
Ashland	175	North Adams	612	NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Harlan Zone	140	Northampton	350	Claremont	200
Henderson	140	Peabody	1,200	Concord	160
Hopkinsville	122	Pittsfield	2,300	Dover	150
Lexington	1,000	Plymouth	200	Keene	112
Louisville	8,250	Salem	1,600	Laconia	120
Owensboro	125	Southbridge	140	Manchester	1,870
Paducah	150	Springfield	10,000	Nashua	418
LOUISIANA					
Alexandria	390	Taunton	800	Portsmouth	480
Baton Rouge	750	Ware	125	NEW JERSEY	
Crowley	311	Webster	140	Alliance	470
Lafayette	194	Worcester	10,500	Asbury Park	3,000
Lake Charles	100	MICHIGAN			
Monroe	900	Ann Arbor	210	Atlantic City	9,000
New Iberia	104	Battle Creek	175	Bayonne	8,300
New Orleans	9,500	Bay City	800	Beach Haven	108
Shreveport	2,300	Benton Harbor	830	Belmar	800
MAINE					
Aroostock County	120	Detroit	72,000	Bergenfield	
Augusta	100	Flint	3,000	Dumont	2,100
Bangor	1,200	Grand Rapids	1,650	Boonton	240
Bath	100	Iron County	161	Bordentown	200
Biddeford-Saco	262	Iron Mountain	104	Bound Brook	100
Calais	137	Jackson	200	Bradley Beach	1,000
Lewiston-Auburn	1,400	Kalamazoo	534	Bridgton	600
Pittsfield	120	Lansing	800	Burlington	250
Portland	3,500	Marquette County	175	Camden	11,000
Rockland	150	Mt. Clemens	350	Carmel	140
Skowhegan Area	120	Muskegon	400	Carteret	600
Waterville	110	Pontiac	700	Clayton	200
MARYLAND					
Annapolis	1,000	Port Huron	146	Cliffside Park	950
Baltimore	78,000	Saginaw	440	Cranford	600
Cumberland	535	South Haven	460	Dover	700
Easton Area	140	MINNESOTA			
Frederick	150	Austin	125	Dunellen	120
Hagerstown	316	Duluth	3,100	Elizabeth	10,500
Havre de Grace	100	Hibbing	250	Elmer	140
Montgomery Co.*	27,700	Mankato	122	Englewood ^b	5,425
Pocomoke City	100	Minneapolis	23,000	Englishtown	260
Prince George Co.	10,000	Rochester	120	Essex County ⁱ	97,419
St. Mary's County	109	St. Paul	10,000	Belleville	1,223
Salisbury	227	Virginia	140	Bloomfield	2,625
MASSACHUSETTS					
Athol	210	MISSISSIPPI			
Attleboro	120	Biloxi-Gulfport	160	Caldwell, Essex	1,750
Beverly	700	Clarksdale	380	Fells, Roseland	1,750
Boston	140,000	Cleveland	250	Cedar Grove	383
Brockton	3,200	Greenville	525	East Orange	7,000
Clinton	112	Greenwood	174	Harrison, Kearny,	
Fall River	3,968	Hattiesburg	180	Arlington, No.	
Fitchburg	607	Jackson	350	Arlington	2,100
Framingham	1,225	Meridian	235	Hillside	5,250
Gardner	175	Tupelo	120	Irvington	8,750
Gloucester	435	Vicksburg	275	Livingston	2,450
Great Barrington	130	MISSOURI			
Greenfield	250	Cape Girardeau	120	Maplewood	4,550
Haverhill	2,500	Hannibal	100	Millburn, Short	
Holyoke	1,600	Hayti	200	Hills	2,012
Hyannis	140	Joplin	200	Montclair, Glen	
Lawrence	2,800	Kansas City	22,000	Ridge	1,400
Leominster	385	Springfield	240	Newark	40,860
Lowell	2,000	St. Joseph ^f	1,002	Nutley	1,130
Lynn	10,391	St. Louis	55,000	Orange	2,100
Medway	135	MONTANA			
Milford	300	Billings	100	Pleasantdale,	
Millis	123	Butte	206	West Orange	7,000
New Bedford	4,000	NEBRASKA			
Newburyport	437	Lincoln	950	South Orange	4,200
		Omaha	6,677	Springfield	1,575
		NEVADA			
		Las Vegas	2,500	Verona	1,050
		Reno	320	Fair Lawn	4,550
				Farmingdale	800
				Flemington	750
				Fort Lee	2,100
				Freehold	1,000
				Gloucester County ^j	900
				Hackensack	1,600
				Hasbrouck Heights	440
				Heightstown	1,100
				Hoboken	1,300

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE (ESTIMATED) (Continued)

State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population
Hamilton	550	Johnstown	1,600	Westerly	140
Lima	418	Kittanning	275	Woonsocket	795
Lorain	800	Lancaster	1,825	SOUTH CAROLINA	
Mansfield	308	Latrobe	150	Aiken	125
Marion	165	Lebanon	656	Beaufort	116
Massillon	130	Lewistown	250	Bishopville	116
Middletown	270	Lock Haven	350	Charleston	2,322
New Philadelphia	180	Lower Bucks Co., (incl. Levittown, New Hope, etc.)	2,100	Columbia	500
Piqua	275	Mahonoy City	150	Georgetown	111
Portsmouth	120	McKeesport	2,500	Greenville	550
Sandusky	150	McKees Rocks	160	Kingstree-Lake City	130
Springfield	488	Meadville	120	Orangeburg	118
Steubenville	1,000	Monessen	250	Spartanburg	221
Toledo	6,500	Mt. Carmel	272	Sumter	275
Warren	800	Mt. Pleasant	180	SOUTH DAKOTA	
Wooster	200	New Castle	800	Sioux Falls	350
Youngstown	5,500	New Kensington	640	TENNESSEE	
Zanesville	300	Norristown	1,200	Chattanooga	2,200
OKLAHOMA		North Penn.	200	Jackson	110
Ardmore	175	Oil City	360	Knoxville	800
Oklahoma City	1,800	Oxford-Kennet Square	132	Memphis	8,500
Seminole	124	Philadelphia (within city limits) ^{dd}	226,668	Nashville	2,800
Tulsa	2,044	Philadelphia (in- cluding suburbs itemized be- low) ^{dd}	251,644	Oak Ridge	350
OREGON		Cheltenham (mainly La Mott, Elkins Park, Melrose Park)	8,745	TEXAS	
Eugene	120	Haverford	2,281	Amarillo	270
Portland	6,600	Lower Merion (mainly Bala- Cynwyd, Mer- ion, Wynne- wood)	7,964	Austin	1,000
Salem	210	Upper Darby	5,986	Beaumont	625
PENNSYLVANIA		Philipsburg	136	Breckenridge	111
Aliquippa	400	Phoenixville	268	Brownsville	100
Allentown	3,250	Pittsburgh	47,000	Corpus Christi	1,200
Altoona	1,100	Pottstown	680	Dallas	15,300
Ambridge	300	Pottsville	870	El Paso	2,800
Beaver Valley (incl. Lower Beaver Valley)	830	Punxsutawney	108	Ft. Worth	2,750
Berwick	119	Reading	3,500	Galveston	1,400
Bethlehem	1,000	Sayre	100	Harlingen	100
Bloomsburg	102	Scranton	5,526	Houston	15,000
Braddock	600	Shamokin	250	Kilgore	108
Bradford	450	Sharon	920	Laredo	184
Bristol	176	Shenandoah	444	Longview	125
Brownsville	260	Stroudsburg	222	Lubbock	300
Butler	645	Sunbury	160	McAllen	100
Canonsburg	120	Tarentum	175	North Texas Zone (Demson, Gaines- ville, Greenville, Paris, Sherman)	225
Carbon County	300	Titusville	129	Odessa	100
Carbondale	335	Uniontown	1,040	Port Arthur	230
Carnegie	268	Vandergrift-Leach- burg	120	Rosenberg	100
Chambersburg	210	Warren	120	San Angelo	100
Charleroi	200	Washington	500	San Antonio	6,500
Chester	2,100	West Chester	300	Texarkana	129
Clairton	110	Wilkes-Barre	5,062	Tyler	450
Coatesville	510	Williamsport	850	Waco	1,250
Connellsville	160	York	1,200	Wharton	215
Coraopolis	152	RHODE ISLAND		Wichita Falls	170
Donora	160	Newport	1,000	UTAH	
DuBois	160	Pawtucket	1,300	Ogden	100
Duquesne	200	Providence	20,000	Salt Lake City	1,305
Easton	1,600	VERMONT		Bennington	100
Ellwood City	140	Burlington	1,000	Rutland	350
Erie	1,750	VIRGINIA		Alexandria ^e	1,300
Farrell	500	Arlington ^e	2,800		
Glassport	120				
Greensburg	440				
Hanover	120				
Harrisburg	5,000				
Hazleton	1,400				
Homestead	600				
Indiana	130				
Irwin	120				
Jeannette	200				

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE (ESTIMATED) (Continued)

State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population	State and City	Jewish Population
Danville	200	Seattle	9,500	Eau Claire	120
Fairfax County and Falls Church	3,200	Spokane	650	Fond du Lac	160
Fredericksburg ..	120	Tacoma	650	Green Bay	500
Hampton	210	WEST VIRGINIA		Kenosha	615
Harrisonburg	112	Beckley	228	La Crosse	150
Lynchburg	280	Bluefield-Princeton	300	Madison	2,150
Martinsville	170	Charleston	2,000	Manitowoc	184
Newport News	2,000	Clarksburg	280	Marinette	120
Norfolk	7,500	Fairmont	200	Milwaukee	30,000
Petersburg	500	Huntington	750	Oshkosh	130
Portsmouth	2,100	Morgantown	150	Racine	1,000
Richmond	8,000	Parkersburg	100	Rice Lake	122
Roanoke	650	Weirton	350	Sheboygan	600
Staunton	110	Welch	144	Stevens Point	105
Suffolk	180	Wheeling	800	Superior	481
Winchester	131	Williamson	180	Waukesha	100
WASHINGTON		WISCONSIN		WYOMING	
Bremerton	182	Appleton	575	Cheyenne	500
		Beloit	150		

^a Incl. 28 communities, the largest of which, Oakland, is listed separately.

^b Incl. Piedmont, San Leandro, Emeryville.

^c Incl. San Luis Obispo.

^d Incl. other communities in Kings County.

^e Greater Washington includes urbanized portions of Montgomery and Prince George Counties (Md.), and Arlington County, Fairfax County (urbanized portion), Falls Church, and Alexandria (Va.).

^f Incl. Atchison, Kans.

^g Incl. Cliffside, Fairview, Ridgefield.

^h Incl. Tenafly, Cresskill, Englewood Cliffs.

ⁱ These data prepared by author from preliminary estimates of distribution of number of households in Essex County. Conversion from households to individuals was made by using 3.5 as the average household size, except for Newark proper, where 3.0 was employed.

^j Incl. Clayton, Paulsboro, Pitman, Swedesboro, Willemstown, Woodbury, Mt.

Royal, Mullicia Hill, Westville.

^k Incl. Woodcliff, Union City, Weehawken, West New York, North Bergen, Guttenberg, Secaucus, Hudson Heights.

^l Incl. Leonia and Ridgefield.

^m Incl. Smithtown, Brightwaters, Islip, East Islip, Islip Terrace, Central Islip, West Islip, Brentwood.

ⁿ Incl. Tuckahoe and unincorporated Eastchester.

^o Incl. Hewlett, Woodmere, Lawrence, Inwood (Five Towns).

^p Incl. Queens section of Floral Park.

^q Incl. Locust Valley, Oyster Bay, Glenhead, Sea Cliff, Glenwood Landing, Lattingtown, Brookville.

^r Incl. various small villages included in Greater Great Neck, e.g., Thomaston, Russell Gardens, Kensington, Great Neck Estates, Harbor Hills, Saddle Rock, Kenilworth, University Gardens, Great Neck Plaza, King's Point.

^s Incl. West and East Hempstead.

^t Incl. Huntington Station, Cold Spring Hills, Northport, East Northport, Center Port, Greenlawn, Commack.

^u Incl. Mamaroneck.

^v Incl. Lido.

^w Incl. North Merrick.

^x Incl. Sayville, Bellport, Bayport.

^y Incl. Lake Mohegan, Montrose.

^z Incl. Manhasset, Sands Point, Plandome.

^{aa} Incl. Roslyn Heights, Alberson, East Hills, East Williston, Roslyn Estates, Manhasset (Section), Sea Cliff, Glenhead, Brookville.

^{bb} Incl. Seaford, North Bellmore, South Levittown.

^{cc} Incl. Scarsdale, Harrison, Hartsdale, Elmsford.

^{dd} These estimates, based upon the Yom Kippur method, are subject to the usual qualifications attendant upon the use of this method. It may be presumed that the estimates are conservative since (1) the Yom Kippur method tends to underestimate Jewish population estimates; and (2) not all Philadelphia suburbs were included.

TABLE 2
 JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES BY STATES,
 ABSOLUTE AND PROPORTIONATE

<i>State</i>	<i>Estimated Jewish Population</i>	<i>Total Population (1955)*</i>	<i>Estimated Jewish Per Cent of Total</i>
Alabama	8,950	3,110,000	0.29
Arizona	11,500	1,007,000	1.14
Arkansas	3,050	1,802,000	0.17
California	510,500	12,961,000	3.94
Colorado	19,400	1,547,000	1.23
Connecticut	95,600	2,200,000	4.35
Delaware	6,750	390,000	1.73
District of Columbia	44,000	857,000	5.13
Florida	95,150	3,580,000	2.66
Georgia	21,150	3,662,000	0.58
Idaho	250	612,000	0.04
Illinois	298,900	9,301,000	3.21
Indiana	23,100	4,329,000	0.53
Iowa	10,200	2,671,000	0.38
Kansas	2,950	2,060,000	0.14
Kentucky	10,350	3,011,000	0.34
Louisiana	14,900	2,934,000	0.51
Maine	7,950	906,000	0.88
Maryland	118,800	2,744,000	4.33
Massachusetts	205,800	4,773,000	4.31
Michigan	84,750	7,326,000	1.16
Minnesota	38,250	3,190,000	1.20
Mississippi	3,850	2,133,000	0.18
Missouri	78,500	4,201,000	1.87
Montana	500	629,000	0.08
Nebraska	8,400	1,394,000	0.60
Nevada	2,850	235,000	1.21
New Hampshire	4,200	553,000	0.76
New Jersey	295,000	5,324,000	5.54
New Mexico	1,650	793,000	0.21
New York	2,395,000	16,021,000	14.95
North Carolina	9,400	4,344,000	0.22
North Dakota	1,250	643,000	0.19
Ohio	155,500	8,945,000	1.74
Oklahoma	5,800	2,210,000	0.26
Oregon	7,450	1,685,000	0.44
Pennsylvania	365,300	10,898,000	3.35
Rhode Island	23,300	817,000	2.85
South Carolina	6,600	2,308,000	0.28
South Dakota	1,050	683,000	0.15
Tennessee	15,700	3,414,000	0.46
Texas	53,700	8,748,000	0.61
Utah	1,450	797,000	0.18
Vermont	2,350	370,000	0.64
Virginia	30,950	3,579,000	0.86
Washington	13,800	2,607,000	0.53
West Virginia	5,950	1,984,000	0.30
Wisconsin	38,200	3,702,000	1.03
Wyoming	750	312,000	0.24

* Source: Current Population Reports, "United States Census Reports Series," 25, No. 14 (July 1, 1955). These data include armed forces in states but exclude overseas forces as well as those in dependencies.