

Surveying Community Responses to Soviet Jewish Immigration: the St. Paul Experience*

Stephen C. Feinstein, Ph.D.

Professor of History, University of Wisconsin, River Falls

... while the community indicates awareness of the presence of newcomers in St. Paul, the general "business-as-usual" approach appears to have led many local Jews to assume that all the problems were being handled successfully by the responsible agencies and synagogues. In reality, however, this is not the case. Experience... seems to indicate that the best absorption comes not via the agencies but with personal contacts and guidance.

Although there has been a tremendous decline in the immigration of Jews from the Soviet Union since December, 1979, there nevertheless exists a considerable number of problems associated with the identity and integration of newcomers into American Jewish communities. One of the serious questions which has been raised in particular is over the issue of the Jewish bond, or as it has been called, the "Judaizing" of the immigrants. The basic question, of course, is whether Soviet newcomers, who have had minimal contact with the Jewish religious and social experiences as understood in an American context, will have the interest and determination to remain Jews in America. Earlier studies have already proven that Soviet Jewish immigrants are by and large culturally Russian. For most, the "Jewish" identity is usually a third item on their agenda—behind being economically integrated into America and learning English. Given the gravity of these two issues in a newcomers' experience, it is almost logical for the dependency upon Russian culture to remain as a security blanket of sorts.

Another aspect of the problem of integration of newcomers relates to the perception of this group by the native Jewish population. Therefore, a survey of attitudes by the local Jewish community towards immigrants was designed to be adminis-

tered in St. Paul. The survey was designed to evoke responses in three specific categories:

1. Community knowledge about Soviet immigration.
2. Community contact with Soviet immigrants.
3. Community attitudes toward integration and resettlement.

There were two varieties of the survey. The first, designed as a trial run, was composed of twenty questions and was administered by telephone to every twentieth person on the UJFC list. The second variant of the survey was reduced to nineteen questions and was mailed out to two thousand people on the UJFC list. Five hundred and sixty five responses were received, a bit more than 25%. This was considered a considerably good and representative response.

The results of the survey provided a confirmation of certain tendencies which had been observable in the community. The data also provided information which may prove to be significant for use by various Jewish organizations in educating the Jewish public into the mechanics of the Soviet Jewish movement and resettlement process. One of the things reflected upon as the results were tabulated, for example, was the fact that while the Soviet Jewry movement was more than ten years old and although there has been a more or less continuous barrage of information toward

* Research Funds provided by the United Jewish Fund and Council of St. Paul, Mn.

the community on the issues, the local community indeed may have been taking the immigration for granted. For example, a third of the respondents did not know how many immigrants had been resettled in the community, while only 22% actually knew the correct number. Fifty-seven percent of those polled indicated they had listened to a speaker on Soviet Jewry, but this result is lower than anticipated given the high priority that the issue has received in the Twin Cities area. A high synagogue affiliation by St. Paul Jews was a factor which we thought would provide greater exposure to the Soviet Jewry issue. But this did not appear to be the case.

Another question which might fall into background category raised the issue of whether or not Soviet Jewish immigrants should go to Israel rather than come to the US. Given the intensity of this debate among major Jewish organizations during the past several years, we expected results indicating a preference for newcomers to settle in Israel. This was not the case in the survey results. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents generally agreed that emigrants should go to Israel, but fifty percent disagreed. The remaining nineteen percent were undecided. These responses were exceptionally interesting as there had been much public talk and even editorial opinion in local Jewish newspapers about the problems for Israel created by *noshrim* (drop-outs) as well as the absorption and financial burden thrust upon the American community. These issues, however, did not seem significant among St. Paul Jews.

St. Paulites also seemed to have a realistic appraisal as to why Soviet Jews were leaving their place of birth. The smallest number indicated "anti-Semitism" as the major reason for leaving, while factors given a higher priority included "political alienation," "educational discrimination," "desire for economic improvement" and "concern for the future of their children." In a similar way, most community members

(74 percent) seemed aware of the efforts of the Jewish Family Service and Jewish Vocational Service in resettlement activities. More than 60 percent were familiar with the activities of the Jewish Community Center in dealing with newcomers and more than 70 percent of those polled were familiar with the "host family" program, although only 8.5 percent had participated in it.

The frequency of meetings between Soviet newcomers and St. Paul Jews is another factor which is significant for understanding the level of integration of newcomers into the community. The results of questions in this area suggests that a major difficulty in the St. Paul absorption process is minimal contact between newcomers and the Jewish community. Forty-nine percent of those polled may be said rarely to come in contact with Soviet newcomers. Thirty-four percent saw immigrants with some frequency (daily or weekly). Thirty-four percent indicated they had helped a newcomer with a problem, 18.7 percent had invited a Soviet immigrant to their home, 11 percent had taken newcomers to synagogue services and only 28 percent indicated they had become friends with a Soviet Jew. One of the inconclusive elements in these answers, of course, is whether or not one should expect greater interaction. The difficulty is that there are approximately three hundred Soviet immigrants coming to a community of around 7,500 Jews. Not every newcomer can be expected to make sufficient American friends to cover an entire community. On the other hand, some concern must be made for the claims of Soviet immigrants when they accuse Americans generally of being overly individualistic and Jews in particular of not being overtly friendly toward newcomers. St. Paul Jews, however, did seem to comprehend rather well that immigrants did, in fact, have difficulty interacting with the local Jewish community (66 percent agreed). While about 40

percent of those polled expressed their belief that newcomers were eager to become involved in American life, 50 percent of the respondents felt a danger that Soviet newcomers might be lost as Jews to the community. The latter statistic alone seems to indicate that there is a common perception among the native Jewish population that there is insufficient fabric in immigrant life to guarantee the maintenance of Jewishness. However, it should be pointed out that the immigrants themselves have indicated that this belief is way off base. The question of Jewishness, furthermore, possesses an implicit danger as it fails to establish clear criteria for defining "Jewishness." Nor does it measure the religiosity of Jewish national identity among the respondents except for synagogue affiliation and participation in community structure, particularly through contributions.

There appeared to be no significant negative feeling about the way Soviet Jews have been supported financially in the community during their absorption. There was, in turn, a strong expectation that immigrants would become full members of the Jewish community as indicated by their contributing money to the United Jewish Fund and Council.

Some further analysis of the data was achieved by establishing a series of cross tabulations based on information from the community profile. These subcategories included age, sex, income, place of birth, difference in synagogue affiliation plus other criteria related to the framework of the questionnaire itself. There were some interesting facts which were observed from these cross-references. Among them were the following:

1. Using age as a criteria, the survey revealed that the group with the greatest *daily* contact were those over 60 years, while those with greatest contact on a weekly basis were in the 46-59 age group.

2. Of the 28 percent of St. Paulites who indicated they had become friends with

Soviet newcomers, there was little differentiation by age.

3. Utilizing income as a criterion for judging contact with newcomers, the group with the highest daily contact were those with less than \$15,000 income (15 percent). The lowest level of contact was the \$36,000-\$49,000 group (2.2 percent). The less than \$15,000 group was also the highest in contact on a weekly level. This under \$15,000 group appears to be the same as the over-60 age group, indicating the highest level of contact is between older residents or retirees and newcomers. These statistics suggest that wealthier members of the community, while sensitized to the Soviet Jewry issue, appear to prefer to express their voluntarism through giving, rather than active involvement with immigrants.

4. The income with the highest record of "helping an immigrant with a problem" was the \$36,000 to \$49,000 category (43 percent of that group). This high figure was somewhat unexpected as it presumably indicates high interaction between newcomers and an American group involved highly in its own work or profession, as indicated by income. However, this statistic may also be perceived as being logical, as that income group, possibly representing a managerial class, might be appropriate to help newcomers. In this context, "problems" of the newcomers should probably be read as "job-related problems."

5. The most interesting information obtained in the survey related to place of birth of the respondents and their participation in the absorption process of newcomers. In every case, St. Paulites placed last in the four categories based on place of birth. This indicates that they have the least exposure to the issues, compared with "non-natives," and were the least receptive to the presence of newcomers. For example, 61 percent of those born in another country, 62 percent of those born in another state and 59 percent of those born in another part of Minnesota had listened to speakers

on Soviet Jewry, compared to 53 percent of St. Paul natives. A remarkably high 50 percent of those respondents who were born in another country had become friends with Soviet immigrants. This statistic is best understood in the common aspect of the shared immigrant experience, plus the utilization of foreign languages by the foreign born group. St. Paulites, however, placed last in this category, with only 21 percent becoming friends with immigrants.

St. Paulites also placed last in the area of helping newcomers when this was calculated on a percentage basis. Respondents born outside the United States saw newcomers on a more frequent basis in the "daily," "weekly," and "monthly" categories and had a very low incidence of "hardly ever" coming into contact with newcomers. St. Paulites were also least hospitable toward newcomers insofar as theirs was the lowest percentage of those having a newcomer over for dinner. Interestingly, although those born on foreign shores had established a high communicative level with Soviet newcomers, a majority felt they would be better off in Israel, compared with the native St. Paulites, who seemed to disagree with the assessment. (53 percent of those foreign-born felt newcomers should go to Israel vs. 25 percent of those born in St. Paul). So, while this statistic might indicate that the native St. Paulites would welcome newcomers because of their presumed preference to have these people in America rather than Israel, the quantitative and qualitative support on a volunteer basis for their presence in the community did not follow. Ironically, the group that gave the most support locally also felt that newcomers would be better off in Israel.

6. Using sex as a basis for dividing the respondents, the statistics indicated that women had greater "daily" contact with immigrants than men (9.7 percent vs. 5.4 percent) as well as a weekly basis (29.5 percent to 24.6 percent), although men indicated a higher contact on a monthly

basis (16.9 percent vs. 11.3 percent). One might conclude, however, that contact beyond a weekly frequency has little effect on the absorption process for the immigrant. More men than women, however, helped newcomers with a problem (37 percent vs. 29 percent). More women than men felt that newcomers were not being successfully integrated into local Jewish organizations. More men than women (31 percent vs. 26 percent) felt that immigrants from the U.S.S.R. should go to Israel rather than come to the United States, but both felt they were in danger of being lost as Jews in the American experience (49 percent women, 50 percent men). Sex, therefore, appeared as a minor, but not insignificant factor in assessing community attitudes toward newcomers.

7. Another way of evaluating a community response toward the new immigration was by synagogue affiliation. The highest level of exposure to a speaker on Soviet Jewry was among respondents from Mt. Zion Temple, a Reform congregation (64 percent), followed by those from Temple of Aaron, a Conservative synagogue (59 percent). Members of all congregations indicated more than 50 percent on this question, but none was over 65 percent. Those who belonged to no congregation (15 percent of the sample) indicated a lower exposure to the Soviet Jewry speaker issue as well as other questions that dealt with the process of absorption. Members of an Orthodox congregation provided the greatest help to newcomers with a problem (57 percent) while only 32 percent from the Reform congregation provided such aid, despite the high exposure to the Soviet Jewry issue. Members of the Orthodox congregation appeared more idealistic about the intentions of the newcomers, possibly linked to their higher level of involvement with them. 62 percent of the Orthodox congregants believed that newcomers were eager to become involved in Jewish life, compared to only a 32 percent

response from the Reform congregation, with the Conservative groups in the middle 37 percent). A majority of all congregants felt that Soviet immigrants might be lost as Jews in America, while only 37 percent of those without congregational affiliation thought this was true.

8. Respondents who belonged to Jewish communal organizations seemed to have a higher sensitivity toward the issues confronting Soviet immigrants. More St. Paulites who were organization members than non-members had listened to a speaker on Soviet Jewry (63 percent vs. 44 percent) and had a higher awareness of the difficulties that immigrants were having. Generally, those who were members of organizations also had higher levels of contact with newcomers and had made more friendships. More organizational members, however, seemed ideologically motivated on the question of Israel or the United States, with more agreeing that newcomers should go to Israel. More organizational members were pessimistic about the future Jewishness of immigrants, compared to non-members. This response reflects perhaps a larger problem in the Jewish community today regarding the definition of "Jewishness." Obviously, those who belong to organizations assume that their presence in the Jewish communal structure in some way is an important manifestation of Jewishness. On the other hand, non-members may have a more casual approach to their Judaism, or actually more serious if one regards religion alone as the main focus of Jewishness. Those who were not organization people, however, seemed more optimistic (or less pessimistic) about the ability of newcomers to remain Jewish.

There are many general statements that can be made as a result of the community survey on Soviet absorption, which in turn may form the basis of an active community policy. Although current immigration statistics are dismal because of the extreme

downturn in the numbers of Jews leaving the Soviet Union, the information derived from this study may indeed be useful for acculturating the current newcomers as well as sensitizing the community for the next wave of immigration.

For example, one item that came out very clearly was that there was substantial need to strengthen community exposure to the Soviet Jewry issue itself as well as the realities of the absorption process. Certainly there has been an ongoing effort for Soviet Jewry, carried out well locally by the Minnesota-Dakotas Action Committee. However, as the issue has been in the community forum for more than ten years with results which have been extremely successful compared to expectation levels before 1970, it appears that a good deal of the community is tired of hearing about Soviet Jewry. This business-as-usual attitude in turn makes dealing with immigrants themselves and their absorption difficult. Therefore, while the community indicates awareness of the presence of newcomers in St. Paul, the general "business-as-usual" approach appears to have led many local Jews to assume that all the problems were being handled successfully by the responsible agencies and synagogues. In reality, however, this is not the case. Experience in the Twin Cities area as well as other cities nationwide seems to indicate that the best absorption comes not via the agencies, but with personal contacts and guidance. One very crucial aspect of this program, therefore, is to make the local St. Paul Jewish community more aware of how insular its native born population has been toward outsiders, as indicated in the survey results. That St. Paulites placed last in the questions dealing with hospitality and friendships is significant in evaluating the success or failure of local programs related both to Soviet Jewry as well as other community issues. Certainly, the idea of integrating Jews into the community in the fullest sense of the word cannot be carried out

with an insensitive local population as demonstrated by their reluctance to become involved in absorption via voluntary roads. Agencies in charge of these processes might begin a process of counseling other voluntary Jewish organizations who may not have sufficient awareness of the need for more direct action in absorption.

All of the above items suggest that a useful device for aiding in the absorption of immigrants would be an educational campaign of high intensity designed to express the difficulties Soviet immigrants have had in the socialization aspect as well as the work process of absorption. Such new educational approaches might break down some of the barriers in St. Paul. At the same time, there must be a concerted effort to remove some of the stereotyping about Soviet newcomers and it must be made clear that they cannot be perceived as any less Jewish than most of the native population. Indeed, it is perhaps this barrier of Jewishness which has become an impediment for newcomers to cross.

That many St. Paul Jews did not come in contact with Soviet immigrants may not be the fault of the community, but may be linked to reclusive social tendencies of the

immigrants themselves, especially related to lack of sufficient English language ability plus possible desires to be self-reliant. While a state of "normalcy" cannot be established overnight, community sponsorship of events which makes efforts to bring immigrants and local community members together in informal settings or normal community events should be enhanced. The survey indicates, for example, that a more forceful direction might be taken by several synagogues. Economically, a program to provide a greater incentive for involvement among middle-income American Jews might be useful for establishing a relationship with Soviet newcomers. In this context, middle income also translates as younger members of the community.

In short, the survey seems to indicate that various levels of awareness exist among the local population regarding the immigration. But, as the agencies and the population seem to have expected more from the immigrants, problems of perception have arisen. The answers to these questions must come from within the community itself, and possibly with some self-help from the newcomers.

Appendix

Results of Telephone and Mail Surveys

I. Knowledge of Soviet Jewish Immigration:

In this section, we are interested in learning what you know about the resettlement process of Soviet Jewish immigrants in St. Paul.

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box(es) for questions 1-7.

1. Are you familiar with the efforts of the St. Paul Jewish Family Service and Jewish Vocational Service in the resettlement process?

TELEPHONE:

YES: 105 (86%)

NO: 17 (14%)

MAIL:

YES: 422 (74%)

NO: 143 (25%)

2. Are you familiar with the efforts made by the St. Paul Jewish Community Center to attract Soviet Jewish immigrants as members?

TELEPHONE:

YES: 96 (79%)

NO: 26 (21%)

MAIL:

YES: 345 (60.8%)

NO: 220 (38.8%)

COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO IMMIGRATION

3. Are you familiar with the efforts made by synagogue congregations to attract Soviet Jewish immigrants as members?

TELEPHONE:	MAIL:
YES: 69 (57%)	YES: 298 (52.6%)
NO: 52 (43%)	NO: 261 (46%)

4. Are you aware of the St. Paul Jewish Family Service host family program?

TELEPHONE:	MAIL:
YES: 76 (62%)	YES: 403 (71%)
NO: 46 (38%)	NO: 160 (28%)

4a. If YES, have you participated in the host family program?

TELEPHONE:	MAIL:
YES: 6 (5%)	YES: 48 (08.5%)
NO: 71 (58%)	NO: 363 (63.8%)
N.A. 45 (37%)	N.A. 156 (27.5%)

5. Do you believe that Soviet Jewish immigrants should be financed with Jewish charitable funds?

TELEPHONE:	MAIL:
YES: 96 (79%)	YES: 391 (69%)
NO: 6 (5%)	NO: 38 (6.7%)
Undecided: 20 (16%)	Undecided: 122 (22.5%)

6. Approximately how many Soviet Jewish immigrants do you believe have come to St. Paul over the last 10 years?

TELEPHONE:	MAIL:
50 [2] (1.6%)	50 [5] (09%)
100 [2] (1.6%)	100 [44] (7.8%)
200 [9] (7%)	200 [68] (12%)
300 [11] (9%)	300 [129] (22.8%)
Over 500 [98] (80%)	Over 500 [136] (24%)
Don't Know [0]	Don't Know [182] (32.2%)

7. Which of the following do you believe to be the motivation(s) for leaving the Soviet Union? (Please "X" all that apply).

	TELEPHONE	MAIL
Economic Improvement	53 (43%)	227 (40%)
Political Alienation	Not on survey	285 (50%)
Educational Discrimination	36 (30%)	248 (43%)
Anti-Semitism	9 (7%)	36 (15%)
Future of their Children	10(8%)	144 (25%)

II. Contact with the Soviet Jewish Community

In this section, we are interested in learning how often you come in contact with a Soviet Jewish immigrant. Please place an "X" in the appropriate box(es) for questions 8 and 9.

8. How often do you see a Soviet Jewish immigrant in the St. Paul community?

	TELEPHONE	MAIL
Daily	12 (7.8%)	41 (7%)
Weekly	25 (20.5%)	153 (27%)
Monthly	28 (23%)	82 (14.5%)
Hardly Ever	39 (32%)	200 (35%)
Never	17 (13.9%)	79 (14%)

9. Have you done any of the following concerning Soviet Jewish immigrants?

	TELEPHONE		MAIL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Listened to a speaker on Soviet Jewry	57 (47%)	65 (53%)	325 (57%)	229 (40%)
b. Met and talked with a Soviet Jewish Immigrant...	80 (66%)	42 (34%)	361 (63.8%)	191 (33.7%)
c. Helped a Soviet Jewish immigrant with a problem.	30 (25%)	92 (75%)	193 (34%)	352 (62%)
d. Had a Soviet Jewish immigrant to your home for dinner	14 (11.5%)	108 (88.5%)	106 (18.7%)	442 (78%)
e. Taken a Soviet Jewish immigrant to a synagogue...	7 (6%)	115 (94%)	67 (11%)	473 (83.5%)
f. Become friends with a Soviet Jewish immigrant...	13 (11%)	109 (87%)	160 (28%)	379 (67%)
g. Talked with a host family	37 (30%)	85 (69%)	235 (41%)	310 (54%)

III. Attitudes toward Soviet Immigration

Now we would like to learn how you feel about Soviet Jewish immigration.

Beside questions 10-19 (20 in telephone survey), please indicate whether you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD), or are Undecided (U).

	SA	A	D	SD	U
10. Soviet Jewish immigrants are eager to become involved in Jewish life when they arrive in America					
TELEPHONE:	5 (4%)	63 (52%)	30 (26%)	2 (2%)	22 (18%)
MAIL:	48 (8.5%)	177 (31%)	160 (28%)	35 (6%)	135 (24%)
11. Soviet Jewish immigrants have become involved with Jewish organiza- tions and clubs (i.e. Hadassah, B'nai B'rith, etc.)					
TELEPHONE:	0 (0%)	37 (30%)	30 (25%)	1 (.8%)	54 (44%)
MAIL:	15 (2%)	88 (16%)	187 (33%)	58 (10%)	206 (36%)
12. Soviet Jewish immigrants should take any job on arrival in order to become independent of the community as quickly as possible.					
TELEPHONE:	14 (11%)	62 (51%)	36 (29%)	3 (3%)	7 (6%)
MAIL:	149 (26%)	185 (33%)	150 (27%)	25(4%)	51 (9%)
13. Soviet Jewish immigrants have difficulty interacting with the local Jewish community.					
TELEPHONE:	3 (2%)	67 (55%)	20 (16%)	0 (0%)	32 (27%)
MAIL:	67 (12%)	306 (54%)	64 (11%)	4 (.7%)	111 (20%)
14. Soviet Jewish immigrants should be given 2-3 months of English lessons before seeking jobs.					
TELEPHONE:	16 (13%)	84 (69%)	19 (10%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.5%)
MAIL:	167 (30%)	269 (47%)	58 (12%)	10 (2%)	45 (8%)
15. Soviet Jews should go to Israel rather than the United States.					
TELEPHONE:	3 (2.5%)	19 (15.5%)	77 (63%)	10 (8%)	6 (5%)
MAIL:	83 (15%)	81 (14%)	226 (40%)	59 (10%)	105 (19%)

COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO IMMIGRATION

16. Soviet Jewish immigrants are familiar with American life when they arrive here.

TELEPHONE:	0 (0%)	8 (7%)	86 (71%)	7 (6%)	21 (17%)
MAIL:	13 (2%)	39 (7%)	273 (48%)	174 (31%)	61 (11%)

17. Soviet Jewish immigrants should have access to St. Paul Talmud Torah and Jewish Community Center at community expense until they become financially independent.

TELEPHONE:	14 (11.5%)	79 (65%)	21 (17%)	1 (.8%)	6 (5%)
MAIL:	186 (33%)	299 (53%)	34 (6%)	8 (1%)	36 (6%)

18. Soviet Jewish immigrants should be solicited for charitable contributions to the United Jewish Fund and Council when they become financially independent

TELEPHONE:	31 (25%)	83 (68%)	3 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)
MAIL:	286 (50%)	252 (44%)	7 (1%)	0 (0%)	21 (4%)

19. There is a danger that recent Soviet Jewish immigrants may be lost as Jews to the community.

TELEPHONE:	3 (2.5%)	34 (28%)	35 (29%)	0 (0%)	49 (40%)
MAIL:	74 (13%)	211 (37%)	108 (19%)	14 (3%)	148 (26%)

X. Soviet Jewish immigrants should go to Israel if they are to remain Jewish. .

TELEPHONE ONLY:	4 (3%)	5 (4%)	91 (75%)	11 (9%)	10 (8%)
-----------------	--------	--------	----------	---------	---------

IV. Respondent Information:

Finally, we would like to know just a little about you so we can see how different types of people feel about the issues we have been examining.

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box(es) for questions 20-29.

	TELEPHONE	MAIL
20. What is your age?		
18 years or younger	0	1 (.2%)
19 years to 29 years	8 (7%)	58 (10%)
30 years to 45 years	28 (25%)	165 (29%)
46 years to 59 years	33 (27%)	154 (27%)
60 years or older	52 (41%)	187 (33%)
21. What is your current marital status?		
Single	11 (9%)	51 (9%)
Married	36 (71%)	432 (76%)
Divorced	4 (3%)	24 (4%)
Separated	0 (0%)	6 (1%)
Widowed	20 (16%)	53 (9%)
22. What is your sex?		
Female	78 (64%)	247 (44%)
Male	44 (36%)	313 (55%)

	TELEPHONE	MAIL
23. What is your approximate income?		
Less than \$15,000	18 (15%)	100 (18%)
\$16,000 - \$20,000	8 (7%)	68 (12%)
\$21,000 - \$25,000	9 (7%)	71 (13%)
\$26,000 - \$35,000	17 (14%)	89 (16%)
\$36,000 - \$49,000	6 (5%)	88 (16%)
Over \$50,000	13 (10%)	123 (22%)
23a. Does the box checked above represent individual or family income?		
Individual	32 (26%)	260 (46%)
Family	36 (30%)	283 (50%)
Non answer	53 (44%)	24 (4%)
24. Where were you born?		
St. Paul, Minnesota	56 (46%)	257 (45%)
Other city in Minnesota	27 (22%)	81 (14%)
Other state in USA	22 (18%)	147 (26%)
Other country	16 (13%)	77 (14%)
24a. <i>If you were not born in St. Paul:</i>		
Did you come to St. Paul as an adult?		
Yes	44 (36%)	237 (42%)
No	21 (17%)	73 (13%)
No answer	57 (47%)	256 (45%)
IF YES:		
I. Approximately how long did it take you to feel at home here?		
Less than 6 months	19 (16%)	89 (16%)
6 months to one year	9 (7%)	54 (10%)
one year to two years	5 (4%)	38 (7%)
two years to four years	4 (3%)	40 (7%)
more than four years	6 (5%)	34 (6%)
II. Did you find the St. Paul Jewish community open to newcomers?		
Yes	32 (26%)	150 (27%)
No	10 (8%)	72 (13%)
Undecided	2 (1.5%)	38 (7%)
No answer	78 (64%)	305 (54%)
25. To which synagogue(s) do you belong?		
Adath Israel (Orthodox)	6 (5%)	19 (3%)
Mount Zion Temple (Reform)	27 (22%)	150 (27%)
Shaare Shalom (Conservative)	1 (.8%)	8 (1%)
Sons of Jacob (Conservative)	5 (4%)	22 (4%)
Temple of Aaron (Conservative)	50 (41%)	263 (46%)
None	32 (26%)	85 (15%)
Other	1 (.8%)	16 (3%)
26. Do you currently belong to other Jewish organizations or clubs (i.e. Hadassah, B'nai B'rith, etc.)?		
YES	78 (64%)	370 (65%)
NO	44 (36%)	184 (33%)

COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO IMMIGRATION

27. Do you currently serve as a board member in any of the following Jewish organizations? (Please "X" all that apply.)

Jewish Family Service	2 (1.6%)	19 (3.4%)
Jewish Vocational Service	0 (0%)	12 (2.1%)
Jewish Community Center	1 (.8%)	31 (5.5%)
Jewish Community Relations Council	0 (0%)	14 (2.5%)
Talmud Torah	3 (2.5%)	31 (3.7%)
United Jewish Fund & Council	3 (2.5%)	43 (7.6%)
Synagogue to which you belong	6 (4.9%)	74 (13.1%)
None	99 (81%)	269 (47.4%)
Other	15 (12.3%)	66 (11.6%)

28. Are you currently employed in a professional position by a local Jewish agency or synagogue?

YES	6 (5%)	35 (6%)
NO	115 (94%)	522 (92%)

28a. IF YES: Do you work with Soviet Jewish immigrants in this position?

YES	24 (4%)
NO	48 (9%)
NA	495 (87%)

29. Do you contribute to the United Jewish Fund and Council?

YES	115 (94%)	527 (93%)
NO	7 (6%)	33 (6%)