

## The Pioneering Ideology and the Roots of Social Welfare in the Pre-State Period of Israel

RUBEN SCHINDLER, D.S.W.

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel

"(during the Second Aliya) . . . Features of social welfare and social security were included in the . . . labor movement . . . (and became) universally applicable with the creation of the State and subsequent national insurance programs. But as indicated, it was the ideology of the pioneering movement that curtailed comprehensive services and restrained the development of welfare programs which would have benefited the Yishuv as a whole."

### Introduction

THE roots of social welfare can be traced back to the new *Yishuv*<sup>1</sup> and in particular to the Second Aliya (1904-1914). The early 1900's saw waves of immigrants reach the shores of Palestine seeking refuge and respite from persecution in the diaspora. They arrived with a commitment to develop a way of life based on the values of labor and of the religious aspect of work. It is suggested that the pioneering ideology which accompanied members of the Second Aliya assumed a pervasiveness which permeated to all spheres of life and influenced the new *Yishuv* in later decades.<sup>2</sup> This paper will examine the formation and development of social welfare programs as reflected in the pioneering ideology of the Second Aliya. It is hypothesized that the pioneering ideology was both a progressive and negative force in the development of welfare services. *Kupat Holim*,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The New Yishuv: The term used for the society that developed along nationalist lines beginning with the first immigration (Aliya) to Palestine in 1880.

The Old Yishuv: The term used for the traditional Jewish society of Palestine.

<sup>2</sup> S.N. Eisenstadt, *Israeli Society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970. "Introduction."

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Itzhak Kanev for the interview granted to me in April 1975. Mr. Kanev was the former Director of Social Research and Chairman of *Kupat Holim* — Worker's Health In-

the worker's sick fund, was established in 1911, and four years later the Workmen's Cooperative Society was created to assist people suffering from hunger and poverty. But the very ideology expressed by members of the Second Aliya also curtailed the development of social welfare services. These services would no doubt have benefited the *Yishuv* and society as a whole.

### The Second Aliya

Until the latter part of the 19th century Jews turning to Zion and settling the land were few indeed. Those who came were motivated primarily by a religious commitment rather than by any Zionist ideal. Settling in Palestine was for many a religious precept bringing closer the period of redemption through the coming of the Messiah. National strivings were, however, to supersede religious yearnings. During the nineteenth century in Eastern Europe, intellectuals began to probe national origins, demanding national unity. The "Return to Zion" movement, coupled with a series of organized pogroms in Czarist Russia brought Jews seeking solace and refuge elsewhere. Many left for

insurance Institution. Mr. Kanev is the recipient of *Pras Yisroel* "The Israel Prize", and considered a leading authority on Social Security and Social Welfare in Israel, and was a member of the Third Aliya.

America, and a large group of about 25,000 Jews came to Palestine.<sup>4</sup> This wave of immigration was known as the First Aliya. By 1903, the Zionist movement had been launched by Theodore Herzl and, a year following, a new wave of immigration from Russia brought to Palestine some 40,000 Jews. This was the beginning of the Second Aliya, lasting to the outbreak of World War One (1904-1914).

The attitude of the Second Aliya to members of the old *Yishuv* was by no means sympathetic. The life style of many Jews of the old *Yishuv* was no different from their way of conduct in the diaspora. Dependence on outside support and income was common in contrast to self-support and search for independence. This support, Eisenstadt notes, was "as institutional as it was ideological . . . functioning virtually unchallenged until well into the 20th century."<sup>5</sup> The pioneers of the Second Aliya were determined to free themselves from outside economic assistance. Dependency upon the diaspora would deter their search for self-realization and blunt them in achieving independence in their own land.

Members of the Second Aliya thus took a negative stance to anything which resembled philanthropy. Poale Zion, one of the two political parties meeting in Yafo during the period of 1907 noted:

The party will fight philanthropy because it lowers the moral fiber of the Jewish population and stifles the development of creative forces.<sup>6</sup>

Accepting any form of assistance was considered a form of parasitism. As Klay notes: "to have lunch at a

<sup>4</sup> For insight into this subject note: S. Dubnov, *Divre Yome Am Olom*, Vol. 9, 1958, pp. 60-116.

<sup>5</sup> Eisenstadt, *op. cit.*, "Introduction."

<sup>6</sup> Klay, *Ha'Aliya Hashniah*, Tel-Aviv: Hamosad Letarbut, 1944, p. 43 (Hebrew).

neighbor's home, to ask for a loan, even to accept money from parents — all this was viewed with distaste and the user was viewed as unclean.<sup>7</sup>

Central to the ideology of the Second Aliya was *Kibbush Avoda*, conquest of Jewish labor and the right to work.<sup>8,9</sup> In the name of national emancipation the settlers of the new *Yishuv* claimed that hard manual tasks must be performed by Jewish hands lest the first outpost of the Jewish nation be lost to them. Furthermore, it was a matter of principle that only those who live by their own labor and do not exploit the work of others were to be legitimate members of the new community. Through physical work members were to learn self-discipline and self-reliance. Perhaps the most difficult challenge facing the new pioneer was to "conquer himself" in order to conquer the labor which was often unbearable. The religious attitude toward labor, the outgrowth of the period, became the sacred inheritance of all the ensuing pioneers who came to Palestine after World War One.<sup>10</sup>

### Antecedents of Social Welfare

The work ethic elevated to a value of the highest magnitude took the toll of many who could not meet the demands of hard physical labor. A large percentage (80 percent) left the country. Others experienced poor nutrition and inadequate housing, and became the victims of malaria, dysentery and

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 168.

<sup>8</sup> A.D. Gordon, *Selected Essays*, trans. by F. Burnce; New York, League for Labor Palestine, 1938, pp. 247-251.

<sup>9</sup> A.D. Gordon, *Havmah Vhaavodah* Vol. 1, Jerusalem: Hasifria Hazionit, Vol. 1, 1953.

<sup>10</sup> Bardin notes that the aim of the movement was to be free and live in a creative Jewish community. Its basis was labor; its character self-realization; its instrument, creative action; its driving power, free will. In Shlomo Bardin, *Pioneer Youth in Palestine*, New York: Bloch Publishing, 1932, p. 100.

trachoma. During this period the mortality rate was high and health services insufficient.

The need for a health service was recognized by the agricultural workers of Judea and the Galilee.<sup>11</sup> The former group, meeting in Petah Tikva in 1911 "realized the importance of creating *Kupat Holim*, through the taxation of members."<sup>12</sup> The reason for its creation can be appreciated by examining a letter forwarded to members of the Judean agricultural workers labor union by its executive. They noted:

*Kupat Holim* must be established through all our efforts. Can you imagine how this institution will ease our plight. . . . Who else but us feels the burden of work and in particular the new workers amongst us. And who but we feel the many illnesses and become weakened because of them. *Kupat Holim* will be the first institution to protect us from such misfortune.<sup>13</sup>

Delegates from various labor groups meeting in Yafo in 1913 set the by-laws of the *Kupat Holim*, the Sick Fund, and created a framework for its future activities.<sup>14</sup> It is important to underscore the basic philosophy of the fund before examining its characteristics which were both residual and institutional. The idea of mutual aid was a major theme.<sup>15</sup> It was based on pragmatic considerations and ideological foundations.<sup>16</sup> Mutual

aid is equated with mutual responsibility. In the period of the Second Aliya this idea had to be demonstrated in all its efficacy if the pioneering spirit and movement were to carry on. The work ethic which was transformed into the religion of work had to create a framework for self-preservation. Man's concern for fellow man was thus not only a value of the highest order in its own right but also valued so that the ideals of labor could be perpetuated. Mutual aid was also viewed as a value of the highest order inextricably tied to Jewish life, though according to Kanev never so articulated.<sup>17</sup>

The fund established through members' direct payment created the framework for health insurance and rights to benefits. It should be noted that cooperation by workers was not always enthusiastic and many had to be urged to join. Some were outright skeptical that the fund was going to materialize in light of previous attempts and failures in mutual aid. A viable fund was therefore essential in assuring financial stability. It was important in countering philanthropic inroads that could easily emerge if autonomy of the fund was not preserved.

The sick fund began modestly with few in number.<sup>18</sup> Its institutional

in Bracha Chabas (Ed.) *Haliya Hashmia*, Am Oved, 1947, pp. 636-639.

<sup>17</sup> Interview with Kanev, *op. cit.*, April 1975. Its source can be found in *Talmud Bauli Kol Yisroel Arevin Zeh Bazeh — Shevuot* 39, *Soteh* 37.

<sup>18</sup> The statistics below suggest the dramatic increase in membership through 1964:

Year	Members	Members and Dependents
1911	150	150
1922	5,700	10,000
1932	16,322	38,900
1948	152,000	328,000
1963	690,000	1,708,000
1964	727,000	1,790,000

In Itzhak Kanev, *Mutual Aid and Social Medicine in Israel*, Tel Aviv, Israel, 1965, p. 10.

characteristics were established early. Health insurance through an initial fee and monthly premiums assured one of a "doctor, medication, lodging and in time of need, hospitalization."<sup>19</sup> Membership in the fund granted equal benefits to the whole family. Family members were viewed as equals with the same privileges and services guaranteed to each of them.

Sound medical care was certainly of utmost concern to the pioneers of the Second Aliya, but so were rehabilitative services. The purpose of the fund was to provide assistance for the ill in order to restore the patient to health in an atmosphere of "calmness and tranquility."<sup>20</sup> Special conditions for convalescent care were emphasized, and provisions were made to achieve this aim. The worker's inability to be self-supporting during convalescence was another major concern raised. The delegates' recommendation for grants-in-aid was emphasized. This recommendation was not implemented because of the fund's limited capital, and loans were therefore substituted for grants. But the spirit of the idea stimulated the creation of a *Keren Nechut*, the fund for the disabled, though it took nearly two decades for it actually to be established.<sup>21</sup>

Characteristics of a preventive nature were also raised. Facilities in the settlements to service the ill were almost nonexistent. The capacity for hospitals to admit patients was limited. This prompted the fund's organizers to rent quarters in Yafo so that the sick could receive proper care until vacancies were available. A nurse was engaged for this purpose and workers were asked to as-

sist with the daily chores, again underscoring the importance of mutual aid. Efforts were likewise made to broaden the awareness of personal hygiene and health care through lectures and discussions.

Accountability and the absence of a profit motive were two other features which characterized the Fund. From its very inception regulations were agreed upon in guiding the manner, time, and form in which monies were to be collected. A member not meeting payment on time without due cause would be expelled from the Fund. This is explicitly stated in the By-laws: "A member not fulfilling his obligation to the kupah within three months without ample reasons, ceases to be considered a member of the kupah."<sup>22</sup> Detailed accounts were forwarded to the central office by its chapters. An elected committee operated each branch and they in turn elected the central board.

The absence of a profit motive as a consequence of limited earnings accompanied the Fund through many decades. The Fund was supported in early years primarily through its membership. During the period of the 1920's support was first granted through the Palestine Immigration Board of Labor and the Zionist organization.<sup>23</sup> It should be noted that the Fund from its very inception was based on mutual aid, an ideal which was inextricably bound to the pioneering community. As noted earlier it was created to perpetuate a worker's society. A profit motive would be antithetical and inimical to the very principles for which the Fund was created.

Katznelson, one of the leading forces of the labor movement, notes that a most interesting and significant clause

<sup>19</sup> *Takanot* (By-Laws) *op. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>21</sup> The fund for the disabled was established by *Kupat Holim* in 1930.

Note Yitzhak Kanev, *Habitua'ch Hasozial Beretz Yisroel*, Briut Haoved, 1941, p. 73.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>23</sup> *Takanot Vehachlatot Shel Kupot Holim Beretz Yisroel*, Vol. 14, No. 18, pp. 14-15. (1920).

<sup>11</sup> For a description of medical care during the period and an overview of the development of *Kupat Holim* note: Dr. Y. Mayer, "Chag Lemifal Habriut" (40 years *Kupat Holim*), *Eytonim. Merkas Kupat Holim*. Vol. 5, No. 12, December 1952, p. 297-301.

<sup>12</sup> From the General Meeting of the Workers of Judea in *Hapoel Hatzair*. Vol. 4, No. 18, (1911) p. 14.

<sup>13</sup> *Hapoel Hatzair*, Vol. 7, Nos. 8, 9 (1913), p. 22-23.

<sup>14</sup> "Takanot Vhachlatot Shel Kupat Holim." *Hapoel Hatzair* Vol. 6, No. 35 (1913), pp. 15-16. (By-laws of Sick Fund).

<sup>15</sup> Y. Apter, "Kupat Holim Shel Poale Eretz Yisroel," *Hapoel Hatzair*, Vol. 14, No. 13 (1920), pp. 8-9.

<sup>16</sup> Y. Apter, "Mamatzy Irgun Lezrah Haddit,"

of the Fund was its concern with new immigrants.<sup>24</sup> Social services with benefits in kind were extended to them. The By-laws indicated that "new workers in the land who did not have time to become members . . . can benefit from the fund like regular members up to two months."<sup>25</sup> Services which were parochial were now to be extended more universally. Of particular concern to the Fund and the labor movement was the interest in the aliya from Yemen.

During the Second Aliya about 1,500 men, women and children from Yemen reached the shores of Palestine.<sup>26</sup> Unbearable living conditions, acute illness, some fatal, faced these newcomers. At the conference of Jewish workers held in Ben Shemen in the winter of 1913, reference was made to paying more attention to the Yemenite community.<sup>27</sup> In the spring of the same year attention to their plight and physical condition is underscored by the delegates of *Kupat Holim*. "The condition of the Yemenites in the Moshavot is most serious . . . *Kupat Holim* must ameliorate the situation without delay."<sup>28</sup> Yavniel, who was instrumental in the Yemenite aliya, comments on their physical state and condition:

The situation of the Yemenite children in the Moshavot does not promise great hope for their development. . . . They live in poor quarters and without adequate medical facilities. . . . The majority of houses are constructed from wood. In the winter the rains and cold penetrate and during the summer the hot winds choke both man and

<sup>24</sup> *Kitve, Berl Katznelson*, Tel Aviv, Hatzeat Miflegat Poale Eretz Yisroel, 1949, p. 30.

<sup>25</sup> *Takanot* (1913), *op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>26</sup> For a detailed account of this aliya, the life in Yemen and their adjustment to the Yishuv note: Shmuel Yavniel, *Masa Leteman*. Tel Aviv: Hozat Miflegat Poale Eretz Yisroel, 1952.

<sup>27</sup> Third Conference of Agricultural Workers in Ben Shemen, Chanukah 1913.

<sup>28</sup> *Takanot*. (1913), *op. cit.*, p. 15.

child. The physician cannot service one moshav and certainly not the complete Yemenite quarter. Within the quarter there are hundreds of families without medical services.<sup>29</sup>

Efforts to aid the Yemenite community came from a number of sources. Some were more effective than others. *Kupat Holim* initiated chapters in Petah Tikva and Hadera where the majority of immigrants were settled. These chapters did not actually begin operating until 1919, seven years after the first wave of Yemenite immigrants had arrived. A number of years earlier, the "workers club" established a hospital in Petah Tikva to service Yemenite families. It was supported by the *Yishuv* for a number of months, but when funds were no longer available the hospital had no choice but to close down.

Assistance which is characteristic of a more institutional nature was provided through the land resettlement office. Through their efforts and financial contributions from organizations abroad, homes of a more substantial nature were built.<sup>30</sup> Settlements such as Machaneh Yehuda near Petah Tikva, Nachaliel adjoining Hadera and Shaarayim in proximity to Rehovot were established. These communities provided permanent homes and hope for a more dignified way of life.

The recognition of need and response in the form of direct aid were opposed by some segments of the working community. The opposition was once again based on ideological grounds since the help given was philanthropic in nature. There was also criticism that the living quarters were too spacious for workers to occupy.

Progress in the sphere of medical services and social benefits as noted earlier

<sup>29</sup> Yavniel, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

<sup>30</sup> Alex Bein, *Toldot Hahit Yashvut Hazionit*, Palestine, Massada 1942, p. 106.

must be given its proper recognition. But the services were also particularistic, selective and limited. Only members who belonged to the labor organization of the period could join. Benefits were not universal, open to, and viewed as a right for all members of the *Yishuv*. When a member of *Kupat Holim* chapters offered his services to non-members, the central office opposed it and threatened him with expulsion.

But the By-laws of the fund were also restrictive for its members. Failure of payment without due cause could mean severance of any further services. One could not be accepted during a sickness and the chronically ill were rejected outright. This exclusiveness or restrictiveness was reflected in the ideology of the pioneering movement. It is highlighted in the fund's By-laws which were expanded some years later. The work ethic is again emphasized and creation through one's own prowess is idealized. The criteria for membership are succinctly noted: Only one who "lives off his work and does not exploit the work of others is eligible."<sup>31</sup>

Though members of the Second Aliya were parochial in their outlook regarding health services, they were more progressive when the *Yishuv* faced a crisis of severe magnitude.

The First World War found the majority of workers in the *Yishuv* living at a low level of subsistence. Economic conditions were at their worst. Laborers in the lower Galilee decided that something must be done to help the workers in Judea "whose economic position is reported as most deplorable."<sup>32</sup> During the Passover week of April 1916 a meeting of agricultural workers in Degania

Alef decided to establish a national consumers cooperative, to be called *Mashbir* (Supplier).<sup>33</sup>

The aim of the *Mashbir* as Katznelson notes was "to purchase wheat wholesale from the primary owner, direct from the barn, when the prices were stable and sell them during inflation at the marginal cost."<sup>34</sup> The aim was to counter the inflationary spiral, and above all war against hunger. Workers could not stand by idly while a large number of their peers experienced hunger and despair. The *Mashbir* as Katznelson suggests was based on the following principles: no profit motive, no accumulation of profit, no dividends to members.<sup>35</sup> The *Mashbir* was established with the "intent of fighting the crisis, . . . against rising prices . . . and the outcry of hunger that engulfed all the workers during the war."<sup>36</sup>

But it was not only the welfare and humanitarian considerations that prompted the creation of the *Mashbir*: There was the strong desire for self-employment; the continuous wish to stand independent, thus countering the danger of receiving alms; the firm belief that mutual aid could extricate them from deepening crisis and despair. Mutual aid was viewed as a "ladder on which everybody is climbing, the strong helping the weak, and which like Jacob's ladder has its feet in the soil and its top in heaven."<sup>37</sup> At the end of the war it had

<sup>33</sup> More specifically called Palestine Workmen's Co-operative Society for the Supply and Marketing of Production. Katznelson notes the significance of the word *Mashbir* suggesting its relationship to the term "mashber", crisis, equated with the crisis of the period. Katznelson, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

<sup>34</sup> Berl Katznelson, *Hamashbir*. Tel Aviv: Achdut, 1924, p. 6.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>36</sup> Yonah Yagol (Ed.), *Yovel Hamashbir* (Fifty Years of *Mashbir*), Dfus Naot, 1967, p. 30.

<sup>37</sup> Viteles, *op. cit.*, "Introduction."

<sup>31</sup> Hapoel Hatzair, Vol. 14, No. 18 (1920) pp. 14-15.

<sup>32</sup> Harry Viteles, *A History of the Cooperative Movement in Israel*, Vol. 1. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1966, p. 17-23.

the support of a large segment of the population and was considered an "anchor of salvation" to the *Yishuv*.

A unique feature of the *Mashbir* — and here it differed from *Kupat Holim* — was its readiness to accept members from a broad spectrum of society. It welcomed teachers, artisans, the self-employed. They did not have to be members of the labor groups, which membership was a major criterion for joining the Fund. A severe critic of this policy was A. D. Gordon who opposed membership in the *Mashbir* for city workers because their ideals were not joined with nature and the soil. Gordon emphasized the importance of the *Mashbir's* educational venture, through "creation" rather than the business and financial characteristics which it took on.<sup>38</sup>

The board of the *Mashbir* met in 1919 to evaluate its past activities and plan the directions it would take for the future. They noted:

We were satisfied with the tentative nature of the *Mashbir* without formalizing an organization. But the period of crisis has passed in supplying food for those on the verge of hunger . . . The *Mashbir* concluded its function as an institution to provide food as an outcome of crisis. In the future it can function within a framework of fulfilling basic needs.<sup>39</sup>

The *Mashbir* was created at a most critical period in the *Yishuv*.<sup>40</sup> Basic services such as food and clothing were extended to a large segment of the population. In this sense it was not the

<sup>38</sup> A.D. Gordon, "Labirur Tarkido Shel Hamashbir," *Hapoel Hatzair*, Vol. 12, No. 31, (1919), pp. 4-7.

<sup>39</sup> "Hamashbir," *Hapoel Hatzair*, Vol. 12, No. 18, 1919, pp. 21-22.

<sup>40</sup> It was somewhat later in the early 1920's that social work as a profession was beginning to develop. Note the seminal study: Akiva Deutsch, *The Development of Social Work As A Profession in the Jewish Community in Eretz Israel*, Jerusalem, 1970, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

benefits of the minority but the welfare of the majority that was important. The *Mashbir* continued with this policy, though in time it would focus its energies in broadening its co-operative base and economic scope.

The pioneering ideology developed by the members of the Second Aliya was strengthened by the fact that no counter ideology emerged from any other group.<sup>41</sup> This perhaps explains the slow development of social welfare programs in general and the nature of these programs in particular.

Welfare services were created in the period of the 1930's by the Histadrut, the General Federation of Jewish Labor. The fund for the disabled and unemployed; the fund for orphans and the widow; and *Dor Lador*, assistance to the elderly were established by the labor community for the exclusive use of its membership. A brief examination of these welfare programs highlights the cause and concern for worker security. But as will be noted the services were not all successful and some had serious shortcomings. The fund for the disabled was established in 1930. It was created to assist workers who were the victims of malaria, trachoma and tuberculosis. The members received hospitalization, medical care, employment in line with the disability and loans to secure housing. The criteria for joining was membership in the Histadrut. Members of *Kupat Holim* were accepted automatically.

It should be noted that the fund was only partially effective since it faced financial difficulties. Furthermore, there was no participation by the various agencies of the *Yishuv* and the mandatory government. Kanev stated, "Until today no other participants sup-

<sup>41</sup> Chaim Adler (Ed.), *Integration and Development in Israel*. Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1970, p. 673.

ported the fund. . . . These institutions who are delegated to care for chronic ill shirk their responsibilities."<sup>42</sup> It was left for the labor organizations to carry the burden. But as Namir indicates, the principles of the fund would later be incorporated into the national insurance scheme providing workmen's compensation for those meeting with accident or illness.<sup>43</sup>

A year after *Keren Nechut*, the disability fund was instituted, the question of unemployment insurance was raised. "We have not done much in this area,"<sup>44</sup> was the reaction by one observer. A fund for the unemployed was recommended by the Histadrut in 1932 and was formally launched a year following. The fund was designated to find work for the unemployed and if necessary to create work projects. Only in rare cases was direct assistance given to the unemployed. Kanev observed that the fund had become more of an economic enterprise than a provider of economic security for unemployed members.<sup>45</sup>

Yavniel, a leading critic of welfare programs of the time, suggests that,

what is missing is the concept of commitment and security, in order for the insured to be certain that during periods of unemployment the fund will assure him payment at a reasonable level.<sup>46</sup>

The fund for the unemployed was actually used for the development of work projects, which increased working days for the population. But this, Yavniel adds, was in complete contradiction to

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 131.

<sup>43</sup> M. Namir, "Leharacht Techoktenv Hasozialit Vkdimoh," *Hapoel Hatzair*, Vol. 50, No. 52 (1957), p. 6.

<sup>44</sup> S. Haktin, *Bituach Mechoser Avodah*, Hapoel Hatzair, Vol. 25, No. 20 (1932) pp. 4-7.

<sup>45</sup> Kanivski, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

<sup>46</sup> For a critical evaluation of the welfare services and structure of the period note: B. Avniel, *Problemot B'Yachase Avodah Baaretz*. Jerusalem: Reuven Mas, 1943, pp. 25-26.

unemployment insurance across the world. The major purpose of the fund was to provide payments for the insured on a regular and continuous basis. The fund had thus far failed to meet this challenge.

A parallel association to meet these shortcomings of the fund was formed by the Palestine Labor Organization known as Mishan.<sup>47</sup> Its objective was to offer loans, provide a basic number of food items at reasonable rates, and serve the worker along more constructive lines. This service was given in the form of grants-in-aid, and a number of social service features were included. In this sense it did meet welfare objectives, though to a select segment of the population.

Concern for orphans and the widow, care for the aged, were other areas of importance raised by labor groups. *Matziz*, a fund to aid the widowed and orphans was established in 1937. The criteria for benefits appear to be more exclusive than inclusive. Like the fund for unemployment it took the form of grants-in-aid. *Dor Lador*, assistance to the elderly through mutual aid, was founded in 1943.

With the creation of the state the above services and workmen's compensation were to become universal. They were included in Israel's first national insurance law passed in 1954. In assessing these laws Namir notes:

The ideological foundations and the social achievements of the *Yishuv* prior to the State was of primary inspiration and a force in the achievement of social legislation in general and legislation of workers in particular.<sup>48,49</sup>

As suggested earlier, however, this

<sup>47</sup> Note Y. Cohen, "Mishan" *Hapoel Hatzair*, Vol. 27, No. 44, p. 15 (1934).

<sup>48</sup> Namir, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

<sup>49</sup> A similar thesis is suggested by Itzhak Kanev, *Population and Society in Israel and in the World*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957, p. 95.

ideology was also a regressive force in providing services which were both particularistic and selective.

**Summary**

This paper explored the period of the Second Aliya and social welfare developments as an outcome of this aliya. The study is thus limited to a particular but very significant period in the development of Jewish settlement. It does not therefore take into account the contribution by philanthropic organizations outside the Yishuv, and their efforts after the establishment of the State of Israel. These must be given more than due recognition. But as for the period examined in this study, both progressive and negative influences in the social welfare network emerged from the Sec-

ond Aliya. Health services which evolved in the period of the Second Aliya were later to reach over 70 per cent of the population. It was also the pioneering philosophy of mutual aid which brought about the workers cooperative — *The Mashbir*. Features of social welfare and social security were included in the various associations and funds of the labor movement. It was these services that would become universally applicable with the creation of the State and subsequent national insurance programs. But as indicated, it was the ideology of the pioneering movement that curtailed comprehensive services and restrained the development of welfare programs which would have benefited the *Yishuv* as a whole.

**What Parents Want From the Jewish Education of Their Children\***

ARNOLD A. LASKER

*Rabbi, Congregation Beth Torah, Orange, New Jersey*

*"In every subgroup that we have examined, we have found that the parents consider that they and their home have a greater effect in helping their children as Jews than does the school. If they can be helped to see that home and school are both directed to the same desired ends, the resources of the home can be mustered and integrated with the resources of the school for the harmonious Jewish development of the child.*

I went up to the Hebrew School over an issue of my daughter's missing one of her classes.

The teacher's attitude bothered me. "You want your child brought up in a Jewish home," she said to me, "and you want her to learn the rituals, don't you?" Well, I don't! And I resented her telling me what I wanted for my child. I was really rather unsympathetic to her point of view, and I was kind of pleased when my daughter decided that she had had enough and made up her mind to quit.

— From an interview with a father.

\* \* \*

**W**HAT do parents want when they enroll their children in a Jewish educational institution? The present writer, serving as a research associate at Hebrew College, Brookline, Mass. in 1972-1973, conducted an investigation designed to find some answers to that question.

A total of 2,418 questionnaires were mailed separately to both the fathers and the mothers of all the children enrolled in the elementary departments of

eight Jewish schools in a New England community. The eight consisted of both day schools and afternoon schools, including those under Conservative, Orthodox and Reform sponsorship. A return of 34 per cent (369 fathers and 447 mothers) was received, providing a reasonable basis on which to draw some general conclusions.<sup>1</sup>

This was not the first attempt to learn the goals which parents have for the Jewish education of their children, but the studies that had been done have been few and the results generally inconclusive. I have been able to discover just seven, ranging in scope from two classes in one school to a national sample.<sup>2</sup> One of them went no further than

<sup>1</sup> A follow-up of a sample of those who did not respond substantiates the representative nature of the 816 responses referred to above. In regard to the survey procedure, see the note at the end of this article.

<sup>2</sup> The seven studies were conducted by the following: Committee for the Self-Study of Jewish Education in Philadelphia; United Jewish Fund of Pittsburgh; Louis Nulman; Alexander M. Dushkin and Uriah Z. Engelman (with their data later reworked by Joshua A. Fishman; Irving H. Skolnick; George Pollak (for Camden, N.J. Self-Study); and Louise Adams, Judith Frankel, and Nancy Newbauer. Related studies, not reporting the views of parents as such, include those by Mervin F. Verbit (North Jersey), and Gerald C. Stone & Neil Newman. If readers know of any additional studies, the writer would appreciate being informed of them. (See note at the end of this article.)

\* Thanks are due to the following: For their cooperation and assistance in planning and executing the research, President Eli Grad, Prof. Michael Libenson, Registrar Martin Rabinovitz, and Mrs. Jeffrey L. (Eileen Kesselman) Houben of Hebrew College, Brookline, Mass.; for counsel on research problems, Dr. Floyd J. Fowler, Jr. of University of Massachusetts (Boston) Survey Research Program; and for providing the computer processing of the data Mr. Albert Jacob and Actuarial Analysts, Inc., Verona, N. J.