

North American Jewish Settlers in Israel

THIS IS a study of native American and Canadian Jews, who chose to go to Israel during the years 1950 through 1966, and became permanent residents¹ of the country in 1962–1966. It presents their replies to a number of specific questions mailed to them between March and the end of August, 1967, inquiring about their American background; their reasons for leaving America, for going to Israel, and for remaining there; their view of why some Americans leave Israel, and their appraisal of the future of American Jewry.

Methodology

All native American and Canadian Jews who became permanent residents of Israel during the years 1962–1966, and who were at least 20 years old at the end of 1966—780 in all, were selected from an Israel government list of permanent residents. Ten per cent were from Canada, 90 per cent from the United States (the Jewish population of Canada is 4 per cent that of the United States).² One-third left America between 1950 and 1962, and the rest during 1962–1966. After eliminating those who were either too young when they left America, or were not in Israel at the time, or deceased, questionnaires were sent to 703 potential participants; 443 or 63 per cent, responded.

For purposes of comparison, the respondents were divided into groups according to background and occupation in Israel at the time of the survey. Classifications were by sex; whether or not their childhood home was Zionist; whether or not they belonged to a Zionist youth organization; whether they were employed as professionals or nonprofessionals in 1967; whether they were living in Israel for less than five years, or five years or longer; whether they now considered themselves culturalists or religious.

¹ According to Israeli law, Jews may become permanent residents by filing a declaration of intention; the Law of Return automatically gives every Jew the right to be a citizen. However, permanent residents must transfer their foreign (tax free) holdings within ten years of the declaration of intention. United States and Canadian citizens who become permanent residents of a foreign country may retain their citizenship under certain conditions. Canadians must not swear allegiance to a foreign state, but may bear arms for a friendly foreign power and vote in a foreign election. A law passed by the U.S. Congress in 1952 stated that citizens voting in foreign elections or bearing arms for a foreign country forfeited their citizenship. In 1957 the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the provision on voting in a foreign election. In 1969 the Attorney General interpreted the decision as permitting voluntary military service by a citizen in a foreign state at peace with the United States.

² Leon Shapiro, "World Jewish Population," *AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK*, Vol. 69 (1968), pp. 543–52.

The last grouping does not necessarily reflect their religious identification in America. In Israel, 255 of the participants related to Jewish religious tradition: 138 were observant (*dati*); 30 were keepers of commandments (*shomer mitzvot*), and 87 were traditionalists (*mesorati*). Of the remaining 188 nonreligious respondents, who were designated as culturalists, 27 were against observance (*anti-dati*); 80 were not observant (*lo dati*); 55 considered themselves secularists (*hiloni*); 24 wrote "don't know," and two called themselves Hebrew Christians.

The professionals, as a group, were divided into culturalist or religious, and Zionist or non-Zionist.

Forty-five per cent of the respondents were men, 55 per cent women. Forty per cent were 20 to 29 years of age; 31 per cent, 30 to 39; 17 per cent, 40 to 49; 10 per cent, 50 to 66; and 2 per cent were 67 years of age and older. Fifty-six per cent were living in Israel for five years or longer.

At the time of the survey, the women, as a group, were younger than the men. Taken as groups, former members of Zionist youth organizations, nonprofessionals, Zionist professionals, and religious professionals settled in Israel at a younger age than did their counterparts. Those who were in Israel for less than five years were younger than residents of five years and over, though they did not arrive at a younger age.

Eighty-four per cent of the respondents were married, 11 per cent single. Seventeen per cent of the men and 7 per cent of the women were unmarried. Over one third, 36 per cent, were married to native-born Americans; an equal number to persons born elsewhere; 28 per cent to *sabras*. More men (43 per cent) than women (31 per cent) were married to Americans, and more women (42 per cent) than men (28 per cent) to persons from other countries. Those who belonged to Zionist youth groups more readily married Americans, 42 per cent compared to 28 per cent of their opposites. More of those who did not belong to Zionist youth groups married *sabras*: 38 per cent, compared to 24 per cent of their counterparts. A greater proportion of those in Israel for less than five years (35 per cent) married Israelis, than of those in the country for five and more years (23 per cent). Twenty-three per cent of the respondents had children at the time of settlement. By 1967, 70 per cent had Israeli-born children.

Fifty-six per cent of the respondents grew up in Zionist homes, 44 per cent did not. Fifty-seven per cent participated in Zionist youth organizations, 43 per cent did not. During their first year in Israel, 25 per cent were employed as professionals (not including teachers), and 75 per cent as nonprofessionals (including 19 per cent who were teachers). Forty-two per cent were culturalists and 58 per cent religious. Forty-four per cent were in Israel for less than five years, 56 per cent for five years and longer. Of the professionals, 50 per cent did not participate in Zionist youth organizations, 50 per cent did; 48 per cent were culturalists, 52 per cent religious.

*American Past*³

FAMILY BACKGROUND

The participants in the study were native-born American men and women. The fathers of 73 per cent, and the mothers of 63 per cent of these settlers were not born in North America. Though children of parents speaking with a foreign accent were less likely to feel at home with American standards and values than those with native-born parents and grandparents, physical rootlessness was not the criterion for *aliyah*. Had it been, the 1962–1966 permanent residents of Israel would represent the end of a line. In the United States today, college students are overwhelmingly third- and fourth-generation Americans. And it is only a matter of time before Canadian Jews become indigenous.

That Israel also can look inviting to secularist American Jewish youth is suggested by the fact that 37 per cent of the respondents had native-born mothers, and 27 per cent native-born fathers. More culturalists had American-born mothers: 43 per cent, compared to 32 per cent of the religious. However the vast majority of respondents came from religious or culturally Jewish homes: 73 per cent from religious, and 19 per cent from culturally Jewish backgrounds. Zionist home background did not provide all *olim* (settlers) with the motivation to live permanently in Israel. Forty-five per cent of the respondents came from non-Zionist homes. Among those who came from Zionist homes were 38 per cent of the culturalists and 68 per cent of the religious. While Zionism in the home was not necessarily what brought these *olim* to Israel, very few raised in an anti-Zionist atmosphere came; only 3 per cent of the respondents: 5 per cent of the women, as compared to 0.5 per cent of the men. Today, Zionism affects fewer young people in their homes in North America. It is gradually losing the importance it had for immigrants.⁴

IDENTIFICATION AS JEWS

While there now is a noticeable generation gap regarding religion among American Jews, those who settled in Israel by and large retained the religious and cultural identification of their parents. They wanted to be almost as Jewish as their parents. Before coming to Israel, they did not share the growing alienation from Judaism of each new generation, as it sought to align itself with a religious group making fewer demands of ritual observance and personal mode of life.⁵

³ For detailed tables see Gerald Engel, "Comparison between American Permanent Residents of Israel: Part I, American Background," *The Journal of Psychology*, No. 71, 1969, pp. 133–42.

⁴ Louis A. Pincus, "The Realities of Western Aliyah (Responsibilities of Israel)," *Jewish Frontier*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 6, June 1969, pp. 17–22.

⁵ See: Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, *Jewish Americans* (Englewood Cliffs, 1968), 274 pp.; Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Front* (New York, 1967), 362 pp.

Of the participants in the study, 41 per cent came from Orthodox homes, and 34 per cent were themselves Orthodox while in America; 25 per cent were raised by Conservative parents, and 24 per cent considered themselves Conservative; 7 per cent came from Reform homes, and 8 per cent said they were Reform Jews. Nineteen per cent came from culturally Jewish homes, but 23 per cent identified themselves as culturalists before leaving for Israel. Eight per cent grew up in homes labeled "other," and 11 per cent considered themselves "other" in America.

In America, 39 per cent of the culturalists identified religiously—as Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform. The changes that appeared to take place among *olim*, once they lived in Israel, as more of the former Conservative and Reform dropped their religious identification and became culturalists, was not belated adolescent rebellion. It was rather a redefinition of Jewish commitment. Being culturally Jewish is more meaningful in a Jewish than in a Christian society. But in America as well as in Israel all had in common identification with Judaism and a desire to be more, rather than less, Jewish.

In America, the respondents showed their Jewish commitment by joining a synagogue, Zionist group, or Hillel, or by attending Jewish schools. Though the synagogue has evolved as a Jewish community center, which should have appeal to anyone who identifies as a Jew, not all American Jews affiliate. Its strongest appeal is in suburbia and the smaller city.⁶ Fifty-six per cent of all *olim* did not belong to a congregation before coming to Israel. This was true of 70 per cent of the culturalists, as compared to 44 per cent of the religious. Yet, they all found their way to Israel. The very high percentage of nonaffiliation among the religious was in part due to their young age at the time they left America.

Membership in a Zionist organization was not a determining factor in *aliyah*. Thirty-two per cent of the respondents belonged to Zionist adult groups in America; 41 per cent of the religious, compared to 22 per cent of the culturalists. Because many of the permanent settlers were not old enough to join Zionist adult groups before leaving for Israel, for purposes of this study Zionist youth group identification was considered the key to Zionist affiliation.

Fifty-six per cent of respondents came from Zionist homes, and 57 per cent belonged to Zionist youth organizations, both culturalists and the religious joining to the same extent as they considered their parents to be Zionists. Of the culturalists, 58 per cent never joined Zionist youth groups; 59 per cent considered their parents neutral. Sixty-nine per cent of the religious affiliated with Zionist youth groups; 68 per cent rated their parents Zionists. More women than men joined Zionist youth groups. More women than men had Zionist-affiliated parents, 57 and 54 per cent, respectively.

⁶ Goldstein and Goldscheider, *op. cit.*, pp. 179–213. Sklare and Greenblum, *op. cit.*, pp. 186–95.

However, more women (5 per cent) than men (0.5 per cent) went against the anti-Zionist sentiments expressed at home.

Almost four-fifths (78 per cent) of the respondents attended college, and therefore were eligible for membership in B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, the Jewish campus community. Of these, only 24 per cent, or 30 per cent of the religious, as compared to 18 per cent of the culturalists, joined.

There was no single organization of which all *olim* were members. Some children coming from various backgrounds and participating in no organized Jewish activities also developed a sense of Jewish identification, which made them move to Israel. What bound the *olim* together was a common tie with the Jewish people, which usually was instilled by parents who religiously or culturally identified with the Jewish people. Almost all parents expressed this commitment by giving their children some formal Jewish education.

JEWISH EDUCATION

The one characteristic common to most of the American settlers was Jewish education. Ninety-one per cent had some Jewish schooling in America: 47 per cent attended afternoon classes; 32 per cent went to Sunday school, 26 per cent of the religious and 42 per cent of the culturalists, and more of the women (37 per cent) than men (26 per cent); 37 per cent attended all-day schools, 53 per cent of the religious and 11 per cent of the culturalists. The proportion of day-school attendance was much higher for settlers (37 per cent) than for all Jewish children in the United States (13 per cent).⁷ The percentage of Sunday school attendance was lower (32 and 42 per cent, respectively). Higher Jewish education among the *olim* was as follows: Eighteen per cent, more religious (27 per cent) than culturalists (6 per cent), attended Hebrew teachers seminaries. More women (23 per cent) than men (12 per cent) attended such seminaries in preparation for a profession offering women the same opportunity as men. Twenty-one per cent of the men attended rabbinical school, and almost all of them considered themselves religious. Nine per cent of the settlers took Jewish graduate studies, 12 per cent of the religious and 5 per cent of the culturalists. There were no comparable figures for the U.S. or Canada. A reflection of this schooling was the settlers' ability to speak Hebrew before coming to Israel. More of the religious spoke Hebrew than culturalists; there was no difference between men and women.

⁷ American Association for Jewish Education, Department of Statistical Research, *National Census of Jewish Schools* (New York, Information Bulletin No. 28, December 1967). No comparison data were available for Canada.

SECULAR EDUCATION

The secular education of the *olim* was above average: 78 per cent had some college training, and 33 per cent went on to graduate or professional school. While the religious had a better Jewish education, there were no group differences in secular education. Women with a high level of Jewish education, equal to that of the men, lagged behind in secular graduate studies. Ten per cent of the American settlers attended technical schools, again fewer women (6 per cent) than men (16 per cent).

ECONOMIC POSITION

Many young people left for Israel before being gainfully employed; 25 per cent were supported by their families and many others had only just begun their careers. Had they remained in America, their good education and professional skills most probably would have helped them obtain well paying jobs. Of the gainfully employed, 56 per cent had family incomes of \$7,000 or over, 44 per cent had lower incomes. Fifty-three per cent of the religious reported family incomes of \$7,000 and over, as compared to 52 per cent of the culturalists. However, a larger number of the religious were not self-supporting.

More women than men were not self-supporting. Of the working women, 47 per cent reported family incomes of over \$7,000. The difference in income level between men and women reflected the difference in both age and education. Working women were younger, and fewer of them were professionals. The difference in income also reflected the double economic standard in America, where women generally earn less than men in comparable jobs. Since almost half the respondents were not married, sex difference was apparent.

According to the 1957 U.S. Census, the median income for Jewish men with one to three years of college was \$5,026; with four years or more, \$8,041. The median income for all Jewish families was \$6,418. By comparison, the economic situation of the *olim* before leaving for Israel was good.

Critique of America

Participants in the study left the United States and Canada during the post-World War II period of growing prosperity and intergroup cooperation. They left because they felt a growing anxiety about being part of a society in which materialism and conformity threatened the realization of their human potential. While their parents, mostly immigrants, had become part of that society which accepted them and gave them the opportunity to live decently, the would-be *olim* were too American to feel grateful, and too Jewish to be satisfied. Their generation rarely voiced doubts about society;

but the dissatisfied left for Israel when the pressure mounted. As committed Jews, they were specifically affected by the threat of assimilation and anti-semitism to the survival of the Jewish group. Assimilation disturbed 65 per cent of all respondents. For the religious it was the most disturbing problem they faced in America. Living in Israel made the question of anti-semitism appear urgent. Though 73 per cent expressed past concern over it, 53 per cent now were only mildly disturbed. The level of reported concern about antisemitism was the same for the religious and culturalists, men and women.

Women expressed deeper anxieties than men regarding materialism and conformity. Culturalists were more troubled about conformity than were the religious. Culturalists, being secularists, were less involved in Jewish organizational activities while in America, and therefore worried more about their place in the general society. Other, less disturbing, issues were: aspects of dating and marriage, for 43 per cent of the respondents; the educational system, for 32 per cent; church-state relationships, for 30 per cent; dependence on family, for 28 per cent. No group differences by sex or religious outlook were apparent here. Table 1 presents, in descending order, the intensity of concerns.

It shows that, while antisemitism disturbed 73 per cent of the *olim* and assimilation only 65 per cent, they felt more intensely about assimilation. Despite difference in intensity between the religious and culturalists on specific items, including conformity and antisemitism, the difference in the total intensity was negligible, making for approximately the same anxiety level for both. There were fewer differences between men and women, but the latter were more vexed about conformity and materialism, and about the total situation in America. As a result women felt a greater need to leave at a younger age in order to reduce the greater pressure.⁸ The same was true of former members of Zionist youth groups and nonprofessionals, as compared to their counterparts.

Attraction to Israel

While the sum of concerns indicated how deeply troubled the future *olim* were by aspects of American life, part of the total pressure creating the movement to Israel was their attraction to that country. This attraction, in fact, seemed stronger than their disturbance about America. Over four-fifths were attracted by the idea of living in a Jewish homeland. They desired to live a Jewish life among Jews. The concept of Israel as the land of the Bible drew three-quarters of the settlers. Seventy-one per cent were attracted by Jewish education. The intensity of feeling on all aspects of Jewish life (except for Israel as the land of the Bible) was high, with almost twice as many feeling "much" attraction as "some" attraction. While the need to

⁸ Kurt Lewin, "Psycho-sociological Problems of a Minority Group," in Gertrude Weiss Lewin, ed., *Resolving Social Conflicts* (New York, 1948), pp. 145-58.

TABLE 1. INTENSITY* SCORE OF CRITICISM OF AMERICA

<i>Disturbance</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Cultural-ists</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Non-Zionists</i>	<i>Zionists</i>	<i>Non-professionals</i>	<i>Professionals</i>
Conformity	112	100	122	123	102	112	114	115	101
Materialism	109	100	117	110	108	110	109	112	97
Assimilation	99	99	99	78	116	74	122	105	82
Antisemitism	93	94	92	89	96	87	97	96	86
Political witchhunting	70	70	70	87	56	76	66	70	68
Dating and marriage	59	51	65	56	60	59	58	63	45
Educational system	40	43	36	40	40	36	44	42	35
Church-state relations	37	39	35	39	35	27	43	38	35
Dependence on family	34	27	40	37	31	30	35	35	28
Totals	653	623	676	659	644	611	688	676	577
Difference from total		-30	+23	+6	-9	-42	+35	+23	-76

* Converted from percentages by giving "much" twice the weight as "somewhat."

TABLE 2. INTENSITY* SCORE OF ATTRACTION OF ISRAEL

<i>Attraction</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Cultural-ists</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Non-Zionists</i>	<i>Zionists</i>	<i>Non-professionals</i>	<i>Professionals</i>
Homeland	152	156	148	131	167	123	173	153	146
Live with Jews	143	147	139	118	161	115	163	149	124
Live Jewish life	137	140	133	96	166	99	162	142	118
Jewish education	119	120	118	93	140	87	143	127	93
Land of Bible	115	119	112	75	145	90	127	117	104
Kibbutz life	61	58	63	71	52	50	74	71	33
Career opportunity	51	65	37	53	48	50	50	43	69
Totals	778	805	750	637	879	614	892	802	687
Difference from Total		+27	-28	-141	+101	-164	+114	+24	-91

* See note to Table 1.

be at home in Israel, where Jewishness would be taken for granted, was a stronger motivational force for the religious than for the culturalists, the difference was one of degree. Both groups agreed on the relative importance of this factor.

Kibbutz life, which can be lived only in Israel, seemed to draw a minority of *olim*. As a cooperative venture, the *kibbutz* had greater appeal for culturalists who were more disturbed by conformity in America.

Career opportunity was not much of an attraction; only 40 per cent considered it so. There was no difference between the religious and culturalists, but men considered it more important than women.

The total intensity level of the respondents' attraction to Israel was higher than of their censure of conditions in America. This may not necessarily have been a true index of their feeling, for, in their replies, they may have tempered their criticism of America, while being expansive about Israel's attractions. Each scale is therefore considered separately to indicate differences between groups (Table 2). Here group differences were more numerous than in the respondents' disturbance about America. Differences between the sexes were least significant. The religious and nonprofessionals expressed stronger attraction to Israel than culturalists and professionals, respectively. The greatest disparity was between former members of Zionist youth groups and nonaffiliates.

Data in Tables 1 and 2 also provide a basis for understanding facts related to age differences at the time of emigration.

Age at Emigration

The large majority of respondents came to Israel before reaching the age of 35. Thirty-five per cent were below the age of 25; 34 per cent between 25 and 35; 17 per cent between 35 and 44; and 12 per cent between 45 and 64. Only 2 per cent were 65 years of age, or older. Age at settlement showed the following relationship to intensity of disturbance about America and attraction to Israel:

1. When both the intensity of disturbance about America and intensity of attraction to Israel were greater for one group than for its counterpart, the group with the higher scores settled in Israel at a younger age. This was true of members of Zionist youth groups and nonprofessionals, in contrast to the nonaffiliated and professionals.

2. When the intensity of disturbance about America was greater for one group than for its opposite, but its intensity of attraction to Israel was less, the more intensely disturbed but less attracted settled at an earlier age. This was true of women, in contrast to men.

3. When the intensity of disturbance about America was similar for both groups, but one was more intensely attracted to Israel than its counterpart, the more intensely attracted did not go to Israel at an earlier age. The religious and the culturalists were equally troubled by life in America, yet

the religious, though more intensely attracted to Israel, were not younger at the time of settlement.

4. When the intensity of disturbance about America of a subgroup and its counterpart was lower than that of the total group, the one attracted to Israel more than the total settled at a younger age. Lower intensity of disturbance about life in America was shared by all professionals: Zionist and non-Zionist, religious and culturalists. But the Zionist and religious professionals, who felt a stronger attraction to Israel, emigrated at an earlier age than their opposites.

The lower intensity of disturbance about conditions in America among men, and particularly professionals, allowed for delayed gratification of the wish to settle in Israel. A contributing factor, or perhaps a reason why men did not permit this concern to become strong enough for early emigration, was that they, as potential family providers, had greater incentive to remain in America and complete their schooling and professional training and, beyond that, to work and save money for family needs in Israel.

Destination Israel

Ninety per cent of American permanent residents came directly to Israel. Fewer of the religious than secularists (6 per cent, compared to 16 per cent) first lived in other countries. Ninety-three per cent of the women, compared to 86 per cent of the men, came directly to Israel. Only 42 per cent of American permanent settlers came to Israel for the first time with the intention of remaining there; 42 per cent had been to Israel once before; 16 per cent made three or more trips before deciding to settle. For 25 per cent there was an interval of five or more years between initial visit and settlement.

Historically, Zionists came in groups. So did the hundreds of thousands of refugees who were brought to Israel immediately after World War II. Although 57 per cent of American *olim* were former members of Zionist youth groups, only 7 per cent (2 per cent of the professionals and 9 per cent of the nonprofessionals) traveled to Israel with a group. The American settler came as an individual; 35 per cent came alone, and the others arrived with mates (30 per cent), with children (23 per cent), and/or parents (5 per cent).

*Living in Israel*⁹

ADJUSTMENT TO ISRAEL

American immigrants, coming from the most affluent society in the world, faced the problem of finding jobs and a home in a new land with a markedly

⁹ For detailed tables see Engel, *op. cit.*, "Part II, Israeli Background," *The Journal of Psychology*, No. 72, 1969, pp. 135-39.

lower standard of living. Yet, from the moment of arrival, 75 per cent felt at home. More women were lonely, 29 per cent, compared to 21 per cent of the men. However, by the end of the first year, women were as relaxed as men, with 84 per cent feeling comfortable. By 1967, 95 per cent of the settlers were adjusted to Israeli life and felt at home.

LANGUAGE FACILITY

Israel is a nation of immigrants, built during years of the most intensive persecution in the history of the Jewish people. Those responsible for welding the newcomers into a nation emphasized the importance of learning Hebrew so that they could communicate with their neighbors and feel a link with the past. American immigrants came with considerable fluency in Hebrew. Thirty-eight per cent were able to speak Hebrew, and 27 per cent had some knowledge of it; 35 per cent knew no Hebrew. Fifty-three per cent studied Hebrew during their first year in Israel. Since the religious had more intensive Jewish schooling in America, only 44 per cent of them studied Hebrew upon arrival, compared to 65 per cent of the culturalists. By 1967, only 14 per cent of the settlers needed further study, again more culturalists than religious.

While command of language facilitates communication between neighbors and is valuable in daily work situations everywhere, Hebrew was not essential for making Jews feel at ease in Israel. But the intensity with which *olim* set out to master Hebrew clearly demonstrates that they wanted more than to feel at home. Language fluency was the first step in their adjustment, for it enabled them to work and socialize with Israelis. Many attended ulpan (Hebrew) courses; some studied at a university, learned a trade, or enrolled in teachers seminaries or *yeshivot*.

OCCUPATION OF NEWCOMERS

Upon arrival, 48 per cent found full-time employment; 20 per cent worked part time; 2 per cent, who came to retire, did not work. Employment figures were higher for men than for women: 64 per cent of the men worked full time, compared to 33 per cent of the women. Eighty-two per cent of the men were gainfully employed full- or part-time, compared to 56 per cent of the women, many of whom kept house. This indicated that employment could be found, despite language barrier.

Thirty-nine per cent of the *olim* were employed as professionals, another 30 per cent as teachers (English teachers were in short supply). Ten per cent were clerical workers, 9 per cent farmers, 4 per cent skilled workers, and 2 per cent manual laborers. Six per cent established their own businesses.

The percentage of new settlers employed as professionals and teachers was very high by Israeli, and even by American, standards. Forty-five per cent

of the men and 32 per cent of the women were in the professions; 41 per cent of the women and 21 per cent of the men were employed as teachers. In 1967, 13 per cent of the United States labor force were employed as professionals, including teachers;¹⁰ the 1961 figure for Canada was 10 per cent.¹¹ More women than men were employed as clerks (15 and 6 per cent, respectively), while more men than women went into business (10 and 2 per cent, respectively). Only men (6 per cent) were employed as skilled workers.

By 1967, when fewer *olim* were full-time students, 55 per cent were employed full time and 22 per cent part time, with 3 per cent retired. Eighty per cent of the men were employed full time, and 14 per cent part time. Ninety-four per cent of the men were gainfully employed (29 per cent part time), compared to 62 per cent of the women. The economic recession before the six-day war affected mainly those who earned their living with their hands. Because of their technical skills and education, American newcomers generally found employment during that period.

In 1967, 56 per cent were doing work for which they had been trained: 67 per cent of the men, and 47 per cent of the women. Ten per cent of the men and 3 per cent of the women were learning trades they hoped to enter. Employment in one's field was not an automatic process, even for professionals. About one quarter of those employed as professionals in 1967 were doing other work when they first came: 6.5 per cent were students, 6.5 per cent teachers, 3 per cent farmers, 2 per cent were in business, 4 per cent were housewives, and 2 per cent had come to retire. At the time of the survey, 92 per cent of the professionals were employed in their fields, compared to 43 per cent of the nonprofessionals. The higher the degree of specialization, the greater the possibility of employment in one's field.

LIVING WITHIN INCOME

When they arrived in Israel, 67 per cent of the settlers expected to manage on their income, a relatively high expectation since they considered job opportunity the least attractive aspect of Israeli life. After having lived in Israel, the percentage of those who found they could easily manage on their earnings dropped to 57 per cent. Sixty-four per cent of those who anticipated an adequate income actually found it to be so, while 57 per cent of the more pessimistic had financial difficulties. More of each group found what they anticipated. Fewer optimists (36 per cent) became pessimists, than the converse (43 per cent). The greater change among pessimists suggests that those having lower expectations more readily acknowledged things to be good when conditions were better than expected, while those with higher

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Labor, *Manpower Report of the President*, Supplement: "Statistics on Manpower," January 1969, p. 11, Table A-9.

¹¹ Canada Dominion Bureau of Statistics, *Census of Canada 1961*, Vol. III, Part I, p. 6-2, Table 6.

expectations were more reluctant to admit the situation was worse than anticipated. The latter continued to assert it was easy to manage on Israeli income, giving a total effect of well-being among the *olim*. These same satisfied settlers often worked at more than one job in order to live comfortably.

HOUSING

In 1967, 77 per cent of American settlers owned their dwellings, mostly in cooperative apartment houses. This was true of more women than men, 82 per cent and 70 per cent, respectively, because more women were married and needed their own housing. (Rental was available mostly for rooms.)

Evaluation of the adequacy of living quarters showed no sex difference. An over-all feeling of satisfaction with housing, by Israeli standards, was expressed by 90 per cent of the settlers, with 28 per cent calling it very adequate. The ability to accept the fact that one could not have in Israel what one had, or could have, in America, was an ingredient of the settlers' adjustment. Women were aware of the differences between an American and Israeli kitchen, with its inferior plumbing; but they also knew that many, who had lived in Israel all their lives, had poorer facilities. Besides, the American settlers were less interested in material things, preferring the kind of life that attracted them to Israel.

RURAL LIVING

Upon arrival in Israel, 38 per cent of the respondents lived in *kibbutzim* and 7 per cent in *moshavim*, which are cooperative only in that agricultural implements and machinery are shared. For example, the Jewish Agency encouraged newcomers to study and work at the *kibbutz ulpan*, where they worked half a day for their room and board, and spent the rest of the day learning Hebrew. Their integration into Israeli society began without the immediate responsibilities of food, housing, or employment. The *kibbutzim* welcomed American *olim* on the assumption that many of them were likely to prefer the simple *kibbutz* life to the more fashionable life in the cities, where 88 per cent of Israel's population are concentrated.¹² Indeed, in 1967, 19 per cent of the *olim* were living in *kibbutzim*, and 6 per cent in *moshavim*. Yet, only 8 per cent of all gainfully employed settlers worked as farmers. The economy of the cooperative, though agriculture-oriented, includes light industry. Therefore industrial specialists, as well as teachers and other professionals, are needed in rural areas.

¹² *Statistical Abstract of Israel* (Jerusalem, 1967), p. 27, table B/7.

Israel and America: A Comparison

As already stated, American settlers considered career opportunity the least important of Israel's attractions. More men than women, and more professionals than nonprofessionals, listed it as such. After having lived in Israel for some years, 31 per cent of the respondents felt that career opportunities in their fields were the same as in America; 23 per cent believed that they were better. More men (55 per cent) than women (36 per cent), and more professionals (63 per cent) than nonprofessionals (39 per cent), thought the situation in America was better. The higher the level of expectancy, the greater the disappointment. Eighty-one per cent (84 per cent of the men and 76 per cent of the women) believed their income in Israel was lower than it would have been in America. More professionals than nonprofessionals (86 and 78 per cent, respectively) shared this view. However, 72 per cent also believed that the Israeli standard of living was lower, and that it therefore was possible to manage with less money in Israel. This realization, too, was part of their adjustment to Israeli life.

In Israel the percentage of married women settlers working to supplement family incomes was higher than of Jewish women in America. Soon after they arrived, 56 per cent became part of the country's labor force: 33 per cent worked full time, 23 per cent, part time. By 1967, with 86 per cent of the women married, 62 per cent were working, with the increase essentially in part-time employment (29 per cent). In 1957, in the United States, 57 per cent of Jewish women between the ages of 18 to 24 were employed; 26 per cent of those between the ages of 25 to 34 (when more women are married and raising children); 34 per cent between 35 to 44, and 38 per cent between 45 to 64.¹³ In Canada, this was true of 25 per cent of Jewish women 15 years of age and older.¹⁴

On the whole, Americans in Israel were unlikely to return to America for the sole purpose of raising their income. Still, academics are happy to spend their sabbatical year in America to augment their income for the purchase of a new apartment, refrigerator, or washing machine.

American settlers found other aspects of their work comparing favorably with America. Forty-seven per cent said they derived greater satisfaction from their work; 34 per cent, about equal satisfaction, and 19 per cent, less. Thirty-nine per cent thought work in Israel brought them more prestige than it would in America; 33 per cent felt it was similar, 28 per cent that it was less. More men than women, most of them full-time employees, derived satisfaction from their work and enjoyed prestige. Women, who usually worked to supplement their husband's income while taking care of their

¹³ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Tabulations of Data on the Social and Economic Characteristics of Major Religious Groups, March 1957* (Washington, D.C., January, 1968). 10 pp., 20 tables (mimeo).

¹⁴ Canada Dominion Bureau of Statistics, *Census of Canada 1961*, Vol. VII, Part I, p. 12-47, Tab.c XXIV, 6-25, Table VIII.

homes and families, did not feel the same psychological need for satisfaction.

Favorable employment opportunities in Israel also gave respondents considerable economic security. Twenty-four per cent believed there was less unemployment in their fields in Israel than in America; 51 per cent felt the situation was the same. Nonprofessionals were more optimistic than professionals about employment possibilities in Israel—30 and 15 per cent, respectively, although they had been less optimistic about career opportunities before settling. To some extent, this was because nonprofessionals found it easier to go from one type of work to another than did professionals, who were more limited to one field. Also, nonprofessionals had lower expectations, and therefore were more easily satisfied.

*Why Americans Stay in Israel*¹⁵

In describing motivations for remaining in Israel, respondents emphasized the Jewish aspects of Israeli life. Eighty-eight per cent were attracted to Israel essentially because they wanted to live in a Jewish homeland. After having lived in Israel, a larger number, 94 per cent, were convinced that they stayed for this reason. The Israel experience strengthened the belief of the respondents, particularly of culturalists and non-Zionists, that it was the strongest factor in keeping Americans in Israel.

For 84 per cent of the *olim*, the religious environment was the second most important reason why Americans remained in Israel. Thirty-nine per cent felt strongly about this. For 74 per cent of the religious, living a Jewish life, which to them was living a religious life, was the third most important reason for coming to Israel. The culturalists looked upon Jewish life as being too parochial, and were less attracted by it. Once in Israel, the religious lost much of their enthusiasm. They observed that official religious leaders operated the ministry of religion like bureaucrats. They also found the Israelis less spiritual than anticipated. In 1967 only 52 per cent considered the religious environment a means of keeping Americans in Israel. Former members of Zionist youth groups also expressed disappointment. The culturalists, on the other hand, who looked upon Jewish life as too parochial to be strongly attracted by it, now rated religious environment with the same intensity as living a Jewish life. Since their hopes had not been too high, they felt the situation could be much worse. The result was that 75 per cent were convinced that the religious environment helped keep Americans in Israel.

Israeli cultural life was considered among the major factors keeping Americans in Israel; 83 per cent thought it important, but here, too, emphasis was mild. Those in Israel for five years or longer thought it less of a reason for staying than did more recent arrivals. Their desire to attend lectures or join study groups had, in the meantime, been satisfied. Zionists and those

¹⁵ For detailed tables see Engel, *op. cit.*, "Part III, Predictions About America and Israel," *The Journal of Psychology*, No. 73, pp. 33-39.

coming from Zionist homes were more inclined than non-Zionists to think it important, 88 and 77 per cent, respectively. More former Zionist youth affiliates (41 per cent) than nonaffiliates (29 per cent) considered it of great importance. Zionist professionals placed unusually strong emphasis on culture, with 41 per cent rating it very important, and 95 per cent, important. In their view, only living in a Jewish state was an important reason for staying in Israel.

Job opportunities ranked just below the three major reasons advanced by Americans for staying in Israel. Sixty-eight per cent considered it important. Those in Israel for five or more years emphasized that, while Americans came to Israel as idealists, their practical needs proved to be greater than expected, and they stayed if they found suitable work.

Jewish education, too, was a strong factor in drawing settlers to Israel. Forty-eight per cent of culturalists and religious were "much" attracted by Israel's Jewish educational opportunities. However, only 28 per cent thought education, both Jewish and secular, had "much" influence on their decision to stay. American settlers did not expect to find top jobs in Israel; but they did expect learning of every kind to have priority. They were disappointed that compulsory free education extended only through eighth grade (since 1969, through tenth grade). The importance of education in holding Americans in Israel therefore was reduced.

Seventy-four per cent of the settlers believed social status kept Americans in Israel. But 55 per cent of these thought it only had some influence.

Family health was considered another retentive factor by 67 per cent of the respondents, with 45 per cent considering this of some influence only.

Housing was given as a factor keeping Americans in Israel by 57 per cent of the respondents; 28 per cent felt strongly about it. That housing was not stressed as a retentive factor should not suggest that adequate housing is unimportant. Almost all *olim* considered their own housing adequate by Israeli standards. However, Israeli housing standards cannot compare with American, and settlers assumed superior housing was not a factor in keeping Americans in Israel. But settlers believed that housing, considered inadequate by Israeli standards, would drive away *olim*.

Although, in 1967, only 19 per cent of American settlers remained in *kibbutzim*, 61 per cent of the respondents felt *kibbutz* life was a factor in keeping Americans in Israel. Culturalists and nonprofessionals, for whom *kibbutz* life was one of Israel's attractions, continued to feel more strongly that it was a factor. Culturalists, who, in 1967, almost exclusively made up the American contingent in the *kibbutz*, were more positive in this view than professionals and the religious. For them, its unique way of life was among the most important reasons for remaining in Israel.

Americans felt at home in Israel, yet their acceptance by the Israelis was a minor reason why the settlers, who have the legal right to be citizens

of the Jewish homeland, remained in Israel. Acceptance was a factor for 59 per cent, of whom 40 per cent considered it only mildly helpful.

Why Americans Leave Israel

Respondents agreed that the major reasons for returning to America were lack of job opportunities, inadequate housing, high cost of living, and family concerns. Ninety-eight per cent considered lack of job opportunities the foremost reason; 73 per cent were very emphatic, while 25 per cent felt it had some relevance. In 1967 Israel did not have enough room at the top for the highly educated. Forty-six per cent of *olim* were dissatisfied with the availability of jobs. Even sabras with considerable training sometimes found it necessary to go abroad for suitable employment. For Americans, particularly men, job satisfaction and prestige had to be rewarding enough to compensate for curtailed opportunity and lower income. The difficulty of finding adequate jobs can be gauged by comparing moderately industrialized Israel with a highly urbanized population (88 per cent), to Canada, with 70 per cent of the population urban,¹⁶ and the highly industrialized United States, with 70 per cent of the population urban.¹⁷

For 90 per cent of the American settlers their own housing was adequate. But 96 per cent maintained that inadequate housing drove Americans from Israel because, they emphasized, immigrants, who were used to American standards, find poor housing by Israeli standards intolerable. Respondents cautioned that increasing American *aliyah* was only half the problem; the other half was keeping the *olim* in Israel. The Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel advised the Jewish Agency that good housing was an essential in holding American settlers. This was especially true of professionals, who were being encouraged by the Agency to immigrate. Sixty-five per cent of the professionals strongly felt that inadequate housing caused Americans to leave. While Americans accepted the prospect of job limitations in a developing country, they expected a government that absorbed over a million refugees in the years following the establishment of the state to underwrite adequate housing for Americans. Voluntary settlers were not as likely to be satisfied with just a roof over their heads, as were refugees. Former members of Zionist youth groups, who were generally very understanding about other shortcomings of Israel, were almost as emphatic as the professionals in blaming lack of proper housing for the departure of Americans.

American settlers acknowledged that the much lower Israeli standard of living made it possible for them to live on a lower income than in America. However, 94 per cent felt that Americans left because the cost of living

¹⁶ Canada Dominion Bureau of Statistics, *Census of Canada 1961*, Vol. VII, Part I, p. 2-4, Table II.

¹⁷ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1969* (Washington, D.C., 1969) p. 17.

was higher than the standard of living Americans wanted to maintain in Israel. Fifty-five per cent believed it was a vital reason for Americans to leave, 38 per cent that it was of some importance. Ninety-seven per cent of former Zionist youth group affiliates and 90 per cent of nonaffiliates rated the cost-of-living factor important. A comparison of professionals and nonprofessionals showed 98 and 92 per cent, respectively, concerned over this issue.

Pressure of family was considered by 96 per cent of the participants another important factor in the return of some settlers to America. In responding to a list of eight possible reasons for the departure of Americans from Israel, the religious and culturalists differed only on family concerns. The religious professionals, Zionist youth group affiliates, and nonprofessionals were more sensitive to the influence of American relatives than were their counterparts. Their attitude reflected their own strong family attachments, which moved them to advise potential settlers to come to Israel with family and friends in order to minimize emotional ties with family and friends still in America.

Other reasons cited for the disenchantment of American settlers were relatively minor. Those who were unhappy with the moral climate in America and had very high expectations for Israel were often disappointed. Political parties, whether they be labor- or religious-oriented, are still political parties, and people are the same, especially under adverse conditions. Seventy-six per cent of the respondents asserted that the moral climate affected the decision of Americans to leave Israel: 50 per cent felt it had some effect, 26 per cent that it had a strong effect, and 24 per cent that it had none.

Only a small segment (3 per cent) of Israelis, compared to 19 per cent of the respondents, lived in *kibbutzim* in 1967. Almost 40 per cent of the settlers lived in *kibbutzim* upon arrival in Israel; the others, through *kibbutz* friends, also were personally informed about cooperative living. Six per cent considered disappointment with *kibbutz* life an important reason why Americans leave Israel; 58 per cent believed this was a minor consideration. Among former Zionist youth, 70 per cent felt it had some influence on the departure of Americans from Israel, compared to 54 per cent of nonaffiliates; strong feeling was expressed by only 7 and 6 per cent, respectively.

Most of the Americans responded to the survey in the hectic, anxious months before the six-day war, some afterwards. Their responses to a question regarding the threat of war as a reason why Americans leave Israel indicated only 5 per cent thought it would be important, while 56 per cent felt it would have some effect. These views were underscored by the fact that only 8 per cent of the 780 who became permanent residents in 1962 through 1966 left Israel immediately before, during, or after the confrontation.

Stay or Leave Israel?

The above discussion of factors, moving Americans to stay in Israel or to leave, emerged from a consideration of two separate lists of queries in our survey. Some items appeared on both lists. Participants were given a single list that included items from the two separate lists, plus several specifics. They were asked to indicate on this list whether, in their view, an item was an influence for staying or leaving. The respondents were inclined to be optimistic, viewing items as more apt to help Americans stay in Israel than to induce them to leave. Where the reply was not positive, it was generally neutral. For 75 per cent, the factors for optimum success include: arrival at an early age, fluency in Hebrew, cash reserve of \$20,000 to \$40,000, and decent housing.

Respondents were convinced that the seasoned businessman was least likely to stay. Forty-one per cent thought he was doomed to fail, though only one-tenth of all permanent residents were in business, and able to judge from personal experience. Professionals, who were farthest removed from the business world, were more emphatic than the others, with 53 per cent believing that experienced businessmen would return to America; 38 per cent of the nonprofessionals agreed. Fifty-four per cent of nonaffiliates of Zionist youth groups shared this conviction, compared to 31 per cent of former members.

Overall views of the settlers concerning reasons why Americans remain in Israel or leave are presented in descending order of intensity in Tables 3 and 4.

The following general conclusions regarding intensity of feeling may be drawn after analysis of Tables 1 and 2, 3 and 4.

1. The more intensely disturbed by America (Table 1) and more intensely attracted to Israel (Table 2) arrived in Israel at a relatively earlier age. They continued to be more emphatic in stating the reasons for remaining in Israel (Table 3). This correlation emerges from a comparison of nonprofessionals and former members of Zionist youth groups, who had greater need to leave America, with their counterparts.

2. The more intensely disturbed about America, but less intensely attracted to Israel, arrived in Israel at a relatively younger age. After having lived in Israel, they felt with as much intensity, as did the more attracted to Israel, the reasons for staying. This was demonstrated by women who felt more pressure to leave America and, though less attracted to Israel, came at a relatively younger age than men.

3. Among the equally disturbed about America, the more intensely attracted to Israel did not arrive at a relatively younger age; but after having lived in Israel, they felt more intensely about reasons for staying. This was true of the religious, who were more strongly attracted to Israel, came at a younger age, and continued to feel more intensely the reasons for staying, than the culturalists.

TABLE 3. INTENSITY* SCORE OF REASONS AMERICANS STAY IN ISRAEL

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Cultural-ists</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Non-Zionists</i>	<i>Zionists</i>	<i>Non-professionals</i>	<i>Professionals</i>
Living in Jewish State . . .	166	163	168	154	173	147	176	166	163
Religious environment . .	123	118	128	95	142	108	138	130	104
Cultural life	118	114	122	118	118	105	129	120	112
Job opportunities	102	105	100	105	101	97	108	101	109
Education	100	93	105	89	107	91	106	104	86
Position in society	92	96	90	99	88	92	95	88	108
Family health	88	88	89	82	93	83	95	91	79
Housing	85	85	84	89	82	85	89	86	83
<i>Kibbutz</i> life	78	76	80	90	69	74	88	84	65
Treatment of Americans	77	79	77	82	75	73	85	79	71
Totals	1029	1017	1043	1003	1048	955	1109	1019	980
Differences from total . . .		-12	+14	-26	+19	-74	+80	+20	-49

* See note, Table 1.

TABLE 4. INTENSITY* SCORE OF REASONS AMERICANS LEAVE ISRAEL

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Cultural-ists</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Non-Zionists</i>	<i>Zionists</i>	<i>Non-professionals</i>	<i>Professionals</i>
Job opportunities	171	168	173	169	172	176	166	168	176
Housing	152	150	153	151	152	145	155	146	165
Cost of living	148	145	153	147	150	148	150	150	147
Family	130	125	134	118	138	119	136	133	124
Moral climate	102	101	103	104	101	95	103	98	112
<i>Kibbutz</i> life	70	71	70	73	68	59	77	70	72
Threat of war	66	69	63	59	71	68	61	68	60
Totals	839	829	859	821	852	810	848	833	856
Differences from total . . .		-10	+20	-18	+13	-29	+9	-6	+18

* See note, Table 1.

4. The settlers who decided to remain in Israel showed greater similarity in the intensity rating of reasons why Americans leave Israel (Table 4) than of reasons why they stay (Table 3). Or, to express it in different terms, those who remained agreed more strongly on why the others left than on why they, themselves, decided against leaving.

In general, people left for practical reasons, and stayed because of ideological conviction. Job opportunities, housing, and cost of living were practical considerations for leaving. The desire to live in a Jewish state, experience a religious environment, and enjoy a cultural life were ideological motives for staying.

The Future

Jews find Israel increasingly attractive, even as it comes closer to resembling an armed camp. American Jews come, while most tourists choose safer lands. More Americans settle in Israel now, although women entering Jerusalem's supermarkets must open their handbags for inspection and students attending Hebrew University must show their identity cards at the newly erected campus gates.

LEAVING AMERICA

In America, most citizens face the next decade with considerable misgivings. While the most fantastic dream of man landing on the moon was realized, the serious problems of feeding the hungry, educating the illiterate, and training the unskilled remain largely unsolved. The rivers and the air have become dangerously polluted, symbols of the fate of an affluent society willing to send men to the moon, while standing knee-deep in garbage. Americans want to bring peace to Vietnam, but minimize the explosive nature of the hostility between blacks and whites at home. Law and order become means of cooling the confrontation between those who have much and those who have little.

The emotional unbalance of society is apparent in the practices of the young. Teenagers drink, use dope, and turn on sex as part of the "don't give a damn" way of life they observe among adults fighting for their share of the ersatz good life, produced by our technological society. Many collegians, euphemistically called forerunners, recognize that we are materially wealthy, but morally bankrupt. Most of them feel powerless to transform society, and plan to adjust to it by making only minor changes in their own life style.

Jews in America are among the elite of the establishment. Yet, they are among the most dissatisfied. Jewish parents feel a sense of frustration and guilt at what happened to their dream of a brave new world. Their children react to the condition of society by joining radical groups at college in disproportionately large numbers, in order to tear down the social system

and build anew. Eventually, however, most of them, too, will come to accept society as it is.

Some of the dissatisfied Jewish youth will make their way to Israel, hoping to find like-minded, socially alert human beings. Their own positive Jewish identity impels them to assume that, no matter how short Israel is of its humanitarian goals, its people are open to social change. Those who will leave America within the next decade and settle permanently in Israel should resemble American permanent settlers now in Israel. Thus, information from these settlers provides a basis for judging which of the dissatisfied will go to Israel. However, in an era of rapid social change, there may be a shift in emphasis on what impels them to leave.

Before going to Israel, permanent residents were most disturbed by conformity and materialism in America; assimilation and antisemitism were less significant. As a result of increased attendance at more demanding Jewish day and Hebrew schools in America, tomorrow's *oleh* may resemble the more Jewishly educated settlers in Israel, who were distressed primarily by the problem of assimilation (Table 1). After having lived in Israel, all American *olim*, including those who did not join Zionist groups in America, displayed considerable fear about assimilation in America.

On the whole, *olim* were less sensitive to the problem of antisemitism before migrating. Those who became permanent settlers in Israel during 1962 through 1966 have as neighbors victims of European and Arab antisemitism. Still, they find it difficult to be overly anxious about rising antisemitism in America. However, differences in the settlers' responses to the question on the future of antisemitism in America suggests that the more highly Jewishly educated *olim* of tomorrow may be significantly troubled about it.

The continued low level disturbance about future church-state relations emphasizes that those who migrated to Israel did not fear that America would become a Christian state. The religious expressed greater doubt—an additional incentive to leave America.

Assimilation should be the major concern of those who leave America during this decade. But fear of the disintegration of the American Jewish community should not be the motivating force. Seventy per cent of the *olim* shared an optimistic feeling about the survival of the American Jewish community, the religious more so than the others, despite their concern about assimilation. They anticipated that American Jewry's link with world Jewry will continue in its present form, or become stronger.

Proportionately more young men may be drawn to Israel as the United States continues to send soldiers overseas to fulfill what they consider morally questionable commitments. While American Jewish youth may object to serving in Vietnam, most view Israel military service as morally acceptable self-defense.

Subjects of this study of American permanent residents of Israel were

almost evenly divided between men and women. However, it is conceivable that more women than men may be attracted to Israel, as American society becomes more disoriented. The woman who goes to Israel views herself primarily as a homemaker. Her family concerns are paramount, and her feeling that Israel is a safer place for her children outweighs the attractions of a higher standard of living in America.

COMING TO ISRAEL

The assumptions that there will be a continuous increase in American *aliyah* during the next decade is based not exclusively on the state of American society, but also on the improvement of economic conditions in Israel and the resultant need for the skills of highly educated Americans. Especially since the six-day war, Israel has been calling for more trained personnel to run the factories and to plan new ones, and America has become an indispensable source of this manpower. The numbers involved in the post-1967 war *aliyah* are not spectacular: Some 4,300 *olim* came in 1968, and an additional 5,600 in 1969.¹⁸ However, in light of the estimated total of 15,000 Americans in Israel before the six-day war, this is remarkable progress.

Teachers continue to come in large numbers. Forty educators went to settle in developing areas early in 1969, followed by 60 more. They go to development areas where Israelis sometimes hesitate to live. Those with no previous knowledge of Hebrew are able to teach in Hebrew after six months' training.

In the next few years more academics will move to Israel, leaving American schools that have become centers of social unrest. Some professors have already lived and worked in Israel for short stints and during sabbatical years. Now they find full-time employment at burgeoning colleges and technical schools. Some of the science professors will teach in English until their Hebrew is adequate; others may continue to lecture in English to the increasing number of American students in Israel.

Professionals and industrialists, called in to provide short-term technical advice after the six-day war, have become aware of Israel's potential, and some are planning to settle permanently. The Israel government now welcomes industrialists with private capital. Ramat Shalom is an entirely new concept of a privately financed, self-contained village being established by Americans on Mount Hermon.

Israel will continue to have special appeal for those who shun private enterprise and competition, and prefer *kibbutz* living. American ingenuity is reflected in Shaal, a new city *kibbutz* movement started in 1968 by Americans in Carmiel, Western Galilee. Opportunities for *kibbutz* living are

¹⁸ Including temporary residents, *hozrim* (returning Israelis), and their children.

being promoted by the Jewish Agency through Habonim's *kibbutz aliyah* desk, which represents all such movements, and Americans are responding: 1,500 in 1968. Programs are geared to attract adults who want to live in a *kibbutz* permanently or temporarily, as well as youths who wish to spend either a summer, or a year, there. They include: permanent residence (at ages 18-40); six months *ulpan* for Hebrew studies and work (18-35); temporary work (18-35); seven summer weeks of working and touring (16-17); summer camp at Geshet Haziv (13-16); Shaal's cultural summer exchange program (14-16), and Habonim's year-workshop of work, touring, and study (high school graduates). Religious *kibbutzim* do not have to advertise for American high-school graduates to come for a year of *hakhshara*. Members of Bnei Akiva, the religious Zionist youth movement, vie for this opportunity.

The enlistment of volunteers, in the fashion of the Peace Corps, was begun four years ago, and has attracted almost 500 college graduates, who work as social workers and teachers in development areas. Between 25 and 28 per cent remain in Israel. Now, engineers and technicians, too, are invited to serve.

Israel has developed still other ways of encouraging American tourism and, more importantly, settlement. In 1964 the American summer school at Ulpan Akiva was established near the seashore town of Natanya for tourists, new immigrants, and Israeli residents. Schools of Jewish learning have considerable appeal for youths who would not come for college programs, which sometimes are below American standards and have limited laboratory facilities. Students from America participate in the intensive programs of *yeshivot*, and training institutes for Hebrew teachers and community workers. Such programs both secure Israel's position as the spiritual center of all Jews and, indirectly, also promote *aliyah*.

The Orthodox will continue to come to Israel in larger numbers than any other segment of American Jewry because their concept that being a Jew is a full time task is coupled with a keen desire to leave the diaspora and return home.

RETENTION

Beyond attracting highly educated, relatively affluent Jews from America, Israel has the more crucial task of hastening their absorption into the total Israeli society. The deeper the roots, the less likely newcomers will think in terms of returning to America. The newly-created Ministry of Immigration and Absorption is now taking steps that the Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel (AACI) has been calling for over the years. Since it is common practice for people to buy cooperative apartments or own their own homes, newcomers are encouraged to arrange for 25-year mortgages on 75 per cent of the total cost of their housing. Families who are

joined by relatives are given attractive terms for enlarging their quarters. Whenever possible, single settlers in development towns are given the same opportunities as families to obtain apartments. Higher standard public housing is now available on a rental basis, with newcomers having the option to buy within three years.

American *olim* are encouraged to maintain their higher standards by bringing personal goods, free of duty. Improved absorption centers, hostels, and *ulpanim* facilitate the immigrants' adjustment. They receive free health insurance during the first six months, and, since 1967, also have special income tax exemptions.¹⁹

Free education for the first two years of high school was introduced in Israel only after the six-day war. However, children of newcomers are assured a completely free high school education. Besides, students who come without their families receive help from the Student Authority of the Ministry of Immigration and Absorption in gaining admission to schools of higher learning; scholarships, based on financial need, are provided.

Reversing itself, the socialistic government of Israel now wishes to attract private enterprise. Newcomers with industrial and business abilities, and financial means, receive special loans.

Even before many of these incentives were offered, 86 per cent of the respondents in this study planned to remain in Israel. They felt just as strongly that their children should study, marry, and live in Israel.

The responses of participants in the study make it possible to predict that the post-June war spiral of American *aliyah* will continue under present conditions. But these settlers represent only a fraction of the people who came with high hopes; the others returned to America. The question is: will future American *olim* resemble those who remained in Israel or those who returned to America? A comparison between permanent settlers and returnees to America would be very helpful in finding the answer.

GERALD ENGEL

¹⁹ *The Rights of the Oleh* (Israel Aliyah Center Inc., August 1969).