To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Marvin A. Rubenstein and Cynthia T. Soloway entitled "Southville Revisited." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Social Work.

Marvin D. Feit, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
79
.R824
cop. 2

SOUTHVILLE REVISITED

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science in Social Work

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Marvin A. Rubenstein

and

Cynthia T. Solcway

June 1979

1390052

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to thank their respective families for their patience during this most difficult period. The researchers also wish to acknowledge the help given to them by their thesis committee, Dr. Marvin Feit (Chairman), Mr. Hugh Vaughn, and Mr. Michael Holosko. The researchers also extend thanks to the American Jewish Committee Library staff, Cyma Horowitz, Director; the Memphis Jewish Federation and Service Agency for their moral support for this project; the volunteers who donated their time and effort to disseminate and retrieve the questionnaires from the sample population; and Miss Ina Mendelsohn, without whose help the 1979 Southville Survey would not have been completed.

ABSTRACT

Southville Revisited is a quantitative-descriptive study which examined (1) the extent to which Jews in Memphis identify with traditional Jewish values; (2) the effectiveness of current goals and objectives of the Memphis Jewish communal agencies in satisfying the needs of the community; (3) the comparison of the 1979 sample of the population with the respondents in the Southville Survey of 1959; and (4) new directions in planning and in expanding Jewish communal services to meet changing needs evidenced in the current study.

In order to accomplish these goals, the researchers utilized approximately 75 percent of the questions derived from the 1959 Southville Survey of Jewish Attitudes. In addition, the researchers added seventeen questions pertaining to the Jewish educational level of the respondents, their views on Israel, and programming for the elderly and Russian immigrants. Sixty-four questions, covering 10 pages, were asked of the respondents in a self-administered questionnaire.

Selection of the 1979 sample was based on a systematic random selection of Jewish heads of households. A master list of current heads of households was obtained from the Memphis Jewish Federation from which every thirtieth name was selected. The target population was to represent 3 percent of the Jewish heads of households in Memphis, approximately one hundred persons. The researchers were able to obtain seventy-five completed questionnaires. The process of dissemination and completion of the questionnaires by the sample selected began in the month of October 1978 and was completed in January of 1979.

Major findings of the Southville Revisited study included the following: (1) the present sample appears to be an older and more financially and occupationally secure population than the 1959 respondents; (2) the age, income, education, and length of residence of the respondents appears to have a significant influence on the Jewish identity of those questioned; and (3) the importance of Jewish communal agencies (e.g., Jewish Community Center, Jewish Service Agency) indicated by the respondents seems to be offset by the lack of Jewish identification seen in their programming. A lack of Jewish educational background among the 1979 sample was also noticed. Many of the findings of the 1979 sample were seen to be similar to those in the 1959 study in areas such as commitment to Israel.

With the knowledge gained from the 1979 sample, a number of program implications became evident. These recommendations included, among others, that communal agencies design programs that appeal to an educated population. These programs should incorporate identifiable Jewish values and customs. Programs related to single parents, separated, divorced, or widowed, should be initiated into the local Jewish community. Programs as well as direct services by the Jewish communal agencies must therefore be positively identified with Jewish values and practices in order to have impact upon the Jewish population in Memphis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Rationale of Southville and "Southville Revisited"	2
	Statement of Problem	6
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
	Introduction	10
	Immigration	11
	Historical Perspective	12
	Summary	16
	Southern Jewry - Historical Perspective	18
	The Jews of Memphis	22
	Determinants of Southern Jewry	23
	Evolution of Jewish Communal Studies	31
	Types of Communal Studies	33
	Historical Studies	33
	Demographic Studies	35
	Demographic/Attitudinal	36
	Summary of Communal Studies	44
	Description and Background Information of 1959	45
	Background Data	45
	Religious Affiliation	46
	Essentials of Judaism	47
	Organizational Life	48

CHAPTER PAGE

Jewish Causes and Philanthropies 49

Israel 49

Relationships to Others 50

Stereotypes 51

Intermarriage, Interdating, and Friendships of Children 52

III. METHOD OF PROCEDURE 54

Background Information 54

Planning Phase 57

The Survey Instrument 57

The Population and the Sample 60

Planning the Questionnaire 62

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 64

Descriptive and Background Information of 1979 64

Alcohol and Drug Problems 65

Relationships With Non-Jews 66

Interdating 66

Satisfying the Needs of the Elderly and the Russian Immigrants 66

Questionnaire Evaluation 67

Comparative Analysis 67

Summary of Findings 88

Exploratory Correlational Analysis 93

Operational Definition of Key Variables 93

Findings 98

CHAPTER PAGE

Orthodox Sample 99

Conservative Sample 105

Reform Sample 109

Trends 113

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 114

Limitations of Southville Revisited Study 114

Implications of Findings in 1979 Study 117

Comparative Findings: 1959 and 1979 118

Conflictual Data 118

Surprising Data 122

Program Recommendations 123

Further Investigation 127

Summary 129

BIBLIOGRAPHY 130

APPENDIXES 136

A. Survey Instrument 137

B. Explanatory Letter 148

C. Affadavit of Confidentiality 149

D. Statistical Data 150

VITA 152

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Frequency Percentages of Age Ranges of Heads of Households: 1959 Southville Survey, 1977 Census, and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	69
2.	Percentages Regarding Marital Status: 1959 Southville Survey, 1977 Census, and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	69
3.	Comparison of Length of Residence in Years in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	71
4.	Comparison of Level of Education in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	72
5.	Comparison of Selected Occupational Status in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	73
6.	Comparison of Views on Religious Affiliation in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey, 1977 Census, and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	73
7.	Comparison of Religious Affiliation by Synagogues/ Temples in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey, 1977 Census, and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	75
8.	Comparison of Importance of Jewish Causes in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	77
9.	Comparisons of Estimate of Jewish Community Center Activities in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	78
10.	Rank Order and Frequency of Response of Essentials to Being a "Good Jew": 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	80
11.	Comparison of Jewish Practices in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	82
12.	Comparison of Agreement With Statements About Jews and Non-Jews in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited"	85

Table Page

13. Comparisons of Statements on Ways Americans Can Help Israel Expressed in Percentages: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited" 86

14. Frequency of Hours Per Month Spent on Organizational Life: 1959 Southville Survey and 1979 "Southville Revisited" 86

15. Intercorrelational Matrix of Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Orthodox Sample Selected 101

16. Intercorrelational Matrix of Demographic Variables and Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Orthodox Sample Selected 102

17. Intercorrelational Matrix of Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Conservative Sample Selected . . . 106

18. Intercorrelational Matrix of Demographic Variables and Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Conservative Sample Selected 107

19. Intercorrelational Matrix of Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Reform Sample Selected 110

20. Intercorrelational Matrix of Demographic Variables and Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Reform Sample Selected 111

21. Intercorrelational Matrix of Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Female Sample Selected 150

22. Intercorrelational Matrix of Variables Related to Jewish Identity in the Male Sample Selected 151

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historically every Jew knew what he was--he had been born a Jew and he served G-d in the manner of his ancestors. Every Jew also knew where he stood in relation to those outside his group. Christians believed in one ultimate truth, Jews in another; and whether the Jew and the Christian lived as friends or as enemies, there was nothing to be done to change the basic relations between them.[1]

In this emancipated modern era, the rigidity of two separate societies--Jewish and Christian--has been relegated to the past. Today, open societies characterized by greater freedom and healthier interaction among religious and ethnic groups have been the motivation for extensive self-examination. Jews are able to ask themselves how they feel about being Jews; they seek to discover what non-Jews think about them and to clarify what they should think about non-Jews.[2] One of the conclusions formulated from this scrutiny is that Jewish continuity in such an open society is largely based on the ingredient of Jewish values and the sense of identity its people feel with these values.

---

[1] Marshall Sklare and Marc Vosk, The Riverton Study: How Jews Look at Themselves and Their Neighbors (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1957), p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

This thesis, a quantitative-descriptive study entitled "Southville Revisited," intends to examine: (1) the extent to which Jews in Memphis identify with traditional Jewish value, (2) the effectiveness of current goals and objectives of the Memphis Jewish communal service agencies in satisfying the needs of the community, (3) a comparison of the data from the 1979 study with the findings of the original Southville survey done in 1959, and (4) new directions in planning and in expanding Jewish communal services to meet any changing needs evidenced in the study.

I. RATIONALE OF SOUTHVILLE AND "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED"

Erik Erikson views the concept of identification as ". . . a lifelong development largely unconscious to the individual and to society."[3] One may identify with a "significant other" in one's life and an ethnic, sociocultural, or political perspective, Dashefsky and Shapiro assert that socialization and the interaction between social structure and personality are key factors in determining Jewish ethnic identification.[4]

Jewish identity is a very complex concept to define. Professor J. L. Talmon said that "the links holding Jews together are--to use the

---

[3]Erik H. Erikson, "Identity and Identity Diffusion," The Self Interaction, Vol. 1, eds. C. Gordon and K. J. Gergen (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 121.

[4]Arnold Dashefskey and Howard Shapiro, Ethnic Identification Among American Jews (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1974), p. 3.

words of Edmund Burke--as invisble as the air and as strong as the heaviest chains."[5] For a Jew, identity is unique because it encompasses both a religious and a cultural consciousness and history.[6] Being Jewish involves two aspects which are complimentary: "membership in the ethnic group and membership in the religious community." "Jewish Identification" can be defined as "a generalized attitude (or set of values) indicative of a personal attachment to the Jewish people."[7] But for the purposes of this study, it will be necessary to limit this definition to a personal attachment dependent on: (1) direct bloodlines, (2) an inherent sense of history within the Jewish people.

What are these "generalized attitudes" related to one's attachment to the Jewish people, and how are these attitudes or values unique to this particular group? One of the central values among Jews is that of ethnic consciousness. This concept may be examined from both an external and internal perspective. Historically, Jews have been compelled by others to be a separate people. From 1654, when the first Jews landed at New Amsterdam and were permitted to stay only if they did not prove to be a "charge" upon the state, until World War II and the confinement of Jews in European ghettos and concentration camps, the Jews externally designated as outsiders by non-Jews and had to rely on themselves for survival.

---

[5] J. L. Talmon, The Unique and the Universal (London: Secker and Warburg, 1965), p. 69, as found in John Slawson, "Jewish Identity in the United States," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1, Fall, 1971, p. 42.

[6] Marshall Sklare, America's Jews (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 26.

[7] Dashefsky and Shapiro, op. cit., p. 9.

Ethnic consciousness has also been raised due to internal factors. It is not enough that an individual recognizes himself as a Jew; other Jews must also consider him so. Jewish public opinion reserves group membership primarily for those born of Jewish mothers who either practice Judaism, or who are religiously inactive as long as they have not converted. Thus, one important aspect of Jewish identity is the resistance to accepting membership in competing religious groups. Jewish group identification in the United States, though, is a matter of a private confirmation rather than a legally defined identity. The individual alone makes the decision about his own group identity.[8]

Another significant internal factor has been the establishment of a Jewish homeland. The fulfillment of the centuries-old dream of returning to the land of Israel has generated a new level of Jewish identity. This identity was heightened with the two most recent Arab-Israeli wars (1967 and 1973) which exposed the vulnerability of the Israeli so vastly outnumbered by his Arab neighbors. The creation of a Jewish State also reiterated the concern for a spiritual survival--a link to the past--as well as a physical survival.

Perhaps the Jew's most identifiable values are related to his distinctive culture and way of life. Again, how a Jew views himself in terms of his sense of belonging to the Jewish people is one such element. This is expressed through participation in activities within the organized Jewish community, e.g., organizations such as synagogue Men's

---

[8]Sklare, op. cit., pp. 27-28.

Clubs or B'nai B'rith, etc., and through his close association with other Jews--his preference for Jewish friends.[9]

A knowledge of Jewish culture and a high regard for the value of Jewish heritage constitute two significant elements in Jewish identity. Conformity to Jewish culture is usually analyzed in religious terms: faith in G-d and observance of Jewish religious practices.[10] Essential to this culture is the Jew's negative attitude toward conversion and intermarriage. Both these attitudes, important in maintaining the highest of cultural and ethical standards, are integral parts of the uniqueness of a Jewish identity. Associated with these cultural elements are the established ethical standards of the Jew. One of the various ethical beliefs is the important role philanthropy (tzedakah) plays.

Many years ago Jewish communal service agencies were created to insure the survival of Jewish identity, and to assess the needs and establish priorities within Jewish communities. Motivated by both the internal and external factors influencing their identity, many Jews today focus their lives around these institutions. To promote Jewish survival, they have fashioned a compact form of Jewish settlement with a full complement of Jewish institutions. Thus, since 1930, the

---

[9] Marshall Sklare, Social Patterns of An American Group (Glenco, Ill.: Free Press, 1958), p. 25.

[10] Arnold A. Lasker, "What Parents Want From the Jewish Education of Their Children," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LII, No. 4, Summer 1976, p. 396.

development of Jewish life in the United States has been directed toward the growth of this ethno-religious enclave.[11]

"The Jewish community is organized around a basic principle of attempting to meet the needs both of Jews in this country and throughout the world. It is not possible for us to achieve this without knowing the full range of needs and analyzing methods for providing necessary services. . . ."[12] Currently, these social service institutions, alone or in joint cooperation with other local communal organizations, develop and implement various programs in response to cultural, social, financial, and mental health deficiencies.[13]

II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Today, American Jews are critically involved in a process of rapid change. The pace of scientific and technological advances has impinged on every individual's life. In the process of growth, old values have been abandoned for new ideals. Sadly this revolution has been a mixed blessing for each American. He has viewed the lack of family cohesiveness developing from an era of unprecedented family mobility. In addition, he recognizes a confusion of what were normal family roles

---

[11] Jacob Marcus, "Background for the History of American Jewry," as found in Oscar I. Janowsky, The American Jew--A Reappraisal (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964), pp. 12-13.

[12] Morris Levin, "Establishing Priorities for Jewish Communal Services," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. XLVII, No. 1, Fall 1970, p. 52.

[13] Peter M. Glick, "The Jewish Family Service Agency: Its Functions in the Jewish Community," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LI, No. 4, Summer 1975, p. 391.

and a significant decline in religious norms.[14] "Hedonism, egoism, selfishness, and the pursuit of pleasure are rife."[15] The results of these changes have radically influenced the American way of life. The divorce rate, infidelity, juvenile delinquency, and drug abuse are rapidly increasing. This changing world has also impacted on the American Jewish family.

The old saying, "Vie es Christelt sich, so Judelt es sich," as the Christians go, so go the Jews, is true. Jews have assimilated more rapidly into the American culture than they have historically in other cultures because of their unparalleled degree of economic, political, social, religious, and cultural freedom.[16] Clearly, the new society in which the Jew lives is making its mark on his entire life. In fact, if present trends continue, the Jew may adhere to few of the cherished Jewish values and ideals of the past.[17]

In this thesis the initial question which will be asked is: Are those values and practices delegated as central to the lives of Jews twenty years ago still essential to their identity as Jews today? This question will help to ascertain whether present service-oriented programs are relevant and therefore responsive to community needs. The first major goal of this study is to examine a randomly sampled

---

[14]Gilbert Rosenthal, The Jewish Family in a Changing World (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1970), pp. 23-24.

[15]Ibid., p. 24.

[16]Ibid., pp. 26-27.

[17]Ibid., p. 28.

population using an adapted version of the 1959 Southville Survey (a survey conducted in Memphis, Tennessee) to determine what, if any, changes in values and identity have taken place in the Jewish community.

The specific tasks related to replicating the 1959 Southville study include obtaining information regarding:

1. General characteristics of the Jewish community
2. Types of religious affiliation
3. Jewish attitudes and practices
4. Jewish customs and beliefs
5. Jewish causes and philanthropies
6. Attitudes and relationships with Israel
7. Understanding the community members' attitudes toward the Jewish Service Agency and the Jewish Community Center
8. Jewish relationships with non-Jews
9. Stereotypic attitudes towards non-Jews
10. Interdating
11. Jewish education
12. Jewish adolescents and the drug and alcohol scene

In order to do this effectively, these issues will be examined from a demographic and a cultural perspective. The Memphis Jewish community will be studied in relation to its emigration patterns, its size and growth, synagogue affiliation, and communal priorities and services rendered.

The final study goal will be to suggest new directions for planning, should changing needs be identified in the restudy. Examples

of possible areas to be explored are: the efficacy of programs offered by Jewish communal service agencies, programs of Israeli content and programs focusing on the plight of the elderly and the resettlement of the Russian immigrant.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

> My life I could compare
> To a lamp with a bit of kerosene:
> The lamp continues to flicker
> But it hasn't the strength to flare.[1]

Voices such as this echoed throughout the world of the European Jew. During the nineteenth century, intellectuals were quite cognizant of how precarious their culture, and very existence, really was. Like the Jews of their past, though, they held onto the "flicker" and created a compelling dream about the "flare." In the early 1870's, they began to feel they had a reason to dream.[2]

What was uniquely characteristic of the European Jews of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the thousands of European Jews who at that time made their way to America, was "the explosive mixture of mounting wretchedness and increasing hope, physical suffering and spiritual exaltation."[3] The new realization which excited this underlying hope was that for the first time in centuries there was some place to go. "America was the safety valve and haven, the place for

---

[1] Irving Howe, World of Our Fathers (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich, 1976), p. 18.

[2] Ibid., p. 24.

[3] Ibid.

renewal and a source of support."[4] America was also the fulfillment of a collective dream. Even though the dream had once been nurtured in the old country, it could never be realized there.

The greatest increase of the Jewish population in the history of America came in the years between 1840 and 1925. Immigration was the cause of this tremendous growth from 15,000 to 4,500,000 American Jews.[5]

II. IMMIGRATION

The issues that established America as a land of opportunity and religious freedom for the immigrant blossomed because of change in the Christians' perceptions of their role in America. They no longer saw themselves as religious agents in each community. By the eighteenth century the concepts of philanthropy and humanitarianism had cut through the barriers between the denominations of Christianity. The denial of absolute religious dogmas provided an inroad for the "synagogue of Satan," a chance for the Jew to be granted rights "nearly equal" to his Christian neighbor.

Because of the separation between Church and State provided by the First Amendment, the European Jew considered resettlement in this foreign land. There was no other country except America that even

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Lloyd P. Gartner, "Immigration and the Formation of the American Jew, 1840-1925," in Marshall Sklare, The Jew in American Society (New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974), p. 35.

hinted at full emancipation as a broad principle. There also was no pressure to convert to Christianity in America. Jews could make the choice of how they would practice their religion. That was very appealing to a generation who had been so repressed.[6] As a further inducement to emigration, Jews found no formal Jewish community operating in America with its usual financial and social restrictions.

Historical Perspective

The immigration of Jews to America extends over three centuries and is characterized by diverse trends in populations. Jews have immigrated from different countries with differing traditions. There have been three major Jewish waves of migration to the United States: (1) the Spanish-Portuguese (the Sephardim), (2) the German, and (3) the East European (both the German and East European Jews are referred to as Ashkenazim). In the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early years of the 1900's, ethnic differences between these Jews were so sharp and immutable that it was believed that the American Jewish community would be permanently bifurcated.[7] Although much of this differentiation traceable to the separate immigration waves have been eroded, it is still slightly recognizable with respect to class attainment, educational levels, and styles of life.

American Jewry traces its origins to Sephardic (Spanish-Portuguese) Jews. When the Portuguese recaptured Recife from the

---

[6] Ibid., p. 35.

[7] Sklare, America's Jews, pp. 5-33.

Dutch in 1654, the Sephardic Jews, who had immigrated to Portugal because of Dutch assistance after the Spanish Inquisition, had to flee. Some went to the Caribbean where Jewish settlements had been established; some returned to Amsterdam. Some ventured to New Amsterdam to help begin the Jewish history on what was later to be United States soil.[8]

Peter Stuyvesant, governor of New Amsterdam, wished to expel this small group of twenty-three Sephardic refugees who had landed at the port; but the ultimate responsibility was with the Dutch West India Company. Because there were influential Jewish shareholders in the Dutch West India Company, and because the Jews had helped to finance the initial victory in Recife, the Jews were allowed to remain in New Amsterdam.[9]

A decade later the Jews had gained the right to own land and do business. But it was not until 1690, under the rule of the British, were they accorded the privilege to worship publicly and to sell at retail.[10] During the Sephardic period, from 1640 to 1840, most of the American Jews were petty shopkeepers, dealing in hardware, dry goods and liquor, all under the same roof.[11]

---

[8]Nathan Glazer, American Judaism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 13-14.

[9]Ibid., p. 14.

[10]Jacob R. Marcus, "Background for the History of American Jewry," in Oscar T. Janowsky (eds.), The American Jew: A Reappraisal (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America), p. 13.

[11]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

Even though by the eighteenth century the numbers of Sephardim settlers was small, their social status and leadership role in the American Jewish community had magnified their importance.[12] The first Sephardim who settled in New Amsterdam in the middle 1600's were devout Orthodox Jews; their central institution was the synagogue.

After the initial wave of Sephardic immigration, the German Ashkenazim began to settle in large numbers in America. By the eighteenth century there were mainly Ashkenazim filling the seats of the Sephardic synagogues. The Ashkenazic Jews accepted the strange customs of the Sephardic synagogue because it was the only synagogue available; and under the community organization named Mahamad, the Sephardim refused to allow anymore local synagogues to exist.[13]

Between 1820-1870, 150,000 German Jews arrived, and they settled more widely throughout the country than did the earlier German Jewish immigrants. They settled along the Ohio River and the ports of the Great Lakes, and became involved in the industrial life in these areas. No matter how integrated the Germans became in the economic system of the country, they nevertheless retained their German heritage. Many that relinquished their identity as Jews maintained their identity as Germans.[14]

There were some basic differences between the Sephardim and the Ashkenazim in the orientation of their religious beliefs. Although the

---

[12] Sklare, America's Jews, p. 6.

[13] Gartner, op. cit., p. 38.

[14] Ibid., p. 39.

wealthy Spanish Jews had adapted to the culture in the New World, they had retained their Orthodoxy. The Sephardim utilized a different Hebraic pronunciation and a different liturgy in the Sabbath and week-day services than did the Ashkenazim. Those Germans (Ashkenazim) who stayed with Judaism were mainly reformed Jews. Their Reform liturgy was reflective of the Protestant liturgy; and the Reform Jew emphasized those customs which did not enhance the gulf between Jew and non-Jew (e.g., organ music, men and women sitting together, and English in the Service).[15]

The German Jews quickly settled into positions of authority because of their spectacular rise into the upper reaches of the middle and upper classes. Not only did they penetrate the class levels, but by the late nineteenth century, a group of Jewish families had amassed wealth comparable to the richest non-Jews in the country. It was inevitable that these certain German Jewish immigrants of the nineteenth century would be bastions of Jewish high society because their families had also been members of important German families. The general German population was able to borrow status from these successful compatriots.[16]

As the nineteenth century came to a close, the German Era came to an end. Between 1904-1908, 642,000 Eastern European Jews entered the United States, mainly from Russia and Poland. The European Jews were not wealthy, and in general they were craftsmen by trade. They were traditional Jews like the Sephardim, but they were not as quick to

---

[15] Ibid., pp. 40-41.

[16] Marcus, op. cit., p. 7.

adapt to the dominant society. This may be seen by their insistence to hold on to their "Yiddish" (a language associated with European life) culture.

They were quite different from the German settlers. They were traditional Jews without the intellectualism of their Western European counterparts. The Russians could be described as much more primitive and clannish, less educated, and more rural than the German immigrants.

The Russian, Polish, Lithuanian, Rumanian, and Hungarian masses of Eastern Europeans began to immigrate after the pogroms of the 1880's. They opened hundreds of synagogues, fortified Orthodoxy and the dietary laws (Kashrut) and preserved the traditional Hebrew liturgy. Their vernacular was Yiddish (dialect; mixture of Hebrew and language of country); and they were ardently ethnocentric and sympathetic to Jewish nationalism, Zionism.[17]

Summary

To understand the values and ethics, attitudes and practices of each Jew in Memphis today, one must understand the disparity exhibited in these early immigrants. This disparity generally forms the basis for the different orientations in the Memphis community. Although the issue of parent's country of origin is only one variable among many, linked with religious affiliation, it may provide an index to the changes and growth of the Jew in Memphis since 1959 and the initial Southville study.

---

[17]Ibid., p. 6.

As one studies American Jewry, it is obvious that the development of an American Jewish identity began at a post-Emancipation level. After the incident with Peter Stuyvesant in New Amsterdam, the majority of Jews came to America after their rights as Jews had already been negotiated with the American system. They did not have to literally fight for religious freedom as they had in the European countries. Abraham Cahan wrote in 1890, "we have no Jewish question in America. The only question we recognize is the question of how to prevent the emergence of a Jewish question here."[18]

Because emancipation was never a political issue in the United States, two critical problems soon become visible: anti-semitism and assimilation. Anti-semitism was not a political vision here. Instead it surfaced as a cultural and social phenomenon because of emancipation. On an informal level, non-Jews excluded Jews from certain societies or social organizations essentially because their beliefs were different, not because the government had isolated the Jews or relegated them to separate communities (ghettos).

Thus, emancipation also was responsible for a lack of form in American society which allowed Jews to live with non-Jews. In America the price to pay for assimilation was the rejection of the old inherited ways of life; whereas in Europe the price one paid for freedom had been the dissolution of the group.[19]

---

[18]Ibid., p. 7.

[19]Glazer, op. cit., p. 16.

III. SOUTHERN JEWRY - HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In order to understand the complexity of the Memphis Jewish community today, one must view the historical development of Jewry, not only nationally but also regionally.

Scarcely had James Oglethorpe founded a colony in Georgia in 1733, when, on July 7th of that year, a party of forty Hebrews sailed up the Savannah River on a vessel direct from London.[20] Among them were Jews of Sephardic origin and others from Germany. Most of them remained in Savannah, which is believed to be the first Jewish community developed in the South.[21] There is evidence that individual Jews had lived in the region some two and a half centuries prior to this date.[22] The Jews in Georgia comprised one-third of the white population during this early period. Many of these Jewish settlers were granted lots and farms, but some entered the coastal trade and opened stores. The first movement toward establishing a Jewish community by the original group of Sephardic and Ashkenazic Jews was to build synagogues. The Jews of Georgia received full civil rights in the early development of the colony.[23]

---

[20] Isaac Markens, The Hebrews in America (New York: Published by the Author, 1888), p. 45.

[21] Leonard Dinnerstein and Mary Dale Palsson, eds., Jews in the South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973), p. 3.

[22] Ibid., p. 3.

[23] Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder, eds., The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1970), p. 743.

Other southern communities became centers of Jewish communal life. Jews from London and the West Indies settled in South Carolina prior to 1700.[24] The Jewish population there increased steadily during the first half of the eighteenth century. As early as 1750, the first Jewish congregation was formed in Charleston, South Carolina, and by 1822 a congregation was formed in Columbia.[25] "For a time, Charleston was the largest, most cultured, and wealthiest Jewish community in North America."[26]

Virginia has provided historians with evidence of Jewish inhabitance as early as 1621.[27] An individual, Elias Legardo, is believed to be the earliest of Jews to find his way into Virginia. There is also evidence of a flourishing community of Sephardic Jews in the western part of Virginia even in the middle eighteenth century.[28] A Jewish congregation was organized in Richmond shortly after the Revolutionary War.

There are several reasons why colonial Virginia did not attract Jews as readily as did the neighboring colonies. One of these reasons was the fact that Virginia did not possess a substantial merchant class, nor large cities to offer mercantile enterprise. "The Jew,

---

[24] Ibid., p. 743.

[25] Markens, op. cit., p. 53.

[26] Roth and Wigoder, op. cit., p. 743.

[27] "The Original List of Persons Who Went from Great Britain to the American Plantations, 1600-1700," edited by John Camden Hotten, London, 1874, p. 261.

[28] The Jewish Experience in America, Vol. 1, The Colonial Period, edited by Abraham J. Karp (Waltham, Massachusetts: American Jewish Historical Society, 1969), p. 109.

through centuries of environment, is accustomed to the city rather than the country. . . ."[29]

Another reason for lack of Jewish communal development was the fact that Virginia's original colonists belonged to a "cavalier" class which did not concern themselves with commerce. Rather, their aim was to divide the country into domains whereby the planter was supreme over his lands.[30] Only one Jew--Isaiah Isaacs--is known to have been a permanent resident of Richmond prior to the American Revolution and as late as 1782. When the city was chartered, it had no more than half a dozen identifiable Jewish people.[31]

Not only did Jews settle along the coastal regions of the Atlantic, but they also settled along the Gulf Coast. Some Jews are believed to have lived in Louisiana as early as 1719. Groups of Jews began to settle in the coastal region in or near New Orleans as early as 1820. According to cemetery records, many of those buried were natives of Germany and Holland.

In 1828, the first synagogue in Louisiana was founded in New Orleans. Later in 1846, another congregation was founded in the old city of Lafayette. An agricultural colony of some 173 Jews was established in Sicily Island in the late 1800's, but a flood wiped out the settlement a year after its formation. Prominent Jewish names in

---

[29] Ibid., p. 93.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ira Rosenwaike, "An Estimate and Analysis of the Jewish Population of the United States in 1790," Publications of the Jewish Historical Society, L (1960), p. 34.

Louisiana's history have included Judah Touro, Asher Phillips and Judah P. Benjamin. Jewish communities developed later in Baton Rouge, Alexandria and Shreveport.[32]

Southern states including Kentucky, Arkansas, the Carolinas verify Jewish inhabitants as early as 1700, but a Jewish communal intrastructure, e.g., synagogue, was not readily seen until the middle to late 1800's.[33] Except for a few individuals, who reportedly settled near the Holston River in 1778, there are no traces of Jewish settlements in Tennessee during the eighteenth century. The first congregations (Reform) founded in Nashville and Memphis were composed of Austrian, Bohemian and German immigrants. It was not until the 1880's that large numbers of Eastern European immigrants arrived in Tennessee.[34]

From colonial times to the present, Jews have comprised less than 1 percent of the Southern population. By the time of the American Revolution, they totaled fewer than five hundred people.[35] Many of these Jews, as mentioned, resided in Charleston, Savannah, New Orleans and Richmond. During the next several decades, increasing numbers of Jewish immigrants chose to move north. Despite the influx of German Jews to the South after 1836, less than 15,000 Jews resided

---

[32]Roth and Wigoder, op. cit., p. 743.

[33]Ibid., pp. 1124, 159, 1454, 1784-1785.

[34]Ibid., p. 849.

[35]Rosenwaike, op. cit., p. 34.

there by 1860.[36] This figure rose moderately as the region began to industrialize after the Civil War. Presently, the Jewish population in the South represents some 15 percent of the total Jewish population of the United States. Translated into numbers, the Jews of the South number approximately 876,740.[37]

IV. THE JEWS OF MEMPHIS

There were German Jews in Memphis as early as the year 1840. The purchase of a plot of land in 1847 for a cemetery indicates that there were enough Jews to justify such a burial place. At the same time came the creation of the Hebrew Benevolent Society which was established for the disbursement of charity and the maintenance of the cemetery.

In 1853, the community was already organized for the purpose of worship--the congregation which was later to be known as Temple Israel. When Rabbi Isaac Wise came to dedicate the Temple building in 1858, he urged the creation of a B'nai B'rith Lodge, which formed one year later, and exists today.

Following the Civil War, Jews came to Memphis to settle. But by 1870, the yellow fever epidemic plagued the city, and many people fled for their lives. The decade from 1880-1890 saw a growth and an

---

[36] Uriah Z. Engelman, "Jewish Statistics in the U.S. Census of Religious Bodies (1850-1936)," Jewish Social Studies, IX (1947), p. 131.

[37] Alvin Chenkin and Maynard Miran, "The Jewish Population in the United States, 1978," The American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 79 (1978), p. 187.

advancement of Jewish life in Memphis. This advancement stemmed largely from an influx of Jews from Poland, Russia and other countries of Eastern and Central Europe. In 1884, Orthodox Jews (Ashkenazim) banded together to form what was to be known seven years later as the Baron Hirsch Congregation. In 1898, Anshe Sephard, an orthodox synagogue, was organized. A Conservative synagogue, Beth Sholom, was chartered in Memphis in January of 1955. This break from the traditional Reform and Orthodox elements of the community has provided for a more moderate approach to religious practice than Orthodoxy and Reform. An Anglo-Jewish paper was created in 1885 and continues to be published today known as the Hebrew Watchman.

Today the Memphis Jewish community population approximates nine thousand (9,000) persons out of a total population of some eight hundred thousand (800,000).[38] Throughout the years, Jews have occupied a vital and prominent place in the Memphis community. Many of the Memphis Jews have distinguished themselves in all levels of government, the professions, commerce and industry.

V. DETERMINANTS OF SOUTHERN JEWRY

Three major determinants are indicative of Southern Jewish history. These include: (1) agrarianism, (2) racism, and (3) Fundamentalist Protestantism. With the exception of different religious practices, Jews made every effort to become absorbed into the activities of their region. Most Southern Jews, however, preferred to be merchants

---

[38] Ibid., p. 181.

rather than farmers. Agrarianism, especially in the South, helped to preserve a typically American bias that favored the producers rather than the financiers.[39] In fact, a mistrust of all those engaged in finance and a desire to restrict the power of urban voters, caused many farmers to protest the rights of Jews to hold public office.[40] It should be noted that after the American Revolution, with the rapid growth of a slavery-based plantation system, few Jews became plantation owners. As mentioned previously, most Southern Jews tended to be involved in shipping or in mercantile trades.

Jews, who did migrate south, settled in urban areas or traveled the countryside peddling their wares; but they never became what Southerners would term "landed gentry." One sees men such as Judah Touro of New Orleans, a prominent investor in ships and in the mercantile trade, as having positive impact upon his community. Morris Rich, a retail dry goods businessman, whose store opened in 1867, can be seen today as having established one of the largest merchandising establishments in the South.[41] It should also be mentioned that men such as David Yulee of Florida, Franklin Moses of South Carolina, and Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana were able to reach high public office, contrary to the wishes of the agrarian segment of the South.[42]

---

[39] John Higham, "American Anti-Semitism Historically Reconsidered," in Charles Herbert Stember, ed., Jews in the Mind of America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966), p. 248.

[40] Edmund Eitches, "Maryland's Jew Bill," American Jewish Historical Quarterly, LX (March, 1971), pp. 258, 278.

[41] Dinnerstein and Palsson, op. cit., p. 13.

[42] Ibid., pp. 13-14.

Racism in the South has been an issue since the first boatload of slaves arrived in this country. Racism, however, in this paper will be viewed from two different perspectives: (1) the Black-Jewish issue, and (2) the social acceptance of Jews by their Southern neighbors.

It seemed that the true test of a Southerner was his acceptance of Negro bondage. This proved to be a dilemma for Southern Jews. Northern Jews could be found on both sides of this hotly debated issue. The Southern Jews had a unique reaction to this issue. Most Southern Jews either kept silent or gave wholehearted support to this ideology.

This is not to say that Jews never spoke out against racism. In more recent times, men such as Rabbi Benjamin Goldstein of Montgomery, Alabama, spoke against injustices incurred by the Scottsboro boys. Rabbi Jacob Rothchild of Atlanta, the late Charles Mantinhand of Texas, and Memphis' own Rabbi James Wax have spoken out on racial integration and other liberal causes, risking personal and professional security to do so. Even in light of the aforementioned opponents of racism, most Southern Jews preferred to remain inconspicuous.[43]

The problem of social acceptance has been a major problem for Jews throughout their existence. The lack of social acceptance by non-Jews was due to many factors. As the Jewish economic position in the South became increasingly secure, those artisans, merchants and financiers of Jewish ancestry sought to expand their civil and political

---

[43]Leonard Dinnerstein, "Jews and Desegregation Crisis in the South," American Historical Quarterly, LXI (March 1973), as found in Jews in the South, p. 11.

privileges. The resistance to their desires was evident in almost every region they inhabited.

Anti-semitism, attacking one's being of Jewish birth, is seen in many ways. Politically Jews were not permitted to hold high offices in many states. A Virginia statute of 1705 (1) prohibited Jews from obtaining full citizenship, and (2) banned their appearance as court witnesses.[44] Louisiana's "Black Code" forbade Jews from becoming settlers, denied them citizenship rights and placed Jews in the same category as Negroes, for whom the code was originally intended.[45] Maryland, considered a Southern colony for many years, in its early inception passed a law requiring the death penalty for those persons who would deny the Trinity. These are but a few of the examples indicative of the fact that at no time in the colonial period did Jews enjoy equal status with non-Jews.[46]

The American Revolution created an environment which did help the Jews become more socially accepted. Many Southern states (including South Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia) granted Jews voting rights during this period.[47] One of the reasons they were given this privilege was that Jews were instrumental in helping the colonies break away from England by participating in and funding the war effort.

---

[44]Jacob R. Marcus, Early American Jewry: The Jews of Pennsylvania and the South (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1953), p. 160.

[45]Markens, op. cit., p. 89.

[46]Ibid., p. 544.

[47]Ibid., p. 525.

Although overt civil and political barriers had disappeared by the time of the Civil War, with the exception of the states of North Carolina and New Hampshire, complete social integration was still elusive.[48]

Intermarriage was common among Jew and non-Jew during this period. By the 1890's numerous social and professional clubs began to exclude Jews from membership.[49] Outbursts of anti-semitism were most violent during the Civil War, the depression of the 1890's, World War I and its aftermath, and the Great Depression of the 1930's. Not only did the wealth of American Jewry bother non-Jews, but also their presence in numbers proved to be an issue.

John Higham, in distinguishing between ideological anti-semitism and the traditional xenophobia, maintained that Americans have always displayed an antagonism toward the arrival of masses.[50] Thus, the large influx of Jewish immigrants in the 1840's, and again between the 1870's and the 1920's, resulted in occasional anti-semetic outbursts.

Many of these anti-semetic outbursts were done in conjunction with protests and cross burnings of the Ku Klux Klan. As the "white" spokesman for the South, the Klan expressed hostility toward both Jews and Blacks. Unlike in the North, Southerners reacted violently to influence and intrusion by those who were non-white or non-native born Americans, In many cases, these proved reason enough for the

---

[48]Dinnerstein and Palsson, op. cit., p. 6.

[49]Ibid., p. 6.

[50]Higham, op. cit., p. 248.

lynchings and cross burnings in the South. In general, these outbursts of anti-semitism stemmed from the fear of foreign influence in the North as well as the South.[51]

The third major determinant of Southern Jewish history was related to the dominant religious element of the time, Fundamentalist Protestantism. Throughout Jewish history in the South, the vicissitudes of a minority group seeking a place within the rigid structure of a closed society was seen. Jews were excluded from a number of colonies in the early history of the United States. Many Southern colonies were formed to accommodate particular religious sects, e.g., Louisiana for the French Catholic, and Maryland for those who were Christian. Thus, many Jews were excluded from the settlement of new lands on the basis of religion.

As time progressed, certain fundamentalist religious traditions were carried to the Southern interior by frontiersmen. Thus, a threat was posed to all other faiths and especially to those Jews residing in rural areas of the South. Because of the cultural and social development of coastal cities, where religious tolerance prevailed and where many Jews resided, Fundamentalist Protestantism had little effect. According to Carl Bridenbaugh, "the compelling religious feature of the entire interior was the existence in its most virulent form of a fierce sectarianism."[52] During the nineteenth century,

---

[51]Ibid., pp. 248-250.

[52]Carl Bridenbaugh, Myths and Realities: Societies of Colonial South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952), p. 181.

Methodists and Baptists, the South's two major religious denominations, became bastions of conservatism. Most Southern churches began to resist the intrusion of alien peoples, ideas, and institutions.[53] This contributed to religious intolerance of other religious denominations in general and Judaism in particular. Many Baptist and Methodist ministers accused Jews of killing the Saviour.[54]

This evidence of intolerance still exists today. In a 1965 study of Southern Baptists by Charles Glock and Rodney Stark, it was shown that only 8 percent of those questioned were free of anti-semetic traits. An overwhelming 80 percent sincerely believed that "the Jews can never be forgiven for what they did to Jesus. . . ."[55]

According to Dinnerstein[56] studies reflect a feeling of insecurity among Southern Jews. This insecure feeling is often characterized by the insistence of the respondents to disguise both their names and their places of residence. This tendency reflects a sense of paranoia which stems from a history of being socially and culturally ostracized and persecuted for practicing Judaism. It seems that reminders that they are "being merely tolerated" make Jews cautious in

---

[53]Joseph H. Fichter and George L. Maddox, "Religion in the South, Old and New," in John C. McKinney and Edgar Thompson, eds., The South in Continuity and Change (Durham: Duke University Press, 1965), pp. 360-364.

[54]William J. Robertson, The Changing South (New York: Boni and Liverright, 1927), pp. 98-99.

[55]Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966), pp. 63 and 202.

[56]Dinnerstein, op. cit., p. 12.

their public activities.[57] Thus, two types of psychological pressure are exerted: internal and external. Internal pressure is the fear one has of how others perceive them. The external pressure is how outside sources affect the individual in his performance.

Another aspect of this feeling of insecurity can be seen in those Jews who reside in rural areas. These Jews face a life of "religious" isolation which some feel brings with it a loss of Jewish identity. Yet, many of these rural Jews are descendants of families who have lived in the same vicinity for a hundred years or more. This is just one more indication of a tie with the past which has not broken.

A great obstacle in understanding Southern Jewry has been in the area of research. The research has, in the past, only revealed a partial glimpse of Southern Jewry (and their attitudes and feelings about themselves and issues). The nature of the type of studies done, the questions asked, and the purposes of these studies can be viewed as possible reasons for this partial glimpse of Southern Jewry. Moreover, most of the available analysis pertaining to Jewish life and attitudes reflected a bias on the part of the researcher or writer. Subsequently, a study of Jewish attitudes, such as Southville, is vital today to overcome the paucity of research in this subject area.

The "revisit" to Southville in 1979 is as important as the initial Southville investigation made in 1959. This will enable the

---

[57] Benjamin Kaplan, The Eternal Stranger (New York: Bookman Associates, 1957), p. 127.

reader to compare and contrast on a longitudinal basis the ever changing views of a group of people. Many of the prevailing feelings of the past regarding race and anti-semitism must be examined and re-examined in order to determine whether and to what degree any changes have taken place over the years. Due to the demographic transitional changes paramount within the Jewish community over the past two decades (moves from rural to urban centers; mobility frequency), it is necessary that the Jewish communal infrastructure be cognizant of any changes in self image and familial and secondary relationships.

VI. EVOLUTION OF JEWISH COMMUNAL STUDIES

From Biblical times, Jews have sought to know how numerous they were. As was commanded to Moses, "Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel, by their families, by their father's houses, according to the number of names."[58] From the beginning of its history, the United States has counted its population. At first, the U.S. Census served as a basis for the amount of representation in Congress; however, it has become a source of information on a wide range of social and economic topics which reflect research and policy-related matters. For needed information, Jewish groups have had to collect their own data on the size, distribution, composition, attitudes, and other factors of the Jewish population.

Since 1955, over twenty Jewish communities have undertaken both attitudinal as well as demographic surveys. Because most of the

---

[58] Old Testament, Numbers 1:2.

surveyed communities have been of moderate size, questions have been raised as to whether they are typical in relation to the Jewish population of the United States as a whole.

There is no single authoritative source of information on the demography or on the attitudes of Jews in the United States. Insights into the characteristics of Jews and the differences between the Jewish population and the total population are available from a number of community population studies. These studies are oftentimes sponsored by the local Jewish Federation. These studies (some of which will be discussed) differ considerably in quality, depending on such factors as the manner in which the samples were chosen, quality of interviewers, data analysis, and questionnaire format.

Some surveys relied only on the lists of families available to a local federation, which were usually those people who identify themselves as being Jewish. In other communities, a concerted effort was made to include both affiliated and non-affiliated families. According to Ronald Goldstein, the findings of the individual community surveys correlated significantly with the patterns of characteristics of the Jewish populations they analyzed.[59] Variations can generally be accounted for because of the nature of the community, because it is a new or an older community, because it is in the North or South.

---

[59]Ronald M. Goldstein, "The Nature, Character and Trends of Post World War II American Jewry as Reflected in Communal Surveys" (unpublished Master's thesis, Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, 1969).

The task of determining all the characteristics of the American Jewish community would be virtually impossible as not all communal studies are published. Many communities, including Southville, have devoted their study of Jewish communal life to be used by the agencies in the community. This document was then used for the purpose of determination of needs and for program implications. Many Jewish communities may have undertaken such studies, but a compilation of these unpublished documents is not presently available.

VII. TYPES OF COMMUNAL STUDIES

The Jewish communal studies can be divided into four major categories. The four categories include (1) historical analysis of the Jews of a community, (2) a strictly demographic profile, (3) socio-economic trends, and (4) a combination of demographic and attitudinal studies. This thesis will focus on similarities between Southville and those that were demographic-attitudinal studies.

Historical Studies

Some historical works pertaining to Jewish communities in the South, prior to 1950, contained factual information regarding the origins, significant persons and events associated with a particular locale. These works included diaries, biographies and events pertaining to the Jewish condition at that time. Works of this nature include, among others, American Jewry and the Civil War by Bertram Wallace Korn, The Jew of South Carolina by Barnett A. Elias, and The

Jews of Louisiana by Leo Shpall. Others include a "Brief History of the Jews of Atlanta," Reform Advocate by Rabbi David Marx.[60]

Cultural histories included Philip Bregstone's Chicago and Its Jews: A Cultural History[61] and Joshua Trachtenberg's Consider the Years, The Story of the Jewish Community of Easton, 1752-1942.[62] The last two books mentioned are indicative of historical works of other cities in the United States undertaken to give the Jewish population a sense of understanding as to their historical origins within the community.

Prior to 1950, most major published studies relating to the Jewish community were either socio-economic or demographic in nature. Research in the area of socio-economic descriptions within Jewish communities prior to 1950 includes among others Samuel Koenig's "Socio-economic Structure of An American Jewish Community" (1942),[63] Julian Feibelman's thesis on "A Social and Economic Study of the New Orleans Jewish Community" (1941),[64] and "The Position of the Jew in Two

---

[60]Dinnerstein, op. cit., p. 391.

[61]Philip P. Bregstone, Chicago and Its Jews: A Cultural History (privately published, 1933).

[62]Joshua Trachtenberg, Consider the Years: The Story of the Jewish Community of Easton, 1752-1942 (Easton, Pennsylvania: Centennial Committee of Temple Brith Sholom, 1944).

[63]Samuel Koenig, "The Socio-economic Structure of An American Jewish Community," in Graeber, Jews in a Gentile World, 1942, pp. 200-242.

[64]Julian B. Feibelman, "A Social and Economic Study of the New Orleans Jewish Community" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1941).

Southern Communities: A Survey by Students at Elon College" (1939).[65] Albert Gordon also discusses the socio-economic impact in his Jews in Transition (1949).[66] These, along with other books, began to describe and analyze the uniqueness of the Jewish community.

Demographic Studies

Demographic studies prior to 1950 provided a wealth of information concerning Jewish communities throughout the United States. One of the earliest surveys made was the Jewish Communal Survey of Greater New York (1928).[67] Maurice Taylor provides demographic insight into a community in his 1941 study of the Jewish population of Pittsburgh.[68] In the period of 1943-1944 alone, there were at least sixteen demographic studies conducted. Some of these studies were conducted in cities such as Manchester, New Hampshire; New Haven, Connecticut; Portland, Oregon; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Detroit, Michigan.[69]

According to the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare, those demographic community studies, done prior to and directly after World War II, were conducted to serve as an informational source for the number and location of Jewish citizens residing in these communities

---

[65]Elon College, Sociology Department, "The Position of the Jew in Two Southern Communities: A Survey Made by Students at Elon College," 1939.

[66]Albert Isaac Gordon, Jews in Transition (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949).

[67]Bureau of Jewish Social Research, Jewish Communal Survey of Greater New York (New York: New York Bureau of Jewish Social Research, 1928).

[68]Maurice Taylor, The Jewish Community of Pittsburgh, December 1938: A Sample Study, January, 1941.

[69]National Conference of Jewish Welfare List of Communal Studies, New York, 1944.

after the war. The purpose of these surveys was to provide a resource base from which to plan needed programs for the Jewish population. There seems to be evidence by the number of demographic studies conducted after World War II that a crisis tended to mobilize the communities so that dissemination of information as well as programming to meet the community's population became a communal concern. The demographic surveys conducted in the 1940's merely enumerated the specifics of the Jewish community in terms of numbers and types of people. Attitudinal questions may have been incorporated within individual community studies; however, these were not noted in the abstracts of the studies mentioned.

Demographic/Attitudinal

Because of the pursuit of the American Jewish Committee to support social science research, periodic polls of public opinion concerning Jews were done.[70] As a result, at the end of World War II, the American Jewish Committee began to involve itself with questions of the continuity of Jewish identity in the United States. "For planning program activity, information was needed on such matters as the social characteristics of Jews, their adherence to religious practices, Jewish education of the young, the Jewish home, Jewish institutions. . . ."[71] The Committee's Scientific Research Department

---

[70]Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, Jewish Identity on the Suburban Front: A Study of Group Survival in the Open Society (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967), p. v.

[71]Ibid., p. vi.

expanded its program to include studies of the internal life of American Jewry.

The first such demographic-attitudinal inquiry focused on an East Coast city ("Riverton"). The Riverton Study was published in summary form (1957). Riverton deals with a community consisting mostly of second-generation Jews, exploring their own and their children's feelings about their Jewish heritage. It also explored their attitudes concerning Israel, non-Jews, and other matters of significance to American Jewry.[72] Because this endeavor was the first of its kind and professional researchers were involved, the methodology was quite scientific. No lay volunteers were involved in the study's formulation, nor were they involved in interviewing the sample population. Riverton provided the Jewish community with a chance to ". . . look at part of itself--to know some of the practices, the aspirations, the hopes and fears of Jews as they related to their Jewishness and to their neighbors."[73]

Riverton proved to be the forerunner of other Jewish communal studies which involved attitudes as well as practices of Jews. With this study, the Jewish community became aware of the decline of religious practice at home and at the synagogue. One does see the emergence of a definition of being a good Jew as meaning the living of an ethical and moral life. Riverton verified the close tie between

---

[72]Ibid., p. vii.

[73]Manheim Shapiro, ed., White Plains Survey of Jewish Attitudes (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1958), p. 2.

Jews and Israel and the preference for giving tzadakah (charity) to Jewish causes. Unlike the following studies, Riverton showed a high degree of persons affected by anti-semitism. Another trend seen was the high percentage of Jewish-Christian relations.

Following the Riverton Study, the American Jewish Committee decided to expand this type of study into a large-scale community study that would involve Jews of not only second generation but of third and fourth generations. In doing so, further insights into the future and direction of Jewish life in an increasingly open society could be shown. This study became known as Lakeville.

The Lakeville Study encompassed many of the factors involved with the Riverton Study. The thrust of this study, however, was to "examine relations between Jews and Gentiles, portray their attitudes toward each other, and scrutinize the behavior patterns and value systems that enter into the experience of living together in the community."[74] Again as in Riverton, the study was conducted with professional research personnel doing the interviewing. Perhaps this study, more so than Riverton, explored more in depth, not only a community's demographic nature but specifics of individuals' religious practices and feelings concerning their non-Jewish neighbor.

Because of the tremendous success of the Riverton Study, Lakeville was designed to provide new insights into the attitudes of Jews.

---

[74] Sklare and Greenblum, op. cit., p. vii.

Lakeville approximated the views of the preceding study, yet Lakeville's participants indicated a concern for providing a good Jewish background for their children. Subsequent studies (e.g., Bayville, White Plains, Southville, and Kansas City) have shown varying concern for Jewish education. White Plains, for example, indicated that less than one out of ten children attend any kind of Jewish educational program, while Bayville and Kansas City showed a high percentage of children attending some form of religious school. Of those studies mentioned, Lakeville Jews had the highest percentage of respondents belonging to non-sectarian groups (91 percent). Although Lakeville respondents believed that it was important to give to Jewish charities, few actually made a contribution.

In 1958, the American Jewish Committee was asked to study the attitudes of Jews in White Plains, New York. The rationale of the study was to find out just what the Jews were thinking about and how ready they were to participate in all phases of general community life while maintaining their Jewish distinctiveness. Up to this point, the previous studies did not concern themselves with this issue.

The White Plains Survey, unlike the two previous surveys, differed in one major respect. In its methodology, the White Plains Study incorporated volunteers rather than professional opinion research interviewers. As a result of comparing the data of this study with others and in examining internal consistency of the study itself, it was determined that the findings accurately reflected the opinions of the White

Plains population even with lay volunteers interviewing.[75] Areas incorporated within the study were: (1) organization affiliations, (2) attitudes toward other Jews, (3) attitudes toward non-Jews, (4) knowledge and experience of local anti-semitism, (5) philanthropy--Jewish and non-Jewish, (6) attitudes about Jewish education and culture, (7) attitudes about Israel, and (8) social relationships.[76]

White Plains drew upon findings of previous studies and questioned the respondents in more depth in many areas. For instance, this study reflected that Jewish-non-Jewish relations were not as strained as expressed in subsequent studies. Fewer than 10 percent were personally involved in anti-semetic incidents. Also worth noting, was the fact that 60 percent of the White Plains respondents wanted their children to belong to non-sectarian groups, but 90 percent would object to their child's interdating. Similar to Lakeville, the White Plains respondents belonged to more non-sectarian organizations than Jewish groups (8 out of 10). White Plains Jews indicated strong ties toward Israel, some ritual practice, i.e., lighting Friday night candles, and yet their participation in Jewish educational programs and Jewish reading was very low as compared to subsequent studies.

With the expertise of the American Jewish Committee's Research Division, other cities in the United States began to evaluate their

---

[75]Henry T. Lipman, Study Director, "The White Plains Jewish Attitudes Survey" (a report to the Westchester Division Annual Meeting of the American Jewish Committee on October 19, 1958), pp. 2-3.

[76]Shapiro, op. cit., p. 4.

communities in hopes of better understanding themselves and planning for change. The Southville Study of Memphis (1959) which will be discussed in more detail in the following section, is another survey which developed from the Riverton and White Plains studies.

The Bayville Survey (1959) of Dade County, Florida, published in 1961, is yet another example of the impact of previous Jewish communal attitudinal studies. With assistance from the Jewish Committee and incorporating topics recommended by local residents, a questionnaire was drawn up and administered. Volunteer interviewers were trained. Varying somewhat from previous studies, Bayville added to its list of questions issues such as views on desegregation, relations between Jewish and Negro children, and the issue of religion in the public schools.[77]

Bayville Jews, unlike the earlier studies, indicated that 50 percent would like to have more contact with non-Jews. The Bayville Study also disclosed that a high percentage of Jews believed that some Jews or groups of Jews were the cause for anti-semetic feelings from non-Jews. Unlike other studies, Bayville Jews were committed to Israel; 50 percent of those questioned belonged to a Zionist organization with 20 percent of the respondents willing to settle in Israel. A large majority of Bayville Jews belonged to at least one Jewish organization, as did Jews in Southville, Lakeville, White Plains, and others. As found in previous studies, Bayville Jews entertained and were

---

[77]Manheim Shapiro, ed., The Bayville Survey: A Survey of the Attitudes of Affiliated Jews in Dade County, Florida (Greater Miami Chapter, The American Jewish Committee, 1958).

entertained by non-Jews on an occasional level. In practicing religious customs, Bayville Jews tended to maintain a low level of practice.

The Kansas City Survey (1962), also a task undertaken by the American Jewish Committee, added another piece to the story of American Jewry. This study, like the one previously mentioned, provided a relatively accurate picture of attitudes and life patterns of local Jews from which problems and needs could be perceived, and upon which program services could be based.[78]

Drawing upon the results of previous studies, the Kansas City Study generally provided a more in-depth view of American Jewry. Kansas City Jewry were seen as the norm, following the other studies with regard to religious practices. Reform Jews of Kansas (64 percent) exchanged Christmas gifts, while 24 percent had Christmas trees. A smaller percentage of Jews in Kansas City disapproved of intermarriage than in Bayville or Southville.

A large number of Jews in the Kansas City Study experienced anti-semitism in comparison to Southville and White Plains Jews. Compared with the other studies, Kansas City Jews expressed the smallest percentage for those feeling a deep sense of loss if Israel was destroyed. Again, one sees a majority of respondents attending High Holiday services, participating in Passover Seders and lighting Chanukah candles. This compared favorably with all other studies mentioned.

---

[78] Manheim Shapiro, ed., Kansas City Survey: A Report of Attitudes and Activities of Jews (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1962).

Each survey provided the impetus for other studies. Answers found on one study helped establish new questions to be found on subsequent studies.

In terms of more up-to-date demographic and attitudinal studies one finds a number of cities undertaking this task. Included among others were Houston (1976), Minneapolis (1973), Dallas (1974), Boston (1965), and San Francisco (1959).[79] These studies were undertaken by the local community and not by the American Jewish Committee. Only two of the demographic-attitudinal studies have been reproduced and published. These studies are the San Francisco Study by Fred Masserik in 1953 and 1959 and the Boston Study of 1965 and repeated in 1975. Analyses of both studies indicated there was a substantial change not only in demographic information, but also in religious observance and the perceived needs of the population.

Demographic changes, as seen in movement of Jews from one part of the United States to others, and attitudinal changes create a number of challenges which American Jews must face. Without a constant flow of information which relates how Jews feel on issues and how their

---

[79]Fred Masserik, A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Research Service Bureau, Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, November, 1959); Floyd J. Fowler, 1975 Community Survey: A Study of the Jewish Population of Greater Boston (Boston: Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, 1977); Judith Erikson and Mitchell J. Lazarus, The Jewish Community of Greater Minneapolis, 1971-1972: A Population Study (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Federation of Jewish Service, 1973); Betty J. Maynard, The Dallas Jewish Community Study (Dallas: Jewish Welfare Federation of Dallas, 1974); Sam Schulman, David Gottlieb, and Sheila Sheinberg, A Social and Demographic Survey of the Jewish Community of Houston Texas (Houston: Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Houston, Inc., 1976).

behavior patterns have changed, the problem of providing effective programming and service delivery cannot be met.

Summary of Communal Studies

Indicative of the studies mentioned and in light of current events on the American Jewish scene (e.g., increased intermarriage, more social mobility), there seems to be change not only in the Jewish home but also in Jewish identity. Historically, the Jewish home has always been synonymous with cohesiveness. The sense of duty and responsibility toward one another extended beyond the nuclear family to include landsleit, fellow countrymen. Common bonds had held the family together as a unit: (1) bonds of blood, (2) bonds of heritage, (3) bonds of history, and (4) bonds of religious ritual. Lakeville, Riverton, Southville and other studies indicated a slight break from the historical cohesive nature of family. Bonds of blood and heritage were seen to have less importance while more emphasis is being placed on Jewish-Christian relations.

Of great consequence to the stability of the Jewish home has been religion. The studies conducted in the 1950's indicated that religious norms have declined and religious observation ratings have reached a low level. What becomes evident is the fact that the "religious sanctuary" of the Jewish home where the finest of Jewish ideals were sanctified daily, e.g., Kashrut (dietary laws), Sabbath and festivals, prayer and family purity, are seen as becoming less important.

Historically, each member of the Jewish family had his own defined role. The father had the dominant role; the mother provided the

family with warmth, understanding a sense of togetherness. Because of the impact of a changing world on the Jewish family, domestic roles have become obscured, confused, and ill-defined. The American Jewish Committee studies have alluded to this change in the Jewish family. The cohesiveness of the Jewish home is seen to be unraveling. The rate of Jewish divorce and assimilation seems to be indicative of new family patterns emerging.[80]

VIII. DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF 1959

The original Southville study of 1959 will be outlined at this point. The findings of each of the following areas will be summarized according to: (1) background data; (2) religious affiliation; (3) essentials of Judaism; (4) organizational life; (5) Jewish causes and philanthropies; (6) Israel; (7) relationship to others; (8) stereotypes; and (9) intermarriage, interdating and friendships of children.

Background Data

The population's age range in the 1959 study can be divided into thirds. One-third of the population fell between the ages of 21 and 41; one-third was grouped between 41 and 51 (n = 285). The final third of the population was 51 and over. Memphis Jews resided in almost all portions of the city but tended to concentrate in lovely, residential, middle-class neighborhoods.

---

[80] Rosenthal, loc. cit.

A fifth of the Jewish families had lived in Memphis for 10 years or less. A large proportion had lived here all their lives. Eighty percent of Memphis Jewry were American-born at the time of the study (55 percent had two foreign-born parents). Only 30 percent had two American-born parents. Approximately 80 percent of the Jewish families of Memphis had one or more children who ranged in age from infancy to adulthood.

The educational level of Memphis Jewry was high in 1959. Forty percent of the men had completed college or post-graduate training. Memphis Jews, like Jews in most parts of the United States, were employed as owners or executives of businesses (predominantly mercantile), as salespeople, as professionals and as white-collar workers. There were no unskilled laborers and only one in twenty was a skilled or semi-skilled laborer when the interviews were administered.

Religious Affiliation

Ninety-four percent of Memphis Jews said they were affiliated with a temple or synagogue. Of these, 53 percent were affiliated with a Reform temple and 41 percent with an Orthodox synagogue. Only 4 percent of the sample was affiliated with the relatively new Conservative temple and were not reported in most of the findings. In Memphis, the Reform-affiliated were more likely to have completed higher levels of general education than the Orthodox-affiliated; they were more likely to be American-born and were much more likely to have had two American-born parents. Regardless of their actual affiliation, 40 percent of the Orthodox Jews indicated that they considered themselves Conservative.

Essentials of Judaism

The respondents were offered a list of principles or practices and were asked to indicate whether they considered it essential for being a good Jew, desirable but not essential, or as making no difference. Memphis Jews listed the following ranked in order of those practices most frequently mentioned as essential: Belief in G-d (95 percent); leading an ethical and moral life (93 percent); accept being a Jew and not trying to hide it (88 percent); gaining respect of Christian neighbors (74 percent); supporting humanitarian causes (72 percent); belonging to a synagogue or temple (71 percent); knowing the fundamentals of Judaism (66 percent); promoting civil betterment and improvement (59 percent); attending services on High Holidays (57 percent); marrying within the Jewish group (53 percent); working for equality for all minority groups (48 percent); contributing to Jewish philanthropies (38 percent); supporting Israel (28 percent); attending weekly services (19 percent); observing the dietary laws (13 percent). These choices did not vary greatly between the Orthodox-affiliated and the Reform-affiliated.

Half or more of the respondents said that they regularly carried out only three of the practices--attending High Holiday services, participating in a Passover Seder, and lighting Chanukah candles. Less than half bought kosher meat regularly, lighted Friday night candles regularly, attended Sabbath or daily services regularly, or kept two sets of dishes. However, it was found that the Orthodox-affiliated observed these practices in excess of the Reform-affiliated, with two exceptions: attending High Holiday services and Sabbath services regularly.

Approximately a third of both the Orthodox-affiliated and the Reform-affiliated said that their children attended a Jewish religious school. Fifty-two percent of the respondents said there should not be a Jewish all-day school. The Orthodox favored a Jewish day school to a much greater extent than did the Reform. One-fourth of the respondents said that they had themselves participated in some type of Jewish educational program during the last year. Two-fifths said that they regularly read books or magazines on Jewish subjects.

Organizational Life

The Jews of Memphis, like Jews elsewhere in the United States, tended to join organizations in 1959. Ninety-one percent belonged to at least one organization and fully a third were officers or board members of organizations. Nineteen percent of the respondents belonged to no Jewish organizations, while 39 percent belonged to no non-sectarian organizations. The Reform-affiliated were more likely to belong to non-sectarian organizations than were the Orthodox-affiliated.

A greater proportion of women than men belonged to organizations, generally, but the women were more likely to belong to Jewish organizations. Fifty-one percent of the women said they belonged to no non-sectarian organizations. Many non-sectarian organizations to which men belonged were business organizations such as trade and professional associations, Chambers of Commerce. The largest number (more than half) of the respondents belonged to temple or synagogue-related organizations. Between 60 and 70 percent did not spend any time on organizational activity in the 1959 study.

Jewish Causes and Philanthropies

The 1959 sample were asked to evaluate eleven Jewish causes as very important, moderately important, somewhat important, or not important at all. Those causes were ranked in descending order of importance: Temples and synagogues (84 percent); national agencies to overcome anti-semitism (64 percent); Jewish family service agencies (62 percent); Jewish Community Center (60 percent); national youth-serving agencies (55 percent); local Jewish education (48 percent); Israeli causes (44 percent); Jewish hospitals (44 percent); overseas relief (42 percent); institutions of higher Jewish learning (36 percent); research and publications on Jewish history and background (27 percent). The Orthodox-affiliated and the Reform-affiliated ran about the same except for the following: more of the Orthodox were likely to consider the Jewish Community Center, local Jewish education and Israeli causes very important; whereas, the Reform were more likely to rate Jewish family service agencies as very important.

Israel

Ninety percent of Memphis Jews said they would feel some sense of personal loss if Israel were destroyed, and 60 percent said this would be a "very deep" sense of personal loss. Seventy-one percent of the respondents thought the effect of the State of Israel on the status of American Jews was beneficial, 8 percent thought it was harmful, and 21 percent said the effect was mixed. When asked whether they thought that aid to Israel by American Jews had influenced the attitudes of other Americans toward American Jews, a majority (60 percent) said they thought that it had. Of these, 85 percent thought that such help

to Israel had made other Americans more friendly and 15 percent thought it had made other Americans more unfriendly. Large majorities thought that American Jews should raise money for Israel and should try to influence both United States foreign policy and American public opinion in favor of Israel. Almost the entire sample was opposed to American Jews becoming citizens of Israel, encouraging their children to do so, or giving Israeli financial needs priority over local needs.

Relationships to Others

Seventeen percent of the respondents said that they divided their charitable contributions equally between Jewish and non-sectarian causes; 13 percent said they gave more than half of the money they donated to non-sectarian causes; 45 percent said they gave more than half to Jewish causes. One out of ten Orthodox Jews said he gave more than half of the money he had donated to non-sectarian causes, while one out of four Reform Jews said this. None of the foreign-born Memphis Jews reported giving more than half the dollars they donated to non-sectarian causes.

The respondents were equally divided on whether they thought there were any problems between Jews and non-Jews in Memphis. Fifty-one percent said that relations between Jews and non-Jews were not at all strained, 37 percent said these relations were only somewhat strained, 9 percent said they were fairly strained, and 1 percent said they were very strained. Of those who said that relations were strained to some degree, fully half attributed this to both Jews and non-Jews. Only one out of seven attributed strained relations to non-Jews alone.

Seventy-one percent said they had heard of no anti-semetic incident in Memphis recently, and 85 percent said that they or their families had not personally experienced any anti-semetic act. Memphis Jews apparently had a large amount of personal social contact with non-Jews. Seventy-seven percent of the sample said they had spent at least one evening in the last year visiting a non-Jewish home, 69 percent said they had had non-Jews visiting in their own homes, and 52 percent reported spending an evening in a social gathering which included both Jewish and non-Jewish couples.

Of the neighbors they reported being more friendly with, 44 percent said that these are either all non-Jews or a majority non-Jews, and another 27 percent reported they are most friendly with an equal number of Jews and non-Jews.

Stereotypes

The respondents were given the opportunity to agree or disagree with a list of stereotypic statements both about Jews and about non-Jews. A small number of the respondents agreed with the stereotype statements about Jews and about non-Jews, e.g., that Jews tended to be cleverer than most people. Half of them agreed with the statements that Jews tended to be more liberal politically, tended to be more money minded and tended to be shrewder businessmen; 65 percent agreed with the statement that Jews tended to be more interested in education and 72 percent agreed with the statement that Jews tended to be more aggressive. A majority of the respondents agreed with all the following statements about non-Jews: they tended to be more religious than Jews,

to drink more, to go in for more physical fighting, to have less closely-knit families, and to be just about the same as Jews in most respects.

Approximately the same proportions of Orthodox-affiliated and Reform-affiliated agreed with the statements that Jews were more interested in education and that Jews tended to be more aggressive, but the Orthodox-affiliated were more likely to agree with the other stereotypic statements about Jews. Fewer of the Orthodox-affiliated agreed with the statement that non-Jews were just about the same as Jews in most respects. More of the Orthodox-affiliated than the Reform-affiliated agreed with the other stereotypes about non-Jews.

Intermarriage, Interdating, and Friendships of Children

Of the respondents with children (n = 222), 68 percent strongly disapproved of their child's intermarrying, 19 percent said they would mildly disapprove, 12 percent said it would make no difference, and 1 percent said they would mildly approve. No parent reported that he would strongly approve. The Orthodox-affiliated were more likely to say they would strongly disapprove than the Reform-affiliated. Fifty-two percent of those with two American-born parents said they would disapprove of their child's intermarrying as against 75 percent with two foreign-born parents who said they would disapprove.

Sixty-one percent said they would not approve if their teenage child dated a non-Jew. With respect to younger children, most respondents who had scout-age children (8 to 14 years) did want their child to be a member of a mixed boy or girl scout troop. However, even

with these young children, 25 percent said they disapproved of their child's having non-Jewish friends of the same sex; 75 percent said they disapproved of their child's having non-Jewish friends of the opposite sex.

The 1959 sample was seen to be a religiously identifiable group of people. Indicative of this was their emphasis on belief in G-d and the high percentage of respondents who affiliated with a synagogue or temple. Israel was also seen as an important part of their Jewish identity as well as synagogue and temple activities. Ritual observances such as lighting Chanukah candles, attending Passover Seders, were customs practiced in both the Orthodox and Reform samples. The newly formed Conservative synagogue was found to represent 4 percent of the total sample.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

The availability of a source of current demographic information on a population is fundamental in providing a community with a vehicle for effective planning and comprehensive service delivery. The Federal Census conducted every decade furnishes a secular community with necessary descriptive information. Unfortunately, specific data concerning the Jewish community are unavailable through this source. Consequently, some individual Jewish communities in the U.S.A. find it essential to secure the needed data via separate surveys and questionnaires.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The beginnings of an evaluative process in Memphis was created in October 1958. At a national American Jewish Committee meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana, a survey process, which already had been used in the Riverton Study, was presented to members from some fifteen cities with the intent of luring other communities to adopt the model. The uniqueness of this model was that it expanded the parameters of previous studies. This survey was able to research a community from both a demographic and an attitudinal perspective. Three members of the Memphis Jewish community were present at this session, and were quite enthusiastic about the utility of such a project.

Within two days after the close of the conference, the decision was made by the Memphis Jewish communal leadership to participate in the study. The process, then, was initiated. The national

office of the American Jewish Committee was equally enthusiastic with the prospect of surveying a Southern community, because it was reputed that the Southern Jew was different from his Northern counterpart--in his religious outlook and his social adjustment.

The Community Relations Committee of the Memphis Jewish community created a Steering Committee (twenty-one members) which subsequently established subcommittees responsible for: (1) planning the questionnaire, (2) recruiting and training interviewers, (3) drawing the sample, and (4) coding. Both the local Rabbinate, and the board of the Jewish Service Agency consulted on many of the questions chosen. The National Director for Communal Affairs of the American Jewish Committee visited Memphis on two occasions to aid in the development of plans and to train interviewers.

The actual questionnaire employed was based on items from both the Riverton and the White Plains studies. There was a total of fifty-eight questions. Because the process of surveying was implemented by a volunteer staff of interviewers, the instrument was constructed so as to limit the possibility of interviewer bias upon the questions. The majority of the questions either demanded yes/no responses, or provided a Likert (1-4) range of responses. Each interviewer was instructed to ask the questions as they appeared on the questionnaire. They were cautioned not to interpret any answer.

Eight interviewers were responsible for collecting the information on the interview schedules from 285 respondents. To compute the

results a separate coding team converted the data on the schedule into numbers compatible with an IBM machine.

The Southville sample was drawn from the Memphis Welfare Fund's nearly complete list of Jewish families in the Memphis Jewish community. This was done to insure each Jewish family an opportunity to be included in the study. The sampling process consisted of selecting out every tenth name of the list. The representativeness of the sample was checked by noting how closely the sample conformed to the pattern of religious affiliation and the location of residence of the total Jewish population of Memphis. Although the consultant to the original Southville Study attempted to secure a 10 percent sample of the 3,000 families (the Jewish population of Memphis in 1959), in actuality 285 families were given a face-to-face interview. No information was provided which revealed why the full sample was not obtained.

Because the report, under the pseudonym "Southville," was never published for the general public, and some of the people who were instrumental in the study are no longer available for questioning, the information dealing with the exact sampling methods can no longer be found. Some of the basic procedures have scantily been described in the findings of the 1959 Southville survey. The only public expression of the results was a verbal presentation by representatives of the American Jewish Committee made on June 2, 1959, to the Memphis Jewish lay leadership.[1]

---

[1]Manheim Shapiro, ed., "Southville Survey of Jewish Attitudes" (American Jewish Committee, 1959, unpublished).

II. PLANNING PHASE

Twenty years later, two graduate students from the University of Tennessee School of Social Work went to the Memphis Jewish Federation with the idea that some of the services rendered to the Jewish community (vis-a-vis the Memphis Jewish Community Center, Memphis Jewish Service Agency) needed to be evaluated. After lengthy discussions with the professional staff of the Memphis Jewish Federation and the Jewish Service Agency, it was decided that a re-examination of the Southville Survey would provide both the professionals and the lay communal leadership with specific information useful in program planning and in assessing services already provided in the community.

After examining the original Southville Survey of 1959, the students thought it would be necessary to broaden the scope of the schedule to assure that it would be a comprehensive source of information for the Jewish communal services agenicies (Memphis Jewish Community Center, Memphis Jewish Federation, Jewish Service Agency, and B'nai B'rith Home). The researchers were slightly hindered by the absence of a complete questionnaire from the 1959 study in the Memphis Jewish Federation files; the American Jewish Committee was also unable to locate a complete survey in its files.

III. THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The schedule used in the present study was ten pages (see Appendix A) with a cover sheet which reported the subject's code number (to insure the subjects' anonymity), the date, sex, and the

interviewer's initials verifying the information received. Forty-seven of the original fifty-eight items were utilized. Each of these original forty-seven questions had been coded and each finding had been documented by tables in the Southville report presented to Memphis Jewish communal leaders in 1959.

The remaining seventeen questions were drafted using a number of actual questions from the 1975 Boston survey and also suggestions by the Executive Director of the Memphis Jewish Federation and the University of Tennessee Thesis Advisor. The instrument was primarily revised by adding a few questions pertaining to: (1) Jewish and secular education, and (2) family life education.

By creating the new addendum to the original schedule, the researchers were careful to adhere to the original guidelines of the initial study, namely that the instrument:

1. Be simple enough that any non-professional volunteer from the general community could administer it.
2. That the items would warrant responses which could be easily managed and would not involve extensive verbatim reporting.
3. That no question would be intimidating, threatening, or offensive to any community member.
4. That all the information gleaned from the instrument would be valuable and useful to the community's professional and lay leadership.

5. That the questionnaire would take no more than 45 minutes to complete.[2]

The schedule was pretested by six individuals in order to assess certain test characteristics such as: (1) the organization of the instrument, (2) the clarity of each question asked, and (3) the time needed to complete the questionnaire. Each researcher was responsible for administering three of the pretested questionnaires.

The pretest proved to be quite informative in that it served to initate organizing the test questions into categories. In the final draft five categories were used: (1) information on socio-economic status and religious affiliation, (2) philanthropies and services, (3) attitudes and practices, (4) Jewish education, and (5) Israel. The final item on the schedule was an evaluative question which attempted to ascertain if the subject felt he/she had an adequate opportunity to respond to issues and attitudes pertaining to the Memphis Jewish community in 1978.

The schedule contained items which when completed would provide the researchers with basic demographic data (age, sex, marital status, educational background, occupation, income, number of children, family's country of origin, and patterns of mobility). It also focused on: (1) synagogue affiliation; (2) membership in secular and Jewish organizations; (3) interest in Jewish/non-Jewish causes, and/or Jewish/non-Jewish services; (4) assessment of the community's performance in the area of immigrant resettlement and programming for the aged; (5) religious attitudes and the extent to which Judaism was

---

[2]Ibid.

practiced; (6) attitudes on Judeo-Christian relationships; and (7) views on Israel. Similar to the 1959 Southville study, all items could be answered by checking an appropriate number or by providing short answers. This response system was easily understood by the six pre-test subjects. The researchers then decided that all the questionnaires would be self-administrered.

IV. THE POPULATION AND THE SAMPLE

The target population of this study was the Jewish community of Memphis in 1978. But this was a rather amorphous entity. Although Jews tend to identify as Jews voluntarily, it is still difficult to determine the extent of their religious, ethnic, or cultural identity. According to Sklare, a Jewish community is comprised of members who identify themselves as Jews no matter what their synagogue affiliation.[3]

In 1977 and 1978, a demographic study was completed of the Jewish community in Memphis which was funded by the Memphis Jewish Federation. The researchers were able to use the May 1978 printout of names from this census to form the population base, from which the sample was drawn. The roster used contained names, addresses, and other coded information pertaining to the Jewish households. At the time this survey was undertaken, the roster included 3,243 households.[4]

---

[3] Sklare, America's Jews, pp. 103-135.

[4] Census of the Memphis Jewish Community, 1977 (Memphis: Southern Consulting Services, 1977).

A systematic random sampling procedure was designed so that every 30th name on the roster was selected. One hundred and ten households were initially selected for participation in the study (n = 110). Each of these individuals was given a code number to assure confidentiality.

The following procedure was used to encourage participation, prior to the actual interviews. A letter was sent on Jewish Community Relations Council stationery to each subject in the sample explaining briefly the purpose of the study, and those facets of the community endorsing and participating in the study (U.T. School of Social Work, Jewish Service Agency, Memphis Jewish Federation) (see Appendix B). Two weeks after these letters were mailed to the prospective subjects, the research team (15 volunteers selected by the researchers) telephoned the households to confirm their participation in the survey. Of the 110 selected, 50 refused to participate. Because the researchers desired a minimum sample of 75 participants, they went to a community-wide program at the Jewish Community Center (the Golda Meir Memorial program) on a Sunday evening which had a diverse group of Memphis Jews and asked for volunteers to complete the questionnaire. Fifteen cooperated. The final sample represented nearly 3 percent of the households in the Memphis Jewish community (as advanced by the Census) and was assumed to be a "viable" base sample considering the completeness of the Census.

V. PLANNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Subsequent to the acceptance of a final draft of the questionnaire, a master code book was developed which translated the actual questions into language manageable for a computer. The researchers worked closely with the University of Tennessee faculty to accomplish this task. The researchers initially went to the National Council of Jewish Women whose membership did the interviewing for the 1959 study. The Council felt that it was not a project with which the membership would want to become involved. Therefore, it was necessary to ask a cross-section of women in the community to offer their assistance. During the following two weeks, the two researchers began recruiting volunteers who would contact the subjects and be responsible for seeing that the questionnaire was completed. Seventeen volunteers finally agreed to make this commitment.

An Affidavit of Confidentiality was introduced to the volunteers, and its rationale was explained to them (see Appendix C). Each volunteer signed an affidavit after receiving his/her specific list of names and their appropriate code numbers. One master list of the 110 subjects randomly sampled was kept in the vault at the Memphis Jewish Federation to insure the rule of confidentiality determined by the University of Tennessee Human Subject Experiments Committee (1972).

The month of December 1978 was allotted for the completion of the interview schedules. Each volunteer was given between three to five names and was asked to assume full responsibility for contacting the subjects and assuring the completion of the schedules. As the questionnaires

were returned to the research team, they were coded and recorded for data processing on computer coding sheets. The data were then key-punched. The majority of the questions were analyzed according to such variables as age, sex, and religious affiliation using frequency distribution, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation, Chi-square, and analysis of variance statistical techniques.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. DESCRIPTIVE AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF 1979

The variables related to Jewish identity in the 1959 study (attitudes on Israel, causes and philanthropies, the essentials of Judaism, stereotypes, attitudes and practices) were examined by correlational analysis and will be described in the subsequent two sections of this chapter. The following data will add an extra dimension at the end of the description of the demographics with regard to: (1) alcohol and drug problems within the Memphis Jewish community, (2) relationships with non-Jews, (3) interdating, and (4) the needs of elderly, and (5) the Russian immigrant. Alcohol and drug problems and the needs of the elderly and the Russian immigrant were questions added by the researchers in 1979.

From the data secured from the 1977 Census and from the random sample in 1979,[1] it is evident that the vast majority of Memphis' Jewry reside in East Memphis. Within this large area, it seems that most of that population make their homes in the 38117 and 38138 zip code areas. These areas can be described as lovely, residential, middle-class neighborhoods.

---

[1]Researchers used 1977 Memphis Jewish Census only when applicable to information related to 1959 and 1979 study. All data used for the 1979 study are reported using adjusted frequencies unless otherwise indicated.

A little less than one quarter of the heads of the households have lived in Memphis ten years or less (28 percent). The subjects have lived in Memphis on the average 24.6 years. Those who are not native Memphians have emigrated here largely from Northeast U.S.A. (21 percent), the proximal states to Tennessee of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Kentucky, Missouri (15 percent), and from the Midwest (12 percent). The present Jewish population of Memphis is a relatively stable one, with over two-thirds of its heads of households indicating that they were not likely to move within the next ten years.

A majority of the subjects' mothers and fathers were of Eastern European origin, 68 percent and 73 percent, respectively. Less than one-fifth of the subjects had one parent that was a native-born American. Four percent of the sample were not born Jewish. The average age of the respondents was forty-five years old.

Approximately two-thirds of the subjects were presently married; none were single. Twelve percent were divorced.

Alcohol and Drug Problems

Seventy-eight percent of the sample population (n = 60, with 15 missing data) reported that there is no alcohol problem among Jews in Memphis. When that same sample was asked to assess the effectiveness of the Service Agency in addressing the problem, 82 percent failed to answer the question.

Fifty-three percent of the respondents were convinced that there was a drug problem among Jews in Memphis. Only 7 percent of the sample

felt the Jewish Service Agency had been effective in making an impact on the community with programming. Fifty-one subjects again had no response to this particular item.

Relationships with Non-Jews

According to the findings of the 1979 "Southville Revisited" study, 36 percent of the problems respondents had with non-Jews stemmed from anti-semetic origins rather than from either religious or economic reasons. Fifty-nine percent of those who answered in 1979 felt that the non-Jew initiated the anti-semetic incidents which had been purely verbal.

The study revealed much social intermixing between Jews and non-Jews. Fifty-one percent of the 1979 sample had much opportunity for contact with non-Jews; 68 percent of the present sample had contact through business. Seventy-four percent had spent evenings in the home of a non-Jew between one and five times a year. Sixty-eight percent had entertained non-Jews in their homes between one and five times a year; 84 percent had had experience with non-Jews at large, mixed social gatherings.

Interdating

Parents were much more approving of their children having non-Jewish friends of the same sex (74 percent) than friends of the opposite sex (50 percent). When the question of interdating was raised, 60 percent of the total sample did not want their children dating a non-Jew at all, and 85 percent disapproved of their children interdating most of the time.

Satisfying the Needs of the Elderly and the Russian Immigrants

Thirty-six percent of the respondents are unaware of what is presently being done by the Jewish service agencies to satisfy the needs of the

elderly in the areas of housing (40 percent), health (47 percent), socio-cultural, religion (36 percent), emotional support (53 percent), financial aid (62 percent), education (55 percent).

Of the 50 percent who responded to the questions which concerned the service agenices' effectiveness at satisfying the needs of the Russian immigrants, the response was not very positive. The major thrust of the findings was the lack of response (which seemed to be apparent by the high percentage of missing data) indicating they did not know if the needs of the immigrants were being satisfied.

Questionnaire Evaluation

Another added dimension incorporated by the researchers in the questionnaire was that of an evaluative question concerning the questionnaire itself. The respondents were asked to rank the 1979 Southville Revisited questionnaire as to being adequate, moderately adequate, inadequate or no opinion. The results were as follows: 61 percent of the 1979 sample believed the survey instrument to be adequate, 29 percent considered the instrument to be moderately adequate, 1 percent believed it to be inadequate, and 9 percent had no opinion. Thus, the 1979 sample indicated that the survey instrument gave them an opportunity to respond to issues and attitudes pertaining to the Memphis Jewish community.

II. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Before any statements can be made about changes in the socio-cultural and socio-economic nature of the Memphis Jewish community

over the past twenty years, it is essential to examine the existing data from: (1) the 1959 Southville Study, (2) the 1977 Census of the Memphis Jewish community (a demographic study), and (3) the 1979 Southville Revisited Study. The results will generally be presented in tabular form, and will provide information about the Memphis Jewish community as it was described in the 1959 study; and if, and to what degree, it has changed over twenty years.

Although the median ages of the population described in the 1977 Census and 1979 Southville study were the same (40-41 years), there was a discrepancy in the percentages found between the age groups: 9L0 20-39 (24 percent and 42 percent, respectively); and (2) 50 and over (36 percent and 61 percent, respectively). An explanation for these age differences may be due to the population randomly sampled at the Jewish Community Center in 1979. Although there was a wide range of people attending the community meeting, over 75 percent of those who were willing to answer the 1979 questionnaire were between the ages of twenty-one and forty (see Table 1).

All three studies had nearly 50 percent ratios of males to females. The 1977 Census and the 1979 study reflected a slightly higher percentage of females (52 percent and 51 percent, respectively). Thus, in both studies there was no sex bias.

The data in Table 2 received on marital status in the present study were more consistent with the 1977 Memphis Jewish Census material than with the 1959 study in the number married (80 percent in 1959, 69 percent in 1977, 70 percent in 1979) and those widowed (9 percent in 1959, 18 percent in 1977, 14 percent in 1979). In the 1979 population

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY PERCENTAGES OF AGE RANGES OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285), 1977 CENSUS (n = 3,245), AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Age Range (Years)	1959 Southville	1977 Census	1979 Southville Revisited
20-39	34	24	42
40-49	32	15	21
50+	32	61	37
(Median Age)	--	(40 years)	(41 years)

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGES REGARDING MARITAL STATUS: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285), 1977 CENSUS (n = 3,245), AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Marital Status	1959 Southville	1977 Census	1979 Southville Revisited
Married	80	69	70
Divorced and Separated	5	4	16
Widowed	9	18	14
Never Wed	6	9	--

sample the percentages of separated and divorced individuals (4 percent and 12 percent) are more consistent with the national average than either the 1959 or 1977 percentages (4 percent). In the present study not one respondent had "never been wed" (0 percent). The increased number of widowed appears to reconfirm that the present sample is older than the population sampled twenty years ago.

Table 3 indicates that there have been some changes in the character of the population over the last twenty years related to length of residence in Memphis. Slightly over one-quarter of the sample (27 percent) has lived in Memphis for ten years or less (versus 18 percent of the 1959 sampled population). This indicates that the Memphis Jewish community seems to be more transient than twenty years ago. The 1979 study indicated increasing numbers (33 percent) coming from the Northeast and the Midwest regions. Of the 37 percent of the sample selected over 50 years old, only 11 percent have resided in Memphis for 50 years or more. The assumption can be made, therefore, that only one-third were possibly native Memphians. Appreciable differences between the 1959 and 1979 samples can be found in the following categories: (1) less than one year (0 percent to 5 percent, respectively); and (2) 41-50 years (16 percent and 5 percent, respectively). Thus, there appears to be an increase of people moving into the community. When asked the likelihood of moving out of the community within the next ten years, less than 12 percent responded that this was a "very likely" possibility. The primary reason for the possible change of location was: (1) occupation (43 percent), and (2) personal or family reasons (33 percent).

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN YEARS IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Length of Residence (In Years)	1959 Southville	1979 Southville Revisited
Less than 1	0	5
1-10	18	22
11-20	18	16
21-30	18	25
31-40	18	16
41-50	16	5
Over 50	11	11

Level of education, as shown in Table 4, evidenced a significant change in 1979 over the findings of the 1959 study. Sixty-nine percent of the sample was seen to have a college degree in 1979 as compared to 31 percent of the sample studied in 1959. The increase in the number of college graduates and professionals seemed to relate positively with the increase of access to colleges and to the professions for Jews.[2]

[2]Marshall Sklare, The Jew in American Society (New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974), pp. 144-148.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF LEVEL OF EDUCATION IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Level of Education Completed	1959 Southville	1979 Southville Revisited
Grade School	12	4
High School	57	27
College	23	40
Postgraduate/Professional	8	29

It appears from this sample that as the educational level of the population changed, the occupational nature of the population also changed. There are more professionals and business or store owners in the present sample population (54 percent) than twenty years ago (34 percent); fewer Jewish women were housewives (35 percent in 1959; 25 percent in 1979). Thus, the traditional role of the Jewish woman (housewife) appears to be changing; and the 1979 population can be characterized as more occupationally active in areas with more status and more power (see Table 5).

Table 6 indicates the numbers of people who have joined or affiliated with a synagogue or temple. The present study shows that in twenty years two times the number (15 percent in 1979; 6 percent in 1959) chose not to affiliate.

The American synagogue appears to be a vital institution, perhaps the strongest agency in the entire Jewish community. There are, however, no reliable nationwide statistics on synagogue affiliation.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL STATUS IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979* "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Occupation	1959 Southville	1979 Southville Revisited
Professional	9	14
Owners of Business (Higher Executive)	7	11
Owners of Stores (Minor Professional)	18	29
Blue Collar Workers	2	4
Housewives	35	25

Note. (*) Less than 100 percent because only selected occupations discussed.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF VIEWS ON RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285), 1977 CENSUS, AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Affiliation	1959 Southville	1977 Census	1979 Southville Revisited
Non-Affiliated	6	16	15
Affiliated	94	84	85

The most notable aspect of synagogue affiliation is that it varies with relationship to the size of the Jewish population of the community. In communities of intermediate size (10,000 to 25,000 Jewish population) the level of affiliation appears to be lower than that of smaller Jewish populations with over 70 percent belonging to synagogues or temples. For example, in Providence, Rhode Island, the figure is 77 percent; in Springfield, Massachusetts, it is 76 percent; in Rochester, New York, 71 percent; and in Camden, New Jersey, it reaches 82 percent. In large Jewish communities, the rate of affiliation is much lower, commonly running at about 50 percent of the Jewish population.[3]

Thus, Memphis Jewry, as seen in the sample, appears to affiliate strongly with temples and synagogues even though there was a slight decline in affiliation since 1959.

Table 7 represents the types of synagogues with which the respondents affiliated. These findings may demonstrate that the present study may not be representative of the general population. There is a much lower percentage of Reform-affiliated Jews in 1979 than in the population of the Census (15 percent in 1979; 49 percent in 1977 Census). This skewed distribution precipitated the researchers to correlate attitudinal and socio-economic variables with religious affiliation. Although the data would appear to be weighted disproportionately in favor of Orthodox views, this may not have actually been the case.

---

[3]Sklare, America's Jews, p. 123.

Even though there were more Orthodox-affiliated subjects, when the respondents were asked to describe themselves religiously (without regard to affiliational ties), there was a more even balance among the three groups. Interestingly, those who described themselves as Orthodox proved to be the smallest of the three groups with 25 percent as compared with those who saw themselves as Conservative (31 percent) or Reform (36 percent). Thus, how people affiliated did not necessarily reflect their actual attitudes and practices. For example, a person indicating Orthodox affiliation may not actually reflect Orthodox attitudes and Orthodox practices.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION BY SYNAGOGUES/TEMPLES IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285), 1977 CENSUS (n = 3,243), AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Religious Affiliation By Synagogue/ Temple	1959 Southville Survey	1977 Census	1979 Southville Revisited
Orthodox	41	40	41
Conservative	4	11	19
Reform	53	49	15
Multiple Affiliations	--	--	7
No Data	(2)		(18)

Except for the findings in the areas of the Jewish Community Center, Israeli causes, Jewish hospitals, and synagogues/temples, all the other findings were consistent with the 1959 results. There was

an increase of 16 percent in the 1979 study in the importance of having a Jewish Community Center, and a 16 percent increase in importance placed on Israeli causes. A decrease in importance was evidenced in the area of Jewish hospitals (11 percent) and, surprisingly enough, there was a decrease in the importance rating for synagogues and temples (15 percent). Two-thirds of the seventy-five respondents believed that institutions for the elderly are very important; the category related to the elderly was added to the "Southville Revisited" questionnaire by the researchers.

The subjects were then asked to choose from the summary data in Table 8 what they considered to be the two most important causes. There was a difference in the findings between 1959 and 1979. In the original Southville study, the two most important causes were: (1) Temples/Synagogues (68 percent), and (2) National Agencies to overcome anti-semiticism (30 percent). In 1979 the two areas with the largest responses were: (1) the Jewish Community Center (28 percent) and (2) Local Jewish education (23 percent).

Table 9 seems to reflect two major differences which seem to be apparent over twenty years in response to the evaluative questions on the Memphis Jewish Community Center. The first difference was that more of the subjects were able to place a value on each specific activity today than they were in 1959. In the original study at least 38 percent (ranging to 55 percent) of the subjects responded "Don't know" as to how the Jewish Community Center was achieving its goals in each of the program categories. In 1979 a smaller percentage of no more than 33 percent (as reflected by missing data) were unable to be decisive about assessing the quality of the various programs.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANCE OF JEWISH CAUSES IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY* (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Causes	Very Important		Moderately Important		Somewhat Important		Not At All Important	
	1959	1979	1959	1979	1959	1979	1959	1979
Jewish Community Center	60	76	30	16	8	8	2	--
Local Jewish Education	49	52	31	28	9	14	10	6
Israeli Causes	44	60	33	33	11	7	10	--
National Agencies Against Anti-Semitism	64	64	16	22	13	13	6	1
Jewish Hospitals	44	35	26	32	8	24	2	9
Higher Jewish Learning	36	40	33	33	20	20	10	7
Research and Publications on Jewish History and Background	27	27	33	46	23	24	15	3
Jewish Family Service Agency	62	71	26	23	8	6	2	--
Overseas Relief	42	39	37	29	11	24	8	8
National Youth-Serving Agencies	55	56	29	24	9	17	6	3
Temples/Synagogues	84	69	11	20	3	10	1	1
Aged Institutions	--	72	--	20	--	7	--	1

Note. (*) Percentages may not total 100 percent due to No Opinion data not in table.

TABLE 9

COMPARISONS OF ESTIMATE OF JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER ACTIVITIES IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)*

Jewish Community Center Activities	Good		Fair		Poor	
	1959**	1979	1959**	1979	1959**	1979
Children's Activities	58	60	3	17	--	1
Teenage Activities	50	37	4	29	1	4
Adult Social	41	37	14	33	--	12
Adult Cultural	39	37	12	36	1	7
Athletics	50	60	6	15	1	1
Jew-Christian Relations	39	29	10	36	1	4
Service to Jewish Community Groups	50	52	7	23	--	3
Service to Total Community	50	44	8	24	1	5
Help to Individuals	33	27	9	29	1	12
Guidance to Youth Groups	51	31	6	28	1	8
Israel	--	51	--	20	--	1
Services to Elderly	--	63	--	17	--	3

Note. (*) Relative frequency used to give the most accurate description of data.

Note. (**) Totals for 1959 do not total 100 percent because of category "Don't know."

In four of the Jewish Community Center activities there appeared to be a noticeable difference in responses. In 1979, 60 percent of the respondents believed that the Jewish Community Center was doing a good job in the area of athletics, an increase of 10 percent over twenty years. In three other areas (teen activities, Jewish-Christian relations, and guidance for youth) the sample selected today felt that the Jewish Community Center's effectiveness decreased 13 percent, 10 percent, and 20 percent, respectively. Only 56 percent of those responding in 1979 believed that the Jewish Community Center was doing a "good job" totally in all areas compared to 85 percent in 1959. In the 1979 study 28 percent gave the Jewish Community Center a "fair rating."

Southville Revisited attempted to assess the quality of Israeli and elderly programming at the Jewish Community Center. Sixty percent felt that the Jewish Community Center was doing a "good" job in the area of activities for the elderly, while 50 percent were favorably impressed with Israeli programming. It should be noted that the Jewish Community Center provides the community with an Israeli representative to the Jewish community of Memphis as a resource person for all Israel-related programs.

Changes were demonstrated in over half of the categories in Table 10 over the last twenty years. In only one area, support of Israel, was there a 19 percent increase in the "essential" responses since 1959. In the 1979 study, the subjects appeared to show less of a commitment than the respondents in 1959 had shown in response to other issues of civic involvement: (1) humanitarian causes (57 percent),

TABLE 10

RANK ORDER AND FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE OF ESSENTIALS TO BEING A "GOOD JEW": 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Belief or Practice	1959		1979	
	Rank Order	Percent	Rank Order	Percent
Belief in G-d	1	95	2	80
Lead an ethical and moral life	2	93	3	77
Accept his being a Jew and not try to hide it	3	88	1	81
Gain respect of non-Jewish neighbors	4	74	11	32
Support humanitarian causes	5	72	6	57
Belong to synagogue/temple	6	71	9	45
Know the fundamentals of Judaism	7	66	4	61
Promote civic betterment and improvement	8	59	13	27
Attend High Holiday services	9	57	8	47
Marry within the Jewish faith	10	53	5	57
Work for equality for all minority groups	11	48	12	27
Contribute to Jewish philanthropies	12	38	10	44
Support Israel	13	28	7	47
Attend weekly services	14	19	15	17
Observe dietary laws	15	13	14	20

(2) respect for non-Jews (32 percent), (3) promotion of civic betterment (27 percent), and (4) work for equality for all minority groups (27 percent). In the 1959 survey, the subjects supported these issues with percentages of 74, 59 and 48, respectively.

Twenty percent of the population seemed to have changed their perspective also on three of the essentials for being a "good" Jew which dealt with religious commitment: (1) belonging to a synagogue (a decrease of 20 percent), (2) belief in G-d (a decrease of 15 percent), and (3) the importance of leading an ethical and moral life (a decrease of 16 percent). This decrease in religious commitment may have strong implications for further planning in the Jewish community, and will follow later in the report.

In comparing the data with the 1959 findings, it appears that the present population, by placing the highest value on "Accept being a Jew," appeared to place emphasis on the issue of Jewish identification. The 1979 sample selected seems less committed to the basic premise of Judaism--belief in G-d (decreased 15 percent from 1959).

Even though the 1979 subjects appear to be philosophically less committed to Jewish religious beliefs than the subjects in 1959 as shown in Table 11, they nevertheless seem more committed to Jewish practices especially in the following areas: lighting Sabbath candles (an increase of 13 percent), participating in Passover Seder (an increase of 21 percent), lighting Chanukah candles (an increase of 32 percent), attending Sabbath services (an increase of 13 percent), and keeping two sets of dishes (an increase of 13 percent). These patterns of ritualistic practice have been maintained nationally by American Jews. It appears

to be supportive of Jewish communalism and of the Jewish home and peoplehood.[4]

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF JEWISH PRACTICES IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Jewish Practices	Regularly		Sometimes		Never	
	1959	1979	1959	1979	1959	1979
Buy kosher meat	21	27	18	32	45	41
Light Friday candles	37	55	18	26	45	19
Participate in Seder	70	91	19	5	11	4
Light Chanukah candles	60	92	12	4	27	4
Attend High Holiday services	91	91	5	8	4	1
Attend Sabbath services	13	26	64	64	22	10
Attend daily services	1	7	11	26	88	67
Keep two sets of dishes	16	29	2	11	82	60
Mezzuzahs on door*	--	81	--	7	--	12

Note. (*) Asked only in 1979.

It also may be that the modern Jew selects the mizvot (commandments) that are subjectively possible for him to fulfill. Although guided by a new personalism, the subject in the 1979 study may also be influenced by the prevailing culture, by his class, his spouse, children, parents, friends, neighbors, and by the traditional commandments which have existed for thousands of years.

---

[4]Sklare, The Jew in American Society, p. 242.

An analysis of any single observance or set of observances would illustrate the problem that individuals may have: (1) identifying with Jewish tradition, and (2) maintaining a feeling of identity should one choose to neglect or reject the observance.

According to Sklare, five criteria emerge in explaining why specific religious rituals are retained in Jewish households. These criteria include that a ritual: (1) "is capable of effective redefinition in modern terms"; (2) does not demand social isolation on the adoption of a unique life style; (3) accords with the religious culture of the larger community while providing a "Jewish" alternative when such is felt to be needed; (4) is centered on the child; and (5) is performed annually or infrequently.[5]

The sample selected appeared to demonstrate a change in how a Jew may view other Jews and how he may view the non-Jewish population. The subjects in 1979 responded more positively to statements about Jews than those subjects questioned in 1959. Each of the changes noted in the results helped to create a more positive picture of the Jew. Fifty-five percent of today's sample selected (compared to 33 percent of the subjects in 1959) felt that Jews are more clever. Only 38 percent felt that Jews are more money-minded, while 52 percent saw Jews as money-minded in 1959. Eighty-seven percent seem to be convinced that Jews are more interested in education than non-Jews. This is a 22 percent increase over the 1959 study.

---

[5]Sklare, America's Jews, p. 114.

Only two major changes were seen in the respondents' attitudes about non-Jews. The present subjects (43 percent) did not feel that non-Jews are more religious; whereas 50 percent felt that non-Jews were more religious in 1959. Fifty percent were convinced that Jews were "about the same" as non-Jews, whereas 70 percent were convinced of this in 1959 (see Table 12).

From the data in Table 13, it appeared that the subjects of "Southville Revisited" are more committed to the state of Israel than the sample in 1959. Those areas with the highest percentage increase were: (1) encouraging children to live in Israel (29 percent increase), (2) giving Israeli financial needs priority over local needs (25 percent increase), and (3) becoming citizens of Israel (10 percent increase). Even though the 1979 respondents demonstrated at least an 8 percent increase over those responding in 1959 in the strength of their feelings toward Israel in these categories, the actual strength of their commitment was still relatively weak. All three of these areas showed less than a 33 percent commitment. One explanation for the increase in support of Israel may be that the last two wars in Israel (1967, 1973) swayed American public opinion in favor of Israel. This has given the local Jewish population sampled a stronger sense of identity and commitment to Israel.

Table 14 illustrates the amount of hours per month both the 1959 and 1979 samples donated to various Jewish as well as non-Jewish causes. It appeared that the 1979 sample was more active in the areas of synagogue involvement, Jewish Service institutions, and other Jewish groups than the 1959 sample. With regard to volunteer

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT JEWS AND NON-JEWS IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Statement	Agree		Disagree	
	1959	1979	1959	1979
Jews tend to be cleverer than most people	33	55	65	45
Jews tend to be more liberal politically	53	64	39	36
Jews tend to be more money-minded	52	38	46	62
Jews tend to be more aggressive	72	50	26	50
Jews tend to be more interested in education	65	87	34	13
Jews tend to be shrewder businessmen	48	54	50	46
Non-Jews tend to be more religious than Jews	60	43	36	57
Non-Jews tend to drink more than Jews	60	69	35	31
Non-Jews tend to go in for physical fighting more than Jews	69	67	23	33
Non-Jewish families tend to be less closely knit	54	63	41	37
Non-Jews are in most respects about the same as Jews	70	50	25	50

TABLE 13

COMPARISONS OF STATEMENTS ON WAYS AMERICANS CAN HELP ISRAEL EXPRESSED IN PERCENTAGES: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Statements on Methods to Help Israel	Yes		No	
	1959	1979	1959	1979
Raise money for Israel	89	97	8	3
Encourage their children to live there	6	35	90	65
Belong to a Zionist group	45	56	50	44
Affect U.S. foreign policy	73	91	21	9
Influence American public opinion	76	93	20	7
Give Israeli financial needs priority over local needs	11	36	85	64
Become citizens of Israel	4	14	93	86

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY OF HOURS PER MONTH SPENT ON ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE: 1959 SOUTHVILLE SURVEY* (n = 285) AND 1979 "SOUTHVILLE REVISITED" (n = 75)

Organizations	No. of Hrs. Per Month				1979 Mean Hours
	0	1-5	6-10	11+	
Synagogue Groups					
1959	60%	20%	7%	7%	11
1979	49	22	15	14	
Jewish Service Institutions					
1959	69	12	5	3	10
1979	50	21	13	16	
Other Jewish Groups					
1959	65	13	4	4	5
1979	57	25	13	5	
Non-Sectarian Groups					
1959	60	23	2	2	1.5
1979	67	27	4	2	

Note. (*) 1959 survey reported no data; therefore, percentages do not total 100.0.

time for non-sectarian groups, the 1979 sample selected indicated a slight increase of 4 percent in the number of hours donated in the 1-5 hour range compared with the 1959 data, but an increase of 7 percent who do not donate any hours to non-sectarian groups. The 1979 sample selected appeared to support, vis-a-vis more volunteer hours, Jewish-related causes and institutions.

Data on education were not compared in tabular form with the 1959 study because Jewish education was not represented by a table in the 1959 findings. There is apparently some relationship between "the Jewish education that Jews seek for their children and for themselves and the image they have of their Jewishness, the future of the Jewish people and their relationship to others."[6] Traditional Jewish beliefs are filled with phrases concerning training children about their people, their G-d and their faith. For many generations, a child studied Jewish matters. In America, however, it seems that the intensity and amount of Jewish study has been reduced to an extracurricular exercise as opposed to the exclusively Jewish education. Factors influencing this include, among others, the surrounding American culture, lesser familiarity of parents with a Jewish background, the reduction of adherence to certain traditional practices and scarcity of teachers qualified to teach an intensive Jewish education.

Memphis currently possesses a Jewish all-day school and high school which teach both Jewish and general curriculum. Sixty-nine

---

[6] Shapiro, Southville Survey of Jewish Attitudes, 1959, p. 12.

percent of the 1979 sample appear to believe that an all-day Jewish school is needed (as opposed to 39 percent in the 1959 study).

Over half of the 1979 subjects (68 percent) indicated participating in some type of Jewish educational program (lecture, discussion) as opposed to some 25 percent in the 1959 study. The 1979 sample appeared to attend general educational programs (61 percent) as opposed to one-quarter of the 1959 study who attended this type program.

Seventy percent in 1979 as opposed to 40 percent in 1959 regularly read "serious books or magazines on Jewish subjects." Ninety-two percent in the 1979 sample indicated that their homes have some kind of Jewish painting or sculpture (as compared with 42 percent in 1959).

An area not explored in the 1959 survey but incorporated in the 1979 study was level of Jewish education. The researchers found the majority of the sample had a Jewish education either: (1) in grade school going to synagogue/temple on Sundays only (65 percent) or (2) in undergraduate school where Jewish courses were taught (59 percent). Also interesting, was the fact that of the sample selected in 1979, only 43 percent had a Bar/Bas Mitzvah and only 49 percent had been confirmed. A possible reason for the lower percentage of Bar/Bas Mitzvah may be in the fact that the Reform Temple has only recently provided the opportunity for this ceremony.

Summary of Findings

Today in Memphis, the Jewish population, as indicated by the sample of 1979, tends to be an older population than that of twenty years ago. The present Jewish population appears to have shown an increase in the number of persons with graduate and postgraduate

education than their 1959 counterparts. This seems to have assured more status in their jobs. Thirty-three percent of the 1979 sample immigrated to Memphis from the Northeast and Midwest with an increase in the percentage of those who have been here one year. Seventy-five percent of the subjects' parents had an Eastern European background, whereas only 55 percent of the subjects' parents had comparable ethnic backgrounds in 1959. Thus, the Memphis Jewish population of 1979 is seen as a more transient population originating from regions having strong ethnic influences.

The marital status of the sample has also changed over twenty years. Less respondents are seen to be married and three times the number are categorized, according to the 1979 sample, as being separated or divorced. Nearly twice as many of the subjects are widowed in comparison to those subjects in 1959. All of the subjects in the present study are married or have been married at one time.

Changes in the relative importance of the synagogue/temple, noted in the decreased percentage of affiliation, appear to be related to the change in the present national status of the synagogue/temple. It appears that synagogues/temples are still the primary focus for social, religious and Jewish cultural activities.

Even though American Jews do not patronize the synagogue with any regularity, the increase in new synagogue construction in Memphis (Baron Hirsch, East; Temple Israel, Anshei Sphard Congregation) seems to suggest that the synagogue must be more than just a house of prayer. This can be observed in smaller Jewish communities such as Memphis. In smaller Jewish communities where Jews appear to be more secular in

orientation and less traditional in thinking, there nevertheless was a greater frequency of individuals who were affiliated.

Sklare suggests that the smaller the community, the clearer is the threat of "assimilation" and the clearer it is that the future of Jewish life is dependent on personal decisions made by each Jew. Affiliation with a synagogue may mean a vote for Jewish survival. In a smaller Jewish community like Memphis, an individual is forced into the decision and a refusal to affiliate characterizes one as an assimilationist.[7]

Other Jewish agencies may also be fulfilling these needs once satisfied by the population's "house of worship." For example, the Jewish Community Center has holiday programming, and it also offers language instruction in Hebrew.

Not only do Jews affiliate with synagogues as a symbolic vote for Jewish survival, but Jews select rituals to symbolize their Jewish identification. Today, Memphis Jews, as seen in the 1979 sample population, tend to be more ritualistic in their practice. They seem to place emphasis upon lighting Chanukah candles, participating in Passover Seders (the ritual Passover meal) and lighting Sabbath candles regardless of their religious affiliation. In Memphis, as throughout the American Jewish community, the observance of religious ritual is geared to a celebration of selected aspects of certain occasions rather than the sanctification of the routine, an aspect of Orthodox Judaism.[8]

---

[7] Sklare, America's Jews, pp. 124-125.

[8] Ibid., p. 117.

The Jewish sample in 1979 appeared to be more secure about themselves and their identity and no longer seemed to be striving to successfully assimilate into the secular, non-Jewish community. The subjects in 1979 tended to be more positive in their views of Jews and more critical of their views of non-Jews. The sample appeared to be more secure financially, educationally, socially and religiously, and thus they no longer needed the approval of the non-Jewish world. They are able to find value within the Jewish community. Those values that seem to be identified with being a "good Jew" are still the more secular type issues, such as: (1) do not stress synagogue affiliation, (2) do not necessarily deal with belief in G-d, and (3) do not necessitate leading an ethical life. Thus Memphis Jewry, according to the present study, is still somewhat influenced by secular non-Jewish values, but the population is able to be more frank in expressing these and their Jewish values.

Memphis Jews in 1979 seemed to participate in various civic, religious, professional and business, Jewish as well as non-Jewish organizations. The 1979 subjects were asked whether they spent time in voluntary organizational activities and, if so, how much per month. As was seen in Table 14, the 1979 sample indicated a preference for working with synagogues/temples (11 mean hours/month), Jewish service institutions (e.g., B'nai B'rith Home for Aged, Jewish Community Center, Jewish Federation) (10 mean hours/month), and other Jewish groups not connected with synagogues/temples (e.g., National Council of Jewish Women, Hadassah) (5 mean hours/month). In terms of percent of change in the 1959 and 1979 samples in number of hours per month for synagogue

groups, the percentage dropped from 60 percent in 1959 with no volunteer hours to 49 percent in 1979 with no volunteer hours, a decrease in those not volunteering by 11 percent. This figure held true for hours in Jewish service institutions as well as in working with other Jewish groups. The least amount of volunteer time appeared to be in the area of non-sectarian causes with 1.5 mean hours per month. Of note was the fact that 60 percent of the 1979 sample engaged in fund raising activities for Jewish as well as non-sectarian causes. Thus, the sample appeared to exhibit an increase in the amount of time donated especially to Jewish institutions and organizations as opposed to the 1959 sample.

One of the most important elements in Jewish life traditionally has been the hope for a return to Zion which is expressed regularly in prayer and ceremony. The events of World War II, the dramatic establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 as a political, social and religious haven for the remnants of Hitler's slaughter, the four Arab-Israeli Wars (1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973), and the hoped for peace seen in the negotiations between Israel and Egypt help give all Jewry a sense of pride and commitment to Jewish survival. The Jews in Memphis, as seen in the 1979 sample, helped to reiterate this fact. In response to questions relating to support of Israel, increases were seen in the 1979 study as opposed to the 1959 population surveyed. Areas of increased support for Israel over the 1959 study included: (1) raising money for Israel (8 percent), (2) belonging to a Zionist organization (11 percent) and affecting U.S. foreign policy as well as

influencing American public opinion (18 and 17 percent, respectively) to name a few. Ninety-one percent of the 1979 sample indicated that they would feel a "deep sense of loss" if Israel were destroyed, as opposed to the 1959 sample which indicated that 60 percent would feel a deep sense of loss. A majority of those sampled in 1979 (60 percent) indicated an affiliation with an organization devoted to helping Israel (e.g., Hadassah, Zionist Organization of America) as opposed to only 31 percent in 1959. Thus, Israel appeared to remain a significant factor in the lives of those sampled in the 1979 study.

In terms of the Jewish educational level of the 1979 sample, there appeared to be a lack of commitment to any type of comprehensive educational program. The high percentage of those who read magazines on Jewish subjects, participated in Jewish educational programs and displayed Jewish art and sculpture in their home indicated a belief in Jewish identity and a sense of curiosity for more Jewish knowledge.

III. EXPLORATORY CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

Operational Definition of Key Variables[9]

Ten categories were correlated with each of the three religious affiliated groups: Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. These categories when correlated with the Orthodox, the Conservative, and the Reform affiliated groups provided statistical evidence from which the researchers made program implications relative to the sample population. The categories are: (1) hours active for voluntary groups

[9] All computed variables used interval and ratio summed score data in their computation.

(mostly Jewish), (2) Jewish causes and philanthropies, (3) the assessment of the Jewish Community Center activities, (4) attitudes and practices, (5) customs and beliefs, (6) stereotypic Jewish opinions about other Jews, (7) stereotypic opinions Jews hold about non-Jews, (8) Jewish educational background, (9) goals of a Jewish education, and (10) relationship between American Jews and Israel.

Only one of the ten categories, number of hours per month donated to volunteer groups, allowed the respondents to specify an exact number. All other responses requested from other categories were in multiple choice form. Each answer was ranked by the researchers according to a prescribed coding system so that computer analysis would be able to test for significant differences among the variables.

Category one, hours active in voluntary groups, provided the respondent with a chance to list the number of hours per month spent in: (1) activities connected with a synagogue or temple (brotherhood, sisterhood, etc.), (2) activities with Jewish service institutions such as the Jewish Community Center, B'nai B'rith Home for the Aged, Jewish Service Agency, and Memphis Jewish Federation), (3) Jewish groups other than service institutions or synagogue affiliated (activities with Hadassah, National Council of Jewish Women, B'nai B'rith), and (4) activities with non-sectarian community groups.

Category two, Jewish causes and philanthropies, asked the respondents to rank from very important to not at all important various Jewish causes and institutions. A Likert Scale was used in order to place a value on each answer. The causes and philanthropies on the questionnaire included: (1) Jewish Community Center, (2) local

Jewish education through the 12th grade, (3) Israeli causes, (4) national institutions to overcome anti-semitism, (5) Jewish hospitals, (6) institutions of higher Jewish learning, (7) research and publications on Jewish history and background, (8) Jewish family service agencies, (9) overseas relief, (10) national youth serving agencies, (11) temples and synagogues, and (12) Jewish institutions for the aged.

The third category, Jewish Community Center activities, provided the respondents with a list of activities sponsored by the local Jewish Community Center. For each activity, the respondents were asked to rate the activities good, fair or poor. Those activities rated were: (1) children's activities, (2) teenage activities, (3) adult social activities, (4) adult cultural and educational activities, (5) athletics, (6) Jewish-Christian relations, (7) services to the total community, (8) services to Jewish community groups, (9) help to individuals, (10) guidance for youth groups, (11) Israel related activities, and (12) services to senior citizens.

Regarding attitudes and practices, the respondents were asked to select those responses which were appropriate for a Jew to be considered a good Jew. A list was given from which the respondents indicated on each item if it was essential, desirable but not essential, or having no bearing on being a good Jew. The list of attitudes and practices included: (1) accept his being a Jew and not try to hide it, (2) contribute to Jewish philanthropies, (3) support Israel, (4) support humanitarian causes, (5) belong to a synagogue or temple, (6) attend weekly services, (7) lead an ethical and moral life, (8) attend services on High Holidays, (9) know the fundamentals of Judaism,

(10) gain respect of Christian neighbors, (11) promote civic betterment and improvement, (12) observe the dietary laws, (13) work for equality for all minority groups, (14) marry within the Jewish faith, and (15) believe in G-d.

The category customs and practices provided the researchers with information related to the respondents' personal ways of observing his faith. For each custom and practice listed, the respondent was asked to indicate whether that custom was observed regularly, sometimes or never. The customs and practices included in the questionnaire were: (1) buy kosher meat, (2) light Friday night candles for the Sabbath, (3) participate in a Passover Seder, (4) light Chanukah candles (Festival of Lights), (5) attend High Holiday services, (6) attend Sabbath services, (7) attend daily services, (8) keep two sets of dishes (part of Kashrut), and (9) place mezzuzahs on doorway (symbol of entering a Jewish home).

In the next category, Jewish opinions, respondents were asked to view statements that have occasionally been made in contrasting Jews with other people. Respondents were asked to either agree or disagree with each statement. Those statements included: (1) Jews tend to be cleverer than most people, (2) Jews tend to be more verbal politically than most people, (3) Jews tend to be more money-minded than most people, (4) Jews tend to be more aggressive than most people, (5) Jews tend to be more interested in education than most people, and (6) Jews tend to be shrewder businessmen than most people.

Complementing this last category was the one dealing with how respondents compared non-Jews with Jews given the following statements: (1) non-Jews tend to be more religious than Jews, (2) non-Jews tend to drink more than Jews, (3) non-Jews tend to go in for physical fighting more than Jews do, (4) non-Jewish families tend to be less closely knit than Jewish families, and (5) non-Jews are in most respects about the same as Jews.

The category, Jewish education, provided insight as to the respondents' Jewish educational backgrounds. The respondents were asked to designate as "Yes" or "No" those educational categories listed in which they had participated. The list was: (1) grade school Jewish education (Sundays only); (2) grade school Jewish education (Hebrew afternoon and Sundays); (3) Jewish day school, elementary; (4) Bar/Bat Mitzvah (a ceremony held at age 13 for boys and girls signifying Jewish adult status); (5) Confirmation; (6) high school (Sundays only), (7) Jewish day school, high school; (8) undergraduate Jewish education; (9) graduate studies in Jewish education; and (10) presently involved in ongoing program of Jewish study.

The goals of the Jewish education category, referred to as Jewish importance, gave the respondents an opportunity to indicate which subject areas they felt were essential, desirable, or unimportant for a good Jewish education. Those goals listed were: (1) teaching children the history of the Jewish people, (2) teaching traditional observances, (3) teaching the code of Jewish law, (4) teaching Jewish ethics to children, (5) helping children to develop their own religious beliefs and practices, (6) developing a strong feeling for

Israel, (7) teaching what it means to be Jewish in modern day societies, (8) strengthening the commitment to the Jewish people, and (9) developing familiarity with the Hebrew language.

The last category was that of Israel and its relationship with American Jews. The researchers were seeking to determine how American Jews as represented by the sample support Israel. The respondents were asked to answer "Yes" or "No" to the following statements: (1) raise money for Israel, (2) encourage children to live in Israel, (3) belong to a Zionist organization, (4) affect U.S. foreign policy concerning Israel, (5) influence American public opinion about Israel, (6) give Israel financial needs priority over local community needs, (7) become citizens of Israel, (8) travel to Israel, and (9) buy Israeli products.

Findings[10]

To study the three religious segments of the Jewish sample selected (Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform), the researchers decided to test for significance among selected variables. Examples of the variables are: highest level of education and income. Using a Chi-square test of significance, a procedure used to study the significant relationships between one or more variables, the researchers found no significant relationship between the above mentioned two variables (education and income) with religious affiliation.

---

[10] n does not equal 75 because there were unaffiliated and missing data in the sample.

The Jewish sample appeared to have many of the same characteristics regardless of religious affiliation. The results of cross tabulations indicated that all three groups tended to exhibit a high level of education, a high level of family income (over $25,000) and a median age of 41.8 years. Also, it should be pointed out that in terms of the quality of Jewish education being offered in Memphis, all three groups seemed equally satisfied.

Two significant relationships did appear, however. One of these was the relationship between attendance at general educational programs and the subjects' level of education. Using $p < .05$, the researchers found that the relationship between attendance and level of education was statistically significant. One reason for this may be that Jews have historically emphasized the need for higher education. Learning, both religiously and secularly, has long been a value among Jewish families. It still appeared to be a very important value today.

Another significant finding dealt with religious affiliation and marriage. Using $p < .10$, the researchers found a significant correlation between these two variables. All three religious subgroups seemed to marry within their own subgroup. For example, the Orthodox affiliated respondents seem to marry Orthodox affiliated people. This finding seemed to be consistent with the belief that marriages among people of similar religious backgrounds and philosophy is desirable.

Orthodox Sample

General description. Of the three religious affiliations indicated by the respondents, those affiliating with an Orthodox

synagogue comprised 41 percent of the sample (n = 31). The number of males and females was evenly divided, fifteen males and sixteen females. The mean age of the Orthodox sample was 43.6 years, while the mean length of residence was 28.6 years which seems to indicate that the Orthodox sample is a very stable group. A majority of the respondents (51.6 percent) indicated a total family income of over $25,000 per year. Forty-five percent of the Orthodox sample had completed a college education, while only 29 percent had completed high school. Seventy-seven percent indicated that their parents were of Eastern European origin. The Orthodox sample indicated that fifteen hours a month is used in synagogue-related activities.

Specific findings. As a group, the Orthodox segment of the sample appeared to have a number of significant correlations when the ten categories were correlated (see Tables 15 and 16). A Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was used to ascertain the relationships. Those areas showing no significant correlations included: (1) hours of activity with volunteer groups per month, (2) Jewish attitudes and practices, (3) Jewish customs and beliefs, (4) stereotypic opinions about Jews and non-Jews, and (5) the Jewish educational background of the respondents.

The only significant correlation with the Jewish Community Center activities was in the areas of Jewish customs and beliefs and the relationship of American Jews to Israel. Jewish causes and philanthropies correlated highly with all of the ten categories with the exception of customs and beliefs. The strongest significant correlation with Jewish causes and philanthropies was seen in the category entitled the American Jew and his relationship with Israel.

TABLE 15

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE ORTHODOX SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 31)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance
Hours Activity	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Jewish Causes	.56*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
J.C.C. Activities	.38*	.32*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Attitudes/Practices	.22	.59*	.10	--	--	--	--	--	--
Customs/Beliefs	.06	.27	.42*	.22	--	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	.21	.67*	.17	.94*	.26	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	.22	.60*	.28	.87*	.37*	.89*	--	--	--
Jewish Educational Level	-.07	.50*	.25	.71*	.19	.76*	.74*	--	--
Jewish Educational Importance	.48*	.58*	.25	.70*	.08	.67*	.60*	.39*	--
Israel and American Jewry	.31*	.58*	.36*	.79*	.26	.82*	.80*	.67*	.81*

Note. (*) Denotes significance $p < .05$.

TABLE 16

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE ORTHODOX SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 31)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance	Israel and American Jewry
Sex	.15	-.05	.41*	-.30*	-.11	-.19	-.13	-.14	-.13	-.09
Age	.23	.50*	.46*	.49*	.07	.42*	.56*	.43*	.52*	.50*
Income	-.05	-.41*	.13	-.55*	.33*	-.59*	-.47*	-.44*	-.58*	-.58*
Education	-.24	-.13	-.29	-.27	.06	-.24	-.35*	-.15	-.30*	-.35*
Length of Residence	.22	.21	.51*	.27	.23	.36*	.45*	.34*	.48*	.48*
Hours of Synagogue Activity	.13	.23	-.16	.01	.09	-.07	-.04	-.11	-.01	-.07
Attend Weekly Services	-.07	.08	-.12	.47*	.53*	.20	.29	-.05	.08	.09
Mother's Country of Origin	.03	.10	.01	.08	-.04	.12	.08	.14	.07	.11
Father's Country of Origin	-.07	.19	.10	-.23	.17	-.21	-.09	-.02	-.40*	-.40*

Note . (*) Denotes significance $p < .05$.

The age of the respondents within this segment of the sample was seen to have a significant relationship with all of the major categories with the exception of hours of activity per month and Jewish customs and practices. Jewish attitudes and practices, stereotypic attitudes about Jews and non-Jews, and beliefs in various Jewish causes all appeared to demonstrate a positive relationship with age in the Orthodox sample. Also, the older the respondent, the more supportive he was seen toward Israel as well as to Jewish Community Center activities. What is unusal is that age within the Orthodox sample does not demonstrate any relationship to one's Jewish customs and beliefs nor to the hours of activity given to religious, civic, social or professional organizations. These findings tend to dispel any misconceptions which might be held about the commitment of the older Orthodox population.

Income, however, proved to have a significantly negative correlation with Jewish attitudes and practices, Jewish customs and beliefs, stereotypic opinions concernings Jews and non-Jews, goals of Jewish education, educational background of respondents, and the relationship between American Jews and Israel. This inverse relationship seemed to indicate that as income increased the commitment to each category area decreased. For example, as income increased, the respondents' commitment to Jewish attitudes and practices decreased. Jewish customs and beliefs was the only category in which income appeared to have a significantly positive correlation.

The researchers found that level of education seemed to also have a significantly negative correlation with regard to (1) stereotypic

non-Jewish opinions, (2) the relationship of American Jews supporting Israel, and (3) Jewish educational goals. The higher the level of education the less likely the respondent would be to accept stereotypic opinions concerning non-Jews, to support Israel, and to place importance on certain standards for a good Jewish education.

The researchers also found a significant correlation among Jewish Community Center activities, Jewish as well as non-Jewish stereotypic opinions, Jewish educational background of the respondents, goals of Jewish education, the support of Israel, and the respondents' length of residence in Memphis. The longer the length of residence, the more positive, for example, the respondent was about the Jewish Community Center, Jewish education and the support of Israel. Surprisingly, there was also a significantly negative correlation seen between the Orthodox subjects' parental country of origin and (1) the goals of a good Jewish education, and (2) the support for Israel by American Jews.

Perhaps the most interesting finding among the Orthodox sample was that no significant relationship appeared to exist between the ten major categories and hours of synagogue activity. Synagogue activity was often thought to be important to the survival of Orthodox Judaism. Attendance at weekly services was found to be significant with regard to Jewish attitudes and practices and Jewish customs and beliefs. Thus, the ten major variables (e.g., Jewish causes, customs and beliefs) used to help describe the Orthodox sample were seen to be strongly influenced by such factors as age, income, education and to a lesser degree by length of residence.

Conservative Sample

General description. The Conservative sample (n = 14), over two-thirds of whose parents were of Eastern European origin, had resided in Memphis a mean of 20.8 years. Thus, these subjects are evidence of what appeared to be a transient Conservative sample. There were twice as many female as male subjects in this population and the average age of the Conservative segment was 44.8 years. Nearly 99 percent of the subjects had completed at least a college education. Ten of fourteen had completed postgraduate work and as of 1979 nine earn more than $20,000 annually. The Conservative subjects spent fifteen hours a month participating in synagogue related activities.

Specific Findings. After the ten variables were correlated with each other using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation, it was discovered that in the Conservative sample (see Tables 17 and 18) nine of the ten variables yielded significant correlations. The only variable which did not show any relationship to the other variables was Jewish Community Center activities. Thus, it appears from the perspective of the Conservative population, that as a commitment to Jewish customs, practices, and causes grows, there is no assurance that subjects will see the Jewish Community Center as important.

When the ten variables were originally correlated with the variable of sex, there seemed to be evidence that the female population tended to be a more actively involved population than the males in regard to all ten variables. Consequently, it may not have been startling to find that because the Conservative segment had more than twice the number of females, the group as a whole might tend to be

TABLE 17

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE CONVERVATIVE SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 14)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance
Hours Activity	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Jewish Causes	.55*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
J.C.C. Activities	-.08	-.02	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Attitudes/Practices	.56*	.91*	.16	--	--	--	--	--	--
Customs/Beliefs	.67*	.88*	.03	.96*	--	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	.52*	.89*	.19	.96*	.95*	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	.59*	.86*	.19	.90*	.92*	.95*	--	--	--
Jewish Educational Level	.69*	.75*	-.00	.69*	.62*	.60*	.63*	--	--
Jewish Educational Importance	.47*	.90*	.18	.98*	.94*	.95*	.88*	.57*	--
Israel and American Jewry	.53*	.88*	.20	.99*	.93*	.94*	.90*	.69*	.97*

Note. (*) Denotes significance $p < .05$.

TABLE 18

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE CONSERVATIVE SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 14)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance	Israel and American Jewry
Sex	-.04	.38	-.19	.20	.15	.20	.30	.33	.18	.20
Age	.48*	.63*	.34	.65*	.62*	.68*	.81*	.55*	.61*	.67*
Income	-.04	-.41	.11	.07	-.14	-.45	-.54*	-.00	-.17	-.12
Education	-.49*	-.54*	.06	-.46*	-.48*	-.49*	-.61*	-.60*	-.36	-.45*
Length of Residence	.10	.26	.43	.31	.24	.35	.47*	.34	.28	.34
Hours of Synagogue Activity	.76*	-.05	-.20	.49*	.78*	.00	.20	.08	.29	.18
Attend Weekly Services	.49*	-.15	-.18	.41	.48*	-.19	-.23	.19	.13	.11
Mother's Country of Origin	-.06	.19	-.03	.07	-.08	-.03	-.12	.44	.02	.05
Father's Country of Origin	-.30	-.01	.47	.03	-.11	.09	.08	.10	.01	.04

Note. (*) Denotes significance $p < .05$.

more involved in, for example, hours of activity, Jewish custom and practices than the other religious groups. Nevertheless, when all ten variables were correlated with the variable of sex, none of the findings appeared to have been directly influenced by the sex of the respondent.

The respondent's age was correlated positively with all the variables except Jewish Community Center activities. Thus, as the age of the subject increased so did: (1) hours spent on activities; (2) commitment to Jewish causes, customs, and practices; (3) stereotype beliefs about Jews/non-Jews; and (4) emphasis on Jewish education and Israeli causes.

Although income tended to yield inverse relationships, only one variable proved to be significant at $p < .05$. That was in the area of non-Jewish stereotypic views. As the income of the subject seemed to increase, the respondent's agreement with stereotypic statements about non-Jews decreased.

All the variables, except Jewish Community Center activities and the importance of Jewish educational standards, demonstrated statistically significant negative correlations with the level of education of the subject. As the level of education increased in the sample, the less likely the subjects were to see certain standards of Jewish education as important. This may affect the nature of Jewish customs and practices, perhaps even the future of American support of Israel and other Jewish causes as the educational level of American Jewry steadily rises. If an individual places less emphasis on the

quality of Jewish education, the less likely the subject will place much emphasis on Jewish customs and beliefs.

It is reassuring to note that in the Conservative sample there was a consistency between the hours of activity spent in synagogual affairs and both customs/beliefs and attitudes/practices among the Conservative sample. Thus a positive relationship has been demonstrated in this study between attendence at weekly services, and customs and beliefs for those affiliated with a Conservative synagogue.

Reform Sample

General description. The Reform sample (n = 11) had the oldest population (47.2 years of age) and had nearly three times the number of males to females than did the other two religious groups. The largest number of the parents (13 percent) of the Reform subjects were of Eastern European origin; although seven, out of a possible twenty-two, came from the Western European countries. This sample has lived in Memphis an average of 26.7 years. Nearly 80 percent of the sample had completed at least a college education and 40 percent earn more than $20,000 a year.

Specific findings. Not only did the Reform sample demonstrate few statistically significant correlations, but nearly half of the relationships studies were inverse (see Tables 19 and 20). Although there were many more males in the sample, there were only two variables which showed any correlation with the sex of the respondent: (1) Jewish Community Center activities and (2) customs and beliefs. The remaining variables were not influenced by sex. The researchers assumed that the predominant number of male subjects did not significantly affect the findings.

TABLE 19

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE REFORM SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 11)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance
Hours Activity	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Jewish Causes	.18	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
J.C.C. Activities	.08	.23	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Attitudes/Practices	.30	.63*	.03	--	--	--	--	--	--
Customs/Beliefs	-.52*	.37	-.41	.20	--	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	-.40	.11	-.32	.22	.54*	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	-.29	.22	.58*	-.15	-.05	-.08	--	--	--
Jewish Educational Level	.63*	.51*	-.31	.41	.17	.04	-.38	--	--
Jewish Educational Importance	-.36	.64*	.09	.36	.58*	.59*	.49	.07	--
Israel and American Jewry	.33	.37	-.39	.51*	.39	.09	-.56*	.81*	.07

Note. (*) Denotes significance if $p < .05$.

TABLE 20

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE REFORM SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 11)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance	Israel and American Jewry
Sex	.37	.20	.77*	.21	-.56*	-.39	.06	-.20	-.17	-.25
Age	-.02	.09	.43	.23	-.44	-.07	.57*	-.40	.13	-.51*
Income	-.10	-.38	-.18	-.27	-.51	-.57*	-.42	-.14	-.66*	.03
Education	.17	-.38	-.43	.33	-.12	-.32	-.43	.14	-.46	.37
Length of Residence	.21	-.10	.31	-.07	-.51*	-.26	.54*	-.36	-.13	-.72
Hours of Synagogue Activity	.09	-.21	-.34	-.66*	-.17	-.01	-.21	.12	-.30	-.23
Attend Weekly Services	-.64*	.29	-.21	-.07	.90*	.51	.09	.13	.46	.33
Mother's Country of Origin	-.45	-.29	.19	.08	-.25	.19	.17	-.78*	.03	-.62*
Father's Country of Origin	-.85*	.02	-.06	.06	.69*	.34	.05	-.40	.36	.04

Note. (*) Denotes significance at $p < .05$.

Because of the few number of relationships within the Reform sample, it is difficult to make any definitive statements on the attitudes of this Reform group. The following are the only significantly positive correlations. Those individuals who had a strong commitment to Jewish attitudes and practices also seemed to be involved with Jewish causes. The subjects who identified strongly with Jewish customs and beliefs seemed to hold stereotypic views of Jews; those respondents who felt the Jewish Community Center was doing a good job held stereotypic views of non-Jews. The more educated Jewishly the subjects are, the more hours they seemed to spend working for Jewish as well as other kinds of causes; the more positive they were about Jewish attitudes and practices, the stronger appeared their ties to Israel. Those respondents who attended services weekly also seemed to be more ritualistic in their approach to Judaism. Yet, there was a negative correlation between attending services (weekly) and hours spent doing activities. Thus, it appeared that less attendance to services yielded a larger amount of time donated to other causes.

Within the Reform sample, there appeared to be many categories that had the tendency toward negative correlations: income, age, length of residency, educational level, and hours of synagogue activities. For example, the higher the respondent's income was the less he was concerned with the standards for a good Jewish educational experience. The longer the subject had lived in Memphis the less he was likely to be committed to the traditional customs of Judaism and to believe in the importance of support for Israel.

Trends

In viewing the 1979 sample findings a number of trends seemed to be evident. Age, income, educational level, and length of residency seemed to be the most dominant variables affecting Jewish identity among all three religious groups. Also, there was some indication that parental ethnic origin also has an effect on areas of Jewish identity. Those findings which were most surprising in the Orthodox sample were the significant negative correlations between father's country of origin and (1) the important goals of Jewish education and (2) support of Israel. In the Reform sample, the father's country of origin is significantly negatively correlated with hours of activities. In the Conservative sample, there appears to be more positive relationships among the variables associated with Jewish identity than seen in both the Orthodox and Reform sample.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. LIMITATIONS OF SOUTHVILLE REVISITED STUDY

Southville Revisited provided a challenge for the researchers. This challenge included: (1) organizing a volunteer labor force to disseminate and collect questionnaires used in the study; (2) producing the questionnaire for use by the sample; (3) coding the responses; and (4) operating a computer to secure a statistical analysis of the data collected.

As the researchers began to implement the methodology for this study, a number of problem areas became apparent. One of the most critical problems involved the use of lay volunteers for the purposes of contacting the sample selected, disseminating and retrieving the questionnaire from those sampled. Originally the researchers had hoped to use volunteers from the National Council of Jewish Women, the same organization whose members interviewed the subjects in the 1959 survey. The National Council of Jewish Women, however, decided that this project was not in their "best interest."

As a result, the researchers used personal acquaintances in order to disseminate and collect the questionnaire from the sample selected. This proved to be a problem. Many of those willing to help could not meet the deadlines for collection of the data designated by the researchers. The volunteers were given a deadline date,

November 15, 1978, for the retrieval of all questionnaires from the sample. This task was not completed until the end of December.

Lack of support from local Jewish agencies, as well as Jewish organizations in stimulating interest in this project complicated the already strained situation. Although agencies such as the Memphis Jewish Federation and the Jewish Service Agency verbally supported the researchers' efforts, only limited manpower and community-wide publicity were provided. The findings of this study will probably receive more attention from the agencies than did the planning process from which the study was conceived and implemented.

Another study limitation was the lack of cooperation on the part of the sample. One hundred and ten letters were sent to prospective interviewees based on a random selection from a master list of the Jewish Federation. It was antcipated that a small number of people would refuse to be part of the study. Unfortunately 50 percent refused to participate in this project--thus a new method for recruiting a supplemental sample, consistent with the randomly selected sample had to be devised and implemented. Much more time was spent on collecting the data than had been initially planned.

Other limitations of this study included: (1) lack of resource material on the local level (e.g. lack of 1959 completed survey) and (2) lack of response from various national Jewish communal agencies regarding information on communal studies. A major piece of work, that of obtaining the original 1959 questionnaire and related data, could not be accomplished.

The researchers were only able to obtain an incomplete copy of the study with summary findings. The researchers were also hampered by the lack of the complete 1959 code book as well as by the lack of complete data relative to individual respondents. From this lack of information, the researchers attempted to reproduce the original questionnaire.

Although the researchers believed that more questions using the term "Don't know" as a choice would have been beneficial conceptually, methodologically few of the "Don't know" responses proved to be one of the strengths of the questionnaire. Many of the responses received on questions relating to specific programs or attitudes (e.g., "How do you rate the various activities at the J.C.C.?" or "Do you feel that there is an alcohol problem within the Memphis Jewish community?") either asked for yes/no responses or used a likert scale. The use of "Don't know" would have allowed the researchers to test the respondents' knowledge of a particular program or attitude. Because of the lack of "Don't knows" many of the responses to questions appeared as missing data rather than as lack of knowledge on the part of the sample.

Another limitation of the study was seen in the lack of questions pertaining to: (1) the quality and effectiveness of services provided by the various local Jewish communal agencies; (2) the role of the various Jewish service agencies in the community (Jewish Community Center, the B'nai B'rith Home and the Jewish Service Agency); (3) the respondents' places of birth; (4) the respondents' views on intermarriage; (5) an analysis of the Jewish educational alternatives

in Memphis; and (6) the role of the Memphis Jewish Federation. With the addition of these questions, greater insight would be gleaned to more effectively plan programs for the Memphis Jewish community.

Perhaps the greatest limitation of the 1979 study was its enormity. With over two hundred variables involved, it was often difficult to remain focused and not to get lost in the wealth of the data which was generated from the sample's responses.

The researchers' lack of knowledge and experience with the computer also served as a limiting factor. The various aspects of computer analysis which had to be learned were: (1) how to input data, (2) knowing what to ask the computer to correlate, (3) the reading of the data, and (4) most importantly, the interpreting of the data retrieved. Thus the researchers had to learn to use the computer as they progressed, from the beginning stage of the study to the completed correlational analysis of the data received. The lack of computer knowledge and skills prolonged completion of the 1979 study. Many hours were spent studying how to use the computer and how to interpret the data provided.

II. IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS IN 1979 STUDY

There are various ways in which program recommendations from the 1979 study can be approached. One method is to elicit recommendations based on the comparative findings of the 1959 and 1979 study of Memphis Jewry. The second method is to merely analyze the data found specifically in the 1979 study. In order to plan programs

based on the analysis of data from the 1979 study, one must first determine which areas have conflicting data as well as surprising or unusual findings. Without this process, it would be difficult to make any statements about the sample and hence to make any major substantial recommendations for program planning.

Comparative Findings: 1959 and 1979

In analyzing the 1979 Memphis Jewish sample, the researchers noted a number of changes which had occurred over the past twenty years. The median age of the sample appeared to be older than that of the sample of 1959. The 1979 subjects tended to be more highly educated, more financially and economically secure, more ritualistic in observances of particular holidays and more willing to donate time for Jewish causes than the respondents had been in 1959.

Conflictual Data

The first important area of conflict is focused on the struggle between: (1) how the Jewish sample defines their Jewish identity; and (2) to what extent that population identifies with the definition (commitment). Commitment may be viewed as a state of being emotionally impelled or ethically obligated to behave in a certain manner and perform a specific duty. Jewish commitment can be viewed as an impelling force which motivates a Jew to be responsive to his obligations as a Jew to his Jewish identity.

Two variables influence the commitment to Jewish identity in the sample selected. The higher the level of income the less commitment the subjects appear to have to Jewish identity, as measured by the ten categories correlated. Two examples of this relationship can be found in the areas of customs and beliefs and support of Israel. The second influential variable is level of education. The higher the educational level of the respondents, the less commitment is seen to exist in the areas of customs and beliefs and support of Israel. Thus the 1979 sample selected can therefore be characterized as less committed Jewishly. According to Sidorsky,[1] the issue of identity and strength of Jewish commitment may include any number of mutual contradictory areas.

Throughout Jewish history a basic Jewish value, education, has motivated the Jewish community to react. Education is seen as a means to gain occupational mobility and higher income. More emphasis has been placed on secular education in America in order to achieve financial success. Jewish education, an understanding of a Jew's way of life and history, is supplemental to an American's way of life. The result of the emphasis placed on higher secular education, according to Sidorsky, is that, "Jews may have significantly higher rates of intermarriage and greater alienation from the Jewish community. This involves not only the possible impact of physical separation from home and the weakening of parental control on dating and courtship patterns, but also the general

---

[1]David Sidorsky, ed., The Future of the Jewish Community in America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973), pp. 131-132.

"liberalization" a college education may have on the religious patterns and Jewish identity of the individual."[2] The 1979 sample seemed to follow the patterns suggested by Sidorsky. The higher the education, the less commitment the subject has to Jewish beliefs and survival.

Further investigation of the sample selected showed another contradiction. A larger percentage of respondents indicated an affiliation with a synagogue or temple and at the same time practiced selected ritual observances. Yet there is little commitment to Jewish identity by the sample selected. The percentage of those affiliating with a synagogue or temple has decreased slightly in the past twenty years. There are possible reasons for the decrease in affiliation. One reason is that there is a segment of the very religious Orthodox population which is unaffiliated. This population identifies with the Memphis Yeshiva, a Jewish institution of higher learning which was established in the last ten years, provides this segment of the population a place for Jewish learning and religious observance. Therefore the unaffiliated population may possibly be more observant than the affiliated subjects.

A second possible reason for the slight decrease in synagogue or temple affiliation may be in the expansion of programming in the Jewish communal agencies. Agencies such as the Jewish Community Center provide an alternative to the traditional house of worship. Now one can go to the Jewish Community Center and participate in Jewish festival observances and learn conversational Hebrew, areas generally associated with the temple or synagogue purposes.

---

[2]Ibid., p. 112.

The conflict therefore today is that the vast majority of the sample are asserting a vote for Jewish survival by affiliating. Because of the nature of the unaffiliated, they too may be indicating a strong statement for Jewish identity and survival. Nevertheless, the sample repeatedly displays attitudes indicative of their lack of commitment to Jewish practices, beliefs and to some degree Israel.

Another area of conflict can be viewed vis-a-vis the Jewish Community Center. A majority of those sampled in the current study viewed a Jewish community center as being an essential Jewish cause. Yet of those who responded, less than 50 percent believe the local Jewish community center is doing a good job in the following areas: (1) teenage activities, (2) adult social activities, (3) adult cultural activities, (4) Jewish-Christian relations, (5) services to the total community, (6) help to individuals, and (7) guidance for youth.

Of the three religious segments sampled, the Conservative and Reform subjects did not view the Jewish Community Center as having any relationship to Jewish identification. The Orthodox sample seem to perceive the Memphis Jewish Community Center a little differently. They see the Jewish Community Center as being effective in the areas of Jewish customs and beliefs and Israel-related programs.

The Conservative segment, viewed by the researchers as the most integrated (based on correlated responses) of the samples, did not see the Memphis Jewish Community Center as having any relationship with the ten categories designated as representative of Jewish identity. Thus the conflict

appears to be between those respondents who feel a Jewish community center is essential versus the sample selected who are unable to view the Memphis Jewish Community Center as an identifiable Jewish institution.

The Conservative and Reform respondents saw little if any relationship between the Jewish Community Center's Israeli activities and the 1979 sample's attitude toward Israel. A conflict appears to exist between the Jewish Community Center's perceived role in relating Israel programs to the community via the Shaliach versus the respondents' perceptions of the Jewish Community Center's inability to establish a viable Israeli program.

Another major conflict appears to be evident in the relationship between synagogue affiliation and the respondents' religious practices. What seems to be apparent is that affiliation to a particular religious institution does not necessarily coincide with the respondents' religious practices espoused by that religious institution. An example of this discrepancy is seen in the number of Orthodox sample selected who indicated that they do not observe the traditional dietary laws (Kashrut). A large majority indicated that they do not buy Kosher meat, yet the same population affiliated with an Orthodox congregation.

Surprising Data

Two findings seemed surprising to the researchers. One of these findings indicates that a large percentage of the sample

spent time raising funds for Jewish as well as non-Jewish causes. This percentage of the sample appeared high.

Another surprising finding is the number of volunteer hours donated per month by the 1979 sample. The sample indicated that a mean average of eleven hours per month was donated to synagogue and temple activities. Five hours per month were donated to Jewish groups not connected with synagogues. The above number of hours appeared to be large considering the low level of commitment seen in the 1979 findings. One might speculate that the hours of activity spent for Jewish causes satisfies social as well as religious needs.

III. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to meet the changing nature of the Memphis Jewish community of 1979, it may be desirable for programs to be designed to appeal to an older population which is highly educated and financially and occupatonally secure. Programs might also be ritualistic in orientation without making any demands on the Jewish community for regular weekly or monthly time commitments.

Because the sample had a mean age of 45, it might prove valuable to deal with the issues of midlife crisis from an educational perspective for both men and women. Also, educating this population on leisure time activities might be beneficial in preparing them for the increasing hours of leisure that accompany aging and affluence.

Both the Jewish Service Agency and the Memphis Jewish Community Center might begin to address the complications which beset a population with a significant number of divorced and separated individuals. Today very little is done in the area of programming with this population and their children. There are no treatment groups in either of the Jewish service agencies to help in guiding single parents through the readjustment process. Children of divorced parents oftentimes feel isolated. Little is being done today to help these children see there are others who share their problems. The needs of these children are only partially being met through individual counseling.

There appears to be a need for a Jewish educational experience within the Memphis Jewish community. As the Memphis Jewish population achieves a higher level of secular education and earns more money, they begin to feel less identified with areas such as the importance of standards for Jewish education, Jewish attitudes and practices, Jewish customs and beliefs. Without these as a basis for the community's Jewish identification, Memphis Jewry runs the risk of losing much of what has historically been traditional Judaism. Programs might be created at the synagogues which would be ritualistic and symbolic; synagogue programs which would focus on holiday festivals and Shabbat experiences.

The Chavurah movement may be one alternative which would satisfy a need for a stronger commitment to Judaism. Chavurah is the banding together of families who are searching for a more spiritual experience than what the confines of a synagogue can offer. It offers a "community" experience for the family centered around

Shabbat and holiday activities. The adults would utilize study groups which address the issues of Jewish identification. Not only would this alternative provide for symbolic and ritualistic activities for the family, but it would also provide the intellectual stimulation necessary for this type of population.

Another alternative for Jewish education is a community-based, comprehensive College of Jewish Education which would provide intellectually stimulating course work for the middle-age population which is secularly educated and financially and occupationally secure. From the 1979 study it was observed that a substantial percentage of respondents had participated in undergraduate Judaic courses. The irony is that a larger percentage of the sample had only a Sunday School education. Therefore any coursework offered would have to deal with elementary issues on a comprehensive level.

The Jewish Community Center might wish to consider its role in the community. As Sklare has stated, many Jewish community centers promote "Jewish secular culture."[3] From the response of the 1979 subjects, it has been suggested that the Jewish Community Center's programming is not identifiably Jewish; it does not relate to any area which promotes Jewish identity. Therefore it seems reasonable that more must be done in the area of Jewish values and practices to make the Jewish Community Center a viable Jewish agency. The secular issues may be left to the secular community. The Jewish community's primary goal might be to halt the move toward assimilation

---

[3]Sklare, America's Jews, p. 117.

and direct the agency toward securing a more comprehensive and a more meaningful Jewish oriented perspective.

Memphis Jewry wishes to have a Jewish identity without initially making an overwhelming personal commitment to it. The Memphis Jewish Community Center could possibly provide the most appropriate environment for programs which would incorporate Jewish identity and yet not demand a tremendous commitment of time and energy. Memorial and commemorative programs dealing with the Holocaust, Israeli programming (utilizing the rituals of independence), courses dealing with the care of the elderly parent (Jewish style) might serve as programs which would involve more participants and enhance center's Jewish image in the Jewish community.

The Shaliach is a center Shaliach which places certain constraints on his job. He must work through the bureaucracy of the agency and is often limited by inaccessibility to the general community. He is seen as another center employee. The 1979 respondents were unable to see a relationship between support of Israel and Jewish Community Center activites even though they have specific personnel to insure the relationship. One might recommend, then, that the Memphis Jewish Federation fund the Shaliach as a community-based Israeli representative, thus offering more visibility and accessibility to the total community.

One specific area of programming may be done with the teenagers to begin linking them with the elderly population. Because Memphis has a large percentage of individuals over 50, it may be beneficial to educate the teens on the problems and struggles of the

elderly. This would help to prepare them for future leadership in the community.

Both the Memphis Jewish Community Center and the Jewish Service Agency have low profiles in the community. Although people are aware of both of the agencies and a percentage utilize their services, there is still an uncertainty among the general Jewish population as to what is being done specifically in certain program areas. If these agencies are to provide adequate services, Jewish community members must be able to identify these activities and services. A needs assessment might be done to determine areas where services might be provided; an outreach into the Jewish community might educate the Memphis Jewish community on the extent of the programs being offered for the elderly, the Russian immigrant, the unemployed, the emotionally distraught and the Jewish family which is in search of a more meaningful Jewish existence.

IV. FURTHER INVESTIGATION

In summary, the researchers found a number of changes in the 1979 Jewish population sampled in comparison to the original 1959 study. These changes, as well as new findings, seem important enough to suggest their further investigation in the following areas.

The first area would include a better understanding of the relationship between religious beliefs (philosophical) and actual practice. By gaining insight as to why a Jew observes certain practices (e.g. lighting Sabbath candles, participating in a Passover Seder) and not others (such as keeping the dietary laws or attending

Sabbath services) religious institutions as well as planning agencies can better plan based on the philosophy of their constituents.

Another area for further investigation is the Jewish Community Center, its identification with Jewish values and its role as a symbol of Jewish identification. "Jewish programming" in centers, according to Sklare, has made limited progress.[4] It seems that as Jews in America have become more secularized, the center should have emerged as a logical option to the synagogue. Because of the emphasis placed on recreational activities, the center has been viewed as undermining the effort to move Jews either toward increased Jewish identity or greater Jewish religiosity. These issues need to be explored especially in a community like Memphis where the traditional view of the Center has been as a place for Jews to participate in athletic activities.

Further investigation into the perceived roles of the various Jewish communal service agencies by the Jewish community is necessary. The 1979 study indicates a need for these institutions; yet the respondents understanding of what these agencies (e.g. Jewish Community Center, Jewish Service Agency) represent and what exactly they are doing is negligible. Viable programs can only come about when both the respondents' needs and agencies' goals and objectives are congruent.

Based upon the findings of the 1979 study, other areas to be investigated should include: (1) the solidarity of the Jewish family, (2) perceived problems within the Jewish community, (3) the role of

---

[4]Ibid., p. 141.

the local synagogues with regard to Jewish identity, and (4) more in-depth analysis as to the effects of income and education as they impact on Jewish identity.

V. SUMMARY

The American Jewish community has made a transition from the belongingness of European communities with their roots in a closed society to the voluntarism of the subcommunity in America's open society. There is concern among Jewish leaders that this ability to become part of another subcommunity may be short-lived. The fear is that the present Jewish communal structure is endangered by indifference or by a more serious threat: the possible attachment of Jews to other subcommunities, namely assimilation.[5]

Many Jewish communities are wrestling with the issue of assimilation, the security it provides, as well as with the need for Jewish identity as a means for Jewish survival. Hopefully this study will begin the analytic process by which the goal will be in providing more appropriate and comprehensive services which ultimately will insure a strong sense of Jewish identity within the Memphis Jewish community.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 150.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bregstone, Philip P. Chicago and Its Jews: A Cultural History. Privately published, 1933.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. Myths and Realities: Societies of Colonial South. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952.

Bureau of Jewish Social Research, Jewish Communal Survey of Greater New York. New York: Bureau of Jewish Social Research, 1928.

Census of Memphis Jewish Community, 1977. Memphis: Southern Consulting Services.

Chenkin, Alvin and Miran, Maynard. "Jewish Population in the United States, 1978." American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 79, 1978.

Dashefsky, Arnold and Shapiro, Howard. Ethnic Identification Among American Jews. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath, 1974.

Dinnerstein, Leonard. "Jews and Desegregation Crisis in the South." American Historical Quarterly, LXI, March, 1973.

Dinnerstein, Leonard and Palsson, Mary Dale, eds. Jews in the South. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973.

Eitches, Edmund. "Maryland's Jew Bill." American Jewish Historical Quarterly, LX, March, 1971.

Elon College, Sociology Department, ed. The Position of the Jew in Two Southern Communities: A Survey Made by Students at Elon College, 1939.

Engelman, Uriah Z. "Jewish Statistics in the U.S. Census of Religious Bodies (1850-1936)." Jewish Social Studies, IX, 1947.

Erikson, Erik H. "Identity and Identity Diffusion." The Self Interaction, eds. C. Gordon and K. J. Giergen. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

Erikson, Judith and Lazarus, Mitchell J. The Jewish Community of Greater Minneapolis, 1971-1972: A Population Study. Minneapolis: Minneapolis Federation of Jewish Service, 1973.

Feibelman, Julian B. "A Social and Economic Study of the New Orleans Jewish Community" (unpublished) Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1941.

Fichter, Joseph H. and Maddox, George L. "Religion in the South, Old and New." John C. McKinney and Edgar Thompson (eds.) The South in Continuity and Change. Durham: Duke University Press, 1965.

Fowler, Floyd Jr. 1975 Community Survey: A Study of the Jewish Population of Greater Boston. Boston: Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, 1977.

Gartner, Lloyd R. "Immigration and the Formation of the American Jew, 1840-1925." Marshall Sklare, The Jew in American Society. New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1974.

Glazer, Nathan. American Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Glick, Peter M. "The Jewish Family Service Agency: Its Functions in the Jewish Community." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LI, No. 4, Summer 1975.

Glock, Charles Y. and Stark, Rodney. Christian Beliefs and Anti-Senetism. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966.

Goldstein, Ronald M. "The Nature, Character and Trends of Post World War II American Jewry as Reflected in Communal Survey." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, 1969.

Goldstein, Sydney. "American Jewry, 1970 - A Demographic Profile." The Jew in American Society by Marshall Sklare. New York: Behrman House, 1974.

Gordon, Albert Issac. Jews in Transition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

Higham, John. "American Anti-Senitism Historically Reconsidered," in Charles Herbert Stember (ed.) Jews in the Mind of America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Hotten, John Camden, ed. "The Original List of Persons Who Went from Great Britain to the American Plantations, 1600-1700." London, 1874.

Howe, Irving. World of Our Fathers. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich, 1976.

Kaplan, Benjamin. The Eternal Stranger. New York: Bookman Associates, 1975.

Karp, Abraham J. The Jewish Experience in America, Vol. 1. The Colonial Period. Waltham, Massachusetts: American Jewish Historical Society, 1969.

Koenig, Samuel. "The Socio-economic Structure of An American Jewish Community," in Graeber, Jews in a Gentile World, 1942.

Lasker, Arnold. "What Parents Want from the Jewish Education of Their Children." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LII, No. 4, Summer 1976.

Levin, Morris. "Establishing Priorities for Jewish Communal Services." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. XLVII, No. 1, Fall 1970.

Lipman, Henry T., study director. "The White Plains Jewish Attitudes Survey." A Report to the Westchester Division Annual Meeting of the American Jewish Committee. October 19, 1958.

Marcus, Jacob R. "Background for the History of American Jewry," as found in Oscar I. Janowsky The American Jew - A Reappraisal. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1964.

Marcus, Jacob R. Early American Jewry: The Jews of Pennsylvania and the South. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1953.

Markens, Isaac. The Hebrews in America. New York: Published by the Author, 1888.

Masserik, Fred. A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles. Los Angeles Research Service Bureau, Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, November 1959.

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

National Conference of Jewish Welfare List of Communal Studies. New York: National Conference of Jewish Welfare Funds, 1944.

Old Testament, Numbers 1:2.

Ringer, Benjamin. Edge of Friendliness: A Study of Jewish-Gentile Relations. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Robertson, William J. The Changing South. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1927.

Rosenthal, Gilbert ed. The Jewish Family in a Changing World. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1970.

Rosenwaike, Ira. "An Estimate and Analysis of the Jewish Population of the United States in 1790." Publications of the Jewish Historical Society, L, 1960.

Roth, Cecil and Wigoder, Geoffrey eds. The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia. Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1970.

Schulman, Sam and Gottlieb, David and Sheinberg, Sheila. A Social and Demographic Survey of the Jewish Community of Houston, Texas. Houston: Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Houston, Inc., 1976.

Shapiro, Manheim ed. Kansas City Survey: A Report of Attitudes and Activities of Jews. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1962.

Shapiro, Manheim ed. The Bayville Survey: A Survey of the Attitudes of Affiliated Jews in Dade County, Florida. Greater Miami Chapter, The American Jewish Committee, 1958.

Shapiro, Manheim ed. The Southville Survey of Jewish Attitudes (unpublished). New York: American Jewish Committee, 1959.

Shapiro, Manheim ed. White Plains Survey of Jewish Attitudes (unpublished). New York: American Jewish Committee, 1958.

Sidorsky, David ed. The Future of the Jewish Community in America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

Sklare, Marshall. America's Jews. New York: Random House, 1971.

Sklare, Marshall. Social Patterns of An American Group. Glenco, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.

Sklare, Marshall. The Jew in American Society. New York: Behrman House, 1974.

Sklare, Marshall and Greenblum, Joseph. Jewish Identity on the Suburban Front: A Study of Group Survival in the Open Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Sklare, Marshall and Vosk, Marc. The Riverton Study: How Jews Look at Themselves and Their Neighbors. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1957.

Talmon, J. L. The Unique and the Universal. London: Secker and Warburg, 1965, as found in John Slawson "Jewish Identity in the United States." Journal of Jewish Communal Science, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1, Fall, 1971.

Taylor, Maurice. The Jewish Community of Pittsburgh, December, 1938: A Sample Study. Pittsburgh: the Author, January 1941.

Trachtenberg, Joshua. Consider the Years: The Story of the Jewish Community of Easton, 1752-1942. Easton, Pennsylvania: Centennial Committee of Temple Brith Sholom, 1944.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SOUTHVILLE REVISITED

1978

Code # _____ Sex (___)

Date _____

Interviewer's initials:

_____

INFORMATION ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

1. How long have you lived in Memphis? _____ (years, months)
2. If not a native Memphian, where did you live just prior to moving to Memphis?

_____

3. How likely is it that you might move out of Memphis in the next ten years?

	Very likely	Fairly likely	Not likely
a. One to four years	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
b. Five to ten years	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____

If likely, what is the major factor for leaving? _____

_____

4. What is the country of origin of:
   1. _____ (your mother's family)
   2. _____ (your father's family)
5. Are you married, divorced, separated, widowed or never been wed?
   1. Married ___ 2. Divorced ___ 3. Separated ___ 4. Widowed ___ 5. Never Wed __
6. Was any member of this household not born Jewish? 1. Yes ____ 2. No ___
7. How many children do you have, if any? _____

	Age	Sex
a. Of those, how many are living at home?	1.___	1.___
	2.___	2.___
	3.___	3.___
b. Of those, how many are away from home?	1.___	1.___
	2.___	2.___
	3.___	3.___

   c. Of those children (3-18) living at home, what type of school do they attend?
   1.Public __ 2. Private (Non-sect.) __ 3. Parochial (J) __ 4. Parochial (N-J) __
8. a. What is the highest level of secular education you have completed?
   1. K-6 __ 2. J.H. (7-8) __ 3. S.H. (9-12) __ 4. College __ 5. Grad. (17-18) __
   6. Doctorate __
9. a. What is your occupation? _____
   b. What is your spouse's occupation? _____
10. What is your age in years? __
11. In general terms, can you please tell me what is your total family income?
   1. 0-9,999 __ 2. 10,000-14,999 __ 3. 15,000-19,999 __ 4. 20,000-24,999 __
   5. 25,000 and above __

12. Do you belong to a temple or synagogue? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

a. If YES, is it orthodox, conservative, or reform? (More than one check should be made if respondent belongs to more than one.)

1. Orthodox ___ 2. Conservative ___ 3. Reform ___

b. (Ask only of those who belong to more than one.) Which of these do you attend most often?

1. Orthodox ___ 2. Conservative ___ 3. Reform ___

13. If now a member of a synagogue/temple, what is the most important reason for belonging?

1. Identification with Jewish community? ___
2. Religious education of children? ___
3. Sense of traditional worship? ___
4. Family tradition? ___
5. Social activities? ___
6. Cannot explain (personal commitment)? ___

14. How many hours a week do you spend doing family (parents and children) activities?

1. 0-5 hours ___ 2. 6-10 hours ___ 3. 11-15 hours ___ 4. 16-20 hours ___ 5. More ___

a. Choose two of the following activities participated in most often as a family (parents and children)?

1. Religious ___ 2. Athletic ___ 3. Cultural (music, art, drama) ___
4. Social ___ 5. Education (learning, school work, etc.) ___ 6. Others ___

b. Give an example of each of the two kinds of activities you participate in?

_____

PHILANTHROPIES AND SERVICES

15. To what civic, social, business, professional and other organizations or clubs, Jewish and non-Jewish, local and national, do you belong? (First record list of organizations, then get other data for each organization.)

Name of organization	Are you an officer or board member?	What % of membership is Jewish? (Omit Jewish org.)
1. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	1. _____
2. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	2. _____
3. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	3. _____
4. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	4. _____
5. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	5. _____
6. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	6. _____
7. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	7. _____
8. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	8. _____
9. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	9. _____
10. _____	1. Yes ___ 2. No ___	10. _____

16. In an average month, how many hours would you estimate you spend for each of the following voluntary activities or groups?

    a. Groups or activities connected with a synagogue or temple? (Sisterhood, brotherhood, fund-raising, etc.) _____

    b. Jewish service institutions? (Jewish Community Center, B'nai B'rith Home for Aged, Jewish Federation, etc.) _____

    c. Jewish groups other than service institutions or those connected with a synagogue or temple? (B'nai B'rith, Hadassah, National Council of Jewish Women, etc.) _____

    d. Non-sectarian community groups or drives? (United Way, PTA, Scouts, etc.) _____

17. During the past year have you spent any time raising funds for a Jewish and/or non-sectarian cause? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

    a. If YES, how much time have you spent on Jewish causes and on non-sectarian causes?

    1. Jewish causes: _____ hours 2. Non-sectarian causes: _____ hours

18. Here is a card with a list of Jewish causes and philanthropies. I would like you to tell me which of these you consider very important, moderately important, somewhat important or not at all important. (Hand respondent card for question 10, then go down the list.)

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Somewhat Important	Not at all Important
a. Jewish Community Center	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
b. Local Jewish education (thru 12th grade)	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
c. Israeli causes	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
d. Nat'l agencies to overcome anti-semitism	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
e. Jewish hospitals	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
f. Institutions of higher Jewish learning-above 12	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
g. Research and publications on Jewish history and background	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
h. Jewish family service agencies	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
i. Overseas relief	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
j. National youth-serving agencies	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
k. Temples/Synagogues	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____
l. Jewish inst. for the aged	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____

19. Would you please tell me which two of the above you consider most important? (Use letters a-l.)

1. ____ 2. ____

20. Do you think the Jewish Community Center generally is doing a good job, a fair job or a poor one?

1. Good ___ 2. Fair ___ 3. Poor ___ 4. Don't know ___

(Do not ask of those who said don't know.) I am going to read you a list of the activities sponsored by the Jewish Community Center. For each one, please tell me if you think the Center is doing a good job, a fair job, or a poor job.

	Good	Fair	Poor
a. Children's activities	1.___	2.___	3.___
b. Teen-age activities	1.___	2.___	3.___
c. Adult social activities	1.___	2.___	3.___
d. Adult cultural and educational activity	1.___	2.___	3.___
e. Athletics	1.___	2.___	3.___
f. Jewish-Christian relations	1.___	2.___	3.___
g. Services to the total community	1.___	2.___	3.___
h. Services to the Jewish community groups	1.___	2.___	3.___
i. Help to individuals	1.___	2.___	3.___
j. Guidance for youth groups	1.___	2.___	3.___
k. Israel-related activities	1.___	2.___	3.___
l. Services to senior citizens	1.___	2.___	3.___

21. Are there any activities you would like to see added to the Center's program?

1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

If YES, what are they? _____

_____

_____

22. Is the Jewish Community (via the Jewish Community Center, the Jewish Federation, Jewish Service Agency, B'nai B'rith Home) satisfying the needs of the elderly in the following areas:

	Don't know	Yes	No
a. Housing	3. _____	1. ___	2. ___
b. Health care	3. _____	1. ___	2. ___
c. Social and cultural activites	3. _____	1. ___	2. ___
d. Religious	3. _____	1. ___	2. ___
e. Emotional	3. _____	1. ___	2. ___
f. Welfare (Financial)	3. _____	1. ___	2. ___
g. Educational	3. _____	1. ___	2. ___

23. Are you aware that the Federation along with the Service Agency in the last five years have resettled Russian families in Memphis? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

24. If YES, is the Jewish community (via the Jewish Community Center, Federation, Jewish Service Agency) satisfying the needs of the Russian immigrants in the following areas:

	Yes	No
a. Housing	1. ___	2. ___
b. Health care	1. ___	2. ___
c. Social and cultural activities	1. ___	2. ___
d. Religious	1. ___	2. ___
e. Emotional	1. ___	2. ___
f. Welfare (Financial)	1. ___	2. ___
g. Educational/Job Development	1. ___	2. ___

25. Does the Jewish community have a responsibility for maintaining the Jewish Union (Hillel House) on the Memphis State campus? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES

26. Now I would like to ask you a question about what you think makes a good Jew. In your opinion, for a Jew to be considered a good Jew, which of the following must he do? Which are essential, desirable but not essential or have no bearing on whether or not you consider him a good Jew? (Hand respondent card.)

	Essential	Desirable but not essential	No bearing
a. Accept his being a Jew and not try to hide it	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
b. Contribute to Jewish philanthropies	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
c. Support Israel	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
d. Support humanitarian causes	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
e. Belong to a synagogue or temple	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
f. Attend weekly services	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
g. Lead an ethical and moral life	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
h. Attend services on High Holidays	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
i. Know the fundamentals of Judaism	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
j. Gain respect of Christian neighbors	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
k. Promote civic betterment and improvement	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
l. Observe the dietary laws	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
m. Work for equality for all minority groups	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
n. Marry within the Jewish faith	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
o. Believe in G-d	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____

27. Regardless of your actual affiliation and membership, would you describe yourself as an Orthodox, Conservative, Reform Jew or none of these?

1. Orthodox ___ 2. Conservative ___ 3. Reform ___ 4. None of these ___

a. What did your parents consider themselves?

1. Orthodox ___ 2. Conservative ___ 3. Reform ___ 4. None of these ___

28. I am going to read you a list of Jewish customs and practices. For each one, please tell me which you observe regularly, sometimes, or do not observe at all.

	Regularly	Sometimes	Never
a. Buy kosher meat	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
b. Light Friday night candles	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
c. Participate in a Passover Seder	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
d. Light Chanukah candles	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
e. Attend High Holiday services	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
f. Attend Sabbath services	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
g. Attend daily services	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
h. Keep two sets of dishes	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____
i. Mezzuzah placed on doorway	1. _____	2. _____	3. _____

29. Do you regularly read any serious books or magazines dealing with Jewish subjects? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If YES, what books or magazines of this kind have you read in the last year?

_____

_____

30. Do you have any paintings, pictures, sculpture, silverwork or other art objects with a Jewish subject in your home? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

The following questions are concerned with your attitudes about the Memphis Jewish community.

31. Do you feel there is an alcohol problem in the Memphis Jewish community?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If YES, to what degree do you feel the Jewish service agencies (Jewish Community Center, Jewish Family Service, etc.) in the community have dealt with the problem?

1. Adequately _____ 2. Partially _____ 3. Inadequately _____ 4. No Impact ___

32. Do you feel there is a drug abuse problem in the Memphis Jewish community?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If YES, to what degree do you feel the Jewish service agencies (Jewish Community Center, Jewish Family Service, etc.) in the community have dealt with the problem?

1. Adequately _____ 2. Partially _____ 3. Inadequately _____ 4. No Impact ___

33. Which denomination, in your opinion, is most influential in the Memphis Jewish community? 1. Orthodox ___ 2. Conservative ___ 3. Reform 4. Don't know __

Now we'd like to get some of your opinions of relationships between Jews and non-Jews.

34. I am going to read a number of statements to you which have occasionally been made in contrasting Jews with other people. I'd like to know your reactions to each. Tell me whether you agree or disagree with these statements.

	Agree	Disagree
a. Jews tend to be cleverer than most people.	1. ___	2. ___
b. Jews tend to be more liberal politically than most people.	1. ___	2. ___
c. Jews tend to be more money-minded than most people.	1. ___	2. ___
d. Jews tend to be more aggressive than most people.	1. ___	2. ___
e. Jews tend to be more interested in education than most people.	1. ___	2. ___
f. Jews tend to be shrewder businessmen than most people.	1. ___	2. ___

35. Here are a few more, which compare non-Jews with Jews. Do you agree or disagree with each statement?

	Agree	Disagree
a. Non-Jews tend to be more religious than Jews.	1. ___	2. ___
b. Non-Jews tend to drink more than Jews.	1. ___	2. ___
c. Non-Jews tend to go in for physical fighting more than Jews do.	1. ___	2. ___
d. Non-Jewish families tend to be less closely knit than Jewish families.	1. ___	2. ___
e. Non-Jews are in most respects about the same as Jews.	1. ___	2. ___

36. Do you think any problems exist between Jews and non-Jews in the Memphis area?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If YES, please list in order of importance the kinds of problems which exist?

1. (Most important) _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

37. For each of the above identified problems, indicate who you feel is responsible?

	Jew	Non-Jew	Both	Neither
1. _____	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
2. _____	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
3. _____	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
4. _____	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___

38. Have you heard of any anti-semitic incidents within the past 12 months?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If YES, have there been many, a few or one? 1. Many ___ 2. A Few ___ 3. One ___

If you have heard of such an incident, please describe it. _____

_____

_____

39. Have you personally experienced any anti-semitic action? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___

If YES, describe one such incident. _____

_____

_____

40. Do you think desegregation has had an undesirable effect on attitudes toward Jews in Memphis? 1. Yes ____ 2. No _____ 3. No Opinion ____

41. How much opportunity do you have for contact with non-Jews?

1. Much ____ 2. Moderate ____ 3. Little ____ 4. None ____

a. Where do you have most opportunity for contact with non-Jews? (Recreation, business, school, etc.) _____

42. Would you like more opportunity for friendly contact with non-Jews?

1. Yes ____ 2. No ____ 3. No opinion ___

43. Have you in the past year spent a social evening in the home of any non-Jews?

1. Yes ____ 2. No ____ a. How many times? 1. 1-5 ___ 2. 6-10 ___ 3. 11+ ___

44. Have you in the past year had non-Jews for an evening in your home?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If YES, how many times? 1. 1-5 ___ 2. 6-10 ____ 3. 11 or more _____

45. Have you been present in the past year at any large mixed social gathering?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If YES, how many times? 1. 1-5 _____ 2. 6-10 _____ 3. 11 or more _____

a. What was the percentage of Jews to non-Jews?

1. More Jews _____ 2. More non-Jews _____ About equal _____

46. Estimate the percentage of Jews living in your neighborhood. _____

47. What is the percentage of Jews you would like in your neighborhood? _____

48. Are you more friendly with your Jewish or your non-Jewish neighbors?

1. Jews _____ 2. Non-Jewish _____

49. In general do you approve or disapprove of your child (children) having non-Jewish friends of the opposite sex? 1. Approve ___ 2. Disapprove ___ 3. No Opinion _____

a. In general do you approve or disapprove of your child (children) having non-Jewish friends of his/her own sex?

1. Approve _____ 2. Disapprove _____ 3. No Opinion _____

50. Do you approve of disapprove of your teen-age child's dating a non-Jew?

	Approve	Disapprove	Indifferent
a. Dating a non-Jew most of the time	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
b. Dating a non-Jew sometimes	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
c. Never dating a non-Jew	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____

JEWISH EDUCATION

51. If your children's ages are between 5 and 14, do they attend religious schools?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

52. In general do you support the need for Jewish Day School education, be it Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform affiliated over and above afternoon and congregational Sunday schools? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

53. During the past year, have you participated in any study or discussion groups, attended courses or lectures, dealing with Jewish religion, culture or history?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

54. During the year, did you attend any general education programs?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

55. In the next questions, we are trying to learn about your Jewish educational background. Read the following list and check all the kinds of educational activities in which you have participated.

	Yes	No
a. Grade school Jewish education (Sundays only)	1.__	2.__
b. Grade school Jewish education (Hebrew and Sundays)	1.__	2.__
c. Jewish Day School - elementary	1.__	2.__
d. Bar/Bat Mitzvah	1.__	2.__
e. Confirmation	1.__	2.__
f. High school (Sundays only)	1.__	2.__
g. Jewish Day School - high school	1.__	2.__
h. Undergraduate Jewish education	1.__	2.__
i. Graduate studies in Jewish education	1.__	2.__
j. Presently involved in ongoing program of Jewish study	1.__	2.__

56. If given the opportunity now, which of the above activities would you have enjoyed participating in in order of importance? (Write corresponding letters.)

1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___ 5. ___ 6. ___ 7. ___ 8. ___

57. Are you satisfied with the quality of Jewish education available for children in the Memphis area?

1. Very satisfied ____ 2. Satisfied ____ 3. Not Satisfied ____

58. I'd like you to tell me which goals you think are essential, desirable or not very important for a good Jewish education to accomplish?

	Essential	Desirable	Unimportant
a. Teaching children the history of the Jewish people	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
b. Teaching traditional observances	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
c. Teaching code of Jewish law	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
d. Teaching Jewish ethics to children	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
e. Helping children to develop their own Jewish religious beliefs and practices	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
f. Developing a strong feeling for Israel	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
g. Teaching what it means to be Jewish in modern day societies	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
h. Strengthening the commitment to the Jewish people	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
i. Developing familiarity with the Hebrew language	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____

ISRAEL

59. Have you ever visited Israel? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

60. What sense of loss would you feel if Israel were destroyed?

1. Very deep _____ 2. Some _____ 3. None _____

61. Do you belong to any Jewish organizations devoted primarily to helping Israel by religious affiliation? (Mizrachi, ARZA.) 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

62. Do you belong to any Jewish organization devoted primarily to helping Israel? (ORT, Hadassah, ZOA, etc.) 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

63. Do you feel the state of Israel has had an effect on the status of American Jews? 1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. No opinion _____

If YES, what kind of effect has Israel had on the status of American Jews?

1. Beneficial _____ 2. Harmful _____ 3. Both _____ 4. Neither _____

64. In which of these ways, if any, should American Jews support Israel?

	Yes	No
a. Raise money for Israel	1.__	2.__
b. Encourage children to live in Israel	1.__	2.__
c. Belong to a Zionist organization	1.__	2.__
d. Affect U.S. foreign policy concerning Israel	1.__	2.__
e. Influence American public opinion about Israel	1.__	2.__
f. Give Israeli financial needs priority over local community needs	1.__	2.__
g. Become citizens of Israel	1.__	2.__
h. Travel to Israel	1.__	2.__
i. Buying Israeli products	1.__	2.__

Do you feel this instrument gave you an adequate opportunity to respond to issues and attitudes pertaining to the Memphis Jewish community in 1978?

1. Adequate ___ 2. Moderately adequate ___ 3. Inadequate ___ 4. No opinion ____

If inadequate, what was omitted? _____

APPENDIX B

Jewish Community Relations Council

6560 POPLAR AVENUE · MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38138
(Mailing Address) P. O. Box 38268
Telephone (901) 767-5161

Dear

Twenty years ago a study was conducted by the American Jewish Committee, at the invitation of the Jewish Community Relations Council, to ascertain descriptive as well as attitudinal information regarding the Jewish population of Memphis. Because of a rapidly changing environment, it was felt that a follow-up study would be beneficial in assessing the current needs of the Jewish community.

Demographic information provided by the local Jewish Federation will form the basis for this project to be guided in part by the selected faculty and graduate students of the University of Tennessee School of Social Work.

Your name, one of over one hundred, has been randomly selected as a prospective subject for this study. A confidential interview lasting approximately forty-five minutes will be performed by a trained interviewer. Information given by you will be coded to insure the right of privacy. One of our interviewers will contact you within the next week and ask for your cooperation in arranging for an afternoon/evening interview.

With your cooperation, the information provided will enable us to establish the current needs of the Jewish community and help in developing programs to meet these needs.

Thank you in advance for being an active participant in a community that is anxious to grow and concerned with plans for its future.

Sincerely,

Cindy Soloway

Marvin Rubenstein
Graduate Students
University of Tennessee
School of Social Work

Mike Greenwald, President

APPENDIX C

Jewish Community Relations Council

6560 POPLAR AVENUE · MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38138
(Mailing Address) P. O. Box 38268
Telephone (901) 767-5161

Affidavit of Confidentiality for Southville Study 1978

I,_____, promise not to divulge the names of subjects assigned to me for the purpose of interviewing, and the content of their responses, for "Southville Revisited". This will help to guarantee their right to privacy.

Signature:_____

Date: _____

APPENDIX D

TABLE 21

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE FEMALE SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 38)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance
Hours Activity	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Jewish Causes	.36*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
J.C.C. Activities	.22	.26*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Attitudes/Practices	.44*	.76*	.15	--	--	--	--	--	--
Customs/Beliefs	.40*	.62*	.12	.84*	--	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	.33*	.95*	.28*	.78*	.67*	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	.47*	.63*	.16	.80*	.74*	.72*	--	--	--
Jewish Educational Level	.28*	.44*	.03	.57*	.58*	.44*	.56*	--	--
Jewish Educational Importance	.43*	.83*	.31*	.69*	.56*	.83*	.54*	.30*	--
Israel and American Jewry	.43*	.55*	.22	.72*	.68*	.61*	.72*	.53*	.76*

Note. (*) Denotes significance $p < .05$.

TABLE 22

INTERCORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF VARIABLES RELATED TO JEWISH IDENTITY IN THE MALE SAMPLE SELECTED (n = 37)

Variables	Hours Activity	Jewish Causes	J.C.C. Activities	Attitudes/ Practices	Customs/ Beliefs	Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	Jewish Educational Level	Jewish Educational Importance
Hours Activity	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Jewish Causes	.49*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
J.C.C. Activities	.26	.10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Attitudes/Practices	.14	.50*	.01	--	--	--	--	--	--
Customs/Beliefs	.19	.19	.13	.20	--	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Jewish Opinions	.17	.44*	-.02	.78*	.15	--	--	--	--
Stereotypic Non-Jewish Opinions	.10	.49*	.11	.76*	.31*	.88*	--	--	--
Jewish Educational Level	.25	.49*	.29*	.57*	.14	.65*	.67*	--	--
Jewish Educational Importance	.47*	.37*	.10	.50*	.04	.64*	.58*	.33*	--
Israel and American Jewry	.26	.53*	.02	.79*	.27*	.92*	.92*	.70*	.66*

Note. (*) Denotes significance $p < .05$.

VITA

Marvin Alan Rubenstein was born in Memphis, Tennessee, on February 5, 1951. He later moved to Shreveport, Louisiana, where he attended public school and graduated from C.E. Byrd High School in 1969. The following August he entered Louisiana State University in Shreveport. Following his sophomore year, he transferred to Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in Speech and Social Studies Education in May 1973. In December of 1974, he accepted a teaching position at Yeshiva of the South High School where he has served both as a full-time and part-time instructor of speech and social studies.

He entered the Graduate School at the University of Tennessee School of Social Work-Memphis Branch in September 1977, and is currently a candidate for the Master of Science degree in Social Work with a major in Administration and Planning and will graduate in June 1979. He is a member of the National Association of Social Workers, B'nai Brith, Baron Hirsch Synagogue, El Karubah Shrine, Scottish Rite and Shreveport Lodge #115 F. & A.M.

He is married to the former Karen Jean Katz of Memphis, Tennessee.

VITA

Cynthia Teper Soloway was born in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 28, 1944. Cynthia graduated from Cleveland Heights High School in 1962, and attended Northwestern University where she graduated with a B.S. degree from the School of Speech in 1966. Cynthia holds a Master of Arts Degree in Educational Psychology from John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, 1975. She is an M.S.W. candidate from the University of Tennessee School of Social Work and will graduate with a Master of Social Work Degree in June, 1979.

She previously held positions as a teacher with the Cleveland Board of Education, The Cleveland Heights-University Heights Board of Education and the Beechwood School System, Beechwood, Ohio. While with the Beechwood School System, she also held the position of a School Psychologist.

In 1974-1976 she was the Director of the Jewish Student Union on the campus of Memphis State University. This campus program was under the auspices of the Memphis Jewish Community Center. Cynthia is presently the Russian Resettlement Coordinator of the Jewish Service Agency.

Cynthia is married to Mark S. Soloway, M.D., Associate Professor, University of Tennessee Center for the Health Sciences. They have two children, Scott, age 10, and Deanna, age 6.