HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
California School

in cooperation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

SOME "WHYS" OF GIVING: A SURVEY OF THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS AMONG MOTIVATIONS OF GIVING, LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND; ATTITUDES TOWARD, KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES

A Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the double degrees

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

JEWISH COMMUNAL STUDIES

and

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

Esther Arner Shapiro

June 1976

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
California School

in cooperation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

SOME "WHYS" OF GIVING: A SURVEY OF THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS AMONG MOTIVATIONS OF GIVING, LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND; ATTITUDES TOWARD, KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES

Thesis approved by

Rosa F. Kogel

Barbara Solomon

Samson H. Levey

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the Board of Directors of the Long Beach Jewish Federation for permission to use campaign records and for the honorarium which helped to defray a portion of the expenses incurred in this project.

Mr. Sol Frankel, Executive Director of the Federation, gave enthusiastic support to the project as well as gracious assistance whenever called upon.

Leah Koortbojian, Director of the Women's Division of the Long Beach Jewish Federation, was as generous in deed as she is in spirit. She willingly shared with me her own extensive background in research and made several valuable suggestions.

Drs. Rosa Kaplan and Barbara Solomon, research advisors at Hebrew Union College and the School of Social Work at the University of Southern California, respectively, were of inestimable assistance. Each in her own way shared special perceptions and raised issues for inquiry that made this research project a true learning experience. I am grateful to Dr. Samson Levey, Director of the Graduate School, Hebrew Union College, for the diligent efforts he expended in checking scriptural references as well as his review of the manuscript.

In addition to assisting in locating needed

materials, Librarian Harvey Horowitz lightened the many hours spent at the Hebrew Union College Library with his good humor and affability.

To my dear friends Ethel Lipetz and Sol Strichartz I extend warmest thanks for their assistance in secretarial and clerical chores. They are true "menschen."

I wish to acknowledge my debt and express my appreciation to Professor Gerald B. Bubis, Director of the School of Jewish Communal Studies at Hebrew Union College. In sharing his particular vision of Jewish communal service and delineating the tensions that exist in Jewish life, he motivated me to explore new ideas and concepts. The fact that, in addition to being my teacher, he has become my friend gives me great pleasure.

My deepest gratitude is reserved for my husband Milt and our teenage daughters, Beth and Diane. From the very first glimmer of the idea to return to school through the final draft of this thesis, and in all of the joy and pain that lay between, they were there with encouragement, support and caring. I am particularly grateful to my husband. His understanding and succor sustained me through these two years. To my family I express my heartfelt appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The survival of their culture, institutions and values is a prime concern of the Jewish people. The distinguished Jewish historian Salo Baron takes note of this in commenting:

> What really matters in the Jewish religion is not the immortality of the individual Jew, but that of the Jewish people. Even when . . . Judaism adopted the belief in the immortality of the soul and in the resurrection, the central point remained the eternal life of the Nation.[1]

Underpinning this fundamental value of group survival are numerous services for Jewish persons on local, national and international levels. Jewish communal services form an integrated support system which has import in addition to meeting individual or family needs. In a very real sense, communal services become the social institutions which support the continuity of Jewish life. When viewed within this frame of reference, the significance of American Jewish philanthropy, defined for purposes of this study as the raising of funds for communal agency support,

---

[1]Salo W. Baron, The Social and Religious History of the Jews, 15 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), 1:136.

becomes apparent.

For effective planning, Jewish lay and professional leaders need to know who supports and uses their sectarian services and why, the nature and relationship of Jewish identity and commitment to philanthropy and its functional and dysfunctional aspects.

This study, conducted in Long Beach with the cooperation of the Long Beach Jewish Community Federation, seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between level of contribution to the United Jewish Welfare Fund and socioeconomic level of givers?

2. Is there a significant relationship between knowledge of community services and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund?

3. Is there a significant relationship between use of community services and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund?

4. Is there a significant relationship between synagogue affiliation and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund?

5. Is there a significant relationship between type of Jewish education and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund?

6. Is there a significant relationship between organizational membership and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund?

In addition, the study addresses itself to a broad range of social and economic characteristics, type of Jewish education, Jewish denominational preference and affiliation and organizational membership and participation of Jewish people in Long Beach.

Significance of the Study

Considering the enormous importance of fund raising to the American Jewish community, this researcher has been astounded by the lack of significant research on motivations related to giving. This situation may be partly explained by the inherent difficulty in measuring motives.

> Where motives are concerned, the techniques of science falter. We can seldom know all the complex factors that move another person to action, and he himself, with every attempt at honesty, may be quite mistaken.[2]

Although extensive writing in the field of philanthropy has been sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation, the foundation acknowledges that

> current information about giving is fragmentary and biased . . . few objective students have made philanthropy their central concern . . . [and] the bulk of what has been written on the subject consists of essays explaining personal points of views about giving, exhortations to generosity for a variety of reasons limited only by human imagination.[3]

Beyond this

> not even elementary facts about donors and their

---

[2]F. Emerson Andrews, Attitudes toward Giving (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1953), pp. 6-7.

[3]Idem, Philanthropic Giving (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950), p. 5.

objectives are known with reasonable accuracy and completeness. This seems out of character in a society which takes pride in efficient planning of its affairs.[4]

In 1974 philanthropy in the United States raised $26 billion, with individual contributions accounting for 72 percent of that figure. Undoubtedly, favorable tax policies influence philanthropic giving. Hutler notes, however, that it "was not American tax policies [that] . . . fathered American philanthropy" but rather that "tax incentives are a reflection and outgrowth of deep rooted [philanthropic] impulses in the American character."[5] The encouragement of giving is created by federal, state and local governments by allowing tax deductions for contributors and permitting tax exempt status to charitable, educational and religious organizations. Therefore, "in effect, the governmental bodies join the giver by waiving their share of taxes on the amount given."[6]

American Jews donate a greater proportion of their incomes to charity, both Jewish and non-Jewish, than do Protestants or Catholics. In accounting for this phenomenon, Kertzer indicates that

Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan's phrase "the education of the

---

[4]Ibid., p. 6.

[5]Albert Hutler, "People Give to People," San Diego, p. 233.

[6]Ibid., p. 236.

> conscience" is probably the best explanation of Jewish giving. An embattled people, faced with annihilation, expulsion, harassment and exploitation over the centuries, cultivated techniques of self-preservation which involved the closing of ranks, mutual assistance and the responsibility of the privileged for those less fortunate.[7]

The combination of historical memory and minority status of American Jews serves to perpetuate group life and community. These have become the prime functions of American Jewish philanthropy. For many, the continuation of Jewish life is a factor in motivations for giving, since in a minority community

> social solidarity that derives from a sense of shared destiny leads to a concerted effort to improve the minority situation. . . . The informal traditional mutual aid is reinforced by the formal associations of the community that has acquired adequate resources.[8]

Beyond the preservation of group life in this country, American Jews continue to regard themselves as part of the Jewish peoplehood, inexorably linked with brethren in Israel and the diaspora. The unprecedented amount of monies raised on behalf of Israel substantiates this point. Even those who disagree with Israel's domestic and foreign policies rarely go so far as to withdraw support from its welfare agencies.

> Israel has become the major unifying symbol in the community, in effect replacing traditional religious values as the binding ties linking Jews of varying

---

[7]Morris N. Kertzer, Today's American Jews (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), p. 94.

[8]Judith R. Kramer, The American Minority Community (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970), pp. 258-259.

> persuasions and interests. Fund-raising for Israel has not only come to dominate all communal activity, but has been the stimulus for the general increase in funds raised for across-the-board Jewish purposes in the United States since the end of World War II.[9]

In searching out motivations for giving, unquestionably the subtleties and complexities of Jewish identity play a significant role. Despite an extensive literature on Jews in America, significant research on the nature of Jewish identity is lacking. Although some work has been done on Jewish identity measurement scales, none of the instruments so far developed "have been adequately tested for validity and reliability on a large enough sample to make it possible to use them with any kind of confidence."[10]

While it is difficult to speak scientifically about the ways in which Jews define their identity,

> it would be a mistake to underestimate the commitment of most American Jews to Jewish identity. . . . To a large extent, the social scientist cannot measure the depth or strength of Jewish identity, much less uncover its bases. The best that can be done is to judge the behavioral responses of American Jews and to recognize that in a time of communal emergency when a threat to Jewish survival is perceived, the reaction is likely to be exceptional.[11]

---

[9]Daniel J. Elazar, "Decision Making in the American Jewish Community," in The Jewish Community in America, ed. Marshall Sklare (New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974), p. 78.

[10]Irving Canter, "The Ethnic Dynamic: Problems Related to the Jewish Component," in Research Readings in Jewish Communal Service, ed. Irving Canter (New York: National Association of Jewish Center Workers, 1969), p. 20.

[11]Charles S. Liebman, "American Jewry: Identity and Affiliation," in The Future of the Jewish Community in America: A Task Force Report, ed. David Sidorsky (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1972), p. 127.

Despite a decline in Jewish observance and a high level of acculturation, Jews maintain a strong pattern of associational Jewishness. In this respect, notwithstanding divergent ideologies, religious practices, cultural and social backgrounds, fund raising has a functional significance. Hence,

> the campaign for funds, itself, has become, intended or not, the means by which millions of Americans visibly identify themselves as Jewish, as belonging to an entity known as the "Jewish community."[12]

In summarizing this point, Winter indicates

> Jewish identity comes to focus each year in these campaigns; through a contribution one can express one's membership in Jewish life. Moreover, the overseas giving symbolizes the universal aspects of Jewish identity, reaching not only beyond ethnic and communal groupings, but also far beyond American identity.[13]

The motivations for giving thus far delineated and the traditions of Tzedakah discussed fully in a subsequent chapter are what Yaffe refers to as "public reasons."[14] However, other motivations for giving exist. Not the least of these is community pressure fostered by the mechanism of the campaign--peer solicitation, "card-calling" at public dinners and annual publication of donor contributions. In

---

[12]Robert I. Hiller and Meyer Schwartz, "Fund Raising as a Social Work Process," Journal of Jewish Communal Service 36 (Fall 1959): 59.

[13]Gibson Winter, Religious Identity (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 77.

[14]James Yaffe, The American Jews (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 171.

most cities membership in Jewish country clubs is contingent upon a substantial gift to the United Jewish Welfare Fund.

Unquestionably many find these techniques repugnant while at the same time acknowledging their successful result. Rabbi Kaelter addresses himself to this dilemma in noting:

> The central problem, as I see it, is the question of whether living a Jewish life is a private and voluntary affair or whether Judaism in its essence and the interdependence of the Jewish people, to which most Jews would bear witness, do not limit, if not eliminate altogether, claims to privacy and voluntarism. . . . I imagine that even severest critics would have to agree that without the instruments, strategies and tactics which we now employ, imperfect though they no doubt are, the Jewish enterprise here and abroad would grind to a deadly halt.[15]

In responding to criticism of "arm-twisting" techniques associated with Jewish philanthropy, Kertzer makes an interesting point:

> Social pressure is one of the devices society at large employs to impose certain norms of behavior. In an atmosphere where so many of these pressures are exerted to promote conspicuous consumption (of material goods) . . . a community which compels its members to maintain a high level of concern for the afflicted, the homeless and the innocent victims of injustice, can hardly be condemned for its social zeal.[16]

Among large contributors social prestige and vanity undoubtedly play a role in motivations for giving. Kramer

---

[15]Rabbi Wolli Kaelter, "A Question of Ts'Dakah," Long Beach Jewish Federation News, April 15, 1975, p. 6.

[16]Kertzer, p. 98.

and Leventman equate Jewish philanthropic contributions with "potlatch,"

> the Indian ceremony in which individuals give away or destroy large amounts of their property as a symbol of their status, measured by how much they can afford to waste. The more a man gives away, the higher his status and the greater the mortification of those who have been outdone.[17]

Plaques, testimonial dinners, prestigeous board memberships accrue to those who give generously. Of course, the motivations of social prestige and vanity are not unique to the Jewish community. The number of colleges, institutes and foundations generously endowed by non-Jews bear witness to the fact that "charity has traditionally been a form of conspicuous consumption in America."[18]

In his study, Andrews indicated that volunteer work has a larger correlation with large gifts than any other factor he isolated. Of course there is a question as to which is cause and which is effect.

> Did large gifts, or hope for such gifts result in invitation to board membership and other activities? Or did work with the agency sharpen interest and result in increasingly generous giving? Either may have been true in particular cases and probably both; but it is certain that the volunteer seldom fails to be, within his means, a generous giver.[19]

Some Jewish giving may be motivated by guilt in that "we all feel a little guilty for having been spared, so

---

[17]Judith R. Kramer and Seymour Leventman, Children of the Gilded Ghetto (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), p. 100.

[18]Yaffe, p. 175.

[19]Andrews, Attitudes toward Giving, p. 26.

there is expiation in giving."[20]

In addition, professional fund raisers recognize habit as a factor in giving--hence the drive to solicit "new" gifts, even modest ones, with the expectation of cultivating a "giving habit." In his 1955 study Massarik found that 63.3 percent of large givers, 55.6 percent of medium givers and 41.2 percent of small givers consider giving as automatic.[21]

Andrews, Hutler and Massarik all acknowledge a small percentage of givers who contribute to philanthropy because of the good feelings they derive from such an act. For some, giving is an opportunity for the donor to "share blessings" and increase his "self-respect."[22] It is somewhat ironic that what has traditionally been considered the "real" reason for giving in fact motivates so few.

Clearly the motivations for giving are complex and overlapping. It is hoped, of course, that the examination of a broad range of variables related to this subject will be useful to this community and others.

In addition, the results of this study are expected to provide a set of relevant statistics that could serve as a factual basis for Federation and affiliated agency

---

[20]Kertzer, p. 99.

[21]Fred Massarik, "What People Think about the UJWF," Research Service Bureau, Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, 1955. (Mimeographed.)

[22]Andrews, Attitudes toward Giving, p. 121.

planning and policy determination, particularly if the attitudinal and behavioral data reveal new insights about the nature and dynamics of Jewish commitment.

Plan of the Report

Succeeding chapters will present the historical and sociological background of the study, reviewing relevant literature. This will be followed by a discussion of the methodology, including sampling plan and instrument used for the collection of data.

The data will be analyzed in two parts. Part I will demographically describe the sample and Part II will be concerned with the relationship of variables associated with levels of giving. The report will conclude with a summary of the findings, their implications and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter will present the historical and sociological context of the study. The traditions of welfare and philanthropy as well as the tradition of community in Jewish life will be discussed. In addition, the translation of these traditions in the United States will be described. Finally, the history of the Jewish community in in Long Beach, California, the setting of this study, will be presented.

Jewish Traditions of Welfare and Philanthropy

"Thou shalt not harden thy heart nor shut thy hand from thy needy brother."[1] The literature on Jewish philanthropy, from ancient days through modern times, traditionally cites as its foundation the concepts of Tzedakah and Gemilut Hasadim. Although not wishing to repeat anew material that is expounded more thoroughly and expertly by others,[2] a brief overview of these concepts is in order.

---

[1] Deuteronomy 15:7.

[2] Boris D. Bogen, Jewish Philanthropy (New York: Macmillan Co., 1917) and Ephraim Frisch, An Historical Survey of Jewish Philanthropy (New York: Macmillan Co., 1924).

While acts of charity and benevolence are universal and feelings that promote care and concern for others are basic human traits, it is within Judaism that philanthropic acts take on the character of duty and obligation.

From the Biblical commandments to care for the poor, detailed rules for the dispensing and receiving of alms and assistance were elaborated in the Talmud,[3] reformulated by Maimonides and codified in the Shulhan Arukh.[4] Who is obligated to give, who is eligible to receive, how much should be given and in what manner have been carefully delineated.

The word Tzedakah, although often used synonymously with charity, has been given deeper and broader interpretation. Meaning "righteousness" or "justice," Tzedakah is "perhaps better rendered as assistance as a right and social equality,"[5] and is considered the highest application of Jewish ethical values.

The concept of Tzedakah must be viewed in relation to the traditional Jewish view of the poor which holds that

---

[3]Talmud: the collection of laws known as Mishnah, redacted by R. Judah and the commentary thereto, known as Gemara.

[4]Shulhan Arukh: commentary and synopsis of Jewish law written by Joseph Caro in the sixteenth century.

[5]Alfred J. Kutzik, Social Work and Jewish Values (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959), p. 34.

poverty is not a weakness of character nor a stigma of disgrace. The prophets did not condemn the poor for having brought poverty upon themselves. Rather the condition of poverty was viewed as having been brought about by social injustice and evils in the social order.

Tzedakah as delineated in the scriptural literature was not to be an act of charity to be bestowed upon the poor but was rather a right to which they were entitled. By accepting alms, the poor enabled the donor to perform a mitzvah.[6] "The poor man does more for the householder [in accepting alms] than the householder does for the poor man [by giving him charity]."[7]

Jewish tradition does not consider aid to the poor a matter of personal choice, for "benevolence is viewed, not as a matter of grace but as an imperative duty."[8] Tzedakah was an obligation and every person was obliged to give assistance according to his means. No one was to be exempt from the obligation of helping others. The poor were to be both beneficiaries and contributors.

Beyond the receiving of alms, the Bible commands that the poor were to benefit from the growth of the fields. At every harvest a corner of all grain fields,

---

[6] Mitzvah: a commandment. In common usage, mitzvah has taken on the meaning of a good deed--a meritorious act.

[7] Lev. R. 34:8. [8] Frisch, p. 9.

the gleanings and the forgotten sheaves were to be left for the poor and the stranger.[9] Further, the vineyards were not to be stripped bare and fallen grapes were to be left for the poor.[10]

While to help persons in need was conceived as doing what was right and just, Mordecai Kaplan cautions against regarding acts of benevolence as based solely on altruistic motives.[11] Noting the traditional religious belief in God's reward and punishment of good and evil respectively, "it was inevitable that the practice of charity should be brought under the category of 'meritorious deeds,'"[12] thereby assuring reward in this world and thereafter. Hence, Kaplan concludes in the early days of the religion the "Jewish system of charity was vulgarized by the belief in reward and punishment."[13]

A corollary to Tzedakah is the value of Gemilut Hasadim, which means bestowing acts of loving kindness. It is the giving of oneself in doing good deeds as contrasted with Tzedakah, which is usually taken to mean the giving of money (alms). It is so valued an ethic that "whosoever denies the duty of gemilut hasadim denies the

---

[9]Lev. 19:9 and 23:22. [10]Lev. 19:10.

[11]Mordecai M. Kaplan, "Jewish Philanthropy: Traditional and Modern," in Intelligent Philanthropy, ed. Ellsworth Faris et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), p. 70.

[12]Ibid., p. 71. [13]Ibid., p. 76.

fundamentals of Judaism."[14]

The significance of Gemilut Hasadim in Jewish tradition is apparent when we consider that the three pillars of Judaism "on which the entire world depends are Torah [wisdom], Temple [service] and Gemilut Hasadim [the bestowal of loving kindness]."[15]

While the foundations of Jewish charity are based on scriptural commandments, its communal character was nurtured by the realities of Jewish life. The history of the Jewish people is replete with accounts of expulsions and persecutions--inevitably strangers in strange lands. The capricious quality of life, coupled with economic uncertainty, was responsible in large measure for the development of forms of mutual help and social assistance among Jews. Hence,

> not because of any innate or cultural superiority of the Jews but due to their particularly hazardous experience, an extensive, considerably specialized social service organization was developed.[16]

Records of the last three centuries which preceded the common era, although somewhat incomplete, point to the fact that early assistance was provided the poor and the stranger through the synagogue.[17] Although the synagogue

---

[14]Ecclesiastes R 7:1.

[15]Maxim of Simeon the Just, Avot 1:2.

[16]Kutzik, p. 42. [17]Frisch, p. 34.

had primary religious and educational purposes, it also served to collect and distribute food and clothing as well as provide temporary shelter. Voluntary tithing furnished the necessary revenue.

During the Talmudic period (ca. 200 B.C.E.-ca. 600 C.E.) the public welfare system became institutionalized as a consequence of extreme need brought about by external social conditions both in Judea and diaspora communities. The primary form of public charity was the Kuppah,[18] which was prevalent in virtually every Jewish community and which exists even in modern day. Somewhat less widespread was the Tamhui,[19] which disappeared from use somewhere between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries.[20] Additional assistance was provided by a clothing fund and a burial fund.

Although by ca. 500 C.E. the public welfare system appeared to be founded on a clearly delineated tax structure, the shift from an agricultural to a commercial economy made judgment of a citizen's income less precise.[21] Consequently, contributions to the Kuppah and Tamhui were essentially voluntary and compulsion was used only as a last resort.

---

[18] Kuppah: charity chest fund.

[19] Tamhui: soup kitchen. [20] Frisch, p. 34.

[21] Alfred J. Kutzik, "The Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1967), p. 88.

> Each individual was permitted to determine the amount contributed, provided it did not fall below the standard minimum which was one-tenth his income . . . overseers were, however, armed with power to enforce the minimum decency in case such action was found to be necessary.[22]

Supervision and administration of the public funds was the responsibility of Gabbaie Tzedakah,[23] who were respected and honored members of the community.

The basic forms of charity assistance previously described continued into the Medieval Period (ca. 700-1800 C.E.). Extraordinary social welfare needs as a consequence of the Crusades and the dislocation of Jews throughout Europe accounted for an expanded welfare system. In addition to individual assistance available through the Kuppah, a variety of institutions and associations developed to meet social needs. Prime among these was the Hekdesh[24] which, while not universal, was found in many communities by the eleventh or twelfth century. From about the thirteenth century on, a variety of associations developed for care of orphans, visiting and assisting the sick, sheltering the aged, burying the dead and educating children of the poor.

Funding for these welfare activities came from voluntary contributions and compulsory assessment. In

---

[22] Frisch, p. 103.

[23] Gabbaie Tzedakah: charity collectors or treasurers.

[24] Hekdesh: combination shelter for the homeless and hospital for the sick.

some communities members were assessed special taxes which were collected by the Gabbaie Tzedakah and "the public welfare fund was augmented by various fines imposed by Jewish courts."[25] Individual philanthropy was also widespread during this period although "most voluntary individual benefactions had such strong social sanction and were so much a part of the role of a member of the Jewish community that they were actually compulsory."[26]

Jewish social welfare continued in modern Europe in much the same form. In the shtetls[27] of Eastern Europe the giving of Tzedakah was equated with being a good Jew and remained an important component of Jewish identity. Fund raising and donations rather than taxes supported welfare institutions. Tzedakah

> is firmly woven into the organization of the community--or rather, it provides the central mechanism by which the community functions. The interweaving of individual benefaction with collective community service, of the voluntary with the compulsory, of religious injunction with civic obligation, is essential to the organization and the flavor of the shtetl.[28]

Jewish Tradition of Community

A Jew alone is nothing. If he is with other Jews he

---

[25]Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 90.

[26]Ibid., p. 91.

[27]Shtetls: small, homogeneous cultural Jewish communities of Eastern Europe.

[28]Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog, Life Is with People (New York: Schocken Books, 1952), p. 194.

> is a force, because then automatically he inherits all of the strengths and all of the tears, all the despairs and all of the joys of his ancestors. A Jew alone cannot be Jewish. A Jew can be Jewish only if he is part of the community.[29]

The tradition of group life for the Jewish people has been historically documented. From the time of ancient Palestine when Israelites, as nomadic farmers, settled around brooks or springs and clustered together to resist Bedouin attack,[30] through the Kehillot,[31] shtetls, and ghettos of Europe, Jews almost everywhere have had some form of organization to govern their internal affairs.

Both external and internal factors have been cited to explain this reality. The historic segregation of Jews from the dominant society must, of course, be considered as an important determinant for this significant aspect of Jewish life. But, beyond this, specific cultural and religious needs have impelled Jews to seek community and maintain the integrity of group life.

The binding character of Halakhah[32] upon Jews in

---

[29]Elie Wiesel, "Teaching Jewish Identity," Jewish Education 44 (Winter-Spring 1975): 7.

[30]Salo W. Baron, The Jewish Community (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1942), p. 58.

[31]Kehillot: plural of Kehilla, community, the nucleus of Jewish local cohesion in small towns and settlements.

[32]Halakhah: generic term for the Jewish legal system which embraces personal and social relationships as well as all practices and observances of Jewish life.

all areas of life from ritual and religion to laws of property, procedure, contracts, private and public interchange, necessitated Jewish self government. The overriding importance of Halakhah is demonstrated by the fact that when conflict arose between Jewish law and that of the general society, rabbinic authority held that Jews must abide by their own law since it derived from the divinely ordained Torah[33] and was binding upon all Jews.

Perpetually uprooted,

> Jews were always moving, either by choice or by necessity, and when they came to new places, they had to set up communities because Jews cannot live as Jews--cannot function Jewishly--without organized communities.[34]

At times the Jewish desire for group survival has been considered to have a mystical quality. From Baron's perspective,

> viewing historical developments less supernaturally, one may see in such an urge only a conscious or unconscious group desire to preserve its identity and to develop its life along accustomed lines. The adaptation of institutions to new and unprecedented situations may merely be the enforced modification of such a drive for continuity.[35]

It is not necessary to weight the relative impor-

---

[33]Torah: The derivation of the word means "to teach," although it is loosely used to designate the Bible (Old Testament) as a whole as well as the entirety of Jewish traditional law from the Bible to the latest development of Halakhah.

[34]Daniel Elazar, "Kinship and Consent in the Jewish Community: Patterns of Continuity in Jewish Communal Life," Tradition 15 (January 1975): 66.

[35]Baron, pp. 21-22.

tance of these external and internal forces which have contributed to the cohesiveness of the Jewish people. It is sufficient to acknowledge, as does Baron, that

> between the two extremes of mystic inner urge and outward political pressure, one must find one's road, recognizing the importance of both factors in varying degrees throughout the history of the disperson.[36]

In discussing the phenomenon of Jewish national existence, Sherman reiterates that

> Jewish history was what it was, and during its course there was hammered out a will to collective life which has no parallel in any other people. Whatever the original sources of this will, it is one of the great positive factors in Jewish existence and the molding of the Jewish fate. Religion and group responsibility are the two most significant sources of the Jewish will to live.[37]

Antecedents of Jewish autonomy in internal affairs date back to the Hellenistic-Roman diaspora. To a large extent, Jews were able to live according to their own laws and customs with the sanction of Roman authorities. The Jewish high priest had influence with the imperial government;

> thus Judaism became an officially recognized and protected religion, and it is important to understand that the Jewish sense of community had its origin in this context. With its center in the synagogue, the community became a remarkably effective, stable and enduring means of supervising, disciplining, instructing and protecting its members.[38]

---

[36] Ibid., p. 22.

[37] C. Bezalel Sherman, The Jew within American Society (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1961), p. 136.

[38] Frederick Schweitzer, A History of the Jews since the First Century A.D. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1971), pp. 28-29.

In Alexandria, Egypt there existed a large Jewish community which was not unified. Numerous separate synagogue-communities developed and functioned along side of each other. In other cities in the diaspora, leadership of the community resided with an ethnarch and was later passed on to a council of elders.

Thus, there were two structural models of diaspora communities during ancient times--the synagogue as the local center of an autonomous community and synagogues as separate communal units.

It was during the Middle Ages, with the emergence of cities and states, particularly in Christian Europe, that local community autonomy flourished. The formation of the European ghetto and a self determined life for segregated Jewry was due in part to "feudalism's dissolution of European society into a hierarchy of corporate bodies, each with a separate function and political status."[39]

Primary institutions of each community were the synagogue and the cemetery. In Eastern Europe, the Kahal[40] was officially recognized and empowered by the government to collect taxes from members of the Jewish community. Other important functions of the Kahal were the

---

[39] Baron, p. 209.

[40] Kahal: administrative body of Jewish communities.

organization and supervision of religious education, administration of charitable institutions, supervision of Kashrut[41] in public institutions, the erection and maintenance of Jewish courts of law and general supervision over religious, educational, economic and social life of the community.[42] From this description, the control exercised over individual members of the community is obvious.

The imminent decline and disintegration of autonomous Jewish communities became apparent by the middle of the eighteenth century. A combination of early capitalism and the growth of an emancipated citizenry about the time of the French Revolution contributed to the dissolution of self governing corporate bodies. "The forces of European and Jewish Enlightenment tended to undermine all inner forces of cohesion."[43] Hence the coalescing of a number of factors brought about the end of Jewish self rule.

> The imposition of heavy responsibilities on lay leaders by government and the inherent social structure fostered oligarchic oppression. Emergent social consciousness sharpened the class struggle of the poor and the guilds. Individualistic tendencies mitigated against the social control of the Kahal. The Haskalah movement in Central and Eastern Europe became religiously iconoclastic and anti-traditional, launching its most venomous onslaught on the "forces of darkness" in control of the Kahal and on its despotic rule. The increasing complexity of business relations after the Industrial Revolution did away with the simpler transactions of the pre-capitalistic era when Jewish civil law was adequate for judges

---

[41] Kashrut: dietary laws.

[42] David Bridger, ed., The New Jewish Encyclopedia (New York: Behrman House Inc., 1962), p. 135.

[43] Baron, p. 353.

> to make decisions based on talmudic law. The old ban against gentile courts was increasingly disregarded; the Jewish civil judiciary shrank. Finally, the force of religious values, which underpinned the medieval social control, gave way to secularist and humanistic attitudes.[44]

What is clear from this brief historical overview is that the specific nature of Jewish community that developed in areas in which Jews lived was shaped by the political, social and economic environment of the host country. The legislative and administrative regulations of the dominant society in large measure circumscribed the features of the Jewish community and interrelationships with the larger society.

American Jewish Philanthropy

> Here were the roots of a unique form of philanthropy. Because America represented a pragmatic civilization in which the doer was more important than the thinker, the American Jew envisaged his contribution to the Jewish community in practical terms. In generosity and efficiency American Jewish philanthropy had no parallel.[45]

Included in the baggage which Jewish immigrants brought to this country were traditions of philanthropy and community. These became the instruments which enabled them to make their way in their new land while still maintaining their religious-cultural distinctiveness. As the

---

[44] Encyclopedia Judaica (New York: Macmillan Co., 1971), 5:823.

[45] Howard M. Sachar, The Course of Modern Jewish History (New York: Delta Books, 1958), p. 526.

perennial minority "without a homeland for centuries, the Jews . . . had a set of institutions already adapted to exile."[46]

The minuscule Jewish population of the early colonial period was composed primarily of Sephardic[47] Jews and a lesser number of Ashkenazi[48] Jews. By the time of the American Revolution, Jews numbered only two or three thousand of the three million population and were about equally divided between Sephardim and Ashkenazim.[49]

Jewish communities were fairly homogeneous. "Sharp divisions and social stratification were aspects of communal living which did not become significant until the last decade of the 19th century."[50] In most communities, Jewish communal activities originated with the establishment of a chevra kadisha[51] for the care of the dead. Jewish communal life centered around the synagogues which, in addition to being houses of worship, were the center of educational, social and philanthropic activity. "Charitable effort was

---

[46] Judith R. Kramer, The American Minority Community (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970), p. 88.

[47] Sephardic: Jews from Spain and Portugal.

[48] Ashkenazi: Jews from Central and Eastern Europe.

[49] Sachar, p. 166.

[50] H. L. Lurie, "Jewish Communal Life in the United States," in The Jewish People, Past and Present, ed. R. Abramovitch et al., 4 vols. (New York: Marsten Press, 1946), 4:191.

[51] Chevra kadisha: burial society.

largely individual and unorganized with the more successful and charitable-minded assuming personal responsibility as leaders of their congregations."[52] Social service needs were met by mutual aid which was a major concern of the synagogue community. The mutual aid character of assistance included the granting of "pensions" to the aged, widowed and infirm members of the community-congregation.[53]

It was through the synagogue that alms were distributed to the local poor, the transient and the newcomer. Funds for such charity depended upon membership dues, charity box collections and contributions made at weddings and funerals.

The migration of large numbers of German Jews in the mid-1800's substantially altered the role of the synagogue. An estimated 200,000 Jews arriving from Central Europe between 1830 and 1860 severely strained the ability of congregations to meet immigrant needs. As a result, there was a decline in the role of the synagogue as the focal point of Jewish life.

> It was not only the fragmentation of religious units . . . but also the multiplicity of Jewish communal activities which doomed the over-all synagogue domination. The problem of raising funds for the crush of frightened, penniless Jewish immigrants . . . simply became too large for the synagogues to handle.[54]

---

[52]Lurie, p. 191.

[53]Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 190.

[54]Sachar, p. 173.

The organizing of autonomous philanthropies, distinct from religious institutions, was consonant both with European custom and American practice. As discussed in the section on the "Jewish Tradition of Community Welfare," in larger European communities Jewish philanthropies and synagogues were organized separately and that pattern was easily adapted to the new environment. Additionally, philanthropy in America had a distinctive voluntary character, with associations developed to support a wide variety of causes. With the German immigration the import of mutual aid societies waned and the charitable organization, with its attendant social prestige, grew in number and influence. Jewish philanthropy "was now sanctioned as an expression of Americanism and modern civilization as well as Judaism."[55]

Commitment to "taking care of their own" resulted in expansion of the Jewish welfare structure.

> In 1860 there were some thirty-five permanently organized burial, mutual aid and charitable societies in New York, twenty-three in Philadelphia and several in each of the small Jewish communities of the mid-West.[56]

In addition to relief societies, specialized social agencies such as orphan asylums and hospitals were established in the larger communities.

---

[55]Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 197.

[56]Sachar, p. 173.

Severe economic hardship, famine and pogroms of Eastern Europe served as the impetus for the great waves of Jewish migration to these shores. Restrictive government policies, based on oppression and discrimination, were successful. Between 1881 and 1924 the incredible number of 2,388,000 Jews immigrated to the United States.[57]

The absorption of so massive a population, most of whom were penniless, and the enormity of their needs mobilized existing philanthropic organizations and was the catalyst for the development of new mutual aid societies. Prime among these were the Landsmanshaften, self help groups promoted by the immigrants themselves for the purpose of creating a cultural framework by which to preserve the values of the old world. Serving the role of extended family, Landsmanshaften, secular and independent from congregations, were mutual benefit societies for newcomers from the same European town or community. In addition to easing the shock of transplantation, these societies offered mutual insurance and burial aid.

The homogeneity of the earliest Jewish communities was shattered by the newcomers who came to this country with diverse political and economic ideologies and a wide spectrum of religious practice. There were the orthodox and the secularist "freethinkers," the "nationalists" committed to Zionism, the Yiddish nationalists and the

---

[57]Liebman Hersch, "Jewish Migrations during the Last Hundred Years," in The Jewish People, Past and Present, ed. R. Abramovitch et al., 1:415.

socialists as well as others.

Conflict and dissension among the immigrants manifested itself in the duplication of organizations and institutions they developed. By 1918, in New York City alone there were 3,637 separate Jewish organizations. These included 858 congregations, 69 schools, 101 recreational and cultural agencies, 2,168 mutual aid societies and other economic agencies, 164 philanthropic and correctional agencies and 277 other organizations.[58]

While most immigrants were able to become independent and self supporting soon after arrival, others needed more extensive assistance. Jewish welfare work of the early 1900's was concerned with a broad range of immigrant needs. Aid was required for those with long-term problems of immigrant adjustment, the transient, the tubercular, deserted families, and delinquent children.

Although much assistance was offered the immigrants by already established wealthy German Jews, tensions developed between the two groups. The German Jews were fearful that the huge influx of impoverished brethren would damage their relatively secure status. In fact, during the early period of the mass migrations, initial attempts were made to restrain and impede Eastern European immigration.[59]

---

[58]Harry L. Lurie, A Heritage Affirmed (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961), p. 187.

[59]Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 210.

> When it became clear that the new immigration was inescapable, American Jewry offered help that was unstinting, energetic, spontaneous. That the immigrants were fellow-Jews, and, if penniless, must not be permitted to fall into the hands of the caretakers of the poor or be consigned to the miserable almshouses of the day, was beyond question. This obligation was assumed as naturally by the thoroughly Americanized German Jews of the 1880's as it had been by their ancestors in every country for centuries.[60]

Assistance German Jews provided the needy masses had a "noblesse oblige" quality. Although Sachar reports that influential German Jews "in virtually all instances . . . demonstrated the highest degree of good will and concern for their less fortunate brethren,"[61] he does take cognizance of strain in the relationship between the two groups. Referring to organizational plans which resulted in the formation of the American Jewish Committee, he notes that the German Jews

> had no intention of creating an organization based on democratic elections; a mass francise, after all, would inevitably return a number of Russian-Jewish delegates, and . . . result in the use of undisciplined and irresponsible mass pressures.[62]

The approach-avoidance character of relations between German and Eastern European Jews impacted on the latter's access to positions of status in already established philanthropic institutions. Kutzik delineates this issue by noting that

---

[60]Herman D. Stein, "Jewish Social Work in the United States 1654-1954" (Ph.D. dissertation, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1958), p. 64.

[61]Sachar, p. 520. [62]Ibid., p. 521.

> for a quarter of a century after the Civil War Jewish philanthropy was monopolized by Jews of German background. The socially superior but numerically and financially inferior old-line "Sephardic" Jews were further integrated with the "Germans" through involvement in philanthropic activity, but the exclusion of even those East Europeans who had arrived in the 1840's divided them from the dominant group, forcing them to "prefer" to devote their energies and funds to the mutual aid organizations which they controlled. The consequent effect of the philanthropy of the dominant group in forming a separate East European sub-community was intensified in the period of mass immigration when, in addition to the exclusion of East European philanthropists, the beneficiaries were mainly Eastern European immigrants who resented the treatment they received, also preferring their own mutual aid beyond the extent normal for lower class groups.[63]

It was philanthropic efforts that eventually drew the two groups together. As Eastern European Jews rose in socioeconomic status from lower to middle class and increasingly participated in established charities, philanthropy was "in these years . . . the lone area of social encounter between uptown and downtown Jews."[64]

The need to coordinate the plethora of local charities, each replete with its charity socials or other extensive fund raising devices, resulted in a move to federate Jewish philanthropies. Combining hundreds of separate fund raising campaigns into one had obvious advantages. It not only curtailed unnecessary duplication of expenses but served to conserve vast amounts of energy required for the

---

[63]Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 333.

[64]Moses Rischlin, The Promised City: New York's Jews 1870-1914 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 111.

fund raising process. In addition to these pragmatic reasons geared toward sound management and economy, federated fund raising was useful in limiting the extreme competition between agencies and the resultant harassment of potential donors.

The first formal federation structure was created in Boston in 1895. Although not without problems, its success was soon apparent and led the way for a steady increase in the number of Jewish communities to establish federations. By 1917, when the New York Jewish Federation was organized, there were forty-five federations and that number grew to ninety-three by 1969.[65]

Under the aegis of most federations are the welfare serving agencies of the Jewish community which include family agencies, community centers, hospitals, homes for the aged and vocational guidance clinics.

Duplication of fund raising endeavors also developed among groups whose purpose was to raise funds for overseas relief directed toward the increasing needs of European Jews following World War I. Religious, labor, Zionist and fraternal orders participated in the formation of individual organizations as the Central Relief Committee (Union of Orthodox Congregations), American Jewish Relief Committee, and People's Relief Committee. Recognition of

---

[65] Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 349.

the need for more efficient and effective collection and distribution of overseas relief led to the merger of the aforementioned groups and the 1915 formation of the Joint Distribution Committee, which concentrated its efforts on European aid.

The need for resources for Palestine was the impetus for the creation of the United Palestine Appeal, which was engaged in central fund raising for the major programs in Palestine. Notwithstanding severe ideological differences related primarily to the percentage of fund distribution for European and Palestinian requirements respectively, in 1939 the Joint Distribution Committee merged with the United Palestine Appeal to form the United Jewish Appeal. Local causes were also united under the combined Jewish Appeal and for many years Jewish communities conducted two separate campaigns for local and overseas needs. Today, in almost every city, funds are raised through one campaign, the United Jewish Welfare Fund, conducted by the federation.

That philanthropy occupies a central role in American Jewish life is not to be disputed. Its primary thrust was relief of the settled poor and Americanization of immigrants. However, the upward mobility of immigrant families and the growth of public welfare (for those whose period of residency was sufficient so as not to threaten their immigrant status) substantially reduced the original function of philanthropy. What appears to have developed,

in a sense, is goal succession, since

> despite the virtual elimination of the domestic welfare problems which had always been its major concerns, American Jewish philanthropy expanded during these decades (since 1920) at a greater rate than ever before, particularly after World War II when the welfare needs of the Jews . . . were at an all time low. While meeting the enormous welfare requirements of Jews overseas, the social requirements of American Jews that Jewish philanthropy met were more than ever apparent.[66]

In the years between 1920 and 1945, Jewish philanthropy took on important new community relations dimensions. Related to the rise in anti-Semitism was the growth and support of "civic defense" agencies: American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The traditional raison d'etre for Jewish philanthropy has always had, in addition to pure welfare needs, the component of group survival. The system maintenance aspect is clear in that "in addition to its historic significance in American Jewish life it [philanthropy] continues to be the major mechanism for the maintenance of Jewish communities and the social identity of [their] members."[67] This point is expanded by Lurie, who sets forth the major aims of the programs of federations:

1. To organize the Jewish community for the purpose of promoting the welfare of individuals and to help individuals, families and groups to adjust to the conditions of their environment.

---

[66] Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," pp. 646-647.

[67] Ibid., p. 653.

2. To organize the Jewish community in order to assure the continuity of the traditional Jewish culture and Jewish religious beliefs and practices and to counteract tendencies toward loss or abandonment of Jewish cultural values and traditions.

3. To organize the Jewish community in order to facilitate the processes of cultural evolution and of adaptation to American life. Such programs may at the same time strive for the integration of the historical continuity and traditional values of Jews with the conditions of a multicultural environment, or to the evolution of current religious ideas.

4. To organize for the protection of Jews in what may be considered an unfavorable or hostile environment; to help avoid the undesirable aspects of prejudice and of discrimination; to improve group relationships and help resolve the difficulties arising from minority status.

5. To organize the community in order to retain, continue and expand the close group association of Jews, so that they may effectively assist Jews in other lands, and to help the state of Israel cope with its problems and difficulties.[68]

The connection and interrelationship between the functions and roles of federations and successful fund raising is made explicit by Zucker:

> The basic strength of the campaign lies in the year-round performance of the Federation and its agencies. If Federation is a sound planning instrument, if its agencies perform in a manner to commend themselves to the contributing community, if the board and staff of the Federation and its agencies are convinced of the soundness of the effort to the point where they themselves contribute liberally, if a large number of laymen participate year-round in the work of the Federation and its agencies, then the campaign will be looked upon as a joint effort to enable the Jewish community to carry on its work. Otherwise it tends to be viewed as the province of fund-raisers who dun people

---

[68] Lurie, A Heritage Affirmed, pp. 210-211.

once a year for a contribution.[69]

There appears to be universal agreement among commentators on modern Jewish life with regard to the unifying function of Jewish philanthropy. Typical of many is Ginzberg's statement:

> . . . the marked degree of heterogeneity which long characterized American Jewry--largely a reflection of successive and continuing waves of immigrants from different parts of Europe--placed almost inseparably hurdles in the path of group action; for a long time, the only meeting ground was "charity." Irrespective of one's social or economic status, or political or religious beliefs, it was possible to join with others to raise funds for the Jewish needy at home and abroad.[70]

That American Jewish philanthropy also has a dysfunctional aspect appears to be increasingly acknowledged. The basic thesis of the Kutzik dissertation is that, in addition to its positive features, American Jewish philanthropy is concomitantly dysfunctional in that

> philanthropy has been the primary influence in dividing communities, preventing upward mobility of otherwise qualified individuals of immigrant background, bringing about status loss for most beneficiaries, etc.[71]

Additionally, American Jewish philanthropy

> has been the primary means of maintaining the Jewish group in America [and] . . . has done so by integrating Jewish communities through the social ranking of individuals whose statuses have depended primarily on their relation to this institution.[72]

---

[69]Henry L. Zucker, "What Every Social Worker Should Know about Federated Jewish Fund-Raising," Journal of Jewish Communal Service 45 (Fall 1968): 61.

[70]Eli Ginzberg, Agenda for American Jews (New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1950), p. 17.

[71]Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 38.

[72]Ibid., p. 37.

That benefits accrue to those who sit on federation boards, often by virtue of their own substantial contributions, is clear.

> What is really happening is that power lies in the hands of those who give the money, and by far the largest portion of the total funds available to the Jewish community is provided by the small minority of contributors. The equation becomes simple; the elite are the equivalent of the large donors; the subjects of the elite are the smaller givers.[73]

Those in positions of power often perpetuate a closed system. "Such people often form a locked and blocked hierarchy with no way in for other members of the community."[74]

Elazar takes a somewhat more positive view regarding the governance of the Jewish community. He conceives of community leadership as a "trustee of doers," self selected because of their interest and willingness to participate.

> They perceive of their function as managing the community's affairs in trust for its members, the Jewish people as a whole, just as earlier generations of leaders saw themselves as managing the community's affairs as trustees of God. It is this sense of trusteeship which keeps the communal leadership from being an oligarchy, or a small body that manages the community for its own profit. Every significant Jewish interest has the right to claim a place in the trusteeship of doers and is accorded that place once it brings its claim to the

---

[73] Judah J. Shapiro, "How Democratic is the Jewish Community?," New York. (Mimeographed.)

[74] Morton I. Teicher, "What Are the Criteria for 'A Good Community'?," Jewish Social Work Forum 3 (Fall 1966): 18.

attention of the appropriate leadership by "doing."[75]

Beyond the social stratification aspect of American Jewish philanthropy, the fact that community finance plays such a central role in the life of the Jewish community a priori leads to the avoidance of public stands on controversial ideological issues. Bubis correctly highlights the "leveling" function of fund raising by indicating that

> the need to raise maximum sums for legitimate services necessitates minimizing conflict [therefore] problem solving and decision-making must frequently be at the lowest common denominator of consensus.[76]

In explaining this avoidance of conflict, Elazar indicates that it

> reflects the traditional desire of a minority to avoid risking any weakening of the ties that bind its members together. But, in part, it also reflects the fact that the voluntary leaders in the American Jewish community are overwhelmingly recruited from the world of business and commerce where open conflict is considered "bad form" and decisions are reached in such a way as to minimize the appearance of conflict if not its reality.[77]

The extensive communal concern with fund raising may also be dysfunctional in that the energies required for successful campaigns drain the talent and vigor of both lay leaders and professionals. Wide ranging issues in the areas of Jewish education and social planning are not given

---

[75]Daniel J. Elazar, "Decision-Making in the American Jewish Community," in The Jewish Community in America, ed. Marshall Sklare (New York: Behrman House Inc., 1974), p. 109.

[76]Gerald B. Bubis, "Brokha Brokers and Power Brokers," Jewish Spectator 40 (Spring 1975): 59.

[77]Elazar, "Decision-Making in the American Jewish Community," p. 107.

equal priority. Rabbi Simon G. Kramer speaks to this point in asserting

> there are many disturbing features in all this hub-bub of fund-raising and the successes we rejoice over. The lay leader, the volunteer worker who seeks the recognition of a grateful community and the professional who seeks both the glory and the high remuneration that come with success will after a while tend to regard fund-raising as a game to be played. Winning the game becomes the all important desideratum. The purposes and goals for which the game was established can very easily be forgotten. Fund-raising in our day tends to become not a worthy means to a worthy end but rather an end in itself.[78]

Without underestimating the tensions herein described, there are few participants in the organized Jewish community who would not agree with Kutzik's conclusion that "the positive effects of Jewish philanthropy for both communities and individuals, historically and currently, outweigh its negative ones."[79]

A History of the Long Beach Jewish Community[80]

Early records indicate that the first Jewish family arrived in Long Beach in 1898, followed slowly by several others. By 1910, when the total Long Beach population was 55,381, there were less than a dozen Jewish families in the

---

[78]Simon G. Kramer, "Fund-raising in America," Jewish Observer and Middle East Review 30 (July 29, 1966): 15.

[79]Kutzik, "Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy," p. 38.

[80]The material in this section, through 1957, is drawn substantially from Sidney A. Hartmann, The History of the Long Beach Jewish Community (Long Beach: Long Beach Jewish Community Council, 1957). Mr. Hartmann was Publicity Relations Director of the Council from 1957 to 1963.

area. For the most part they were scattered throughout the city and unconnected with each other.

The year 1913 marked the occasion of the first High Holy Day services. Lacking a minyan[81] by one, a trip was made to Boyle Heights, the area of heavy Jewish population in Los Angeles, and a participant was recruited.

The Jewish population had grown to about twenty-five families by the spring of 1915. That was the year the first organizational attempt was undertaken with the development of the Long Beach Benevolent Association, which had religious, social and philanthropic purposes. Its original project was the establishment of a religious school which received little support and was quickly abandoned. The dissolution of the Long Beach Benevolent Association itself soon followed. Attempts to establish a B'nai B'rith Lodge also met with no success.

The need for religious expression resulted in the formation of a group of men who met in each other's homes for Friday evening services.

By 1919 the Jewish community began to take root, assisted by an increasing Jewish population. The newcomers came to Long Beach as a result of business opportunities brought about by the general growth in population resulting from numerous wartime government contracts. Individuals with prior organizational experience and traditions of par-

---

[81] Minyan: quorum of ten males for public religious services.

ticipation in their former communities formed the nucleus of a B'nai B'rith Lodge in 1920 and spearheaded the launching of the Jewish community with attendant social and philanthropic activities.

The concept of a community building which would serve as a rallying point for all Jewish activity was proposed by one family who offered to donate property conditional upon the raising of additional funds to erect a suitable structure. Successful fund raising efforts resulted in the completion of a Community Building in the spring of 1922. The building served as a meeting place for Jewish groups including B'nai B'rith, the Community Building Association, Jewish Women's Club, Jewish Mother's Alliance, ladies' and men's gym classes, and Young Folks Section.

Attempts to develop a formal religious institution through the Long Beach Jewish Congregation met with conflict and difficulty. Consensus could not be reached between reform and orthodox Jews, and tensions escalated. When discussions of the formation of a temple culminated in a motion to establish it as reform, orthodox members who had previously joined the Long Beach Jewish Congregation resigned. The Jewish Community Building became Temple Israel, reform, while orthodox Jews met for a brief period in the Odd Fellows Building before disbanding.

Tension between reform and orthodox Jews was not

unique to Long Beach. Referring to mid-nineteenth century efforts to unite the American Jewish community, Sachar reports that plans "floundered because the devotees of Orthodoxy and Reform were constantly at each other's throats."[82]

The need for a conservative congregation providing a full range of religious services resulted in the organization of Temple Sinai in 1924. Hartmann reports that "the life of the Long Beach Jewish Community for many years to come was to revolve around Temple Israel and Temple Sinai with B'nai B'rith serving as the common meeting ground for both groups."[83]

By 1927 there were 375 Jewish families in the Long Beach area including several in Wilmington and San Pedro. Succeeding years saw the development of the National Council of Jewish Women and B'nai B'rith Women.

The forerunner of the United Jewish Welfare Fund, "United Jewry," was created in 1929 and raised approximately $3,900.

> From its inception, regardless of community tensions that were bound to develop from time to time, the United Jewish Welfare Fund was to act as a uniting force around which the Jewish community rallied year after year fulfilling its obligation of raising funds for local, national and overseas philanthropic needs.[84]

In 1937 Temple Sinai affiliated with the National

---

[82]Sachar, p. 178. [83]Hartmann, p. 18.

[84]Ibid., p. 24.

Jewish Welfare Board and assumed the responsibility of providing Jewish associations for the Jewish sailors stationed in Long Beach. Out of this development grew a Navy YMHA.

The increasing growth of Jewish population and its movement to the eastern part of the city, as well as the disrepair of existing buildings, led to the relocation of both Temple Israel and Temple Sinai in the early 1940's.

While the outbreak of World War II resulted in major changes in most American communities, its impact on the coastal community of Long Beach was overwhelming.

> Long Beach, because of its airplane industry, oil wells and refineries and its harbor facilities was recognized as a prime target for enemy bombing. It was one of the cities in the country to feel the impact of the change from peace to war. The ocean front became a gigantic fenced-in barracks with large guns at intervals along the entire length of the city. Huge barrage balloons floated overhead at strategic points. Douglas Aircraft Co. was completely covered with a mottled camouflage net. Empty fields were dotted with anti-aircraft batteries. Recreation Park was completely surrounded with tall wire fencing and was covered from one end to the other with tents and barracks. This was true of many other locations in the city. Something had to be done to entertain the tremendous number of men who were being rushed here.[85]

The need to join together to provide for the social needs of all servicemen, with special attention to the religious needs of Jewish personnel, had a unifying effect on heretofore disparate Jewish organizations. Following the war, the idea of developing a community organization uniting all Long Beach Jewish groups began to take hold.

---

[85]Ibid., pp. 27-28.

In May, 1946, final plans were ratified for the institution of the Long Beach Jewish Community Council and the first executive director was hired. This was followed by the launching of a semi-monthly community newspaper. In that year the United Jewish Welfare Fund raised $101,531.

The year 1947 saw the development of a Jewish Young Adult Council, a Community Relations Committee, and a committee to study the need for a Jewish Community Center. The pressing needs of Jews throughout the world following the Holocaust were reflected in the United Jewish Welfare Fund campaign, which reached $126,260.

The press for a Jewish state led to the growth of the Zionist Organization of America and Hadassah, both of which served to disseminate information and raise funds for Palestine.

In Long Beach the 1948 United Jewish Welfare Fund drive raised $190,835, reflecting commitments to the new state of Israel. That year saw the development of a Youth Division and a Women's Division of the campaign. The National Council of Jewish Women accepted the responsibility of resettling displaced families arriving from Europe. Premises were leased for the Jewish Community Center, which offered a wide variety of programs directed by volunteers. It became headquarters for the Jewish Community Council, served as a meeting place for local Jewish groups, and became the focal point for Jewish life in Long Beach. Late in 1948 the community's only orthodox congregation, Temple

Beth El, was established.

By 1951 the Long Beach Jewish community provided a full range of services and activities, and the Jewish Community News was enlarged. Thirty-seven Jewish immigrant families had resettled in Long Beach.

The Jewish community affiliated with the Long Beach Welfare Council, thereby achieving recognition by a non-Jewish civic organization.

A newly formed conservative congregation, Temple Beth Shalom, established itself in 1952 and the increasing Jewish population pointed the direction for a more adequate Center facility to meet growing communal needs. The petition of the adjoining Lakewood Jewish Community Congregation (a combined Temple and Center) for affiliation with the Long Beach Jewish Community Council was accepted.

In 1957[86] Jewish Family Service was founded as a six-month pilot project. It later incorporated as a separate agency, thus qualifying for Community Chest support. That year also saw the organization of the Long Beach Children's Jewish School (Kindershule), offering a secular Jewish education. The United Jewish Welfare Fund campaign raised $135,955.

The following years saw the Jewish community come of age. In addition to congregation sisterhoods and

---

[86]Material detailing the growth of the community from 1957 through the present was compiled by this researcher from copies of Council minutes, Jewish Federa-News, and General Assembly proceedings.

brotherhoods there was the usual array of Jewish fraternal, social and philanthropic organizations. Joining groups previously mentioned were Jewish War Veterans, Pioneer Women, Brandeis University Women, Young Judea, and Organization for Rehabilitation through Training (ORT), as well as B'nai B'rith Girls (BBG) and Aleph Zadik Aleph (AZA) chapters.

The year 1960 was one of great growth. Following much planning and fund raising activity, the new Jewish Community Center was constructed on Grand Avenue, its present address. That same year marked the inauguration of a B'nai B'rith Hillel unit on the campus of California State College (now University) at Long Beach. In adjoining Rossmoor a Jewish Men's Association was formed and affiliated with the Long Beach Jewish Community Council. In 1960 the United Jewish Welfare Fund drive resulted in $197,844.

The desire to determine how well agencies were serving constituents and to define unmet service needs precipitated a study of the Jewish population.[87] Five hundred families were personally interviewed and provided demographic as well as attitudinal data.

In 1961 the United Jewish Welfare Fund campaign raised $219,500, and the Long Beach Jewish Community Council became the Jewish Community Federation with appropriate structural changes to achieve a better balance

---

[87]Dr. Fred Massarik, "A Study of the Jewish Population of Long Beach, Lakewood and Los Alamitos," report prepared for the Long Beach Jewish Community Federation, 1962.

between agencies, organizational representatives and delegates-at-large. A smaller Board of Directors was to meet monthly with General Assembly meetings several times a year.

The continued eastward movement of the Jewish population into adjoining Orange County communities resulted in the establishment of a new reform congregation, Temple Beth David of Los Alamitos, which subsequently relocated in Westminster.

Lakewood Jewish Community Congregation became Temple Beth Zion in 1962, and a new conservative congregation, Temple Beth Shalom, was founded in Long Beach. That same year saw the founding of the Jewish Free Loan Society to aid Jewish families and individuals experiencing temporary financial difficulties where no bank or commercial company would make a loan.

By 1962 the Jewish population stabilized at approximately 15,000, and the major growth of the community slowed. (Appendix A lists United Jewish Welfare Fund totals from 1963 through 1975.)

Subsequent developments included the construction of the Nathan Shulman Auditorium addition to the Jewish Community Center in 1967; establishment of the Long Beach Hebrew Academy, the first Jewish day school, by the Lubavitch group; purchase of a site in Lake Arrowhead in 1972 for Camp Komaroff, the Jewish community resident camp; merger of two conservative congregations, Temple Sinai and

Temple Beth Zion into Temple Beth Zion-Sinai in 1974; and the acquisition of a motel adjoining the camp for the development of the Camp Komaroff Conference Center in 1975.

Future concerns to which the community is addressing itself relate to the age shifts in Jewish population and increasing needs of the elderly, primarily in the area of low-cost housing. Plans are under way to relocate two Soviet Jewish families. Explorations of cooperative programming and relationships with the Orange County Jewish Federation Council are also of high priority.

The development of the Jewish community of Long Beach parallels that of other small and medium size cities.

> The first step in communal organization in a small community is for religious services and for religious education of the young and a temple or synagogue is usually the first and if the population remains small, the only Jewish institution in that community. Informal methods of self help are another spontaneous development as is the growth of various forms of association whose primary purpose may be social and recreational relationships for their own sake or involving a function such as raising funds for some national or overseas cause. As the community grows somewhat larger there may be more formal organization on a fraternal basis or as part of the Zionist movement. With increasing population there are established replicas of the many types of association which exist in the larger cities such as varieties of Zionist groups, varieties of congregations, varieties of formal and informal social clubs, professional associations and other groups. As the population grows voluntary self help may lead to organized services for families and the aged or interest in obtaining such services through regional organization. It is pertinent that differentiation in religious and cultural outlook and social and economic aspirations and status are the factors responsible for proliferation of agencies.[88]

---

[88] H. L. Lurie, "Jewish Community Organization--Functions and Structures," Jewish Social Service Quarterly 26 (September, 1949): 50.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the setting of the study, the sampling plan and the method of data collection. In addition, it discusses plans for analysis of the data and the limitations of the study.

The Setting of the Study

Located in Los Angeles County, twenty-five miles south of Los Angeles, the city of Long Beach, California has a population of 361,110[1] which has remained relatively stable since 1960.

A study of the Jewish community made in 1962[2] revealed a Jewish population of 14,000 or 15,000 individuals. According to Federation records, there is a current estimated Jewish population of 15,000-16,000 individuals, representing 3700-4500 families. Thus, the Jewish population figure also has remained relatively stable although

---

[1]Long Beach City Planning Department, "Statistics on Long Beach Population and Housing," Long Beach, January, 1974.

[2]Dr. Fred Massarik, "A Study of the Jewish Population of Long Beach, Lakewood and Los Alamitos," report prepared for the Long Beach Jewish Community Federation, 1962.

the age distribution has shifted during the years.[3] There has been a decrease in the number of younger families, with movement into nearby Orange County (served by its own autonomous Jewish Federation) and an increase in the senior adult population.

Accounting for the decrease in young family population is the availability in Orange County of new housing in a moderate price range. The increase in senior adult population is due in large measure to the Long Beach mean temperature of 63.3 degrees and the fact that Long Beach is increasingly viewed as a desirable community for retirement.

For the past ten years, units of membership in the Long Beach Jewish Community Center have also remained fairly stable with a small decrease in family memberships and a small increase in the senior adult category.[4]

The study was conducted in the service-solicitation area of the Jewish Community Federation of Long Beach. In addition to the cities of Long Beach and Lakewood, the service-solicitation area includes nearby communities in western Orange County: Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Westminster, Fountain Valley and Huntington Beach.

Sampling Plan

The sample was drawn from the Jewish Community

---

[3]Interview with Sol Frankel, Executive Director, Long Beach Jewish Community Federation, Long Beach, 25 February 1976.

[4]Interview with Joseph Parmet, Executive Director, Jewish Community Center, Long Beach, 3 March 1976.

Federation mailing list, which includes members of local Jewish organizations and temples, Jewish Community Center members, contributors to the United Jewish Welfare Fund, and individuals who have indicated their desire to receive the Jewish Federation News. As new people move into the area and become known to the Federation, their names are added. Organizational lists are updated annually. The 1976 list has 3,348 names.

The sample was stratified according to level of contribution to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. For purposes of this study, a contributor is defined as anyone who had made a contribution to either the 1972, 1973 or 1974 United Jewish Welfare Fund campaigns. Although Federation campaign records are based on separate contributions from husband and wife, the researcher determined that contributors would be defined by family contribution. Hence, if either a husband or wife made a gift to the 1972, 1973 or 1974 campaign, that family would be considered a contributor.

As a first step in the sampling process, the entire Federation mailing list was addressographed on index cards. These were then alphabetized and cards representing persons outside the service-solicitation area were removed. The remaining 3,183 cards were then checked against computer print-outs of contributors, and contributions for both husband and wife in 1972, 1973 and 1974 were recorded. The 3,183 cards represented 2,119 contributors and 1,064 non-

contributors. Contributors were divided into five categories according to the combined total in the year of their most recent contribution.

It was determined that the sample would be 524 (see Table 1). Cards in each of the categories of contribution were shuffled out of alphabetical order. A stratified random sample was drawn, the specific number in each stratum determined by the proportion of contributors in each category. Similarly, a proportionate sample was drawn of Jewish persons on the Federation mailing list who had not made a contribution in either of the aforementioned three campaign years. In each stratum, every sixth card was drawn.

The percentage of responses in each category was anticipated with the exception of the $1000-$2499 category. The expectation was that non-contributors would have the lowest return rate and givers in the highest stratum would have the largest response rate. In this study respondents in the $1000-$2499 stratum are underrepresented (see Table 2).

Strategies for Increasing Respondent Participation

Several important procedures were utilized in an effort to gain a significant respondent return. In view of the fact that a 50.95 percent return was achieved without any additional follow-up, these procedures are worthy of mention.

TABLE 1

SAMPLING STATISTICS

Contributor Categories	Total Cards	% of Total Sample	Number of Sample Cards
non-contributors	1064	33.4	174
$1 to $99	1347	42.3	222
$100-$499	485	15.2	80
$500-$999	111	3.48	18
$1000-$2499	124	3.89	22
$2500+	52	1.6	8
Totals	3183	99.87	524

TABLE 2

RESPONDENT RETURN STATISTICS

Contributor Categories	Number in Sample	Total Responses Returned	Number of Usable Responses
non-contributors	174	83 - 47.7%	70 - 40.2%
$1-$99	222	114 - 51.3%	105 - 47.29%
$100-$499	80	46 - 57.5%	45 - 56.25%
$500-$2499	22	7 - 31.8%	7 - 31.8%
$2500+	8	7 - 87.5%	7 - 87.5%
Totals	524	267	244

Several weeks prior to the mailing to the sample, the researcher sent individually typed letters on the stationery of either Hebrew Union College or University of Southern California, School of Social Work, to local temple rabbis and Jewish agency directors (Appendix B). The Jewish community clergy and professionals were advised of the study and asked to share this information with their temple/agency boards and leadership. Therefore, a number of community leaders were apprised of the research project and were in a position to authenticate the legitimacy and value of the study, should questions be raised by congregants or constituents.

Questionnaires were mailed with a covering letter (Appendix C) which, although offset printed, was personalized with individually typed address and salutation and hand signature. It was hoped that respondents would feel that their contribution to the study had value and would be significant. The use of University of Southern California, School of Social Work letterhead added the prestige and influence of the university to the study.

The letter contained several important points. Recipients were being asked to participate in the project and assist the researcher in completing work for her Master's Degree. This "tapped into" the Jewish value of education. Although subtly, the respondents were being asked to perform a mitzvah. The many warm messages of "good luck on your project" and "wish you success"

included on returned questionnaires attest to the personal involvement of respondents and validates this conclusion. A number were returned with explanatory notes and good wishes even in instances where the respondent was unable to complete the questionnaire.

Additionally, the letter acknowledged that some of those receiving the questionnaire might not be currently interested or involved in Jewish communal life. By including that paragraph, the researcher attempted to reduce the number of those who would not respond because they did not consider themselves knowledgeable or in the mainstream of Jewish life. It emphasized the importance of their opinions and ideas, regardless of the extent of their participation.

The covering letter further indicated that respondent replies would assist in efficient and effective planning and that the study could become the basis of improved Jewish services for everyone. The questionnaire provided ample space for comments on specific questions or broad general issues, and respondents were encouraged to share their thoughts and feelings.

Included with the covering letter and questionnaire was a self addressed, stamped envelope. Further, the researcher indicated that a summary of the findings would be available to those who returned the enclosed self addressed post card. One hundred seventy-six or 72.1 percent of the respondents indicated a desire to receive

the summary. As an additional motivational piece, a small scratch pad was included, imprinted with "Things to do . . ." On the first page of each pad the researcher wrote "Please fill in and mail questionnaire," and signed her name, thereby again personalizing the research project.

The questionnaire covered six pages on both sides. Concerned that recipients might be overwhelmed by its length, a notation was made at the beginning of the questionnaire and underlined in red pencil that "this questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete." It was expected that recipients would be more willing to become involved in the study if they were assured that the time involvement would be minimal.

Although difficult to measure, another variable which may have contributed to the unusually high rate of return should be noted. The researcher and her family have lived in the Long Beach community for eight years. For three years she worked professionally in the Jewish community as coordinator of Hillel at California State University at Long Beach and as coordinator of the Program for the Retired at the Long Beach Jewish Community Center. Consequently, her name may have been familiar to a number of respondents and this may have been a contributing factor to the high return rate.

Of the twenty-three questionnaires returned but not usable, only one was returned undeliverable because of wrong address, attesting to the excellent record keeping

and accuracy of the Federation mailing lists. Table 3 accounts for each of the unusable questionnaires.

TABLE 3

UNUSABLE RESPONSES

Number of Unusable Questionnaires	Reasons for Non-use
1	undeliverable, wrong address
1	code number removed by respondent; unable to be analyzed by dependent variable, level of contribution to UJWF
2	not Jewish although previously married to Jewish men
3	recent death, illness and problems in family
1	previous negative experience with a Jewish agency
1	completed but received too late for data to be used
1	on vacation and missed deadline
4	"too personal," "do not want to participate," "sorry, do not fill out surveys"
8	returned uncompleted without comment
1	returned uncompleted but with general comments
23	

Data Collection

The research instrument was pretested by four persons, two male and two female, who have varying levels

of involvement with the Jewish community. Their comments indicated that the original questionnaire was too long, taking between thirty-five and fifty minutes to complete. It was felt that a question relating to whether respondent's friends have used or would use services such as Jewish Family Service, Jewish Free Loan, Project Outreach, etc., was difficult to answer since it dealt more with assumptions than with knowledge. It is significant that each of the persons participating in the pretest had difficulty answering a question which asked respondent to note whether he or she felt listed Jewish organizations were "extremely prestigeous," "highly prestigeous," or "prestigeous." Three felt they did not have enough knowledge about the various groups, and one indicated that it was not a matter of prestige--all that was required was payment of dues.

As a result of these comments, these two questions were deleted. Further, a question relating to degree of interest in specific features of the Federation News was not used because of the need to abbreviate the instrument. This question was not central to the issues being studied. Two questions relating to purposes of the Federation were combined since there were areas of overlap.

In final form the research instrument (Appendix D) consisted of five sections designed to collect (1) demographic data; (2) information on Jewish practices;

(3) organizational affiliation and participation; (4) knowledge, use of and attitudes toward Jewish community services; and (5) attitudes related to Jewish identity and motivations for contributing to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. Data was analyzed using the level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund as the dependent variable.

Section I was concerned with demographic data. Of prime importance was question 13 relating to total family income, since one of the questions being studied was the relationship of giving to socioeconomic level.

Section II requested information on Jewish education, religious practices and synagogue affiliation to determine if these factors are variables in level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund.

Questions in Section III pertained to Jewish organizational affiliation, a variable to be tested as a factor in motivations for giving.

The questions in Section IV relating to knowledge and use of Jewish services were salient in that they solicited data relevant to the issues under study. These questions also addressed matters of import for future agency planning.

Information solicited in Section V related to attitudes toward Israel, motivations for giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund, conceptions of why respondents considered themselves Jewish, and sense of relatedness to the Jewish community. The data is pertinent as factors to

be considered as components of Jewish identity.

Plans for Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in two parts. Part I is concerned with demographic features of the population and description of responses relating to Jewish self conception, affiliation and attitudes.

Part II examines the relationship of variables associated with motivations for giving. Chi square, a non-parametric test of significance, was used to test significance of relationships.

A typographical error in Section V of the questionnaire caused some difficulty. Section V, soliciting information about attitudes toward Jewish issues, was to be answered on a four-point scale: "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." Unfortunately, "strongly agree" in the first column was mistyped and read "strongly disagree." The great majority of respondents caught the error and made the correction. On those questionnaires where there was no correction, if responses were checked in both "strongly disagree" columns, it was assumed that the respondent recognized the error and answered appropriately without noting a correction. In situations where "strongly disagree" was checked in only the first column, the researcher checked the questionnaire

for internal consistency. Thus, if "strongly disagree" in the first column was checked in response to "Jews should contribute money to support humanitarian (welfare) services in Israel" and the respondent indicated membership in Hadassah or contributions to the Israel Emergency Fund or Bonds for Israel, it was assumed that column 1 was intended to mean "strongly agree." In six cases it was impossible to make a clear determination of respondent's sentiment and hence these were coded as "no response."

The drawing of a proportionate stratified sample presented difficulty in analyzing data, since there were too few cases in each of the three top giving stratum to test for significance. Contributions in the three highest giving strata ($500-$999, $1000-$2499, $2500+) represent 9.83 percent of the usable responses. Therefore, it was necessary to collapse categories for purposes of analysis as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

CATEGORIES USED FOR DATA ANALYSIS

Contributor Categories	Number Sampled	Number of Usable Responses
non-contributors	174	70 - 28.7%
$1-$499	302	150 - 61.5%
$500+	48	24 - 9.8%
	524	244 100.0%

There were too few responses in specific codes of other questions. It was thus necessary to collapse the categories in order to test for significance. In both age and income distribution, there were only nine responses in the lowest category of each question. Hence, these were collapsed with the next highest category of response. Similarly, only twelve respondents indicated Sephardic ancestry and those responses were shifted to "other." Sunday or Hebrew school education accounted for 64.5 percent of responses. Therefore, all other types of Jewish education were collapsed into "other." With regard to Section V, relating to attitudes toward Jewish issues, very few questions evoked a "strongly disagree" response; hence, "disagree" and "strongly disagree" codes were collapsed.

Limitations of Study

The data collected from non-contributors cannot be generalized to all non-contributors since those in this study have some Jewish "connection," even if limited to a desire to receive the Jewish Federation News. This study did not sample those members of the Jewish population who, for whatever reason, did not affiliate or identify formally with Jewish institutions or organizations.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA: PART I

This chapter will present and discuss the demographic description of the sample and responses relating to Jewish education, religious affiliation and organizational membership, as well as attitudes toward Jewish issues.

Demographic Description of Sample

An analysis of the data supports statements made in the previous chapter indicating a trend toward an increasing aging Jewish population in the Long Beach area. As shown in Table 5, 32.6 percent of the population is sixty years of age or older. This percentage of senior adults is double that of the National Jewish Population Study.[1] Only 3.7 percent of the sample are between twenty and twenty-nine. It is likely that there may be a greater number of young adults in the community who were not represented in the sample, since by and large this age group does not affiliate with the established Jewish community.

---

[1]Fred Massarik and Alvin Chenkin, "United States National Jewish Population Study: A First Report," in American Jewish Year Book, 1973, ed. Morris Fine et al. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973), p. 271.

TABLE 5

RESPONDENTS BY AGE

	(%) (n=242)
20-29	3.7
30-39	16.9
40-49	23.6
50-59	23.1
60-64	7.4
65+	25.2
	99.9

The Jewish population of the community is scattered throughout Long Beach and nearby Orange County communities with no clusters of Jewish population in any specific area. In the sample 31.5 percent reside in Orange County (Table 6).

The fact that Long Beach is a relatively stable community is clear from an examination of the data. New families moving into the area represent 2.0 percent of the sample; 76.5 percent of the Jewish population has resided in the community for more than nine years, and 86.3 percent indicate that it is unlikely that they will move from the Long Beach/Orange County area.

Three-fourths of the population is married, 14.5 percent is widowed, 8.2 percent divorced or separated, and 2.1 percent never married.

In small or medium sized cities, most Jews are either lower middle or upper middle class. Table 7 shows

TABLE 6

RESPONDENTS BY NEIGHBORHOOD

Area	(%) (n=244)
Rossmoor, Los Alamitos, Seal Beach (Orange County)	18.9
Lakewood	16.8
Los Altos	11.5
Belmont Shore, Naples	8.2
El Dorado	7.0
Westminster, Garden Grove, Fountain Valley (Orange County)	6.1
Bixby Knolls	4.9
Cypress (Orange County)	4.9
Cerritos	3.7
Park Estates	3.7
Other, Long Beach	12.7
Other, Orange County	1.6
	100.0

that 22.2 percent of the Jewish population in Long Beach earn upwards of $35,000. The median income is $20,500, as compared with a median income of $12,630 for the national Jewish population,[2] and $10,282 for the general Long Beach community.[3] It is possible that the median income figure for Long Beach Jewish people might be somewhat diminished had this study included individuals who were not known in any way to the Jewish community. The high income for Jewish families obviously correlates with level of education and type of occupation. Approximately 70 percent of the population has had some college education, with 22.8 percent completing college and 21.2 percent receiving graduate or professional training.

Not to be disregarded, however, are the 14.7 percent who report incomes below $6,999. While there is increasing awareness that not all Jews are affluent, the relatively large percentage of the sample at the lower income levels may be related to the high percentage of Jewish aged in Long Beach.

Table 8 shows that professionals account for 27.5 percent of the Jewish population. The fact that 20.3 percent are retirees corresponds to the fact that 25.2

---

[2]Fred Massarik, "Demographic Highlights: National Jewish Population Study" (New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1971), p. 10. (Mimeographed.)

[3]Long Beach City Planning Department, "Statistics on Long Beach Population and Housing, 1974," Long Beach, p. 8. (Mimeographed.)

TABLE 7

RESPONDENTS BY INCOME

Income	(%) (n=225)
under $2,900	4.0
$3,000-$6,999	10.7
$7,000-$11,999	14.2
$12,000-$17,999	14.6
$18,000-$22,999	13.7
$23,000-$34,999	20.4
$35,000+	22.2
	99.8

TABLE 8

RESPONDENTS BY OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTION

Occupation	(%) (n=232)
student	2.2
unskilled	3.0
skilled	5.2
clerical/sales	14.6
managerial	3.0
proprietor	2.2
professional	27.5
homemaker	21.5
retired	20.3
	99.5

percent of the Long Beach Jewish community are sixty-five or older.

Jewish Background, Affiliation and Education

When preferences for branch of Judaism (percentage of Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, etc.) between respondent and his or her mother and father are examined, a decrease in Orthodox preference and an increase in Reform identification are noted (Table 9). With regard to comparison of preference between respondent and oldest child, Orthodox and Reform preferences are stable. However, there is a decrease of 21.1 percent in Conservative preference between respondent and oldest child. There are suggestions that this decrease in Conservative preference among the third generation is not idiosyncratic to Long Beach but represents a national trend.[4] Additional data that requires further study is the 11 percent increase in identification of "Jewish by birth" by respondent's oldest child as compared with respondent. The analysis of generational difference is an important tool in understanding the Jewish community and the changes taking place within it.

Table 10 shows that 46.6 percent of the sample do not affiliate with a congregation. This is somewhat lower

---

[4]Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 177.

TABLE 9

PREFERENCES FOR BRANCH OF JUDAISM

	Respondent's Mother (%) (n=222)	Respondent's Father (%) (n=225)	Respondent (%) (n=232)	Respondent's Oldest Child (%) (n=180)*
Orthodox	31.5	35.6	2.6	2.8
Conservative	40.0	34.2	40.5	19.4
Reform	14.0	12.0	28.9	28.3
Reconstructionist	0.4	0.0	0.4	3.3
Non-religious cultural Jew	6.8	10.2	13.3	15.6
Jewish by birth	4.5	4.9	11.2	22.2
Other	2.7	3.1	3.0	8.3
	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9

*In accounting for the significantly smaller n, it is important to note that twenty respondents had no children, and of those having children, twenty were under the age of five.

than the national Jewish population figure of 51.3 percent. While on the surface it would appear the Long Beach Jews affiliate at a higher percentage than do the national average, it is likely that the 46.6 percent of non-affiliation cannot be generalized to all Long Beach Jewish people inasmuch as the sample was drawn from those who have Jewish "connections." A survey of the entire Jewish community would undoubtedly show a larger percentage of non-congregational affiliates, perhaps approaching the national figure.

TABLE 10

RESPONDENTS BY MEMBERSHIP IN CONGREGATIONS

Congregation	(%) (n=236)
Temple Beth Shalom (Conservative)	10.6
Temple Beth Zion-Sinai (Conservative)	9.7
Temple Israel (Reform)	17.8
Temple Beth David (Reform)	2.5
Congregation Shalom, Leisure World	4.2
Congregation Lubavitch	2.5
Other	5.9
None	46.6
	99.8

It is important to note that data regarding membership in congregations is idiosyncratic to the Long Beach Jewish community. Community surveys with which this

researcher is familiar,[5] as well as the National Jewish Population Study, find that Jewish people affiliate more with Conservative than with Reform congregations. Table 10 shows an equal number, 20.3 percent, affiliated with each of the two branches mentioned.

Nearly 40 percent of Jews sampled attend religious services occasionally. These figures indicate a higher percentage of synagogue attendance than that found in Jewish population studies of other communities and again may be related to the focused nature of the sample. In explaining non-affiliation, several respondents cited the high cost of synagogue membership. The following statements are typical:

> "I do not practice many of the religious aspects of being Jewish but I do believe in the traditions and past culture. What bothers me and many of my generation about being Jewish today is the cost. Many people that I talk to who do belong to a temple are resentful about the high price of membership. I have heard the term 'blackmail' used when referring to what they must do to have a child Bar Mitzvahed. I have not made any first-hand inquiries yet so all my information is 'second hand' but not very encouraging."
>
> "I feel that Jewish parents who wish to give their children a Jewish education should be accepted without the parents having to join and pay a membership fee, which they may not be able to afford. This happened to a family member of mine. Their son was unable to

---

[5] Goldstein and Goldscheider, p. 179; Morris Axelrod et al., A Community Survey for Long Range Planning (Boston: Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, 1967), p. 143; Mervin F. Verbit, "Characteristics of a Jewish Community," Jewish Federation of North Jersey, 1971, p. 15. (Mimeographed.)

be Bar Mitzvah or go to Hebrew School unless they joined the Temple and paid for membership they could not afford. We will lose our young if this practice continues. We belonged to a Temple for many years and we cannot afford to now. . . . How can I or my children or grandchildren continue as participating Jews and be interested in a social religious life. . . . I am proud to be a Jew. What will my grandchildren feel?"

"Most Jewish couples that I know do not support a Temple because they usually can find other things to do with their money. Such as decorating their homes, cars, nice clothing, trips, microwave ovens, and a lot of other luxuries. I know it's the wrong way to think, but I'm afraid we fall into the same category of people. Sometimes when we want to go to high holidays we don't feel like paying the price for four seats. In other words, to have to pay for religion. Yet, I understand that all temples need money and some are merging with other temples to survive. People are very spoiled in this day and age. We have wants for things and go and buy them. Also, we are so busy, it's hard to fit another organization into our lives with more committee meetings, banquet dinners, etc."

"I can't begin to tell you how many times the churches have invited us to services and married couple groups. Their pre-schools are practically free and their youth groups and campouts are also priced reasonably and everyone is encouraged to come and made to feel welcome. No wonder Jews are losing the interest of the young."

Several respondents echoed the following statement:

"I do not believe membership in a Temple has any bearing on whether a person is a 'good Jew.' One can worship in his own heart and mind."

Responses to the question on type of Jewish education received by respondent reveal that two-thirds of the sample have attended either Sunday school or Hebrew school while 20.3 percent have had no formal Jewish education.

In response to the question, "How concerned are you, or were you, with providing your children with an

understanding of Jewish culture and religion?" approximately one half of the sample were very much concerned while 8.4 percent did not consider it an important issue.

Several questions attempted to study social network relationships. Sixty-three and three-tenths percent of the population have more Jewish than non-Jewish friends, and 52.7 percent socialize primarily with Jewish people; 68.4 percent indicate that their friends belong to substantially the same organizations as they do. As shown in Table 11, Hadassah claims the largest percentage of membership, followed by B'nai B'rith and temple sisterhoods.

Among community-wide organizations, respondents affiliate most frequently with Parent Teacher Associations. While many respondents hold memberships in a number of organizations, both Jewish and community-wide, the greatest percentage respond that they are inactive (Table 11).

Approximately 50 percent of the population join Jewish organizations for sociability and because of Jewish commitment. Only 8 percent join for reasons of business benefits.

Knowledge and Use of Jewish Services

As shown in Table 12, the greater percentage of the sample indicates familiarity with the major Jewish agencies serving Long Beach. This is not surprising

TABLE 11

RESPONDENTS BY ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Organization	Very Active (%)	Fairly Active (%)	Inactive (%)	Total (%)
Men's Club	1.6	2.5	7.8	11.9
Sisterhood	2.5	5.7	11.5	19.7
Temple Board	2.9	2.9	6.6	12.4
B'nai B'rith	3.3	2.5	13.9	19.7
Hadassah	4.5	9.8	9.4	23.7
Jewish War Veterans	0.4	0.4	5.7	6.5
National Council of Jewish Women	1.6	2.5	6.6	10.7
Brandeis University Women	0.4	4.1	2.0	6.5
Pioneer Women	2.9	2.0	0.8	5.7
Other	2.5	3.3	2.5	8.3

since, as stated before, the sample was drawn from the Federation mailing list. Individuals on this list receive the Federation News, which interprets agency services.

TABLE 12

RESPONDENTS BY LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH AGENCIES

Agency	Knowledge (%)*	No Knowledge (%)	n
Jewish Community Federation	80.0	20.0	225
Jewish Community Center	95.7	4.2	236
Jewish Family Service	87.2	12.8	227
Hillel, C.S.U.L.B.	63.5	36.4	214
Project Outreach	59.7	41.2	221
United Jewish Welfare Fund	94.8	5.2	231
Jewish Free Loan	46.7	53.2	216
Long Beach Hebrew High School	45.1	54.8	217

*Two dummy agencies, American Hebrew Foundation and Commission on Jewish Youth, were included and approximately 10 to 17 percent indicated knowledge of these organizations. Therefore, it is suggested that the percentages included in this table may also perhaps reflect a 10 to 17 percent inflationary factor.

Thirty-three and two-tenths percent of the sample never uses the facilities or participates in activities sponsored by the Jewish Community Center, while 16.7 percent participates at least once a month. There was no significant correlation between age of respondent and

degree of participation at the Jewish Community Center. The low percentage of participation is interesting in view of the fact that 64.7 percent would recommend to a Jewish family that they join the Center.

With regard to clientele served by Jewish Family Service, 60.7 percent indicate that the agency serves people of all income levels; 69.2 percent would recommend that Jewish persons having marital, family or child and parent problems contact Jewish Family Service.

As shown in Table 13, Jewish agencies are considered particularly important in the areas of senior citizens' activities, day and resident camping, and teenage recreation.

This study indicates a higher preference for Jewish sponsored services that does the Axelrod survey referred to earlier. Again, this may be explained by the select nature of the sample as compared with the broader population surveyed in the Axelrod report.

Housing needs for elderly are given priority among potential new services for older adults. About half of the sample rate low cost housing and a home for the aged as most important, followed by housekeeping assistance, information and referral and day care.

Table 14 shows the ranking of importance ascribed to various purposes and responsibilities of the Jewish Community Federation.

TABLE 13

RESPONDENTS' PREFERENCE FOR USE OF JEWISH SPONSORED AGENCY BY AGENCY TYPE

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Doesn't Matter (%)	n
Financial assistance	20.0	18.5	61.5	216
Nursery school	56.6	8.6	34.7	210
Recreation for younger children	55.7	5.7	38.6	210
Help in finding job	20.2	12.7	67.1	213
Help with a marital problem	50.2	8.9	40.8	213
Help with a child behavior problem	43.1	8.1	48.8	211
Senior citizens' activities	81.5	1.8	16.6	222
Children's day camp	72.1	3.7	24.2	215
Children's resident camp	71.4	4.6	23.9	213
Teenage recreation	72.4	3.7	23.8	214
Adult recreation	54.1	4.5	41.7	222

TABLE 14

RANK ORDER OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF IMPORTANT PURPOSES OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION

	Purpose	%	n
1.	Give help to Jews in need.	82.1	212
2.	Build a strong Jewish community.	75.5	212
3.	Promote cooperation among all Jewish groups.	74.0	207
4.	Give leadership and direction to the Jewish community and its programs.	73.1	208
5.	Support Israel.	72.2	216
6.	Promote good will between Jews and non-Jews.	68.7	214
7.	Raise funds to support Jewish social services.	66.7	207
8.	Perpetuate traditional Jewish values.	57.0	207

It is interesting to note that although giving help to Jews in need is considered high priority, its operationalization, raising funds to support Jewish social services, is listed seventh. This suggests a perceived separation between the giving of needed help and the fund raising process. Several respondents spoke to this issue:

> "I became extremely annoyed by the methods used in collecting for charities, i.e., hanging guilt, saying how much one contributed recently, telling one what he can afford and most importantly of all, publishing amounts people contribute. It seems to me as if charity should be voluntary and I am made to believe by those doing the collecting that they feel it is compulsory. I don't think they should have the right to tell me how to spend my money."

"I resent the emphasis placed on 'givers,' and the publicity given to them, although I do admit I'd like to see my name in the paper. But yet I feel it is not in the Jewish tradition to be 'coved' seekers."

Attitudes toward Jewish Issues

The following chart in Table 15 depicts consensus items and neutral items among respondents relative to attitudes toward and feelings about Jewish issues. For this purpose the researcher determined that if 65 percent or more of the respondents either agreed or disagreed on any issue, there would be consensus. Issues receiving less than 65 percent agreement or disagreement would be considered neutral items.

A number of respondents made comments relating to conception of how and why one considers himself or herself Jewish. The tensions were expressed with feeling:

"As my answers indicate, I am Jewish by birth and belief, although I take no part in local Jewish affairs. I have had little formal Jewish training and rarely attend the synagogue. My children, too, are not being brought up in the Jewish tradition. In fact, since my wife is a non-Jew, they are attending church with her and mostly see the Christian viewpoint of religion. This troubles me and I feel I should get involved with a Jewish congregation and expose my children to a Jewish education. But I have not yet taken any steps to this end."

"I believe you will find my answers in many instances contradictory because the Jewish part of my life represents one of extreme conflict for me personally. Even though my parents were strongly Jewish, immigrants, business people, they had me reared in a non-sectarian boarding school, 100 miles upstate New York and far removed from their Brooklyn ghetto. . . . There was no religious instruction except every Sunday morning we thanked God for all the good things in our lives. I didn't know I was Jewish until I was 13. I didn't know

TABLE 15

CONSENSUS ITEMS AND NEUTRAL ITEMS
RELATIVE TO ATTITUDES TOWARD AND
FEELINGS ABOUT JEWISH ISSUES

Consensus Items	Neutral Items
I feel a personal concern in the outcome of the Arab-Israeli conflict. (97.0% agree, 3.0% disagree)	Israel is the only place where all Jews can live as Jews in the fullest and broadest sense of the term. (43.7% agree, 56.6% disagree)
Israel has given American Jews a feeling of pride in Jewish accomplishment. (96.6% agree, 3.3% disagree)	
Jews should contribute money to support humanitarian (welfare) services in Israel. (91.0% agree, 9.0% disagree)	
I feel that Israel is the spiritual homeland of the Jewish people. (90.2% agree, 9.8% disagree)	I consider myself Jewish primarily because of my religious practices. (41.9% agree, 58.0% disagree)
I consider myself Jewish primarily because I believe in Jewish ideals and practices. (82.1% agree, 17.9% disagree)	Jews should donate to Jewish causes before donating to other causes. (54.5% agree, 45.4% disagree)

TABLE 15--Continued

Consensus Items	Neutral Items
I consider myself Jewish primarily because I had Jewish parents. (66.9% agree, 33.0% disagree)	Of the money collected in the annual United Jewish Welfare Fund drive, the greatest proportion should be sent to Israel. (53.4% agree, 46.5% disagree)
I consider myself Jewish primarily because I was raised in the Jewish tradition. (69.1% agree, 30.8% disagree)	
People contribute to Jewish charities because they want to maintain Jewish life. (83.3% agree, 16.6% disagree)	Services to the Jewish people locally (Jewish Family Service, Jewish Community Center, Hillel, etc.) should receive the greatest proportion of money collected by the United Jewish Welfare Fund. (50.2% agree, 49.7% disagree)
Tzedakah (charity) is one of the most important principles of Judaism. (85.4% agree, 14.5% disagree)	
The only way to become prominent in the Jewish community is to make a big gift to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. (20.9% agree, 79.1% disagree)	Jewish people should try to do business with other Jews when possible. (49.4% agree, 50.6% disagree)
Jews should support Jewish agencies even if they themselves may not use them. (92.3% agree, 7.2% disagree)	

TABLE 15--Continued

Consensus Items	Neutral Items
The continuation of Jewish life in the United States is very important to me. (92.7% agree, 7.2% disagree)	
That which binds Jews together is stronger than that which separates them. (90.5% agree, 9.5% disagree)	
Support of social services for Jews was or is an important part of my parents' philosophy. (68.1% agree, 30.9% disagree)	
Social pressure from friends is what motivates people to give to Jewish charities. (25.8% agree, 74.1% disagree)	
Jews need to take greater responsibility for fellow Jews than for non-Jews. (67.1% agree, 32.9% disagree)	
Anti-semitism is likely to become a serious menace to Jews in the United States. (65.6% agree, 34.4% disagree)	
It is important to me that my children select Jewish mates. (67.5% agree, 32.5% disagree)	
I feel a part of the local Jewish community. (72.2% agree, 27.7% disagree)	

there were different religions and that such beliefs could divide men and cause so much hatreds. This whole area of religion has caused me a great deal of stress."

"We are anti-religious but deeply Jewish, proud of our heritage and the handicaps we overcame and the accomplishments of all my family. We support many Jewish causes but don't join any religious organizations."

"I consider myself as an anomaly. A study in contrasts . . . I've had no formal religious training and consider myself an agnostic yet I strongly believe that in our 'assimilationist society' our 3rd generation Jewish children should get the training I did not get."

"All I can say to sum it up is: as a child in a lovely all Jewish neighborhood, life seemed sweeter and more comfortable. Note, I mention as a child."

Summary

In looking back over the data, we can describe the organized Long Beach Jewish community as follows. The population is stable, primarily middle-aged and older, living throughout Long Beach. One third of the population in the service-solicitation area live in Orange County.

Although 14.7 percent have incomes of below $6,900, the median income is $20,500, with 22.2 percent earning $35,000 or above. Over one quarter are professionals and 20 percent are retired. Three quarters are married.

In regard to preferences of a branch of Judaism, the largest percentage prefer a Conservative identification, followed by Reform. There appears to be a decrease in traditional religious orientation (Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Cultural) and an increase in self identifica-

tion as "Jewish by birth" with each succeeding generation.

Slightly more than half of the population is affiliated with synagogues or temples, and 40 percent attend religious services occasionally. Two thirds of the population has attended either Sunday or Hebrew school, and half of the respondents regard Jewish education for their children as an important concern.

Jewish people continue to socialize primarily with other Jews and find that their friends belong to the same Jewish organizations as they do.

Many people indicated concern that the ties that bind them to a Jewish life may not hold for their children. The following statement is not untypical and represents a fairly widespread concern:

> "What I consider important is not necessarily what my children consider so. I feel that despite their Jewish upbringing and my emphasis on a Jewish mate, my children will still choose their mate regardless of religion. Also, despite their temple and Center affiliations, once they leave home they seem to select their friends and social activities away from Judaism. I think the synagogues and Center, despite all they do . . . have been ineffective. They have failed to keep our college youth secure within the Jewish fold. They have failed to stem the growth of marriage outside the Jewish faith. I believe the future of Judaism in the United States is very uncertain."

There is a high level of knowledge about local Jewish agencies, although many who do not themselves use services would recommend them to others.

There is a great deal of agreement regarding matters of concern about the future of Israel.

The Jewish population is split regarding the relative importance of support for Israel and support for local service.

Commenting on perceived stratification of the community, one respondent observed:

> As part of the responsibilities in their effort to build a strong Jewish community, the so-called leaders need to treat all members of the Jewish community with the same sense of fairness and compassion. Too frequently the "big" supporter is catered to at the expense of those unable to afford the same."

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA: PART II

This chapter examines the relationship between factors associated with motivation for giving and contribution size. The test of significance used in all analyses is chi square, and the level of significance is .05.

The Relationship between Level of Giving and Socioeconomic Level of Contributor

Although respondents were originally divided into six income categories, the small number of families in the sample who gave $500 or more made it necessary to collapse income levels to produce a coherent table.

Table 16 shows a significant relationship between level of contribution to the United Jewish Welfare Fund and socioeconomic level of giver. The collapsing of income categories just described and the collapsing of level of giving categories (see chapter on Methodology) leads this researcher to question the validity of this finding. More precise measurement in both income and giving categories might lead to different findings in relation to this question. In any event, it is important to note that 39.4 percent of those who made no gift earn $23,000 or more.

TABLE 16

LEVEL OF GIVING TO THE UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND BY INCOME LEVEL*

Annual Income	No Gift (%) (n=66)	$1-$499 (%) (n=135)	$500+ (%) (n=24)
under $11,999	34.8	30.3	4.2
$12,000-$22,999	25.7	33.3	8.3
$23,000+	39.4	36.3	87.5
Total %	99.9	99.9	100.0

*Chi square = 23.47, 4 df, p. $<$.05.

The Relationship between Knowledge of Community Services and Level of Giving

The data in Table 17 show that there is not a significant relationship between knowledge of community services and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. The two major agencies, the Jewish Community Center and Jewish Family Service, are well known to givers in the $500 and over category. Among non-givers and those in the $1-$499 range, however, a larger percentage know something about the Jewish Community Center than about Jewish Family Service. This could be explained by the fact that the Jewish Community Center offers to the entire community basic "social supplies" which are highly visible, while the services provided by Jewish Family Service, as a family agency, are less public. Similarly, it is not surprising

TABLE 17

KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES BY LEVEL OF GIVING

Jewish Community Services	Know Something about			Know Nothing about		
	No Gift (%)	$1-$499 (%)	$500+ (%)	No Gift (%)	$1-$499 (%)	$500+ (%)
Jewish Community Federation	74.6	80.1	95.5	25.4	19.9	4.5
Jewish Community Center	92.8	96.5	100.0	7.2	3.5	0.0
Jewish Family Service	80.2	88.2	100.0	19.1	11.8	0.0
Hillel, Cal. State Long Beach	57.6	63.5	81.8	42.4	36.5	18.2
Project Outreach	49.3	63.9	60.9	50.7	36.1	39.1
United Jewish Welfare Fund	90.9	95.7	100.0	9.1	4.3	0.0
Jewish Free Loan	41.5	46.0	65.2	58.5	54.0	34.8
Long Beach Hebrew High	39.4	44.2	68.2	60.6	55.8	31.8

that a smaller percentage know something about Jewish Community Federation since its function as a fund raising, allocating and social planning body is not visible and has relatively little impact on the daily life of the average Jewish citizen.

With all services except Project Outreach, the data reveal that the higher the contribution to the United Jewish Welfare Fund, the higher the percentage of persons who know something about an agency. This must not be construed as constituting a causal relationship. For obvious reasons (including financial resources) greater knowledge of agencies in itself may not lead to a larger gift. The larger percentage of those in the $1-$499 category having knowledge of Project Outreach, a program for senior adults, correlates with the fact that of persons sixty and older, 70.9 percent give in the $1-$499 stratum.

The Relationship between Use of Jewish Community Center and Level of Giving

Table 18 shows that there is neither a significant positive nor inverse relationship between use of facilities and/or participation in activities sponsored by the Jewish Community Center and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund.

The Relationship between Synagogue Affiliation and Level of Giving

Although Table 19 shows a significant relationship

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION IN AND USE OF JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER FACILITIES BY LEVEL OF GIVING*

Participates	No Gift (%) (n=69)	$1-$499 (%) (n=145)	$500+ (%) (n=24)
Once a week	14.5	9.7	8.3
More than 6 times a year	11.6	19.3	20.8
3 to 6 times a year	8.7	13.8	12.5
Once or twice a year	24.6	26.9	29.2
Never	40.6	30.3	29.2
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Chi square = 5.7513, 8 df, $p > .05$.

TABLE 19

CONGREGATIONAL AFFILIATION BY LEVEL OF GIVING*

Affiliation	No Gift (%) (n=68)	$1-$499 (%) (n=145)	$500+ (%) (n=23)
Reform	14.7	17.2	56.5
Conservative	16.2	21.4	26.1
Other	17.6	12.4	0.0
No affiliation	51.5	49.0	17.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Chi square = 26.54654, 6 df, $p < .05$.

between synagogue affiliation and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund, it is important to note that the small number of cases in the $500+ contributor stratum and the fact that slightly more than an acceptable number of expected frequencies is less than five, the chi square test of significance cannot be applied legitimately. Nonetheless, it is clear that those affiliating with Reform congregations make larger gifts to the United Jewish Welfare Fund than do either the non-affiliated or those affiliating with other branches of Judaism. Further, of those making no gift, more than half are not affiliated with a congregation.

In explaining larger gifts to the United Jewish Welfare Fund by those affiliating with Reform congregations, it was important to determine whether these gifts were a function of affiliation or income. Table 20, which indicates respondents' congregational affiliation by income, reflects the fact that those at the highest income levels affiliate most frequently with Conservative congregations. Therefore, it is significant that those who affiliate with the Reform movement contribute larger gifts to the United Jewish Welfare Fund.

If this situation is idiosyncratic to Long Beach, two factors may be cited by way of explanation. Temple Israel, the largest Reform congregation in the service-solicitation area, has established membership conditional

upon contribution to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. Even though this regulation may not be strictly enforced and some Temple members make merely token gifts, its intent is clear. More significant perhaps is the important communal role played by the Temple's leader, Rabbi Wolli Kaelter. He actively participates on a number of Jewish agency boards and committees, and by his activity is a role model for his congregation.

TABLE 20

CONGREGATIONAL AFFILIATION BY INCOME*

Income	Conservative (%) (n=43)	Reform (%) (n=44)	Other (%) (n=105)	No Affiliation (%) (n=105)
under $6,999	2.3	15.9	26.9	16.2
$7,000-$11,999	7.0	13.6	11.5	19.0
$12,000-$17,999	2.3	9.1	19.2	21.9
$18,000-$22,999	14.0	20.5	11.5	10.5
$23,000-$34,999	30.2	22.7	11.5	18.1
$35,000+	44.2	18.2	19.2	14.3
Total %	100.0	100.0	99.8	99.9

*Chi square = 38.69985, 15 df, $p < .05$.

The Relationship between Type of Jewish Education and Level of Giving

The data in Table 21 indicate that formal Jewish education is not a variable in motivations for giving. Although this study did not measure length or intensity of formal Jewish instruction, nearly 80 percent of the sample obtained some Jewish education with 64.5 percent attending either Sunday or Hebrew school. Whether or not a person received formal Jewish instruction is not significant in relation to level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund.

TABLE 21

TYPE OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION BY LEVEL OF GIVING*

Jewish Education	No Gift (%) (n=64)	$1-$499 (%) (n=126)	$500+ (%) (n=22)
Sunday school	29.7	34.9	45.5
Hebrew school	32.8	29.4	27.3
Other	10.9	16.7	18.2
None	26.6	19.0	9.1
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.1

*Chi square = 5.21523, 6 df, $p > .05$.

The Relationship between Organizational Membership and Level of Giving

That a significant relationship exists between organizational membership and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund is clear from the data in Table 22: 62.5 percent of those making gifts of $500 or more belong to two or more Jewish organizations; 58.6 percent of those making no gift do not belong to any Jewish organizations. This seems to suggest that those involved in Jewish communal life have a variety of overlapping commitments. This supports similar findings by Massarik in 1955.[1]

TABLE 22

MEMBERSHIP IN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS BY LEVEL OF GIVING*

Number of Jewish Organizational Memberships	No Gift (%) (n=70)	$1-$499 (%) (n=150)	$500+ (%) (n=24)
None	58.6	36.0	16.7
One	17.1	26.7	20.8
Two or more	24.3	37.3	62.5
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Chi square = 19.07863, 4 df, $p < .05$.

[1] Fred Massarik, "What People Think about the UJWF," Research Service Bureau, Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, 1955, p. 12. (Mimeographed.)

The Relationship between Length of Residence and Level of Giving

The data in Table 23 support the findings by Massarik[2] and indicate a significant relationship between length of residence and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. Nearly 80 percent of those making gifts of $500 or more have resided in the Long Beach area for fifteen years or longer. Of those making no gifts, 40 percent have lived in the area over fifteen years. This suggests that those with long term residency tend to make an investment in the Jewish community. Among those who do contribute, there is an increasing percentage of people who contribute as length of residency increases.

TABLE 23

LENGTH OF RESIDENCY BY LEVEL OF GIVING*

Length of Residency	No Gift (%) (n=70)	$1-$499 (%) (n=149)	$500+ (%) (n=24)
Less than 8 years	38.6	18.8	8.3
9 to 15 years	21.4	19.5	12.5
Over 15 years	40.0	61.7	79.2
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Chi square = 17.46242, 4 df, $p < .05$.

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

The Relationship between Social Network and Level of Giving

There is a significant relationship between the nature of one's personal friends and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. Of those contributing $500 or more, 79.2 percent have more Jewish than non-Jewish friends. In the $1-$499 stratum, 67.8 percent have more Jewish friends, and among those making no gift, only 48.6 percent have more Jewish than non-Jewish friends.

The Relationship between Concern with Children's Jewish Education and Level of Giving

The data indicate a significant relationship between concern with giving children a Jewish education and level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. Of those in the $500 and above category, 77.3 percent are very concerned about giving their children a Jewish education, while 51.5 percent of non-givers show the same degree of concern.

In his 1955 study, Massarik notes that larger givers tend to have relatively larger families than do small givers.[3] The data available from this study do not support the Massarik findings. Of those with four or more children, only 20 percent give at the $500 and above level compared with 40 percent each in the $1-$499 and "no gift" strata.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 6.

With regard to preference for use of Jewish sponsored agency for social service needs, there was not a significant difference in response between levels of givers.

Respondents were asked to note what they regarded as the important purposes of the Jewish Community Federation. Of the eleven purposes listed, only one registered a significant difference in response between varying level givers. The statement "Federation should promote cooperative effort among all Jewish groups in the community" was considered very important by 100 percent of the $500+ givers, 71.8 percent of those in the $1-$499 stratum, and 68.3 percent of those who made no gift. This suggests that those who do not give have less concern about the role of the Federation in promoting cooperation.

There is a significant positive relationship between level of giving and the type of charities to which respondents contribute. In responding to whether they contribute more to Jewish or community-wide causes, or about the same to each, 83.3 percent of those in the $500 and above stratum indicated that they contribute more to Jewish causes, followed by 69.0 percent of those in the $1-$499 category and 55.9 percent of non-givers. It appears, therefore, that the greater one's gift, the larger one's felt commitment to Jewish causes.

Attitudinal Questions

Included in the questionnaire were twenty-five attitudinal statements which respondents were asked to rate in terms of their degree of agreement or disagreement. The statements were divided into four groupings and related to attitudes toward Israel, self conceptions of why one considers himself or herself Jewish, motivations for giving, percentage of support for local services compared with overseas needs, and several general statements.

For the most part, there was very little significant difference in response to these statements in terms of level of giving.

The deep and continuing concern with the future of Israel is very apparent. In each of the giving categories there was over 90 percent agreement with the statement, "I feel a personal concern in the outcome of the Arab-Israeli conflict." The same holds true for the statements, "Israel has given American Jews a feeling of pride in Jewish accomplishment" and "Jews should contribute money to support humanitarian (welfare) services in Israel." It is interesting to note, however, that of the small number disagreeing with the three statements, the largest percentage are to be found in the $1-$499 category rather than the non-giving category as might be expected.

There is a positive relationship between level of giving and the considering of Tzedakah as one of the most

important principles of Judaism. Agreement responses range from 95.9 percent for those in the highest giving category to 75.3 percent for non-givers.

The statement "Jews should support Jewish agencies even if they themselves may not use them" showed a positive relationship in responses by varying level contributors. The agreement ranged from 100 percent for contributors in the $500 and over category to 86.9 percent in the non-givers' category.

There was less unanimity among the giving levels with regard to the statement, "Jews need to take greater responsibility for fellow Jews than for non-Jews." Agreeing with that statement were 69.6 percent of the top giving category, 76.6 percent of the $1-$499 stratum, and 54.5 percent of non-givers.

The statement "Jews should donate to Jewish causes before donating to other causes" shows a positive relationship between agreement and levels of giving, ranging from 66.6 percent in the top giving category to 43.4 percent in the non-giving stratum.

As might be expected, a larger percentage of those at the $500 and above level of giving agree with the statement, "The continuation of Jewish life in the United States is very important to me," than those in the non-giving category.

The data show that there are no significant differ-

ences in response to the attitudinal statements with regard to respondents' age, ancestry (German or Eastern European Jews), and type of formal Jewish education.

Summary

This chapter tested relationships between level of giving to the United Jewish Welfare Fund and key variables related to motivations for giving. The findings show that there is a significant relationship between level of giving and socioeconomic level of contributor, Reform synagogue affiliation, and number of organizations in which respondents hold membership.

Additional variables that are significantly related to level of giving are length of residence in the community, Jewish social network relationships, and type of charities (Jewish or community-wide) to which respondents contribute.

Variables that did not correlate significantly with level of giving were knowledge of Jewish community services, participation in Jewish Community Center activities, and type of formal Jewish education received by respondent.

For the most part there was not a significant relationship between respondents' level of giving and attitudes toward Jewish issues.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

American Jewish philanthropy has the dual function of meeting sectarian social service needs and perpetuating the continuity of the community. As Kutzik notes, it also stratifies and organizes the community "through processes of socialization and social control of group members.[1] However, the existence of social norms which encourage and exhort Jews to contribute voluntarily and generously has not resulted in giving by the majority of American Jews. The fact remains that despite traditions of Tzedakah and community, only 40 percent of the American Jewish population contributes to the annual combined campaign for Jewish philanthropies in non-war years.

In an attempt to discover why some people give and why some do not, this study was addressed to an examination of the variables that might account for differences in giving patterns.

---

[1]Alfred J. Kutzik, "The Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1967), p. 32.

Summary of Findings

Several components of Jewish experience were tested to determine if they were, in fact, key variables. Areas under study relating to levels of giving included religious affiliation, organizational membership, knowledge and use of community agencies, and aspects of Jewish identity. In addition, of course, was the question of whether level of giving is related to socioeconomic indices of contributors.

The data confirm the expectation that participation in Jewish life, whether religious or secular, is a key variable in giving. Thus, those who affiliate with temples and synagogues and those who hold membership in a number of Jewish organizations tend to be larger givers than those who are unaffiliated and non-joiners. Of course, as in all correlational research, it is difficult to define a causal relationship. We cannot be certain whether participation serves an educational role, thereby encouraging giving, or whether those who give participate actively in Jewish life because their contributions give them a sense of proprietorship and belonging.

Another explanation for the significant correlation between level of giving and communal participation may relate to income. One would expect that those in higher socioeconomic levels would participate to a greater extent in Jewish organizations.

Jewish education in the United States is generally

considered to be inadequate due to the fact that it apparently has little long-range effect on religious involvement and Jewish identity. Of further concern is the fact that few students seem to learn very much about their history and tradition.[2] This, therefore, led to the expectation that whether or not one had received the typically available formal Jewish instruction would not be an important variable in motivation for giving, and this expectation was confirmed. Himmelfarb's findings pertaining to the effectiveness of Jewish education is particularly relevant. He indicates that

> supplemental types of Jewish education (Sunday schools and weekday afternoon schools) generally do not increase adult religious involvement [i.e., Jewish identification] beyond the level obtained by those with no Jewish schooling unless one has more than 12 years of such schooling.[3]

The data confirmed the expectation that there is not a significant relationship between knowledge of agencies and level of giving, although the researcher was surprised by the large percentage of respondents in all categories who indicated knowledge of available communal services. This finding appears to have important implications for fund raising. Rather than the standard recitation of agency services during the solicitation process, it may

---

[2]Harold S. Himmelfarb, "Jewish Education for Naught: Educating the Culturally Deprived Child," Analysis, No. 51 (September, 1975): 1.

[3]Ibid., p. 3.

be more productive to interpret and relate the role of sectarian services to the future of Jewish life, particularly since 92.7 percent of the sample agreed with the statement, "The continuation of Jewish life in the United States is very important to me."

The finding that there is a significant relationship between level of giving and socioeconomic level of contributor was not expected by this researcher (see chapter on Analysis of Data: Part II). Nevertheless, it must be noted that 39.4 percent of those who earn $23,000 or more make no gift. Further, of those earning $35,000 and over, 25 percent make no gift and 35.3 percent give in the $1-$499 stratum.

As previously reported, Jewish people who live in the Long Beach area have a median income of $20,500, well above the 1971 national Jewish median income figure of $12,630. Yet the Long Beach Jewish community ranked twentieth out of twenty-three medium-sized communities in per capita gifts to the United Jewish Welfare Fund (see Appendix E), and the total number of gifts has declined by 464 since 1973 (see Appendix F).

Implications

It is interesting to speculate on why such a discrepancy exists between income and giving in the Long Beach

area.[4] As indicated previously, social pressure is an effective, albeit sometimes unpleasant factor, in successful fund raising. The Long Beach campaign uses few of the usual accoutrements associated with fund raising, e.g., kick-off dinners featuring prominent Israeli government leaders, parlor meetings, and victory banquets. This researcher is loath to suggest the incorporation of some of the more vulgar techniques of fund raising. Nonetheless, alternate methods need to be devised to reach those whose level of commitment and motivation to give need additional stimulation. Non-contributors are not necessarily unwilling to give. Rather, because their priorities and values may be different from those who contribute easily and generously, they are people who have not yet been motivated. Therefore, what is needed is a broader range of fund raising strategies designed to reach those with varying levels of commitment. As Yaffe notes: "The entire machinery of the Charity Establishment . . . operates not to create in Jews impulses that they don't have but 'to nudge the inevitable.'"[5]

Zucker makes an interesting correlation between the

---

[4]See Appendix G, "Implications for the Future of the Long Beach Jewish Community."

[5]James Yaffe, The American Jews (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 179.

the functions and roles of Federation and successful fund raising.[6] He suggests that an active, visible Federation, involving large numbers of committed lay leaders, tends to be the sine qua non for a successful campaign. Additional efforts must be made in the Long Beach community in the areas of planning and programming so that the Federation is seen as more than just a fund raising entity. A disproportionate amount of time and effort is spent in year-round campaigning to the detriment of other important and viable programs.

In this sample, opinions are fairly evenly divided with respect to whether local services or Israel should receive the greater percentage of funds collected. This appears to be in contrast to priorities of other communities where it is almost axiomatic that funds can be raised on the basis of a strong appeal regarding Israel's needs.

Long Beach has never used this particular kind of appeal, tending to be somewhat more even-handed in its campaign rhetoric with relation to the needs of Israel and the local community, except, of course, during periods of crisis. Even-handedness in this case may constitute a somewhat excessively mild appeal. Both the even-handedness and the mildness of appeal should be reassessed.

The soliciting of funds is not an easy--and for

---

[6]Henry L. Zucker, "What Every Social Worker Should Know about Federated Jewish Fund Raising," Journal of Jewish Communal Service 45 (Fall 1968): 61.

most people--agreeable process. Yet the success of a campaign often depends on a corps of volunteers who are knowledgeable and motivated. Beyond the motivation and training, however, is the need for the development of a psychological sense of community among volunteers that forms a network of mutual support. Lacking these vital supports, too often volunteers are "turned off" by the campaign and are lost both as solicitors and contributors.

Recommendations for Federation Programming

1. The Federation should review its list of contributors to determine whether differential strategies should be developed for different levels of giving.

2. The Federation should reconsider the structure of the campaign, particularly as it relates to shortening and intensifying the campaign.

3. The Federation should, in addition to upgrading worker training, develop programs that will serve to psychologically support campaign workers.

4. The Federation should develop more community-wide programs and thus become more visible on a year-round basis.

5. The Federation should actively seek to broaden its leadership base and involve a larger segment of the community in decision making.

Recommendation for Future Study

The entire subject of motivations for giving needs further research. Particularly significant would be the charting of generational differences as they apply to attitudes toward support of sectarian social services.

Conclusion

The motivations for giving in the Jewish community are unquestionably complex and intricate. Most Jewish people continue to feel a sense of responsibility for their fellow Jews and express concerns for the future of group survival.

It is the differential manner in which people act on these feelings that causes concern in the Jewish community. We need to understand that agreement on values does not ensure that there will be agreement on how to operationalize those values. A particular value does not give rise to only one course of action. There exists a universe of alternatives on how one may act on his or her Jewishness in our pluralistic society.

The failure to acknowledge and act on that reality will mean the forfeiting of opportunities to design and develop programs and campaigns that could reach the broadest segment of the Jewish community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books

Andrews, F. Emerson. Attitudes toward Giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1953.

_____. Philanthropic Giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950.

Axelrod, Morris, ed. A Community Survey for Long Range Planning. Boston: The Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, 1967.

Baron, Salo W. The Jewish Community. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1942.

_____. The Social and Religious History of the Jews. 15 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Bogen, Boris D. Jewish Philanthropy. New York: Macmillan Co., 1917.

Bridger, David, ed. The New Jewish Encyclopedia. New York: Behrman House Inc., 1962.

Canter, Irving. "The Ethnic Dynamic: Problems Related to the Jewish Component." In Research Readings in Jewish Communal Services. Edited by Irving Canter. New York: National Association of Jewish Center Workers, 1969.

Dean, John. "Jewish Population in the Life of Middle-Sized Communities." In The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group. Edited by Marshall Sklare. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1968.

Elazar, Daniel J. "Decision-Making in the American Jewish Community." In The Jewish Community in America. Edited by Marshall Sklare. New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974.

Encyclopedia Judaica, 1971 ed.

Frisch, Ephraim. An Historical Survey of Jewish Philanthropy. New York: Macmillan Co., 1924.

Ginsberg, Eli. Agenda for American Jews. New York: Kings Crown Press, Columbia University Press, 1950.

Glazer, Nathan, and Moynihan, Daniel P. Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge: The MIT and Harvard University Press, 1963.

Glazar, Nathan, ed. The Characteristics of American Jews. New York: Jewish Education Committee Press, 1965.

Goldstein, Sidney, and Goldscheider, Calvin. Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Goren, Arthur A. New York Jews and the Quest for Community. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Kaplan, Mordecai M. "Jewish Philanthropy: Traditional and Modern." In Intelligent Philanthropy. Edited by Ellsworth Faris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

Kertzer, Morris N. Today's American Jews. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

Kramer, Judith R. The American Minority Community. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970.

Kramer, Judith R., and Leventman, Seymour. Children of the Gilded Ghetto. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Kutzik, Alfred J. Social Work and Jewish Values. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959.

Liebman, Charles S. "American Jewry: Identity and Affiliation." In The Future of the Jewish Community in America. Edited by David Sidorsky. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Lurie, Harry L. "Jewish Communal Life in the United States." In The Jewish People Past and Present. Edited by R. Abramovitch et al. New York: Marsten Press, 1946.

_____. A Heritage Affirmed. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961.

Massarik, Fred, and Chenkin, Alvin. "United States National Jewish Population Study: A First Report." In American Jewish Year Book, 1973. Edited by Morris Fine et al. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973.

Mayer, Albert I. Columbus Jewish Population Study. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Jewish Welfare Foundation, 1969.

Maynard, Betty J. The Dallas Jewish Community Study. Dallas: Jewish Welfare Federation of Dallas, 1974.

Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Parsons, Talcott. "A Revised Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification." In Essays in Sociological Theory. Edited by Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.

Rischlin, Moses. The Promised City: New York's Jews 1870-1914. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Sachar, Howard M. The Course of Modern Jewish History. New York: A Delta Book, 1958.

Schweitzer, Frederick. A History of the Jews since the First Century A.D. New York: Macmillan Co., 1971.

Shapiro, Judah J. "The Philistine Philanthropists: The Power and the Shame of Jewish Federations." In Jewish Radicalism. Edited by Jack N. Porter. New York: Grove Press, 1973.

Sklare, Marshall. The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.

Sklare, Marshall, and Greenblum, Joseph. Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier. New York and London: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Tumin, Melvin. Social Stratification. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Winter, Gibson. Religious Identity. New York: Macmillan Co., 1968.

Wirth, Louis. The Ghetto. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Yaffe, James. The American Jews. New York: Random House, 1968.

Zborowski, Mark, and Herzog, Elizabeth. Life Is with People. New York: Schocken Books, 1952.

2. Periodicals

Bubis, Gerald B. "Brohka Brokers and Power Brokers." Jewish Spectator 40 (Spring 1975): 58-61.

Chein, Isadore. "The Problem of Jewish Identification." Jewish Social Studies 17 (1955): 219-225.

Elazar, Daniel J. "Kinship and Consent in the Jewish Community: Patterns of Continuity in Jewish Communal Life." Tradition 15 (January 1975): 64-79.

Handlin, Oscar. "Changing Patterns in Group Life in America and Their Implications for the American Jewish Community." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 34 (Summer 1958): 348-352.

Hiller, Robert I., and Schwartz, Meyer. "Fundraising as a Social Work Process." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 36 (Fall 1959): 59-64.

Himmelfarb, Harold S. "Jewish Education for Naught: Educating the Culturally Deprived Jewish Child." Analysis 51 (September 1975): 1-11.

Kaplow, Herman L. "Motivations for Giving." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 38 (Fall 1961): 88-99.

Kramer, Simon G. "Fund-raising in America." Jewish Observer and Middle East Review 30 (July 29, 1966): 6.

Levy, Charles S. "Fundraising: Design for Human Service." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 5 (Winter 1973): 136-144.

Lurie, Harry L. "Jewish Community Organization--Functions and Structures." Jewish Social Service Quarterly 26 (1949): 47-57.

Sheehan, Robert. "The Miracle of Jewish Giving." Fortune Magazine, January 1966, p. 148.

Slawson, John. "Jewish Identity in the United States." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 48 (Fall 1971): 42-48.

Teicher, Morton I. "What Are the Criteria for 'A Good Community'?" Jewish Social Work Forum 3 (Fall 1966): 3-28.

Wiesel, Elie. "Teaching Jewish Identity." Jewish Education 44 (Winter-Spring 1975): 8-10.

Zucker, Henry L. "What Every Social Worker Should Know about Federated Jewish Fund-Raising." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 45 (Fall 1968): 60-65.

3. Unpublished Sources

Dashefsky, Arnold M. "Social Interaction and Jewish Self-Conception: A Two Generation Analysis in the St. Paul Community." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1969.

Hutler, Albert. "People Give to People." San Diego.

Kutzik, Alfred J. "The Social Basis of American Jewish Philanthropy." Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1969.

Lazar, Robert J. "From Ethnic Minority to Socio-Economic Elite: A Study of the Jewish Community of Fargo, North Dakota." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1968.

Massarik, Fred. "A Study of the Jewish Population of Long Beach, Lakewood and Los Alamitos, 1962." Report prepared for the Long Beach Jewish Community Federation, Long Beach, 1962.

_____. "What People Think about the UJWF." Research Service Bureau, Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, 1955.

Shapiro, Judah J. "How Democratic Is the American Jewish Community?" New York. (Mimeographed.)

Stein, Herman D. "Jewish Social Work in the United States 1654-1954." Ph.D. dissertation, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1958.

Verbit, Mervin F. "Characteristics of a Jewish Community." Jewish Federation of North Jersey, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

4. Newspapers, Pamphlets, Minutes

Hartmann, Sidney A. The History of the Long Beach Jewish Community. Long Beach: Jewish Community Council of Long Beach, 1957.

Jewish Federation News [Long Beach] , 1957-1976.

Long Beach City Planning Department. Statistics on Long Beach Population and Housing. Long Beach: City Planning Department, 1975.

Long Beach Jewish Community Council. Minutes, 1957-1961.

Long Beach Jewish Community Federation. General Assembly Proceedings, 1961-1975.

APPENDIX A

LONG BEACH CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND AND ISRAEL EMERGENCY FUND

YEAR	U.J.W.F.*	LOCAL EMERGENCY	I.E.F.**	TOTAL
1962	$219,500			$219,500
1963	230,000			230,000
1964	247,250			247,250
1965	247,250			247,250
1966	242,900			242,900
1967	218,000	$32,000	$150,000	400,000
1968	260,000		36,000	296,000
1969	300,500		85,400	385,900
1970	255,000		89,000	344,000
1971	316,000		97,000	413,000
1972	342,000		70,000	412,000
1973	415,000		315,000	730,000
1974	505,000		191,000	696,000
1975	526,000		97,000	623,000

*United Jewish Welfare Fund
**Israel Emergency Fund

APPENDIX B

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
Cincinnati • New York • Los Angeles • Jerusalem

SCHOOL OF
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

3077 UNIVERSITY MALL • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007
(213) 749-3424

November 20, 1975

In connection with work towards Masters degrees in Social Work from USC and Jewish Communal Studies from HUC, I am embarking on an exciting piece of research that is expected to be of significance to Jewish people residing in the greater Long Beach area.

The focus of the project is to survey attitudes toward and knowledge/use of Jewish communal services, as well as to collect data concerning Jewish identity and sense of relatedness to the Jewish community and its institutions.

It is expected that the findings will be of value to the Federation, affiliated agencies and local temples in terms of both short and long range planning. Additionally, the results may have significant implications for organizational and communal structures, particularly if the attitudinal findings suggest important new understandings about the dynamics of Jewish commitment.

A randomly selected sample of 500, drawn from the Jewish community mailing list, will be sent questionnaires in early January. I am particularly anxious that community leaders be apprized of this research so that they can attest to its legitimacy and importance, should they be questioned by persons receiving the questionnaire. To this end, I would be most grateful if you would share this letter with your Board and other leaders. And, of course, if you have any questions, I hope you will call me.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Cordially,

Esther A. Shapiro
598-6306

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

January 5, 1976

In connection with my work toward a Masters Degree from the USC School of Social Work, I am involved in an important and exciting research project for which I need your assistance.

I am asking you to participate in a survey to obtain both demographic information and attitudes towards use of Jewish community services. Your name is one of 500 that have been randomly drawn from community mailing lists of Jewish persons residing in the greater Long Beach area.

Whether or not you are currently using Jewish services or involved and interested in Jewish community organizations, your ideas and opinions are of great importance. The data you will provide is vital for efficient and effective planning and program development.

Various leaders in the community have agreed that the findings will undoubtedly provide information which can become the basis for improved services for everyone.

I assure you that your replies will be used for statistical computation only. The questionnaire has been coded for purposes of confidentiality.

I think you will enjoy filling out the enclosed questionnaire and participating in this significant research. If you would like to receive a report of the findings, please so indicate on the last page of the questionnaire.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope no later than Monday, January 19th.

Should you have any questions, I hope you will call me evenings at 598-6306. I sincerely appreciate your assistance.

Cordially,

Esther A. Shapiro

APPENDIX D

IT WILL TAKE APPROXIMATELY 30 MINUTES TO COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: IF QUESTIONNAIRE IS RECEIVED BY A MARRIED COUPLE, IT MAY BE COMPLETED BY EITHER HUSBAND OR WIFE.

Please answer each question by placing a check (✓) next to the appropriate response. It is very important that each question be answered.

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED FORM NO LATER THAN MONDAY, JANUARY 19th

If you have any questions, please call me evenings at 598-6306.

SECTION I - THIS SECTION REQUESTS GENERAL INFORMATION TO DESCRIBE THE SAMPLE POPULATION STATISTICALLY.

1. In what area do you live?
   - ____Belmont Shore - Naples
   - ____Bixby Hills
   - ____Bixby Knolls
   - ____Downtown Long Beach
   - ____El Dorado
   - ____Lakewood
   - ____Los Altos
   - ____North Long Beach
   - ____Rossmoor - Los Alamitos - Seal Beach
   - ____Westminster - Fountain Valley - Huntington Beach
   - ____other (specify)_____

2. When did you move to the Long Beach or western Orange County area?
   - ____born here
   - ____less than 1 year ago
   - ____4 to 8 years ago
   - ____9 to 15 years ago
   - ____over 15 years ago

3. Is it likely that you will move, by choice or transfer, from the Long Beach/western Orange County area?
   - ____not at all
   - ____within 1 year
   - ____within 2 to 5 years

4. Sex
   - ____male
   - ____female

5. Please check your age category.
   ____20 to 29
   ____30 to 39
   ____40 to 49
   ____50 to 59
   ____60 to 64
   ____65 and over

6. Please check your marital status.
   ____married
   ____widowed
   ____divorced
   ____separated
   ____never married

7. Are you Jewish?
   ____yes
   ____no

8. If married, widowed or divorced, is or was your spouse Jewish?
   ____yes
   ____no

9. How many children do you have?
   ____none
   ____1
   ____2
   ____3
   ____4
   ____5
   ____6 or more

10. What are the ages of your children?

Age	Number in that age group
0-5	_____
6-12	_____
13-19	_____
20-25	_____
25+	_____

11. What is your present occupation? Please be specific.

    _____

12. How much schooling have you had? Please check highest level completed.
    ____no schooling
    ____8th grade or less
    ____high school
    ____vocational school
    ____some college
    ____college graduate
    ____graduate or professional school
    degrees held_____

13. Please check appropriate category for total family income.
    ____under 2,999
    ____3,000 to 6,999
    ____7,000 to 11,999
    ____12,000 to 17,999
    ____18,000 to 22,999
    ____23,000 to 34,999
    ____35,000 and over

SECTION II - THIS SECTION IS CONCERNED WITH INFORMATION RELATING TO YOUR JEWISH BACKGROUND AND PRACTICE.

1. Which of the following describes your ancestors? Consider your father's ancestry only.
    ____German Jews
    ____Eastern European Jews
    ____Sephardic Jews
    ____Other (specify)_____

2. At what age did you, your father, your grandfather and great grandfather immigrate to the United States. Consider your father's ancestry only.

	you	father	grand-father	great grand-father
born here	___	___	___	___
immigrated under age 12	___	___	___	___
immigrated over age 12	___	___	___	___
did not immigrate to U.S.	___	___	___	___
don't know	___	___	___	___

3. What kind of formal Jewish education did you receive?
    ____Sunday or other one day a week school
    ____Hebrew or religious school more than one day a week
    ____All day school (parochial)
    ____Yiddish or Jewish secular school
    ____Hebrew High School
    ____courses in College of Jewish Studies
    ____College degree in Jewish Studies
    ____other (specify)_____
    ____none

4. To which congregation do you belong?
    ____Temple Beth David
    ____Temple Beth Shalom
    ____Temple Beth Zion-Sinai
    ____Temple Israel
    ____Congregation Sholom, Leisure World
    ____Congregation Lubavitch
    ____other (specify)_____
    ____none

5. How often would you say you attend synagogue or temple?
   ____at least once a week
   ____occasionally
   ____High Holidays only
   ____rarely
   ____never

6. How concerned are you, or were you, with providing your children with an understanding of Jewish culture and religion?
   ____very concerned
   ____somewhat concerned
   ____slightly concerned
   ____not an important issue

7. Which of the following observances are or were practiced regularly in your grandparent's home? Which are or were practiced in your parent's home? Which are practiced in your home? In your oldest child's home if separate than yours?

	grand-parent's home	parent's home	your home	child's home
Kosher dietary laws	____	____	____	____
Strict religious Sabbath observance	____	____	____	____
Lighting Friday candles	____	____	____	____
Mezzuzah on door	____	____	____	____
Yahrzeit (memorial)	____	____	____	____
Giving or going to a Seder	____	____	____	____
Lighting Chanukah candles	____	____	____	____
Observance of other Jewish holidays	____	____	____	____

8. On the High Holidays do you close your business or stay home from work? Answer question only if you are working outside the home.

	always	occasionally	never
Rosh Hashonah (1st day)	____	____	____
Rosh Hashonah (2nd day)	____	____	____
Yom Kippur	____	____	____

9. Which of the following did your parents consider themselves? Which do you consider yourself? Which does your oldest child consider himself?

	your father	your mother	your-self	oldest child
Orthodox	____	____	____	____
Conservative	____	____	____	____
Reconstructionist	____	____	____	____
Reform	____	____	____	____
Non-religious, cultural Jew	____	____	____	____
Jewish by birth	____	____	____	____
other (specify)_____	____	____	____	____
none of the above	____	____	____	____

SECTION III - THIS SECTION REQUESTS INFORMATION ON YOUR PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZATIONS AND LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES.

1. If you are a member of any of the following organizations, please check the degree to which you participate.

	very active	fairly active	inactive
Synagoque or Temple			
Men's Club	___	___	___
Sisterhood	___	___	___
Temple Board	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Jewish Organizations e.g.			
B'nai B'rith	___	___	___
Hadassah	___	___	___
Jewish War Veterans	___	___	___
Nat'l Council of Jewish Women	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Civic or Community Organizations e.g.			
Art League	___	___	___
Elks	___	___	___
League of Women Voters	___	___	___
Political Party Club	___	___	___
PTA	___	___	___
Symphony Association	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Professional Organizations			
Medical Association	___	___	___
Bar Association	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Jewish Social Service Agency Boards			
Jewish Community Federation Board	___	___	___
Jewish Community Center Board	___	___	___
Jewish Family Service Board	___	___	___
Camp Komaroff Board	___	___	___
Project Outreach Board	___	___	___
Active Volunteer e.g.			
Hospital auxillary	___	___	___
Jewish Community Center	___	___	___
Jewish Family Service	___	___	___
Project Outreach	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___
Other_____	___	___	___

2. Of your personal friends, do you have
   ____more Jewish friends
   ____more non-Jewish friends
   ____about equal

3. Do you socialize primarily with
   ____Jewish people
   ____non-Jewish people
   ____about the same

4. Do your Jewish friends belong to substantially the same Jewish organizations as you do?
   ____yes
   ____no

5. For what reasons would you join Jewish organizations?
   ____sociality and friends
   ____community needs
   ____Jewish commitment
   ____invitation by friends to join
   ____business benefits
   ____other (explain)_____

6. Please check the degree to which you participate in the following leisure time activities.

	very often	moderately often	rarely	never
spectator sports	____	____	____	____
participant sports	____	____	____	____
hobbies	____	____	____	____
cultural functions (plays, etc)	____	____	____	____
card playing	____	____	____	____
participation in clubs and organizations	____	____	____	____
watching television	____	____	____	____
visiting with friends	____	____	____	____
visiting with relatives	____	____	____	____
other (specify)_____	____	____	____	____

7. Most frequently, what have you done on vacation. Please check one.
   ____stay at home
   ____go to resorts
   ____take short trips
   ____take extended travel trips
   ____visit family
   ____other (specify)_____

8. Do you or your family take <u>weekend</u> vacations?
   ____never
   ____once or twice a year
   ____3 to 5 times a year
   ____6 to 8 times a year
   ____more than 8 times a year

9. In your opinion, to what degree are the following factors important in contributing to a person's social standing in the Jewish community?

	of great importance	of moderate importance	not important
occupation	___	___	___
work for Jewish causes	___	___	___
education	___	___	___
income	___	___	___
work for community-wide causes	___	___	___
large gifts to Jewish charities	___	___	___
personal attributes and behavior	___	___	___
organizations to which one belongs	___	___	___
who one's friends are	___	___	___

SECTION IV - THE QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION REQUEST INFORMATION ON YOUR POINT OF VIEW TOWARDS AND USE OF JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES.

1. In each of the following situations would you prefer to use a Jewish-sponsored organization or agency?

	yes	no	doesn't matter
financial assistance	___	___	___
nursery school	___	___	___
recreation for younger children	___	___	___
help in finding a job	___	___	___
help with a marital problem	___	___	___
help with a child behavior problem	___	___	___
activities for senior citizens	___	___	___
day camp for children	___	___	___
resident camp for children	___	___	___
recreation for teenagers	___	___	___
recreation for adults	___	___	___

2. Please check how familiar you are with the following Jewish agencies in the Long Beach/western Orange County area.

	I know quite a lot about	I know something about	I know nothing about	I never heard of
Jewish Community Federation	___	___	___	___
Jewish Community Center	___	___	___	___
Jewish Family Service	___	___	___	___
Hillel, Cal. State Long Beach	___	___	___	___
American Hebrew Foundation	___	___	___	___
Project Outreach	___	___	___	___
United Jewish Welfare Fund	___	___	___	___
Jewish Free Loan	___	___	___	___
Commission on Jewish Youth	___	___	___	___
Long Beach Hebrew High School	___	___	___	___

3. Whether or not you are members, how often do you or your family use the facilities or take part in activities sponsored by the Jewish Community Center?
   ____once a week
   ____once a month
   ____more than 6 times a year
   ____3 to 6 times a year
   ____once or twice a year
   ____never

4. If Jewish Community Center activities, in which you were interested, took place closer to where you live (for instance, in a local school or temple) would you or your family participate more often?
   ____probably yes
   ____probably no
   ____would not make a difference

5. Would you recommend to a Jewish family that they join the Jewish Community Center?
   ____yes
   ____no
   ____don't know

6. What programs, activities or facilities not now available would you or your family like to have at the Jewish Community Center?

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. Based on what you have seen or heard, is it your impression that the Jewish Family Service serves
   ____people at all income levels
   ____people at higher income levels
   ____people at lower income levels
   ____don't know

8. If you were acquainted with Jewish persons having marital, family or child and parent problems, would you recommend that they contact Jewish Family Service?
   ____yes
   ____no
   ____don't know

9. What services or facilities for older adults would you like to see sponsored by the Jewish community? Check the 2 which you regard as most important.
   ____low cost housing
   ____day care
   ____Jewish home for aged
   ____transportation
   ____information and referral
   ____housekeeping assistance
   ____other (specify)_____

10. Of your total contributions for last year, did you contribute
    ____more to Jewish causes
    ____more to community-wide causes
    ____about the same to each
    ____made no contribution last year

11. Excluding regular membership dues, to which Jewish organizations do you contribute?

____Temple or synagogue	____Kindershule
____B'nai B'rith	____Long Beach Hebrew Academy
____Bonds for Israel	____Nat'l Council of Jewish Women
____Brandeis Women	____ORT
____Hadassah	____Pioneer Women
____Israel Emergency Fund	____United Jewish Welfare Fund
____Jewish Community Center	____Zionist Organization of America
____Jewish Family Service	____other (specify)_____
____Jewish National Fund	____other (specify)_____
____Jewish War Veterans	____none

12. To which of the above organizations do you make the largest financial contribution?

    _____

13. Please check what you believe are the important purposes and responsibilities of the Jewish Community Federation.

	very important	somewhat important	not important
give help to Jews in need	____	____	____
build a strong Jewish community	____	____	____
support Israel	____	____	____
promote good will between Jews and non-Jews	____	____	____
help perpetuate Jewish traditional values	____	____	____
support Soviet Jewry	____	____	____
give Jews a sense of pride and identification	____	____	____
raise funds to support Jewish social services	____	____	____
support Jewish education	____	____	____
give leadership and direction to the Jewish community and its programs	____	____	____
promote cooperative effort among all Jewish groups in the community	____	____	____

14. What kinds of Jewish services not now being provided for you and your family would you like to see offered in the Long Beach/western Orange County area?

    _____

    _____

    _____

SECTION V - THE QUESTIONS IN THIS FINAL SECTION ASK ABOUT YOUR ATTITUDES TOWARD JEWISH ISSUES.

1. For each of the following statements, please check the one response which comes closest to indicating how you feel about the statement.

	strongly disagree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
I feel a personal concern in the outcome of the Arab-Israeli conflict.	___	___	___	___
Israel has given American Jews a feeling of pride in Jewish accomplishment.	___	___	___	___
Jews should contribute money to support humanitarian (welfare) services in Israel.	___	___	___	___
Israel is the only place where all Jews can live as Jews in the fullest and broadest sense of the term.	___	___	___	___
I feel that Israel is the spiritual homeland of the Jewish people.	___	___	___	___
I consider myself Jewish primariiy because I had Jewish parents.	___	___	___	___
I consider myself Jewish primarily because I was raised in the Jewish tradition.	___	___	___	___
I consider myself Jewish primarily because of my religious practices.	___	___	___	___
I consider myself Jewish primarily because I believe in Jewish ideals and practices.	___	___	___	___
People contribute to Jewish charities because they want to maintain Jewish life.	___	___	___	___
Tzedakah (charity) is one of the most important principles of Judaism.	___	___	___	___
The only way to become prominent in the Jewish community is to make a big gift to the United Jewish Welfare Fund.	___	___	___	___

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
Support of social services for Jews was or is an important part of my parent's philosophy.	___	___	___	___
Social pressure from friends is what motivates people to give to Jewish charities.	___	___	___	___
Jews should support Jewish agencies even if they themselves may not use them.	___	___	___	___
Jews need to take greater responsibility for fellow Jews than for non-Jews.	___	___	___	___
Jews should donate to Jewish causes before donating to other causes.	___	___	___	___
The continuation of Jewish life in the United States is very important to me.	___	___	___	___
Of the money collected in the annual United Jewish Welfare Fund drive, the greatest proportion should be sent to Israel.	___	___	___	___
Services to the Jewish people locally (Jewish Family Service, Jewish Community Center, Hillel, etc.) should receive the greatest proportion of money collected by the United Jewish Welfare Fund.	___	___	___	___
Anti-semitism is likely to become a serious menace to Jews in the United States.	___	___	___	___
Jewish people should try to do business with other Jews when possible.	___	___	___	___
It is important to me that my children select Jewish mates.	___	___	___	___
I feel a part of the local Jewish community.	___	___	___	___
That which binds Jews together is stronger than that which separates them.	___	___	___	___

I am deeply grateful to you for completing this questionnaire and hope it has been an interesting experience.

There may have been some questions which you feel require broader response. I would greatly appreciate your comments, either on a specific question or on a general issue.

A summary of the findings will be available this summer. If you would like to receive a copy of the report, please fill in and mail the enclosed self-addressed, stamped post-card.

Again, you have my most sincere thanks for your cooperation and participation.

ESTHER A. SHAPIRO
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

APPENDIX E

PER CAPITA GIFTS AND RANKINGS

1975 CAMPAIGN
(Based on estimated finals)

15,000 to 40,000 Jewish Population

City	Total per Capita	Rank
Atlanta	$333.33	1
Dallas	305.00	2
Milwaukee	259.41	3
Houston	246.99	4
Minneapolis	226.40	5
Winnipeg	174.86	6
Denver	161.10	7
Hartford	153.62	8
Kansas City	140.91	9
Phoenix	134.67	10
Cincinnati	123.33	11
Buffalo	121.28	12
San Diego	116.67	13
New Haven	105.00	14
Southern N.J.	103.85	15
Hollywood, Fla.	97.00	16
Central N.J.	94.29	17
Oakland	88.10	18
Raritan Valley	55.56	19
Long Beach	45.31	20
Orange County	24.29	21
Framingham	14.06	22
Lower Bucks Co.	11.88	23
Average	$134.56	

APPENDIX F

LONG BEACH CAMPAIGNS

GIFT CATEGORY	1973	1974	1975
$10,000 and over			
No. of Gifts	5	10	6
Amount Contributed	$56,000	$133,160	$78,500
$1,000 to $9,999			
No. of Gifts	192	174	152
Amount Contributed	$402,412	$330,545	$310,144
$100 to $999			
No. of Gifts	836	726	656
Amount Contributed	$225,147	$188,349	$184,014
Under $100			
No. of Gifts	1,812	1.705	1,567
Amount Contributed	$48,581	$44,446	$42,536
TOTAL			
No. of Gifts	2,845	2,615	2,381
Amount Contributed	$732,140	$696,500	$615,194

APPENDIX G

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE LONG BEACH JEWISH COMMUNITY

Demographically the Long Beach Jewish community has been described as stable and aging (see Chapter IV). When one looks at the small percentage of young people in Long Beach, the small number of new residents, the 31.5 percent of the population that reside in Orange County, and the increasing age of constituents, it becomes clear that there are not the ingredients present for a growing, vibrant community.

Increasing senior needs and a diminishing contribution base (see Appendix F) plus the ravages of inflation and increased service needs due to a recessive economy have already placed great stress on local agencies.

On the basis of these facts and the vision of service that an enlarged and vital community could provide, the researcher supports the concept of merger with Orange County Jewish Federation Council which is now under discussion. Together, the two communities could provide for the needs of Jewish citizens with a variety of intensified and expanded services.

This proposed merger offers unlimited possibilities