



INTRODUCTION

THE RELATIONSHIP of American Jews to Israel is both one of the oldest and one of the newest topics in the sociology of the American Jew. As Calvin Goldscheider points out, the link of American Jews to Palestine is over a century old. However, most American Jews, and even many American Zionists, conceived of this link exclusively in philanthropic, political, or cultural terms. American Jews would give financial assistance to the Jews of Palestine and later of Israel, and might also be helpful by influencing American foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction. Such assistance would be reciprocated in two ways: 1) Israel would serve as a symbol of Jewish affirmation and achievement, and 2) Israel would constitute a center where Jewish culture would develop free of the limitations inherent in the Diaspora. While Israeli culture could never be transferred in toto to America it would nonetheless provide American Jews with a significant source of cultural enrichment that would in turn constitute a valuable resource in the fight against assimilation.

While a small group of ultra-Reform Jews resisted any link with Israel the dominant tendency of American Jews from the beginning was to nourish and strengthen their connection to the Jewish state. Minimalists saw the relationship of the American Jew to Israel as

centered in philanthropic aid, while maximalists emphasized cultural interchange as well as political action. To be sure, a segment of Zionist youth maintained that the relationship of the American Jew to Israel went beyond philanthropy, political action, and cultural exchange—that there was a responsibility for American Jews to participate personally in the upbuilding of the land through aliya [migration]. This view, however, was hardly the dominant one. America was considered exceptional: it had no “Jewish problem,” it was a land of immigration, not emigration, and there were no grounds for expecting a significant American aliya.

A number of Israeli spokesmen have suggested that sooner or later a Jewish problem will emerge in the United States, and will disprove this doctrine of American exceptionalism. Others have maintained that while anti-Semitism is not in fact a problem, assimilationism will become so rampant as to undermine completely the Jewish identity of the American Jew. It must be said that neither position has been argued with real conviction, and that no one has ever really seemed to harbor great expectations for a large-scale emigration of American Jews to Israel.

The fact is, however, that there has been an American aliya for many decades. Carefully analyzing the available statistics Goldscheider provides us with the most reliable data yet available on the ebb and flow of this emigration. He does not treat all American olim [migrants] as a single type, but indicates rather their different motivations and personal characteristics as well as those factors which they have in common.

At the present moment aliya has assumed an importance in the relationship between American Jews and Israel which rivals the traditional avenues of philanthropy, political support, and cultural exchange.

Given the new significance of aliya it is essential that we improve our knowledge about the demographic characteristics of American olim. Goldscheider not only provides such information but, on the basis of previously unpublished data concerning the attitudinal, behavioral, and personal characteristics of olim, analyzes their level of Jewish education, the frequency of their synagogue attendance, the level of their ritual observance, and their affiliation with Zionist organizations. His conclusions provide the starting point for future research on what he terms “the intricate web of interdependence between the American Jewish community and Israeli society.”

M. S.



ALIYA from the United States¹ is but one small segment of the complex, symbiotic, and dynamic relationships between the State of Israel and the American Jewish community. Since the Six Day War of 1967, dramatic and revolutionary changes have occurred in these interdependencies and have been reflected in the changing nature of American Jewish immigration to Israel. In addition to the increase in the volume of American aliya, American *olim* have become more conspicuous within Israeli society and, of equal importance, aliya from the United States has become acceptable, normative, and institutionalized within the American Jewish community.

No contemporary sociological analysis of American Jews can be considered complete without a discussion of the role of Israel, and in particular the place of American aliya, in American Jewish life. This had not always been the case, despite the long-standing ties and connections between American Jews and Israel. Social scientists in the 1950's and 1960's had in fact dismissed the importance of the establishment of the State of Israel for the inner life of American Jews and had argued that the idea of a serious impact of Israel on Judaism in America was largely illusory. Large-scale aliya from the United States was thought to represent "wishful thinking" and except for sporadic emigration, no mass movement appeared likely. Indeed, the prognosis was made that in order to have "a wholesale immigration to Israel from the United States, there would have to be a revolution in the situation and mentality of American Jews, the vast majority of whom belong to the middle classes and, in the absence of religious motivation, can

¹*Aliya*, literally "ascent," is used to mean immigration to Israel; persons who go on aliya are called *olim*—or in the singular, *oleh*.

Note: The research reported in this paper was started 1969–70 while I was on leave from the University of California, Berkeley. Initial support from the National Foundation for Jewish Culture and from the Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley is gratefully acknowledged. Cooperation from the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, its former director, Professor Roberto Bachi, and its current director, Dr. Moshe Siron, is most appreciated. I am grateful to Etan Sabatello, Zion Rabi, and Zvi Eisenbach, all of the Central Bureau of Statistics, for providing access to unpublished data and assisting me in numerous ways.

feel no temptation to uproot themselves and settle in Israel."²

In the pre-1967 era, American Jews and among them American Zionists, assumed that aliya would come from other countries, where Jews faced persecutions and hostility. The role of American Jews was at most to provide adequate economic support and effective political aid to Israel. Paradoxically, the American Zionist expressed great opposition to the idea of American aliya; the thought of his own immigration to Israel never seriously entered his mind while the idea of aliya on the part of his children "struck him as fundamentally absurd in theory and entirely to be rejected in actual practice."³ It is against the background of these assumptions that the radical change in the character of American aliya must be viewed.

There is a variety of sociological and demographic contexts within which American aliya may be analyzed, each requiring a somewhat different set of orientation questions. American aliya may be viewed, for example, as part of the migration interchanges between countries; hence, the study of American immigration to Israel would include an analysis of alternative migratory flows—the movement of Israelis to the United States and return migration of Americans and Israelis to their respective countries of origin. A somewhat different orientation treats the aliya of Americans as part of all immigration to Israel, focusing on the place of American aliya within the variety of migration streams to Israel and examining the differential absorption or integration of American and other olim within Israeli society. Often these approaches have been combined and American aliya has been placed in the broad context of world Jewish migrations.

A different starting point in the study of American aliya focuses on the role of American immigration to Israel as one aspect of the total social, cultural, economic, and political exchanges between

²Georges Friedmann, *The End of the Jewish People?* New York: Doubleday-Anchor Books, 1967 (translated by Eric Mosbacher), p. 231. See also Nathan Glazer, *American Judaism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957, pp. 114, 115. My own pre-1967 research on the American Jewish community reflected this general tendency as well. See, for example, Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, *Jewish Americans*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968, pp. 9-10. In contrast, Marshall Sklare's book *America's Jews*, New York: Random House, 1971, devotes an entire chapter to "The Homeland: American Jewry and Israel," pp. 210-223.

³From an article by S. Halkin, "American Zionism and the State of Israel," *Forum I*, December 1953; cited in Edward Neufeld, "Zionism and Aliya on the American Jewish Scene," *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 5 (June 1963), p. 112.

Israel and the American Jewish community. In this context, American aliya is investigated as one facet of the influences of American Jews on Israel and of Israel on American Jews: Aliya from the United States may be considered, on the one hand, part of the general flow of money, tourists, students, economic investments, political aid, and psychological support from American Jewry to Israel and, on the other hand, as a response to the ideological, cultural, and educational influences of Israel on the American Jewish community.

These perspectives have been utilized in one form or another to study American aliya and olim and in a general way serve as guidelines for the ensuing analysis. However, particular emphasis will be placed on understanding American aliya from the perspective of the sociology of the American Jewish community. The point of view to be explored treats American aliya as one of the multiple responses of American Jews to the problems of Jewish identity in a modern, secular society that is guided by universalistic rather than particularistic ideologies.

Faced with the options to choose, American Jews have responded in multiple directions: Some have moved in the direction of assimilation, intermarriage, loss of Jewish identity, and indifference to interaction, association, and affiliation with other Jews and the Jewish community; others have chosen Jewish segregation and isolation as a vehicle to protect and preserve Jewish particularism; others have attempted to retain ties to the Jewish community through various organizational or communal activities focused on local or national Jewish issues, Jewish defense, and issues of world Jewry (including, of course, Israel); still others have expressed their Jewishness by their concern with general issues of social justice and morality within a Jewish organizational framework or through philanthropic activities in a general or Jewish context. Some Jews have attempted to find new meaning for American Judaism and have searched for creative Jewish ways to express their social-religious identities; others have found religious significance and ethnic identity in ritual observances that are neither overly conspicuous nor intrusive in their daily lives and that fit most comfortably into the American scene. For some, however, the response to the dilemma of universalism-particularism, to the "conflicts" of religious (Jewish) identity in a secular (Christian) society and to minority status in a pluralistic nation has been aliya. Hence, immigration to Israel may be viewed as one of a multiple set of responses to a complex of challenges facing the American Jew.

This orientation to American aliya requires two major directions of empirical inquiry: First it is important to measure the changing volume of aliya from the United States. Through an analysis of the numbers of American olim at different periods in American, Israeli, and Jewish history, a picture of the changing quantitative importance of the aliya response may be outlined. After describing the changing numbers of Americans who become olim, the selectivity of American aliya must be investigated. What are the social characteristics of American olim, e.g., what types of American Jews have responded to the challenges of being Jewish in American society by immigrating to Israel? The exploration of these general themes provide the essential background for understanding the determinants, consequences for the American Jewish community, and possible future course of American aliya.

The volume of American aliya and the social characteristics of American olim are among the all too many topics in the sociology of American Jews about which a great deal has been written and little is known. Much of the discussion of American aliya in the Jewish mass media is tainted by ideological biases and distortions. Systematic empirical evidence to analyze American aliya in more objective terms is not available in the depth or in the quality that is desirable and necessary. Despite reservations and qualifications, a preliminary analysis can be presented in broad outline using two major sources of data: 1) official immigration registration data in Israel, and 2) sample survey materials.

The Central Bureau of Statistics in Israel collects a series of registration data on immigrants extending back to the establishment of the State of Israel. They are derived from questionnaires collected by border police on declared immigrants and temporary residents; for tourists settling, i.e., persons entering the country as tourists but changing their status to immigrants or temporary residents, data are obtained from the Ministry of Interior. Together these data show the number of immigrants arriving or tourists settling in Israel along with selected data on age, sex, marital status, occupation, country of birth, place of last residence. Special publications on immigration to Israel are issued⁴ but these do not contain detailed information on immigrants from the United States. Unpublished data were made available to me by the Central Bureau of Statistics on American olim (defined by place of last residence) 1948-71, along with more detailed information on the characteris-

⁴See, for example, Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, *Immigration to Israel*, Special Series No. 349, Jerusalem, 1971.

tics of American olim arriving in 1970. Unfortunately, adequate data to measure return migration are not available; hence, the analysis is limited to American olim who arrive in Israel and not to those who remain.

An additional source of information about American olim is the "Survey on Absorption of Immigrants" conducted by the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics in conjunction with the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption and the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research. The purpose of the survey is to follow various aspects of the absorption process of new immigrants during their first three years in Israel. The survey population includes a representative sample of all immigrants and potential immigrants aged 18 and over, who immigrated to Israel between September 1969 and August 1970.⁵

As part of the survey on absorption, background questions on the characteristics of olim before aliya were obtained. Unpublished data on the social characteristics of immigrants and potential immigrants whose last place of residence was in the United States were made available by the Central Bureau of Statistics for this analysis.⁶ The number of olim from the United States included in the sample was 167 and represents a random sample of all registered American immigrants and potential immigrants arriving in Israel, September 1969 to August 1970. Since the number of cases is small, sampling variation and error are large. Hence, the findings based on the data from the immigrant absorption survey should be viewed as preliminary and tentative, allowing for a margin of statistical error.

The data on American olim derived from these two sources will be compared to other olim (derived from published and unpublished data in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics), the Jewish population of Israel (derived from official registration and census data), and the American Jewish population (derived from several sources).⁷ Sources for historical materials on American aliya prior to the establishment of the State of Israel are cited *ad locum*.

⁵The details of the sample design and first results are presented in Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, *Survey on Absorption of Immigrants*, Special Series No. 381, Jerusalem, 1972. See below for discussion of "potential immigrants" and *ibid.* for definition and general description of olim in these two statuses.

⁶Part of the original material was recoded for the specific needs of this project and, hence, I remain responsible for the data and interpretations to be presented.

⁷I have relied heavily on the tabular material presented and analyzed in Sidney Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970: A Demographic Profile," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 72 (1971), pp. 3-88. These data summarize and organize a variety of Jewish community studies in addition to special tabulations of the Current Population Survey of 1957. For specific sources see Goldstein's bibliography and footnotes.



THE CHANGING VOLUME OF AMERICAN ALIYA

The most elementary starting point in the analysis of American aliya focuses on the quantitative issue: How many American olim settled in Israel at different points in time? The question is deceptively simple. It assumes that the definitions of "American" and "olim" are clear and uniform over time, that reliable, complete, and comparable statistics were collected under various political administrations (Turkish, British, Jewish), and that adequate measures are available to differentiate olim that arrive from olim that settled in Israel. It should be clear to anyone with even a casual acquaintance with social science data that these assumptions are not very realistic. From a strictly quantitative demographic point of view, there is no possibility to reconstruct in a statistically accurate form exactly how many Americans arrived and settled in Israel over the last several decades.

The objective of this section is more modest: Estimates of the approximate volume of American aliya from the middle of the nineteenth century to the 1970's will be presented, with an emphasis on patterns and processes. An overall quantitative picture of the patterns and processes of American aliya can be pieced together despite contradictory statistical reports, inadequate data coverage, and definitional changes in official records. Crude estimates of the number of American olim for various historical periods provide the necessary background to gauge 1) the changing patterns of American aliya over a period of 125 years; 2) changing proportions of American olim relative to all immigrants to Israel; 3) changing proportions of American olim relative to the estimated Jewish population of the United States. Since the data to be presented are estimates, a margin of error of 10 to 20 percent should be allowed, particularly for the earlier period. The discussion of the changing volume of American aliya will be related to three broad periods: 1) the early American aliya, from the mid-nineteenth century to World War I; 2) aliya during the British Mandatory Period, 1919-1948; 3) contemporary aliya, 1948-1971, to the State of Israel, with a special emphasis on the pre- and post-Six Day War (1967) periods.



THE EARLY AMERICAN OLIM

It is difficult to identify a definitive migration stream from the United States to the land of Israel prior to World War I. Largely this is because the number of American olim was small, the reasons for aliya were idiosyncratic and diverse, and detailed statistics, records, or documents on early American immigration to the land of Israel are nonexistent. The absence of an identifiable, pre-twentieth-century American aliya does not imply that there were no American olim. On the contrary, scattered historical records reveal the settlement of individual American Jews in the land of Israel dating from the middle of the nineteenth century.

One of the earliest references to an "American oleh" is the case of the first American consul for the Middle East region, a Protestant, who moved to Jerusalem in 1845. After less than two years in this position, he converted to Judaism and founded an agricultural colony on the outskirts of Jerusalem. In time, at least 50 Americans joined this pioneer colony including some Protestants, converts to Judaism, and the ex-consul's bride—a Jewish woman from New York.⁸

This pattern was, in all probability, quite atypical for this period. Although the evidence is fragmentary and inadequate, selected documents suggest that most American immigrants to the land of Israel in the nineteenth century were neither Jewish converts nor agricultural pioneers. The majority were motivated by more "parochial" religious reasons—to live or die in the Holy Land. Like the majority of the Jewish settlers before 1880, American Jews in the land of Israel were concentrated in the four "holy" cities of Jerusalem, Hebron, Tiberias, and Safed. Settling in these cities was viewed by the majority of Jews as a religious duty or act of piety. These settlements were, however, not consolidated; rather, they were subdivided into communities and *landsmanschaften* according to place of origin. Moreover most of the early American olim failed to establish economic roots in the land of Israel; they were sustained

⁸P. E. Lapidé, *A Century of U.S. Aliya, Israel: The Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel*, 1961, pp. 37–39.

by monies collected from European and American Jews. The American settlements were small, poor, and consisted mainly of unemployed older men and women dependent on the generosity of others for survival.⁹

American Jews had a long history of supporting "religious" settlements in Israel and "Palestinean messengers" made regular trips to collect money from the "rich Jews of America."¹⁰ In the 1860's, however, the Jews of America witnessed a significant development in requests from Palestine: A small group of American olim complained that the money received from America was not being distributed among them and that American Jews did not realize that there was an American Jewish settlement in Israel. In a letter, dated November 1867, addressed to leaders of American Jewry, the U.S. consul in Jerusalem wrote:

The number of American Jews residing in Jerusalem is very limited, a dozen altogether; but these unfortunates are the most miserable of all and do not receive pecuniary succor from any one, the German committees never having given them a cent, and those of America perhaps do not know them at all.¹¹

Ten years later, the situation had not improved and another letter to leaders of American Jewry was sent by the American consul. In part, it stated:

I think it proper that the Hebrew people in America should know the conditions of their brethren at Jerusalem, who are in distress, and need assistance. They are citizens of the United States, with naturalization papers and passports . . . one of them a soldier in the United States army four years, a dragoman, says he has had no food for two days, except the garbage picked up from the street. . . . There are 13 families or perhaps 15 representing 45 to 50 persons who need help and who, without help, must suffer. . . . They beg me to let their brethren in America know their situation.¹²

⁹This description follows that of Ben-Zion Dinur, "The Historical Foundations of the Rebirth of Israel," in L. Finkelstein (ed.) *The Jews*, Vol. I, 3rd edition, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960, pp. 588-589.

¹⁰See the important article by Salo Baron and Jeannette Baron, "Palestinian Messengers in America, 1849-79: A Record of Four Journeys," in Salo Baron, *Steeled By Adversity: Essays and Addresses on American Jewish Life*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1971, pp. 158-266. (This essay originally appeared in *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. V. (1943), pp. 115-62, 225-92.)

¹¹Cited *ibid.*, p. 219.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 239.

By the turn of the century, funds were being distributed among over 200 members of the American settlement in Jerusalem.¹³

American Jews in the land of Israel were organized like Jews from other countries partly because monies were divided in terms of communities and partly for protection. In 1879, over one hundred American Jews in Jerusalem demanded that the U.S. consulate recognize them as an independent American community. A decade later, 800 U.S. citizens were under the protection of the Jerusalem consulate and in the early 1900's the number increased to more than 1,000.¹⁴

Not all Americans requesting protection or seeking formal recognition in order to obtain funds lived in Jerusalem. In the 1870's, for example, the U.S. consulate in Jerusalem received a request from a rabbi from New Jersey who resided in Tiberias. He sought permission to establish an American congregation. In his letter, the rabbi revealed that there were over 20 Americans living in the Galilee.¹⁵

In general, so little is known about American aliya prior to World War I that the entire period may be treated as a whole. As a rough estimate, it seems reasonable to accept the guess that no more than 2,000 Americans (defined by place of last residence and/or citizenship but not by country of birth) arrived to settle in Israel prior to 1914, representing less than 3 percent of the estimated 55,000 to 70,000 immigrants to the land of Israel, 1880 to 1914.¹⁶

There is precious little evidence to cite nor are data available to document changes in the volume or character of American aliya during this period. However, assuming that early American aliya did not differ radically from the patterns of general aliya, two additional observations may be made. First, the volume of American aliya probably increased slightly after the 1880's and certainly after 1900. It has been estimated that between 1903 and 1914 over 1,000 American *chalutzim* (pioneers) and pious Jews immigrated to the land of Israel; if accurate, this figure is as large as the total number

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 619, footnote 74. On this general topic, see Moshe Davis, *From Dependence to Mutuality: The American Jewish Community and World Jewry*, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1970, pp. 343-433 (Hebrew).

¹⁴Lapide, *A Century of U.S. Aliya*, p. 45.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 45.

¹⁶American olim are estimated by Lapide, p. 132. On the estimated number of all olim, see *Statistical Yearbook of Israel*, 1971, p. 125, Table E/1.

of registered American citizens under the protection of the American consulate in Jerusalem in 1902.¹⁷

A second related point concerns the shift in the motivations for *aliya* and in the characteristics of *olim*. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, American *aliya* was increasingly characterized by a stream of young, American pioneers, agriculturists and secularists, joining or establishing Jewish settlements outside of the "holy" cities.¹⁸ Unlike prior American *olim*, these Americans were part of the growing *Yishuv* (Jewish settlement) who were inspired by secular nationalism, emphasized the need and value for Jewish agricultural labor, and formed part of what is referred to as the First and Second *aliya*.

It is clear, nevertheless, that American immigration to the land of Israel prior to World War I did not constitute an independent stream or wave of migration. Initially, the movement was motivated by traditional religious commitments and subsequently secular-nationalists from America (these "Americans" were largely recent immigrants from Eastern Europe to America) joined other Jews in settling agricultural lands. To understand the nature of this early *aliya* and to prepare the way for the analysis of subsequent immigration waves an additional question must be raised: Why did so few American Jews immigrate to the land of Israel?

The small number of American *olim* is not surprising or unexpected given what is known of the American Jewish community and the Jewish settlement in the land of Israel during this period. In general, there was little "pull" to the land of Israel and almost no "push" from the United States. Indeed, the pull was in the opposite direction—to America, not away from it.

Except for the few who were strongly motivated by religious or secular ideologies, the small number of Americans who became *olim* is consistent with the difficulties of travel, of pioneering, of foreign domination and the barrier of distance. In general, few Jews from anywhere came to settle in the land of Israel—there were about 25,000 Jews in the land of Israel in the 1880's and by 1914 the Jewish settlement numbered less than 85,000.¹⁹ But in addition to

¹⁷ Lapidé does not document his source for this and all other figures cited so it is impossible to determine its accuracy. See pp. 45–50.

¹⁸ On the general pattern, cf. Dinur, "The Historical Foundations of the Rebirth of Israel," pp. 589–593.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 588–589.

the general lack of "pull" factors to encourage aliya, there were opposite pulls to America. Indeed the attraction of Jews from around the world, but in particular from Eastern Europe where there were religious and economic persecutions, was to the "new Zion," the promised land of America.

Beginning with a small population of about 15,000 Jews in 1840, the Jewish community of the United States increased fifteenfold by 1880 to almost a quarter of a million, doubled two more times to one-million by 1900, and further tripled by 1917. This Jewish "population explosion" came in large part from waves of Eastern European migrants who made their choice of a promised land when they came to America; the land of Israel was simply not the land of "opportunity" and did not loom very large in their consciousness.²⁰

Up to the 1880's the size of the American Jewish population was too small to contribute much to aliya; subsequently, the social composition of the American Jewish population precluded mass out-migration. Most American Jews, during this early period, were newly acculturating Central or Eastern Europeans who either wanted or had begun to share some of the economic rewards of industrializing America. The country whose history was being shaped and defined by immigration could hardly serve as a major source of aliya; the nation that attempted to be a beacon to all was particularly attractive to politically and religiously oppressed Jews. In a sense America and Israel "competed" for the refugees of world Jewry. Given the choice, few Jewish refugees immigrated to the land of Israel. Once in America, most Jews no longer thought of themselves as refugees. The land of Israel was distant both psychologically as well as geographically.



AMERICAN ALIYA IN THE MANDATORY PERIOD

American aliya continued on a small scale after World War I. In contrast to the absence of immigration records for the early American aliya, official statistics are available for the British

²⁰See Oscar and Mary Handlin, "A Century of Jewish Immigration to the United States," *The American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 50 (1948-49), pp. 78-80.

Mandatory Period showing the number of registered legal immigrants to Palestine by country of origin, 1919–1948. From these data, a first approximation of the volume of American aliya during these three decades may be obtained.

Data in Table 1 show one set of official registration statistics on the number of immigrants to Palestine from the United States, 1919–1948. According to these data, 6,613 American olim were registered as immigrants, an average of 220 per year for 30 years, representing 1.5 percent of all registered olim. Fluctuation in the volume of aliya should be noted, specifically the increase in annual numbers during the late 1920's and 1930's and the sharp reduction

TABLE 1
Registered olim from the United States, Mandatory Period, 1919–1948: Numbers and rate per 1,000 total olim

<i>Period</i>	<i>Number</i>		
	<i>Total*</i>	<i>Average per year</i>	<i>Per 1,000 total registered olim</i>
Total Mandatory (1919–48)	6,613	220	15
Third Aliya (1919–23)	601	122	17
Fourth Aliya (1924–31)	1,985	248	24
Fifth Aliya (1932–38)	3,854	551	20
During and after World War II (1939–48)	173	17	2

*Includes only legal immigrants from the United States registered by place of origin.

Source: Data on American and total registered olim were adapted from Moshe Sicon, *Immigration to Israel, 1948–1953, Statistical Supplement*, Falk Project for Economic Research in Israel and Central Bureau of Statistics, Special Series No. 60, Jerusalem, December 1957, p. 6, Table A8.

during the war years. In particular, American aliya during the "fifth aliya," 1932-1938, averaged over 500 per year; owing to the general increase in immigration to Palestine during this period, the proportion of American olim relative to total olim declined slightly.

The increase in the number of American olim during the 1930's coincided with the economic depression in the United States and perhaps reflected the general trend toward emigration from America. (During the early 1930's net immigration from the United States was negative for the only time in American history.) Unlike other immigrant groups in America, few Jews wanted to return to their countries of origin (i.e., Eastern Europe) and, if motivated to emigrate, were somewhat more inclined toward Palestine as their "national homeland." Subsequent to the increases in American aliya during the 1930's, a significant decline in aliya resulted from conditions associated with World War II. These fluctuations in American aliya parallel the changing rates of all immigration to Palestine.

There is general agreement in most discussions of American aliya during the Mandatory Period that: a) aliya from the United States was low, relative to the total aliya and to the size of the Jewish population in America, and continuous from the pre-Mandatory period; b) fluctuations in the flow of American olim to Palestine were tied to the U.S. economic situation in the 1930's and the general slowdown of aliya during World War II. There is wide disagreement, however, about the absolute numbers of American olim who arrived in Palestine.

It is almost impossible and in large part unnecessary to review all the various guesses and estimates that have been made about American aliya during the Mandatory Period. Few authors provide specific references for their estimates and, hence, the source or sources of all the numerical confusion cannot be traced. Moreover, since Jewish immigration was a sensitive political and ideological issue during these decades, it is not unexpected that variations in the reporting of immigration figures were a function of considerations other than technical, statistical, or demographic. Yet arguments over the "exact" number must be placed in some perspective. Without plunging into a detailed debate about contradictory data that are irreconcilable, we may note several major points:

1. The figures presented in Table 1 were prepared by Sicron²¹

²¹See source cited bottom of Table 1.

from official data of registered olim by "country of origin." Data available from the *Statistical Yearbook of Palestine* are consistent with these data, except for the 1932–38 period. According to the data reported by the British government, the number of persons registered as immigrants 1932–38, whose previous place of residence was the United States, was 5,933.²² This averages to 848 per year (but ranges from a high of 1,892 American olim in 1935 to a low of 121 American olim in 1938), representing 28 per 1,000 total registered immigrants of the fifth aliya. If we accept the higher figure for 1932–38, American aliya totals 8,692 for the three decades in place of 6,613.

2. Some confirmation of the higher figure is provided by Lestschinsky.²³ Detailed data he collected from a variety of sources place the number of American olim, defined by country of origin, at over 8,000 for this period; the number of American olim defined by country of birth is closer to Sicron's figure of around 6,600. Apparently, much confusion surrounded the distinction between Americans defined by country of birth, by national citizenship, by country of last residence, or by origin. Because of the large proportion of immigrants among the American Jewish population, distinctions between country of birth and country of last residence among American olim are critical. For example, the annual report of the Palestine Department of Migration listed the number of immigrants to Palestine from the United States in 1936 by country of birth (109), country of citizenship (325), and "country of past abode" (387).²⁴ While these numbers are small by any criterion, cumulative differences over several years are of sufficient magnitude as to yield discrepant estimates using one or the other definition.

3. The highest estimate of American olim during the Mandatory Period is 11,195 (with 3,585 returning to America—leaving less than 8,000 American settlers).²⁵ It is not at all clear how these data were obtained, how the number of return migrants was

²²See data in *Statistical Abstract of Palestine, 1937–38*, Jerusalem, 1938, p. 36, Table 40 and the 1943 volume, p. 19.

²³Jacob Lestschinsky, "Jewish Migrations, 1840–1956," in L. Finkelstein (ed.), *The Jews*, Vol. II, 3rd edition, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1960, p. 1572, Table 8 and p. 1584, Table 14.

²⁴Palestine, Department of Migration, *Annual Report, 1936*, Jerusalem, 1937, Tables IV, V, VI, VIII.

²⁵Lapide, *A Century of U.S. Aliya*, p. 132; similar figures are presented in the *Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel*, ed. Raphael Patai, New York: Herzl Press/McGraw-Hill, 1971, Vol. I, pp. 26–27.

determined, and whether the data relate to North Americans or Americans. Without further support, this estimate must be treated as an exaggeration. Nevertheless, this level of American aliya represents only 3 percent of all aliya 1919-48 and in no way distorts the notion that the volume was small.

4. If we assume that the level of American aliya 1919-48 is somewhere between the lowest and highest estimate, we may conclude with only a small margin of error that no more than 9,000 Americans (by the most generous definition) immigrated to Palestine during the British Mandatory Period, averaging less than 300 per year, and less than 3 percent of all olim.

5. Finally we know very little either of the social characteristics of American olim during this period or their staying power, i.e., rates of return migration. We may suspect that many more young *chalutzim* were among the American olim of the Mandatory Period than in the earlier aliya, more were imbued with secular nationalism, and were more conspicuously American either because they were born in the United States or had spent a longer time living there. Given what is known of general rates of return migration from Palestine, it is not unreasonable to suggest that 30 percent (plus or minus 10 percent) of the American olim returned to America.



AMERICAN ALIYA TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The numerically small flow of American olim, beginning in the mid-nineteenth century and gathering some momentum in the 1930's, continued after the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. The period 1948 to 1971 may be subdivided into three periods: 1) 1948-60; 2) 1961-66; 3) 1967-71. The data in Table 2 show the number of American immigrants, 1948-1971, defined by place of last residence, and include tourists settling in Israel. These are official data, gathered from the files of the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, and have hitherto been unpublished. (Others have relied on data from Jewish Agency records both in Israel and abroad, newspaper reports, estimates from Zionist organizations, or from the Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel. These data

are often biased for political or ideological purposes and in no case can they be used without important qualifications and reservations. As far as can be determined, data in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics are the most complete and accurate in Israel.)

The total number of American olim arriving in Israel between 1948–60 was 5,528, ranging from a low of 187 in 1956 (part of the period when Israel was facing severe economic problems) to a high of close to 1,000 in 1949. These data relate only to declared immigrants and do not count temporary residents. Other estimates, based on alternative statistical sources and using other estimation procedures to include the non-declared immigrants, range to a high of 7,595 American olim and “pseudo-olim” for this period.²⁶

On the average, about 425 American olim arrived yearly in Israel (using official data), close to double the average yearly number of American olim during the three decades to 1948. Nevertheless the rate of American aliya per 1,000 total olim never exceeded 18 and appears to have been significantly lower than during the overall Mandatory Period and considerably below the periods covering the Fourth and Fifth aliya. In large part, the increase in annual numbers of American olim along with the increase in annual rates per 100,000 estimated American Jewish population was counterbalanced by the even larger increase in total aliya. Therefore, for the first decade or so following the establishment of the State of Israel the number of American and total olim increased—the latter substantially more than former. As a consequence American olim represented far less than one percent of all olim during the period 1948–60.

The period 1961–1966 (and the first six months of 1967) witnessed several significant developments in the history of American aliya. These changes have often been ignored or overlooked because of the more conspicuous and dramatic changes in American aliya and in Israeli society following the Six Day War of 1967. A careful examination of American aliya during the six years preceding that war, however, is essential in placing contemporary American aliya in perspective.

First, the number of American immigrants increased noticeably. During the six years 1961–66, 4,763 declared immigrants from the United States arrived in Israel, about 800 annually. To these, however, must be added another category, “temporary residents.”

²⁶Lapide, *A Century of American Aliya*, p. 129; cf. Neufeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 128–133.

TABLE 2

Number of American olim^a and rate per 1,000 total olim, 1948–1971

	<i>Immigrants^b</i>	<i>Temporary residents^c</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Per 1,000 total olim^d</i>
1948	510 ^e	N.A.	510	5
1949	990 ^e	N.A.	990	4
1950	761	N.A.	761	4
1951	579	N.A.	579	3
1952	292	N.A.	292	12
1953	202	N.A.	202	18
1954	294	N.A.	294	16
1955	321	N.A.	321	9
1956	187	N.A.	187	3
1957	271	N.A.	271	4
1958	378	N.A.	378	14
1959	330	N.A.	330	14
1960	413	N.A.	413	17
1961	592	1,279	1,871	35
1962	619	1,733	2,352	35
1963	868	1,982	2,850	39
1964	1,006	2,276	3,282	53
1965	924	2,598	3,522	91
1966	754	2,473	3,227	136
1967	665	3,383	4,048	162
1968	932	5,284	6,216	192
1969	671	5,068	5,739	152
1970	1,093	5,789	6,882	187
1971	1,049	6,315	7,364	176

^aAmerican by place of last residence.^bIncludes tourists settling.^cAfter 1969 these are defined officially as "potential immigrants."^dTotal olim, 1948–60, do not include temporary residents; total olim 1961–68 includes temporary residence; total olim, 1969–71 includes "potential immigrants."^eData on country of residence (U.S.) are not available officially for 1948 and 1949. Estimates were prepared based on country of birth (U.S.) data. The average ratio of country of birth (U.S.) to country of last residence (U.S.) 1950–53 was applied to country of birth (U.S.) data 1948–49.*Source:* Data on American olim are from unpublished official data in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel. Data on total olim were derived from Central Bureau of Statistics, *Statistical Yearbook of Israel*, No. 22 (1971), Tables D/1, E/1 and from unpublished data in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel.

Defined formally, temporary residents were "foreign citizens entering Israel for a stay of over six months for purposes of temporary work, study, etc."²⁷ This ambiguous status was selected by many Americans not eager to risk the possible loss of their American citizenship by declaring formal "immigrant" status. (Before a May 1967 American Supreme Court decision, it was not clear that Americans could hold dual citizenship. Since immigrant status in Israel confirms citizenship automatically, many American olim opted for "temporary resident" status.²⁸) To be sure, a large number, perhaps a majority, of Americans who were "temporary residents" stayed only for the purpose of temporary work or study. Clearly, however, these Americans were not tourists and a significant, if only a minority, proportion settled. Between 1961 and 1966 over 12,000 Americans were registered as temporary residents, averaging more than 2,000 annually.

As part of the increase in the numbers of American olim (including temporary residents), and some slowdown in the aliya of other Jews, the relative proportion of American olim of the total aliya increased noticeably in these six years. In 1961, 35 out of every 1,000 olim to Israel were American; by 1966, 13.6 percent of all olim were Americans. In no period prior to 1961 was the rate of American aliya as high.

One central conclusion to be derived from these data is that the increase in American aliya, in absolute volume and in the rate per 1,000 total olim, had its roots *before* the events of June, 1967; the Six Day War accelerated the tempo of a phenomenon that had already started.

This is not to minimize the importance of the Six Day War, through its impact on American Jewish life and on the shape and character of Israeli society, in stimulating American aliya. Indeed between 1967 and 1971, the number of Americans who were "immigrants" averaged 882 per year, totaling 4,410 for the five year period; the number of "temporary residents" (referred to formally after June 1969 as "potential immigrants") averaged over 5,000 per year and totaled more than 25,000, 1967-71. Adding these two categories together, a total of over 30,000 American olim arrived in Israel in a five-year period. How many of these olim have or will

²⁷For definitions of "temporary residents," "potential immigrants," and other migration categories see *Statistical Abstract of Israel*, 1971, No. 22, pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

²⁸This is one of the central themes in Harold R. Isaacs, *American Jews in Israel*, New York: The John Day Co., 1966.

return, in what ways those who stay become part of Israeli society, are some of the issues that will be studied over the next several years. What is clear at this stage is that the increased volume of American olim after 1967 is unprecedented; it is also clear that not all the increase can be attributed simply to the Six Day War and its aftermath since these patterns were emerging well before June, 1967.

Another feature of the post-1967 American aliya is the increase in the proportion of total olim who are from the United States. Although a clear pattern of increase in the rate of American aliya per 1,000 total olim may be discerned in the late 1950's, the levels reached in the post-1967 period are unprecedented. Some fluctuation in these rates reflects external events affecting total aliya, in particular the unexpected increase in the immigration to Israel of Soviet Jewry in the last several years.

Data in Table 3 summarize the changes in American aliya 1919-71. The data are official estimates and are grouped into

TABLE 3
American^a olim, 1919-71, summary of official data

	1919-48 ^b	1948-60 ^c	1961-68 ^d	1969-71 ^e
Number	6,613	5,528	27,368	19,985
Average per year	220	425	3,421	6,662
Per 1,000				
Total olim	15	6	73	172
Per 100,000				
estimated U.S.				
Jewish population				
per year	4.9	8.1	59.5	113.3

^aAmerican by place of last residence.

^bThese are Sicron's estimates; see discussion in text for other estimates.

^cIncludes immigrants and tourists settling.

^dIncludes immigrants, tourists settling, and temporary residents.

^eIncludes immigrants, potential immigrants, tourists settling.

Source: Data on American olim and total olim derived from sources listed in Tables 1 and 2; estimates of the U.S. Jewish population were derived from data appearing in the *American Jewish Year Book*.

somewhat different periods, reflecting changes in the definitions of olim, particularly the shift from "temporary resident" status to "potential olim" in 1969. The dramatic increases over more than a half-century in the absolute number and yearly average number of American olim, and changes in the rate of American aliya per 1,000 olim and per 100,000 estimated U.S. Jewish population, per year, are clearly evident.



SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF AMERICAN OLIM

Up to this point the analysis has focused on the changing volume of American aliya and technical issues related to the various definitions of American olim. Another set of questions revolve around the types of Americans who have immigrated to Israel. Who are American olim? What are their social characteristics? How do they differ from other olim? Do American olim represent a cross-section of the American Jewish population? In what ways do American olim fit the stereotyped versions of the "American in Israel"? These are some of the elementary but essential questions that demand empirical comparisons between the social characteristics of American olim and those of selected populations: other olim, American Jews, and Israelis. Despite important defects in the quality and detail of existing data-sources on American olim and the American Jewish population, a more or less consistent picture of the types of Americans immigrating to Israel in the contemporary period emerges.

Undoubtedly, there have been changes in the social characteristics of American olim over the last several decades, if only because the social characteristics of American Jews have changed radically. However, no source of data is available that provides a dynamic portrait of the changing characteristics of American olim or that permits their retrospective reconstruction. Hence, the analysis to be presented only sketches a cross-sectional picture of the types of contemporary American Jews immigrating to Israel.²⁹

²⁹For some impressionistic but methodologically problematic analyses of pre-1967 social characteristics of American olim, see Isaacs, *op. cit.*, and Gerald Engel, "North American Jewish Settlers in Israel," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 71 (1970), pp. 161-187.

Several major objectives guide the analyses that follow. First, insight into the general determinants of American aliya may be obtained from an investigation of the social characteristics of American olim. The fact, for example, that American olim are concentrated in particular age categories or are more likely to define themselves as "religious" becomes an important first clue in the identification and isolation of the complex matrix of factors determining the social composition of immigration streams from the United States. From the types of American olim, we may infer the determinants of American aliya.

A related theme in the analysis of the characteristics of American olim is the extent to which the selectivity of American olim constitutes a "drain" of American Jewish human resources. To be sure, the small number of American olim relative to the population size of American Jewry reduces the quantitative impact of American aliya on the social composition of the American Jewish community. Nevertheless, certain implications about the Jewish organizational and religious structure of the American Jewish community may be inferred from the Jewish organizational and religious characteristics of American olim. This may be particularly dramatic and conspicuous in middle-sized and smaller American Jewish communities where the aliya of even a small number of key Jewish leaders may indeed reflect a Jewish "brain drain."

A third perspective in the analysis of the social characteristics of American olim is the degree to which American olim are conspicuous within Israeli society because of their exceptional social and economic characteristics. Whether or not American olim are representative of the American Jewish population, they may be exceptional when compared to the Israeli population. Clearly any investigation of American aliya must deal with the similarities and differences between the social characteristics of American olim and the Israeli population not only for the purpose of studying the integration and absorption of American olim into Israeli society but for the equally important objective of understanding the basic processes of American aliya. Analogously, the social characteristics of American olim need to be compared to olim from other countries.

These themes in the analysis of the social characteristics of American olim—providing clues to the determinants of American aliya, examining the extent of the selectivity of American olim from the point of view of the American Jewish community, Israeli society, and other olim—constitute the framework for interpreting

the empirical findings derived from registration and survey data in Israel.

A convenient starting point in the analysis of the social characteristics of American olim is to examine two variables that have been linked to important areas of American Jewish heterogeneity and are reflective of the particular historical development of the American Jewish community—region and generation status.



REGION

It is clear even to the casual observer of the American Jewish scene that region of residence is a powerful differentiator of American Jewry. Region of residence is important precisely because it is inextricably interrelated with almost every social, economic, ethnic-religious variable subdividing American Jews. In part this is true of states and certainly true of city-suburban variation. However the sample of American olim drawn from the absorption survey is too small to permit a detailed classification of American cities and states where olim resided before aliya.

As a preliminary step, the last place of residence in the United States of olim was classified according to broad geographic regions comparable to those used to classify the estimated distribution of the American Jewish population. Remarkably little difference appears in the distributions of American olim (1969–70) and of the U.S. Jewish population (1968) according to regions: About 65 percent of both populations are from the Northeast, 10 percent are from the South, 13 percent are from the North Central region and the remainder are from the West (Table 4). An examination of the two states with the largest American Jewish populations (New York and California) reveal that 46 percent of the American olim resided in New York before aliya and 9 percent immigrated to Israel from California. Compared to the estimated distribution of the American Jewish population, these data show a slight overrepresentation among olim of New Yorkers (46 percent compared to 43 percent) and an underrepresentation of olim from California (9 percent compared to 12 percent). Whether these comparisons permit the inference of regional or state selectivity in aliya or are an artifact of

sampling error (of American olim in the survey) or estimation error (of the American Jewish population) must await more detailed study. At this point it appears reasonable to conclude that no conspicuous selectivity by state or region characterizes recent American aliya.

TABLE 4

Distribution of American olim and U.S. Jewish population by region

<i>Region</i>	<i>American olim, 1969-70</i>	<i>U.S. Jewish population, 1968</i>
Northeast	66.2	64.0
North Central	12.8	12.5
South	9.7	10.3
West	11.3	13.2
Total	100.0	100.0

Source: Data on American olim refer to region of last residence and are from special tabulations of the sample survey on immigrant absorption in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel; the distribution of the U.S. Jewish population is based on estimates presented in Alvin Chenkin, "Jewish Population in the United States," *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 70 (1969), pp. 260-72.



GENERATION STATUS

In dealing with the question, who is an American oleh, it was concluded that "American" did not necessarily imply American born. In terms of the social characteristics of American olim, we may now inquire, how "American" are American olim? More specifically, how does the distribution of American olim by generation status compare to the distribution of the American Jewish population by generation status? (Generation status refers to whether American- or foreign-born and, if American born, whether parents were American- or foreign-born.)

Indeed, most sociological research, implicitly or explicitly, has

concentrated on the importance of generation status as the critical analytic dimension in understanding American Jewish life.³⁰ Any attempt to clarify the transformation of the American Jewish community during the last century, to analyze the dynamics of variation within and between Jewish communities in the United States, or to project the direction of change toward which American Jews are moving must take as its elementary starting point an analysis of the trends and variations in generation status. A wide range of behavioral, attitudinal, and structural variables have been linked theoretically and empirically to the generation status of American Jews. Hence, it is important to discover the extent to which American aliya is selective of Jews in one generation status or another.

In the early American aliya, before World War I, perhaps 80-90 percent of American olim were not born in the United States. Some were American by citizenship; all were American by place of last residence. This reflected in large part the fact that most Jews in the United States at that time were not American-born. The American Jewish population was transformed during the course of the twentieth century to a predominantly native-born population; hence, it is not unexpected that American aliya has increasingly become a movement of native-born Americans.

Results of the immigration survey point to the fact that about 70 percent of the American olim 1969-70 were born in the United States and 30 percent were foreign-born residents of the United States before aliya (i.e., first-generation Americans). Among the American-born olim 60 percent were of parents born in the United States (i.e., at least third-generation Americans) and 40 percent were of foreign-born parents (i.e., second-generation Americans).

Comparisons between the generation-status distributions of American olim and the American Jewish population are hampered by the absence of national American data on the generation status of Jews. Most Jewish community studies taken during the 1960's reveal that foreign-born Jews represent between 20 and 25 percent of the total Jewish population, while an estimated 37 percent of the New York Jewish population are foreign born.³¹ However, the survey data on American olim relate to the adult population only (18 years of age and older) and thus Jewish community studies covering

³⁰See Goldstein and Goldscheider, *Jewish Americans*.

³¹Data reported in Sidney Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," pp. 53-56.

the total population, including children, are more weighted toward native-born Americans.

In general it does not appear that contemporary American aliya is conspicuously selective of foreign- or native-born Americans. However, some selectivity seems to be related to the difference between the second generation (Americans born of foreign-born parents) and the third generation (Americans born of American-born parents). Contemporary American olim tend to be more concentrated among American born of American-born parents (40 percent) than might be predicted from the estimated distribution of the adult American Jewish population. Some insight into this question emerges from an analysis of age differentiation between American olim and the American Jewish population.

Clearly, there is a strong correlation between generation status and age (see Table 5). Almost all (91 percent) of American-born

TABLE 5
Generation status^a of American olim, 1969–70, by age

<i>Age group</i>	<i>GENERATION STATUS</i>			<i>Total^b</i>
	<i>First generation</i>	<i>Second generation</i>	<i>Third generation</i>	
18–24	15.2	16.2	51.0	31.8
25–34	4.4	27.0	45.3	27.1
35–44	8.7	16.2	1.9	7.3
45–54	19.6	27.0	0.0	13.2
55–64	15.2	10.8	1.9	8.6
65+	37.0	2.7	0.0	11.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Percent in each generation	30.4	29.4	40.1	100.0

^aGeneration status refers to place of birth and related to status in the United States. For definition, see text.

^bTotal includes small number of unknown Generation Status.

Source: Special tabulations of the sample survey on immigrant absorption in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel.

olim of American-born parents are less than 30 years of age and over half are age 18–24. In contrast, 72 percent of American olim not born in the United States are over age 45 and half are 55 years of age and older. Put in another way, of all American olim age 65 and over, 95 percent were not American born; of all American olim 18–29 years of age, over 70 percent were born in the United States of American-born parents. Given this strong relationship between age and generation status, the question of selectivity of American aliya by generation status can be investigated indirectly by examining selectivity by age. The analysis of the age distribution of American olim has the added advantage of being comparable to data available on the American Jewish population. We shall, however, return to the direct examination of generation status in conjunction with other social characteristics of American olim.



AGE, SEX, MARITAL STATUS

In addition to the importance of age selectivity in American aliya as an indirect reflection of generation status, age (and sex) distributions are fundamental to understanding the demographic and social structure of populations.³² Furthermore one of the few universal empirical generalizations about internal and international migration relates to the tendency of young adults to migrate more often than others. Hence we now turn to the question of whether American olim are characterized by particular patterns of age and sex when compared to the American Jewish community, the Israeli population, and other olim

No systematic pattern of difference emerges when the age distributions of American olim and all olim in 1970 are compared (Table 6). In general olim tend to be young, approximately half are below age 25. Whereas the average ages of American and total olim are almost the same, American olim tend to be relatively more concentrated in the 20–34 age group (39 percent compared to 30 percent of all olim) and less concentrated in the “middle ages,” 35–64 years of age.

³²See the discussion in Calvin Goldscheider, *Population, Modernization, and Social Structure*, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1971, Chapters 1 and 8.

TABLE 6

Age and sex distribution of American olim, total olim, and U.S. Jewish population

Age group	American olim, 1970		Total olim, 1970		U.S. Jewish pop., 1957	
	Percent	Percent male	Percent	Percent male	Percent	Percent male
Total	100.0	47.3	100.0	47.6	100.0	N.A.
Under 15*	22.4	53.0	22.1	51.2	23.2	N.A.
15-19*	7.1	46.9	11.6	48.2	6.9	45.7
20-24	18.1	36.1	15.8	40.2	4.6	54.5
25-34	20.6	44.3	14.2	47.1	13.1	46.8
35-44	8.9	54.2	10.6	48.8	14.5	44.7
35-64	12.0	49.0	17.2	49.1	27.7	50.1
65+	10.8	53.0	8.4	46.9	10.0	45.7
Median Age	25.9	—	25.3	—	36.7	—

*For U.S. Jewish population the lowest age categories are "under 14" and "14-24."
Source: Data on American olim were tabulated from unpublished immigration registration records in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel; data on total olim were adapted from Central Bureau of Statistics, *Immigration to Israel, 1970*, Special Series No. 349, Jerusalem, 1971, Tables 5 and 8; data on the U.S. Jewish population, 1957 were calculated from U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States: March 1957," *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 79, February, 1958, Tables 5 and 7.

The contrast between the age distributions of American olim and the American Jewish population is more distinct and significant. The population of American olim is, on average, ten years younger than the U.S. Jewish population and is overrepresentative of the 20-34 age group and underrepresentative of the 35-64 age group. Whereas 18 percent of American olim are age 20-24 and 21 percent are 25-34 years of age, only 5 percent and 13 percent, respectively, of the American Jewish population are in these age groups. At the other end of the age scale, over one out of every four American Jews are 45-64 years of age compared to less than one out of every eight American olim. In short, out of every ten American olim approximately four are age 20-34 and two are age 35-64; out of every ten American Jews the reverse is the case—about two are age 20-34 and four are 35-64. This finding about the age selectivity of American olim is most consistent with our guess that American olim tend to overconcentrate among American born of American-born

parents and are underrepresentative of the American born of foreign-born parents. Third-generation American Jews are most typified by the 20-34 age group and second-generation American Jews by the 35-64 age group. Interestingly the proportions of American olim and the American Jewish population in the 65-and-over age category are about the same, adding weight to the argument that the selectivity of American olim by generation status is not to be located in the distribution between those born in the United States and the foreign born.

It should be emphasized that the age distribution of the American Jewish population refers to 1957. The question naturally arises whether the American Jewish population has become younger in the dozen or so years since 1957 to account for the younger age distribution among American olim. While no definitive answer can be given, there are no signs that such is the case. There are, for example, no indications that fertility among American Jews has increased after 1957 to influence the age structure. Indeed, if the past is any guide, we should expect that American Jewish fertility followed the prevailing pattern and trend of the general American population, which since 1957 has been downward.³³ Moreover comparing data on American olim to information obtained from 13 Jewish communities studied since 1957 supports the finding that American aliya is selective of the young. From these community studies we know that between 10 and 17 percent of the Jewish population are concentrated in the 15-24 age group and between 23-28 percent are in the 45-64 age group.³⁴ This contrasts to 25 percent and 12 percent of American olim in these respective age categories.

In addition to the selectivity of American olim by age there is selectivity by sex (Table 6). American olim tend to be more concentrated among women, particularly in the early adult ages, 20-34. The sharp undersupply of American male olim 20-24 should be contrasted with the high proportion of males age 35-44 (54 percent) and age 65 and over (53 percent). Although all young olim are somewhat more concentrated among women, Americans accentuate the pattern: Approximately 60 percent of the American olim in the age groups 20-24 and 25-29 are women. Among the

³³For a discussion of Jewish fertility, see *ibid.*, Chapter 10; general American fertility is discussed briefly in Chapter 6.

³⁴Data derived from Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," p. 58, Table 14.

middle and older ages, males are more likely to undertake aliya. Detailed data not shown indicate that fully 55 percent of the over-70 age group are males. This is surprising given the higher male mortality rates in the middle and older ages but perhaps understandable given the tendency for greater economic and family dependence among widows and their general low rates of migration.

One clue to these patterns of age and sex selectivity lies in the comparative analysis of marital status for American olim, all olim, and the U.S. Jewish population (Table 7). Comparing the marital status of American and total olim, only relatively small differences emerge, with a tendency among American olim toward a lower proportion married. The comparison between American olim and the U.S. Jewish population, however, reveals strikingly sharp differentiation. About twice as many American olim are single when compared to the U.S. Jewish population and the contrast is stronger among women. In support of our earlier hypothesis, widowed men

TABLE 7

Marital status distribution of American olim, total olim, and U.S. Jewish population

<i>Marital status</i>	<i>American olim, 1970^a</i>		<i>Total olim 1970^a</i>		<i>U.S. Jewish population 1957^b</i>	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Single	44.2	45.2	42.4	38.8	23.5	17.7
Married	49.3	43.5	52.9	46.7	73.0	67.4
Widowed	3.4	7.4	2.7	11.1	2.5	13.4
Divorced	3.2	4.0	2.0	3.4	1.0	1.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a15 years of age and over

^b14 years of age and over

Source: Data on American olim were tabulated from unpublished immigration registration records in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel; data on total olim were adapted from Central Bureau of Statistics, *Immigration to Israel*, 1970, Special Series No. 349, Jerusalem, 1971, Table 10; data on U.S. Jewish population, adapted from U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey of 1957, as cited in Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," Table 4.

tend to come to Israel in slightly larger proportions than their representation in the American Jewish population while considerably fewer widows go on aliya than their proportion in the American Jewish population.

Some of the differences in the marital status distributions of American olim and the American Jewish population are the results of the different age distributions of these two populations: American olim are younger and, hence, are more likely to be nonmarried than Jews in the United States. Can the large differences in the proportion married among American olim and the American Jewish population be attributed solely to the differential distributions of these populations by age? It seems an unreasonable assumption. A crude empirical examination—crude because detailed data by sex and marital status for all ages are not available for the U.S. Jewish population—shows that, at least for the four age groups for which data are available, male and female olim are much more likely to be nonmarried than the Jewish population of the United States (Table 8). Most importantly, differences are pronounced in the 25–34 age group: 70 percent of U.S. Jewish males and 90 percent of U.S. Jewish females are married in this age category compared to only about half of the American olim.

In sum, American aliya is selective by three major demographic characteristics: age, sex, and marital status. Olim from the United States clearly do not represent a demographic cross-section of the American Jewish population. A description of the demographic selectivity of American aliya reveals: a) American olim tend to be young; b) young women are more likely to undertake aliya than young men; c) young, unmarried women are more likely to be olim than married women; d) widowers are more prone to aliya than widows.

Taken together these data suggest that one facilitating factor in the aliya of Americans relates to the extent of age-marital-family attachments. Young and single are two social characteristics providing for the greatest freedom of movement; widowhood, at least for men, operates in a similar way. Moreover, the unusually high proportion of young American women olim who are unmarried suggests that at least for some, Israel is perceived to represent a potential marriage market. It may also be expected that the highest rates of return migration (*yerida*) among American olim will characterize precisely those groups who have the greatest freedom to move, i.e., the young and unmarried. Those who come

TABLE 8

Proportion married of American olim and U.S. Jewish population by age and sex

Age	<i>American olim, 1969-70</i>		<i>U.S. Jewish population, 1957</i>	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
25-34	50.0	53.6	69.3	88.6
35-44	75.0	83.4	92.6	87.5
45-64	83.3	66.7	90.0	75.0
65+	66.7	40.0	80.0	42.5
TOTAL*	57.4	42.9	73.0	67.4

*For American olim total is for those 18 years of age and older; For U.S. Jewish population total is for those 14 years of age and older.

Source: Data on American olim were obtained from special tabulations of the sample survey on immigrant absorption in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel; data on the U.S. Jewish population were adapted from U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey of 1957, as cited in Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," Table 4.

to Israel in search of a mate either succeed and stay, succeed and leave with their mate, fail and stay, or fail and leave. We suspect that the largest majority return to the United States in the same marital status category they had upon arrival in Israel.



EDUCATION AND OCCUPATION

Educational attainment and occupational skills are social characteristics of American olim that are important from the point of view of the American Jewish community and Israeli society. The relatively small number of olim from the United States precludes any real quantitative impact of educational and occupational selectivity on the American Jewish community. This is not necessarily the case for Israeli society, particularly in specialized occupational catego-

ries. In any case, the education and occupation of American olim are significant indicators of the types of Americans undertaking aliya.

The extraordinary educational achievements of American Jews including the dramatic increases in college attendance among the younger generation are well documented trends.³⁵ It is therefore not unexpected that American olim are well educated (Table 9): Over 40 percent of the American olim in the survey had 16 or more years of education compared to 18 percent of all olim (1969-70) and 6 percent of the Jewish population of Israel (1970). Whereas 9 percent of the olim from the United States had less than some high school education about half of the Jewish population of Israel and over a third of all olim had less than 9 years of education.

As might be expected, these total data on American olim are distorted by complexities of age and generation status. Among American olim who were not born in the United States (first generation) 30 percent had less than a high school education and two-thirds did not attend college. In contrast, none of the American olim born in the United States of American-born parents had not graduated from high school and fully 84 percent had some college education. Bearing in mind that 21 percent of the third generation are 18-21 years of age and 38 percent are 22-24 years of age, we may safely assume that their extraordinary educational level already achieved does not represent a final stage. Indeed differences between American olim of the second and third generation who completed at least 16 years of schooling reflect this age factor.

The fact that 78 percent of the second generation and 84 percent of the third generation among American olim had some college education establishes American olim as an educational elite in Israeli society. To what extent, however, do American olim represent an educational cross-section of American Jews? Although we are dealing with small numbers of American olim, gross comparisons between the educational level of American olim and the U.S. Jewish population reveal sharp educational selectivity. The comparison is limited to 1957 data of the American Jewish population 25 years of age and over, and relates separately to males and females (Table 10).

Although the educational level of Jewish males in the United

³⁵See the discussion in Goldstein and Goldscheider, *Jewish Americans*, Chapter 4; Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," pp. 60-68.

TABLE 9

Years of school completed, Jewish population of Israel, all olim, American olim (total and by generation status), aged 18 and over

AMERICAN OLIM 1969 - 70 ^a						
Years of school completed	Jewish population of Israel 1970	All olim ^a 1969-70	Total ^a	First generation		
				Second generation	Third generation	Third generation
Less than 9 years	49.7	35.7	9.3	29.9	0.0	0.0
9-12	35.5	31.7	23.8	36.4	21.6	15.7
13-15	9.2	14.9	25.2	16.8	13.5	32.7
16+	5.6	17.7	41.7	16.8	64.9	51.5
TOTAL ^b	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^aIncludes potential immigrants.

^bTotal includes small number of cases of unknown generation status.

Source: Data for all olim and Jewish population of Israel were adapted from Central Bureau of Statistics, *Survey on Absorption of Immigrants*, Special Series No. 381, Jerusalem, 1972, Table B, P. XI. Data on American olim are from special tabulations of the sample survey on immigrant absorption in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel.

TABLE 10
Years of school completed by American olim and U.S. Jewish population 25 years of age and older, by sex

<i>Years of school completed</i>	<i>American olim, 1969-1970</i>			<i>U.S. Jewish population, 1957</i>		
	<i>Total</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
<i>Elementary</i>						
0-7	8.1	2.6	11.7	15.6	14.7	16.6
8	6.1	10.3	3.3	13.1	13.1	13.1
<i>High school</i>						
1-3	9.1	15.4	5.0	10.0	9.7	10.2
4	16.2	5.1	23.3	29.0	21.5	35.8
<i>College</i>						
1-3	18.2	10.3	23.3	12.7	12.6	12.8
4+	42.4	56.4	33.3	17.3	25.6	9.7
<i>Not reported</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.8	1.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Data on American olim are from special tabulations of the sample survey on immigrant absorption in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel; data on U.S. Jewish population derived from U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey of March 1957 as cited in Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," Table 16.

States is high by total U.S. population standards,³⁶ it is clearly lower than that attained by American olim. About one out of four male Jews in the United States had completed college or attended graduate school and 38 percent had at least some college education. Among male olim, fully two-thirds attended college and over half had at least four years of college education. The difference in college attendance is even sharper among women: Among American women olim, 57 percent had some college education and one-third had at least four years of college education; among

³⁶See Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," Table 16, p. 63.

American Jewish women the proportions are 23 and 10 percent, respectively.

Part of the differences between the educational attainment of American Jews and olim from the United States reflect age differences (and, in turn, generational differentiation) between these populations. As noted earlier, olim tend to be younger and more concentrated among the American born of American-born parents, categories associated with higher educational attainment. Some additional part of the educational differences between American olim and U.S. Jews is a function of the changing level of education among American Jews between 1957 and 1969–70. Indeed more recent data from nine Jewish communities in the United States suggest such an increase: Studies between 1958 and 1966 show that about 25 percent of the adult Jewish population in these communities had four or more years of college education.³⁷ This level equals the U.S. national Jewish male educational level in 1957 but is higher than the educational level attained by the total 1957 U.S. Jewish population. Nevertheless, this level remains considerably below the proportion of American olim completing at least four years of college (42 percent). Hence, the evidence available points to a clear education selectivity in American aliya.

Consistent with these data on educational selectivity, the available information from immigration records in Israel points to an unmistakable and accentuated occupational selectivity among American olim in 1970 (Table 11). Over 60 percent of the male American olim and two-thirds of the female American olim were classified on arrival in Israel as professionals; over 80 percent of the male American olim and almost all the American women olim who were in the labor force had white-collar occupations. The occupational distribution of American olim is clearly extreme even by the distortedly high white-collar concentration—particularly professional and managerial—of the American Jewish population.³⁸

Comparisons between the occupational patterns of American olim on arrival in Israel and the only available national occupational data for American Jews (1957) reveal the relative over-concentration of professionals among male and female olim. Moreover the comparison points to the relative absence of managers and proprietors among American olim—whereas over a third of the U.S.

³⁷*Ibid.*, Table 15, p. 62.

³⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 68–79.

TABLE 11
Occupational distribution of American olim, total olim, and U.S. Jewish population by sex

	<i>American olim</i> 1970		<i>Total olim</i> 1970		<i>U.S. Jewish</i> <i>population</i> 1957	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Professional	62.5	66.9	39.0	47.3	20.3	15.5
Managers and proprietors	4.1	0.7	1.8	4.7	35.2	9.1
Clerical workers	5.1	27.2	11.1	29.0	8.0	43.9
Sales workers	10.3	1.1	16.0	2.9	14.1	14.4
Blue-collar	17.9	4.1	32.1	16.1	22.2	17.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Data on American olim were tabulated from unpublished immigration records in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics, Israel; data on total olim were adapted from Central Bureau of Statistics, *Immigration to Israel, 1970*, special series No. 349, Jerusalem, 1971, tables 18 and 19; data on total and American olim refer to occupation declared on arrival in Israel; data on the U.S. Jewish population were derived from the U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey of 1957 as cited in Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970," Table 21.

Jewish labor force was concentrated in the managerial group, only 4 percent of American olim were in this category. Similarly clerical and sales work characterized twice as many of the Jewish women working in the United States when compared to American women olim.

To be sure, the occupational distribution of the American Jewish population in 1957 is but a rough approximation of the patterns in 1970. Nevertheless information for over a dozen Jewish communities in the United States between 1958 and 1969 shows a range of 27 percent to 57 percent of the Jewish population in managerial positions and a range of 18 percent to 36 percent in professional positions.³⁹ Comparisons between the extremes of

³⁹*Ibid.*, Table 18, p. 70.

these ranges and the occupational distribution of American olim on arrival in Israel adds confirmation to the view that American aliya is overselective of professionals and underselective of managers. Moreover, selectivity extends to specific occupations within general categories. For example, detailed data not shown point to the fact that over half of the American olim classified as "professionals" were either teachers or engineers.

It should be noted that compared to the Jewish population in Israel (1970), olim from all countries tend to be more concentrated in white-collar, particularly professional, occupations. In Israel about 16 percent of the labor force is in the professional category, 19 percent are managers and clerks and a total of 43 percent are in white-collar occupations.⁴⁰ In contrast, data in Table 11 show that among all olim in 1970, 39 percent of the males and 47 percent of the females were in the professional category and two-thirds of the males and five-sixths of the females were in white-collar occupations. Hence what distinguishes American olim from the Israeli Jewish population and other olim is not the direction of occupational concentration, but its extreme form.

American olim therefore represent an occupational and educational elite in Israel. Whether they continue in these jobs in Israel and whether there is differential integration within Israeli society by occupational background are open questions that data to be gathered in the next several years will help answer. Nevertheless, what is clear from the current stage of analysis is that aliya from America is highly selective of professionals and underselective of managers. This reflects, in part, the greater ease in transferring professional skills from one labor market to another. On the other hand, managerial positions are much more localized and difficult to transfer between cultures. This is particularly true for those types of managerial positions that are dependent on personal contact and/or represent proprietorship—positions that are prevalent among a significant segment of the American Jewish population.

A final point relates to the types of professionals emigrating from the United States to Israel. These, we noted earlier, are very much concentrated in two categories—teachers and engineers. Although it would require more intensive analysis with more detailed data than now available, it seems reasonable to postulate

⁴⁰Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, *Survey on Absorption of Immigrants*, Table D, p. xiv.

that some Jewish teachers have responded to the personal, social, and professional problems of urban-racial conflict in the school system by deciding on aliya. Similarly, it is not unlikely that the over-concentration of engineers among American olim reflects the tight, over-supplied market for engineers in the United States. Hence, "push" factors may be playing an important role in the selective movement of American teachers and engineers to Israel. If this speculation is correct, it follows that the occupational composition of future American aliya will reflect variations in occupational opportunities for Jews within the United States. Perhaps, changes in the economic situation of the United States and in particular changing demands for certain skills will affect the level of Jewish immigration to Israel. At the same time, we should not lose sight of the fact that most Jewish teachers and engineers have not responded, and most likely will not respond in the future, to occupational difficulties by deciding on aliya. Rather the analysis of the occupational selectivity of American olim suggests that for some small segment of the American Jewish community, job factors are part of the total complex of issues that result in differential decisions for aliya.



THE RELIGIOUS-IDEOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF AMERICAN ALIYA

The fact that a significant proportion of American olim may have come to Israel searching for youthful adventure, quiet retirement, a job, or a mate does not necessarily reduce the significance of the "ideological" component of aliya. For every *oleh* who is a frustrated teacher, an unemployed engineer, an unmarried woman, or a retired widower, hundreds—more likely thousands—of American Jews in similar positions have sought alternative solutions to these situations *within* the American community. Nor should we lose sight of the fact that many American olim have voluntarily given up excellent jobs, homes, and incomes to settle as a family in Israel. Hence, the ideological components of aliya must be analyzed for all olim so that the motivational structure may be isolated and identified. On the other hand, whatever role ideological factors play

in aliya, they cannot be understood independently, or to the exclusion, of other migration pushes and pulls. Nor is it justifiable analytically to conceptualize ideology as a singular, uniform dimension or treat it in a narrowly defined context. The intricate ways in which ideological factors blend with other determinants of American aliya have not been identified fully; nor have the multifarious meanings of ideology been satisfactorily unraveled. Despite the preliminary stage of our analysis, one conclusion seems fully justified by the evidence: Ideology, at least those components that are more conspicuous and measurable, plays an important, if not critical, role in shaping the amount and type of American aliya. This ideology seems much less "Zionist" in the narrow, formal sense and much more "religious" in its broadest, sociological meaning.

It seems clear from the above that one central dimension in the sociological analysis of American aliya revolves around the religio-ethnic-ideological complex. To what extent, for example, do American olim conform to the prevalent pattern of religious identification, affiliation, ritual observances that have emerged in the American Jewish community? Does aliya constitute a qualitative drain of American Jewish (religious and secular) leadership? Are formal membership and active participation in Zionist organizations prerequisites for aliya? How is Jewish education related to aliya? The analysis of these and related issues is indispensable in any attempt to understand American aliya, to gauge its most likely future course, and to appraise the impact of aliya on the American Jewish community.

A full and complete picture of religio-ideological selectivity in American aliya cannot be drawn, simply because the requisite information on Jews in the United States is not available. Although general information and insightful journalistic evidence might be of some help, as are several community studies, there is no way to overcome the basic limitation that we do not know in simple quantitative terms the most elementary facts about the distribution of religio-ideological variables among American Jews.

The data on the religio-ideological characteristics of American olim are preliminary results of the absorption survey described earlier (derived from unpublished materials in the files of the Central Bureau of Statistics) and are limited by the small number of cases (about 150) for detailed analysis. Yet, consistent patterns emerge from the data that are at variance with what is generally held to characterize American Jewry and, hence, allow for tentative

conclusions to be reached with respect to the religio-ideological selectivity of contemporary American aliya.

We shall focus on five interrelated components of the religio-ideological syndrome: 1) membership and activity in Zionist organizations; 2) Jewish education; 3) religious identification; 4) synagogue attendance; 5) ritual observances. For each component, data on American olim will be presented by generation status.



ZIONIST ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

We do not have a measure of the extent to which specific Zionist ideological factors played a role in the recent aliya from the United States. Aliya itself is clearly the fulfillment of a central tenet of Zionist ideology, whether or not the *oleh* feels that way. Nevertheless, it should be noted that formal membership in Zionist organizations or active participation therein is not a necessary prerequisite for aliya. On the other hand, the lack of membership or activity in Zionist organizations does not necessarily imply the lack of Zionist ideology as a powerful motivating force in aliya.

The data from the survey of American olim show that about half of the American olim were not members of any Zionist organization before aliya and only about one out of every five American olim defined themselves as very active members (Table 12). Of equal importance, particularly for gauging the future, are generational patterns. Among American olim who were not born in America about 60 percent were members of American Zionist organizations; among American olim born in the United States of American-born parents 60 percent were not members of American Zionist organizations. Whether this generational pattern reflects the disenchantment of young American Jews with Zionist organizational affiliation, or simply reflects life-cycle factors, or general (rather than specifically Zionist) organizational non-affiliation among the young are open questions. What is clear is the noncorrelation between Zionist organizational affiliation and American aliya.⁴¹

⁴¹For similar conclusions, see Engel, "North American Jewish Settlers in Israel," pp. 163-164. See also Fred Sherrow and Paul Ritterband, "An Analysis of Migration to Israel," *Jewish Social Studies*, 32 (July 1970), pp. 214-223.

TABLE 12

Zionist organizational affiliation by generation status, American olim, 1969-70

<i>Zionist organizational affiliation</i>	<i>GENERATION STATUS</i>			
	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Total*</i>
Very active member	19.6	27.0	18.9	20.9
Active member	26.1	21.6	9.4	18.4
Not very active member	15.2	5.4	11.3	11.4
Non-member	39.1	45.9	60.4	49.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Total includes small number of cases where generational status is unknown.

Zionist organizational membership is neither a necessary precondition to aliya (i.e., half of those on aliya have not been members) nor is it a sufficient precondition to aliya (i.e., not all members of Zionist organizations go on aliya). The absence of comparative data on membership rates in Zionist organizations among American Jews prevents us from analyzing the extent to which American olim are more likely to be Zionist organization members than American non-olim. It is reasonable to assume that American olim are more likely to be affiliated with Zionist organizations but that such affiliation is a consequence rather than a causal factor in the chain of aliya determinants.



JEWISH EDUCATION

American olim are characterized by a fairly intensive background of Jewish education (Table 13). Fully 85 percent had some Jewish education and of those 63 percent attended for six or more years. Fully one-third of all American olim attended a Hebrew day school

TABLE 13
Jewish education by generation status, American olim, 1969–70

	GENERATION STATUS			
	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Total*</i>
<i>Jewish education: Type</i>				
Sunday school only	0	3	21	10
Afternoon Hebrew school	33	38	25	32
Hebrew day school	33	38	31	33
Other	16	8	8	10
No Jewish education	19	14	15	15
Total percent	100	100	100	100
<i>Jewish education: Years</i>				
Proportion with 6 or more years	62.9	65.6	63.6	63.2

*Total includes small number of cases of unknown generation status.

or yeshiva and of these 70 percent attended ten or more years. Although there is no way of comparing these data with evidence for the American Jewish population, there is no doubt that American olim have a more intensive Jewish education background than a cross-section of the American Jewish community.⁴²

Reflecting changes in the American Jewish community, a larger proportion of American born olim of American-born parents received only a Sunday school Jewish education than American olim who were not born in the United States. However, what appears most conspicuous in the distribution of Jewish education by the generation status of American olim are two facts: 1) the proportion attending Hebrew day schools varies little between generations—about one-third of the American olim of each generation attended Hebrew day school; 2) very little generation change may be noted in the proportion with at least six years of exposure to some form of Jewish education.

⁴² Cf. Engel, "North American Jewish Settlers in Israel," p. 165.

These data suggest that exposure to intensive Jewish education is an important factor determining American aliya—either because intensive Jewish education is an indicator of heightened Jewish-Zionist consciousness and/or because Jewish education imparts the religio-Zionist ideology of aliya.



RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION

Data in Table 14 show that over one-third of the American olim defined themselves as Orthodox and the remainder were about equally divided among Conservative, Reform, and other. Fully 46 percent of American olim defined themselves either as religious or very religious and about one-fourth defined themselves as not at all religious or secular. Not unexpectedly, a larger proportion defined their parental home as religious or very religious than so defined themselves. Over 60 percent of the American olim came from homes that were in their view religious or very religious and only 14 percent came from homes that were not at all religious.

These overall patterns of religious identification among American olim reveal a clear tendency toward the more Orthodox religious segment; a tendency not at all expected on the basis of the religious patterns in the American Jewish community. Data by generation status point in the same direction that would be expected from generational differentials in the United States, i.e., trends toward less religious identity among the third generation. However, what appears exceptional in the patterns of religious identification among American olim are not the trends but the concentration—over one-fourth of the American olim born in the United States of American-born parents define themselves as Orthodox and fully 43 percent of third-generation Americans on aliya define themselves as religious or very religious. Similarly no shift in the concentration of the Orthodox or of the “religious-very-religious” may be noted between the foreign born and the American born of foreign-born parents among American olim—a shift that would be unquestionably expected on the basis of evidence available on American Jews.

In sum, what emerge from these data on the religious

TABLE 14
*Selected measures of religious identification by generation status,
 American olim 1969-70*

	GENERATION STATUS			
	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Total*</i>
<i>Institutional identification</i>				
Orthodox	42	41	28	37
Conservative	24	19	18	20
Reform	14	27	28	22
Other	20	14	26	21
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
<i>Self-identification</i>				
Very religious	23	8	9	13
Religious	26	43	34	33
Not very religious	28	24	37	30
Not at all religious	23	24	20	24
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
<i>Religious identification of parental home</i>				
Very religious	39	24	10	23
Religious	33	38	45	40
Not very religious	17	19	29	23
Not at all religious	11	19	16	14
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

*Total includes small number of cases where Generation Status is not known.

identification of American olim are patterns of over-concentration and selectivity among religious and Orthodox Jews relative to the American Jewish population.



SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE AND RITUAL OBSERVANCES

Synagogue attendance among American olim before aliya seems well out of proportion to that generally estimated for the American Jewish population but quite consistent with the data on Jewish education and religious self-identification (Table 15). Almost 40 percent of the American olim attended synagogue at least once a week and less than a third never attended or attended only for the High Holidays (three times a year). Even among the third

TABLE 15

Synagogue attendance and selected rituals by generation status, American olim, 1969–70

	GENERATION STATUS			
	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>Total^a</i>
<i>Synagogue attendance</i>				
Once a week or more	44	46	32	38
Often ^b	15	22	25	21
Occasionally ^c	22	3	6	10
High holidays only	9	14	17	14
Never	11	16	21	17
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
<i>Proportion fasting on Yom Kippur</i>				
	77	81	69	75
<i>Proportion observing dietary regulations</i>				
	64	60	39	53

^aTotal includes small number of cases where generation status is not known.

^bOften = "often and on holidays."

^cOccasionally = "only on holidays and high holidays."

generation over 55 percent attended synagogue services at least several times a month. Among the American born of American-born parents there is a tendency toward less regular attendance at synagogue services and a trend toward non-attendance. These are not unexpected patterns given our impressions and studies of American Jewish communities. Again what is different among American olim is the unusually high level of regular attendance at synagogue services for each generation status category and not the trends between generation-status categories.

The data on two crude measures of ritual observances—fasting on Yom Kippur and observing dietary regulations—present a similar unexpected pattern (Table 15). Fully three-fourths of American olim fasted on Yom Kippur (before aliya) and over half observed dietary regulations. These levels appear quite high relative to impressionistic and scattered evidence on the American Jewish community. Again, the patterns generationally follow the expected trend, i.e., less observance among the American born of American-born parents. However, of more importance is the fact that 70 percent of third-generation Jews in America who are olim fasted on Yom Kippur and 40 percent observe religious dietary regulations.



THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN ALIYA

What can be pieced together from the analysis of data on the changing volume of American aliya and the social characteristics of contemporary American olim that may shed light on possible future patterns? We can do no more than project patterns of the past and present into the future. Assuming all other things are equal (they never are), some guesses about the future character and volume of aliya from the United States seem more reasonable than others.

To take a look first at the question of future mass aliya from the United States, several facts are clear. Since the middle of the nineteenth century, a small steady trickle of Americans has immigrated to Israel. Although the rate of aliya and the absolute number of olim from America have increased, particularly since the early 1960's, the level of aliya relative to the population size of the

American Jewish community is still minuscule. The events surrounding the Six Day War clearly accelerated the tempo of American aliya. Yet it seems that the forces operating to encourage aliya from the United States were rooted in pre-1967 conditions. Whereas some American aliya must have been precipitated by the "crises of 1967," it seems reasonable to argue that two more lasting factors were at work: 1) the radical political, economic, and psychological changes that followed in the wake of the Six Day War in Israeli society and 2) the changing relationship of Jews, particularly among the young third generation, to America and the American Jewish community that had in fact begun before 1967. These two sets of factors, in combination, were powerful elements in reinforcing the interdependence between American Jews and Israel and in channeling some of this new interdependence into aliya. Moreover, as in other migratory streams, aliya tends to feed on itself—through chain migration and through the recognition, acceptance, and institutionalization of aliya among American Jews.

The question of the future volume of aliya, therefore, revolves around 1) the continuance of social changes within Israeli society; 2) the degree to which aliya from the United States has reached its climax, having already drawn those American Jews who have not found American society conducive to their Jewish identity; and 3) the continuance of selected disenchantment among Jewish youth of America and American Jewish society. In the fall of 1972, there were early signs, statistical and impressionistic, that American aliya was declining. Whether this will be confirmed by future evidence and whether this can be attributed to changes in the political-social-psychological-economic situation in Israel and in the United States, or is a function of the shift in aliya encouragements and priorities to Russian Jewry, or is a consequence of disenchantment and disillusionment among American olim and *yordim* (returnees), or is some combination of these factors, are open questions. One conclusion, nevertheless, appears certain: Barring unforeseen and unpredictable circumstances, no mass aliya of Jewish Americans (mass in the sense of a significant proportion of American Jews) can be expected to occur in the near future. In large part, this is because alongside the nearly universal American Jewish concern for Israel lies the almost unanimous Jewish commitment to America and the genuine indifference (although no longer major hostility) to aliya. Hence large-scale aliya from the United States remains in the realm of fantasy.

A social profile of contemporary American olim includes several different components, reflecting some historical continuity but mostly revealing the heterogeneity of aliya determinants and differential probabilities of integration and absorption. Clearly, aliya from the United States does not represent a cross-section of the American Jewish population. American olim are on average more likely than Jews in the United States to be young, American born of American-born parents, female, and unmarried. Olim also tend to be selective by education and occupation and are much more likely to identify themselves religiously in a variety of ways.

Given a basic ideological thrust behind all aliya, several overlapping types of olim may be identified: 1) young men and women searching for adventure, education, religious and ethnic identity, or marriage; 2) older men and women settling in Israel after retirement; 3) educated and technically trained Jews who are in greater demand in Israel than in America; 4) Jews in search of Jewishness and Judaism who see Israeli society as a rich, natural environment for the expression of their own Jewish identity and that of their children.

While these types of American olim undoubtedly appeared in the past, one critical change lies in the broad area of religious identity. In the past, aliya was viewed by a select handful as a religious duty in the narrowest sense; contemporary aliya appears to be more a reflection of Jewish consciousness in the broadest sense. Aliya, for some, represents a response to the particular dilemmas of Jewish identity in an American pluralistic context.

The preliminary evidence available suggests quite clearly that it is unacceptable analytically to treat American olim as a homogeneous group with respect to background social characteristics, reasons for aliya, or requirements for social integration and absorption. A more intensive examination of the degrees of integration and the levels of return migration among American olim must await the collection of additional empirical materials. We may conclude, however, that aliya from the United States in the post-1967 era does not imply the severance of ties to America. American aliya must be viewed as an extension of the unique American Jewish dilemma. It has also become the master symbol of the intricate web of interdependence between the American Jewish community and Israeli society.