

Characteristics of the Israeli Philanthropy in the 21st Century: Motives and Barriers for Giving and Future Developments

Hillel Schmid



The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The Paul Baerwald School of Social Work and Social Welfare

The Center for the Study of Philanthropy in Israel



JDC Israel

**Characteristics of the Israeli Philanthropy in the 21st Century: Motives and Barriers for Giving
and Future Developments**

Prof. Hillel Schmid

Head of The Center for the Study of Philanthropy in Israel at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem

A. Introduction

This paper describes and analyzes the characteristics of philanthropy in 21st century Israel. It presents the scope of contribution, the motives and barriers for giving as well as the dilemmas, challenges and future developments.

Philanthropy is not a new phenomenon within the traditional Jewish society or the modern Israeli society. The moral decree of contribution can be found in the Jewish sources and sages, philosophers, religious scholars, leaders, researchers and public opinion makers refer to the ideological and philosophical aspects of contribution (Haski- Leventhal, 2009). Contribution in the Israeli society, as well as in other western societies, has changed its face from the traditional charity institution to the new philanthropy. Philanthropy is aimed at large-scaled national and social goods and makes use of private money for promoting public goods instead of focusing on improving the status of a certain individual who is in need of financial or mental assistance or compassion (Payton & Moody, 2008).

Following that, the last decades have witnessed the development of a different type of philanthropy in Israel. This is the “New Philanthropy” which refers to the wealthy people who have made their fortune in the electronics, high-tech and other advanced industries (Schmid & Rudich, 2010). The “New Philanthropy” is defined as rational philanthropy which is based on various motives while being advertent and cautious. It thoroughly examines the purpose and boundaries of contribution and does not contribute to general purposes which are not designated, clear and “tainted” (Shimoni, 2008; Silver, 2008). Traditional philanthropy, on the other hand, is perceived as more “romantic”, Zionist and nationalistic. It directed its contribution towards important, ideological and superior goals, but it lacked a cautious, qualitative and authoritative evaluation of the contribution and its impact. “New Philanthropy” is more task-oriented and strives to be involved in the social and civil programs and projects the philanthropists support. These philanthropists apply the managerial, business model on their philanthropic investments, and expect a return on their investment in the social sense and in the

sense of measuring the impact of the investment on the society in Israel. Despite these changes in the characteristics of Israeli philanthropists, studies still show that only a small percentage of them (11%) perceive themselves as the new type of philanthropists, while most of them perceive themselves as traditional philanthropists (Schmid & Rudich, 2010). Moreover, the scope of philanthropy in Israel is not going through a significant transformation, although, in this area as well, there have been some changes I wish to point out below.

B. The Scope of Philanthropy in Israel

Comparative data published by The Center for the Study of Philanthropy at the Hebrew University reveal a certain increase of contributions by Israelis (individuals and corporations); however, researchers from the center believe that the increase does not reflect the potential for financial contributions and volunteering within the Israeli society. Israel membership in the OECD and financial data reflect the solid financial situation of the state of Israel which was not badly affected by the turmoil of the financial crisis in 2008-2009. These data do not undermine the significance of the major social gaps in Israel which place it amongst the rich countries, such as the U.S, characterized by a high social inequality.

According to data collected at the center, Israeli philanthropy constitutes 0.74% of the GDP, in comparison to 2.1% in the U.S and 0.73% in England. The Israeli philanthropy share (households and businesses) increased from 33% in 2006 to 38% in 2009, while the share of overseas philanthropy (mostly from the U.S) decreased from 67% in 2006 to 62% in 2009. From this perspective Israel is one of the world major importers of philanthropy funds while contributions derive from the world Jewry have a great impact on initiation and operation of social programs in Israel. Nevertheless, it should be noted that there was a significant decrease in overseas contributions in 2008-2009. The share of overseas philanthropy in 2008 was 71%, while its share in 2009 was 62%. The decrease is ascribed to the impact of the financial, economic crisis on the Jewish philanthropists who regularly contribute to Israel but also to other purposes. Other explanations are related to changes taking place in the world Jewry, especially in the U.S, with respect to the commitment of the second and third generation, children of traditional philanthropists, whose commitment to Israel weakens and who perceive themselves as contributing to “universal causes” as being part of the larger society and country they live in. Moreover, contributions are channelled to “Tikun Olam” which is perceived by some of the philanthropists as the most important goal which influences various populations not necessarily

from Israel. In addition, a great deal of money is directed at strengthening of communities and maintaining the mechanisms responsible for fundraising. Another explanation is that the financial crisis of 2008-2009 served, for some of the traditional Jewish philanthropists, as a good excuse to reassess their contributions and as a result, to change their strategy, courses of action and favorable areas for contribution.

Data collected at the center also reveal that the philanthropy share (local and overseas) in financing non-profit organizations has remained steady and equals NIS 16 billion while the scope of the financial activity of non-profit organizations in 2010 was NIS 106 billion (The Central Bureau of Statistics, 2010). Income Tax data with respect to contributions from individuals and corporations reflect an increase in the number of donors (66.5% of total population) and in the sum of contribution, but the scope of the average contribution is relatively low compared to other western countries (the percentage of individual donors in the U.S. is 70% and 86% in the Netherlands). It should also be noted that the number of reported donors is relatively small since many of them do not report to the tax authorities in order to receive the tax benefit they are entitled to. Moreover, the scope of contribution, as aforementioned, is low and there is a gap between data on contributions by individuals and corporations and data regarding the share of philanthropy in financing the activity of non-profit organizations that receive philanthropic contributions. Data from the tax authorities regarding tax benefit for contributions from individuals and corporations reflect a decrease of millions of NIS in tax benefit from 2007 (NIS 243.180 million) to 2008 (NIS 192.273 million).

Only 15% of Israeli citizens participate in voluntary activities compared to 50% of the population in England and Canada and 30% of the population in Australia, The Netherlands and Germany. Only 9% of the corporations contribute to the community as part of "Corporate Social Responsibility" (Bar-Zuri, 2008) and their contribution totaled NIS 1.1 billion in 2006.

The expenses of institutional philanthropy in Israel in 2006 constitute 1.03% of GDP and 2.38% of governmental expenses out of which money transfers by philanthropic institutions equaled NIS 5.1 billion which constitute 0.8% of GDP (Brener et al, 2010).

In spite of the data presented above there is no central database which includes all the information received and given by the various authorities regarding the scope of contribution in Israel. Initial attempts to establish such a record are made by The Center for the Study of Philanthropy in cooperation with The Central Bureau of Statistics, Sheatufim – the Israel Center

for Civil Society and other organizations. The issue was discussed as part of a round-table discussion on 01.03.2011 and the prime-minister encouraged the participants to submit a final proposal for the examination of such issues before the next meeting. It is hoped that the prime-minister's directive will lead to the establishment of a registration which is highly important in the sense of a systemic tracking of the developing trends at the philanthropic arena in Israel. Such a registration might also assist policy makers in formulizing clearer polices and approaches related to the Israeli philanthropy and its relations with the government and the civil society. The registration might also provide information about the potential for contribution of individuals and corporations whose motives might be channeled to more significant philanthropic activities while the obstructions might prevent the development of philanthropy in spite of economic growth in Israel. The next chapter is dedicated to a discussion of motives and barriers for giving.

C. Motives and Barriers for Giving amongst the Israeli Public

The study of motives for giving around the world and in Israel has gathered momentum in recent years and the findings of the studies have been published in the scientific literature. However, the study of barriers for giving has been given much less empirical attention, especially in Israel. Thus, I shall briefly review the known motives and expand on the barriers, since their elimination has the potential for increasing philanthropic activities and contributions (Payton, 1988; Schervish, Havens & O'herily, 2001; Noonan & Rosqueta, 2008; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007).

As for the Motives - Shimoni (2008) analyzed the motives of great donors in Israel and found five major motives: collective and patriotic identification; taxation and business positioning; wishing to return to the society that has contributed to their education and wealth; peer pressure by colleagues in the informal social community and an attempt to imitate them; search for meaning and satisfaction.

Schmid & Rudich (2009) examined motives for giving amongst wealthy people who are part of the top echelon and contribute to Israeli organizations. They identified seven motives: family tradition of contribution; change of life circumstances or a life-changing event that leads to philanthropic activity; a sense of responsibility for the surroundings, a sense of fulfillment and joy; a need for social involvement; a sense of belonging to the community; a wish to promote certain issues.

On the other hand, Shay et al (1999) examined the motives for philanthropic activity amongst citizens who are not part of the top echelons of the Israeli society. The most prominent finding in their study was the importance of the religious variable with respect to philanthropic activity. For example, ultra-orthodox individuals show a strong tendency to contribute and their average contribution is higher compared to the rest of society. They also found that the Jewish population tends to contribute more than the Arab population. Katz, Levinson & Gidron (2007) found that donations often derive from personal motives related to a sense of religious virtue. Moreover, many of the subjects who participated in the study claimed that they donate property and money since they were asked to contribute.

Zeidan (2005) examined the characteristics and patterns of contribution in the Arab-Palestinian society in Israel. The findings show that political developments affect the motivation for contribution and lead to an increased number of donations. An example is the Al-Aqsa Intifada and the confrontation between Israelis and Palestinians in the west bank during 2001-2002 which led to an increase of donations in the Arab-Palestinian society compared to previous years.

Silver (2008) believes that from the mid 1990s there has been a significant increase in Israelis' willingness to contribute: as private donors, as philanthropic funds, as private businesses and as public corporations. She points out significant changes in the culture of contribution in Israel and offers some explanations which derive from the dramatic changes the Israeli society went through during these decades: the decline of the Israeli welfare state, expansion of the neo-liberal ideology, a major increase of social gaps and the multiplicity of associations and third-sector organizations. She further claims that these changes have taught Israeli citizens about the importance of philanthropy.

As for the Barriers – A survey conducted at The Center for The Study of Philanthropy, examined the barriers for contribution amongst the public in Israel. The survey was based on interviews with donors who have reached important insights with respect to barriers elimination as a condition to increasing contribution. The barriers can be divided into several groups:

Organizational Barriers:

First of all, the lack of a state-of-the-art fundraising practice. An efficient, professional fundraising influences the scope of donations and their frequency. Many donations are given as a result of successful fundraising efforts, yet many of the people working for non-profit

organizations are not properly trained or skilled to work with the donors, do not understand the donors' motivation and are not familiar with their organizational and structured systems. As a result, potential donors totally avoid organizations which seem unprofessional. Alternatively, repetitive, unprofessional requests from donors have the same effect (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007).

The second barrier is related to the negative public image of non-profit associations in Israel which alienates many donors. Cases of public corruptions that have been exposed in recent years, reports on extravagant salaries and huge gaps between the salaries of managers compared to salaries of employees have all led to a negative image of the associations as perceived by many donors, individuals and businesses alike.

The source of the third barrier is the difficulty of assessing and measuring the implications of donations and philanthropic activity. As aforementioned, most contributions are transferred to non-profit organizations whose goal setting is opaque, amorphous, generally phrased and lacking clear, measurable objectives. In addition, it is very hard to reach a consensus with respect to the goals since they are affected by the pressure of different interest groups wishing to make the most of the organizations. The result is a struggle between different interest groups and organizational coalitions which prevent the organizations from achieving their goals. Under such circumstances, the donors remain reluctant.

Fourthly, as discussed in the beginning of this paper, in recent decades we have witnessed the appearance of the "new philanthropists" at the philanthropy arena in Israel. Not only that these philanthropists contribute in a different way, but they also wish to apply the "involved and interfering philanthropy" (Almog-Bar & Zychlinski, 2010). These philanthropists are interested in a greater control of the objectives of the contribution and wish to be more involved in policy making, the organizational strategy and the courses of action. On the contrary, the organizations are interested in the contribution but less interested in the active involvement of the donors. The result is a tension between the expectations of the donors and the organizations and a lack of an understanding and common interest for collaboration.

Finally, the relationship between the donors and the government also constitutes a source of unwillingness to contribute. Studies present gaps with respect to perceptions and working methods between the donors who come from the modern businesses and the conservative, bureaucratic governmental agencies that resist changes and external threats such as

philanthropists who wish to promote social goals in an effective and efficient way. Alongside projects which were defined as successful with respect to collaboration between private entrepreneurs and the government (such as the Avnei Rosha educational project), there are many cases of programs which were not realized for many reasons related to the relationship between philanthropists and the government (such as the Yaniv Project for children and youth at risk).

Personal Barriers:

The first barrier is lack of a education for giving. Studies' findings show that a family tradition of contribution and appropriate education in this framework or in formal and informal educational settings promote contribution and volunteering. In Israel there are not any educational programs dedicated to contribution, volunteering or civil involvement. Only a handful of people are concerned with these issues and they are not followed by the masses to respond to challenges and risks the Israeli society faces.

The second barrier relates to the responsibility and commitment of the state with respect to its citizens. The concept of collective responsibility and state responsibility for its citizens has been undermined in recent decades in light of the trends of privatization of public services, especially of social and human services. Privatization has exposed numerous populations to a new reality where the services are provided by private for-profit organizations whose first priority is making profits and are less concerned by the welfare and well-being of their clients. Under these circumstances the citizens' commitment to the state's institutions, and their willingness to contribute and volunteer is also being undermined (Schmid, 2009).

Thirdly, "average Israeli citizens" feel they have numerous commitments to the state. Prolonged regular army and reserve force service, taxes which are higher than in most other western countries, the difficulties experienced by newly-married couples who wish to purchase an apartment, changes in mortgage conditions and the long-term commitment to pay off the mortgage – all of these prevent the citizens from contributing for the sake of others.

Moreover, the sense of collectiveness that characterized the Israeli society for many years has been replaced by a high level of individualism, egocentricity, materialism and consumption. Nowadays the Israeli citizen focuses more on promoting his personal and familial interests and is less concerned in social and national goals and others' needs. The sound economic situation in Israel is also reflected in an increase of the expenditure per capita designated for improving the

standard of living of individuals and families. Under these circumstances there is less motivation to contribute and share with others, except for emergency situations, wars and personal and national dangers when we witness cases of contribution and volunteering as needed. Many people believe that it is the government's role to respond to the needs of underprivileged populations instead of making new demands on the tax payers who fulfill their obligation towards the state (Schmid & Rudich, 2008).

These feelings are mostly common in the Israeli middle class which is getting weaker and even disappearing as many people claim. The common public stance towards the middle class perceives it as the class which carries most of the burden in an unequal manner compare to the other classes. Limor (2009) adds that social and economic tendencies that were developed in the last three decades such as: the decline of welfare state and the growth of the privatization, have undermined the middle class and pushed it towards a lower strata. In light of all these, the middle class refrain from contributing and in recent years has even further decreased the sums of contribution.

Moreover, in spite the fact that 33% of Israel's population live below the poverty line, I dare say that a large part of the Israeli public doubts the definition of poverty and the situation of those who are defined as poor except for some social coalitions which demand to include the issue in the social and political agenda. In lack of empathy and sensitivity towards the poor, people of different social classes believe that the government should solve the poverty problem, and are unwilling to contribute or support the less fortunate ones.

Finally, about 67% of the population assume a suspicious, cynical and skeptical attitude towards the philanthropists and their contribution (Schmid & Rudich, 2008). Despite the fact that the Israeli public believes in the importance of philanthropic activities, it is suspicious about the motives of the major donors who might be doing this for the sake of building up strength and making close contacts within the government which will grant them special benefits in the future. A major part of the Israeli public does not perceive contribution as derived from pure motives. This approach weakens the philanthropists' willingness to contribute to social and national programs.

These and other obstructions are a source of concern amongst those who still believe that philanthropy has an important role in the Israeli society, not as a substitute for the government, but as a complementary to it. Alternatively, philanthropy is also the one that encourages and

motivates the government to initiate innovative activities which promote the well being of its citizens. In order to overcome the resistance and barriers for giving, a few actions are required. The integration of these actions might promote the state of philanthropy in Israel as will be discussed further.

D. Moral and Ideological Dilemmas of Philanthropy

Philanthropy in Israel faces some moral and ideological dilemmas common to different western countries (United-States, Canada, England, Australia). Amongst these dilemmas:

First, the issue of the legitimacy of philanthropic initiatives and activities. Philanthropy is essentially based on private money which is directed at the public sphere in order to make an impact on it. The question is whether private donors have a moral right to influence the public arena which they are not part of.

In absence of a legitimacy of ideological and material involvement which is directed at the “public good”, the legitimate basis of philanthropy is rather narrow. It will probably come across objections and difficulties posed by governmental entities that perceive philanthropy as invading domains and areas that the government is exclusively responsible for. In order to deal with this problem, philanthropy must clarify its relationship with the government, set boundaries, division of responsibilities and make arrangements of coordination and collaboration (Frumkin, 2006).

Secondly, to a great extent, philanthropy encourages differentiation, segmentation, sectorial divisions and gaps in the Israeli society. Although one of the basic assumptions of philanthropy is that it contributes to a reallocation of national resources through financial support given to needy populations, (Prewitt, 2006; Wolpert, 2006), in practice, its involvement is selective and widens the gaps between different classes. The fact that the donor prefers to support a certain population or a specific domain means that the other domain or the other needy population loses and its needs are not met. Philanthropy must consider this aspect and adopt the appropriate policy and strategy while selecting the projects and social programs so that the gaps will be narrowed instead of widened. It is also reflected in the fact that most philanthropic investments are directed at the center region of Israel and only a small part of them reaches the peripheries which are discriminated once again and lack sufficient resources (Brener et al, 2010). Thirdly, accountability of the philanthropic activity is of great importance with respect to broadening the formal – institutional legitimacy and the non formal – public legitimacy in Israel.

Both the formal administration and the public in Israel are ambivalent towards philanthropy. Alongside the acknowledgement of the importance of contribution, the government still has not found the appropriate way to collaborate with philanthropy. Some political leaders perceive philanthropy as a threat to the democratic process because of its involvement in the public sphere and its attempt to promote norms and standards of work taken from the business sector and are less known to the governmental agencies (Schmid & Rudich, 2009; Shimoni, 2007; Hess, 2005). The danger also lies in the relative great power advantage of philanthropy versus the organizations in need. The resources of philanthropy on the one hand, and the non-profit organizations which are in great need on the other hand create an imbalance in the relationship between donors and the receivers. This situation places philanthropy at a position of moral dogmatism, imposing its position on society, patronage and ignoring the real needs of the organizations and their clients.

One way to overcome these concerns is by presenting the transparency of philanthropy and its added value to the society and the country. Another way is to be accountable to the state institutions, the organizations and the clients – the people who should benefit the most from the contribution.

Fourthly, the importance of philanthropy does not lie in the scope of contribution, but rather in the impact it creates. Studies that have examined this issue, show that the level of effectiveness of the philanthropic activity and its achievements is controversial, although one can point out many successes with respect to initiating and developing innovative and creative concepts. Some claim that the contribution of philanthropy with respect to minimizing inequality and reallocation of national resources is marginal (Wolpert, 2006). Foundations have not made the changes they claimed to have made and their effectiveness is doubtful. The added value of their contribution to the citizen in return for the tax benefits they receive is not clear and hard to measure. In spite of the donors' innovative inspirations, the resources contributed by philanthropy are limited and they do not make a significant change or provide solutions for the basic problems of modern society (Frumkin, 2006; Prewitt, 2006).

These dilemmas are significant with respect to understanding the philanthropic process and ignoring them might raise questions about the contribution of philanthropy and its importance in modern society. In order to find solutions for these dilemmas and to overcome the barriers,

philanthropy must collaborate with the government and civil organizations at several levels which are specified below.

Challenges and Future Courses of Action

The Israeli society faces numerous challenges and so do the “old-traditional” and “new” philanthropy. Assuming that governmental entities on the one hand, and the Israeli public, on the other hand, acknowledge the importance of contribution, we should act at several levels whose coordination and combination have the potential of increasing philanthropic activity in Israel.

First, we should develop a culture of giving and volunteering in Israel. Creating a culture of giving means to create appropriate stimuli amongst the rich and amongst the rest of the citizens with respect to generous contribution which is not a substitute for the responsibilities of the government. Studies have taught us about the motives of the donors amongst which is the motive to return to the society for enabling wealthy people to make their fortune. Alongside personal motives, the donors have a sense of responsibility and this sense must be adopted by the general public since “All Jews are responsible for one another” not only in times of emergencies. Creating a culture of contribution means educating the young generation about contribution and volunteering. The educational process should start at a young age at school and in other informal settings where teenagers meet. Sometimes we come across moving examples of voluntary settings where young people work together in order to promote social agendas, social change and social justice, but they are too limited. Many of us still believe “we deserve it” since we pay taxes (most of us), serve in the army, and fulfill many other civil obligations. The sense of “we deserve it” should be replaced by the sense of commitment to others and to unprivileged groups in the Israeli society.

Secondly, creating and formulating a culture of contribution shall not be sufficient if there is no governmental policy that encourages contribution. Studies show that tax considerations affect only to some extent the willingness to contribute and donate. Nevertheless, one should not ignore the need for systemic governmental policy which encourages contribution and perceive philanthropy as an important means of making important moves in the Israeli society. These steps were thoroughly discussed during the “round-table” meeting on 01.03.2011. It should be hoped that the proposals submitted by the State Revenue Division and the Israel Tax Authority with respect to modifying the floor and ceiling of contributions entitled for tax exempt, the

arrangement of “tax benefit through employer” which will be applied in workplaces that includes more than 50 employees and an addition of objectives such as public objectives of public institutions which will enable acknowledgement according to section 46 will all become operative decisions which will affect the willingness to contribute.

Thirdly, it is important that contribution is done in a modest way and not out of a sense of patronage and power. The art of contribution enables donors to express their personal values but contribution out of a sense of patronage that creates dependency leads to alienation and does not enable healthy discourse and fair exchange relations between donors and receivers. Here, we adopt the words of Maimonides who claimed that the highest level of contribution is a donation which leads to economic independence of the person who receives it. Our aim is to create a stronger, healthier society where philanthropy has a major role alongside the government and civil society.

Fourthly, attempts should be made to change the approach of most of the Israeli public towards philanthropy and philanthropists. In spite of the acknowledgement of the importance of philanthropy, as aforementioned, most of the public is cynical towards philanthropists and suspects their non-kosher motives. Many of us perceive contribution as a means of promoting the interests of wealthy people, making contacts within the government and achieving further power and control which will allow them to expand their business cycle, their profits, and their scandalous wages. This approach does not encourage philanthropists since they also look for acknowledgement and respect both on a personal level and on a public level. Criticism is important but a deep understanding and a thorough familiarity with the importance of philanthropic contribution to the development of social programs which cannot be implemented solely by the government alone are a must.

Fifthly, the society in Israel must be aware of the changes taking place amongst the world Jewry and its approaches towards the Israeli state and society. These changes are reflected in the undermined commitment of numerous cycles amongst the Jewish communities with respect to Zionist acts and the Israeli economy which is perceived as a solid one. The weakening of commitment has an impact on the scope of overseas contribution which is also reflected in this document. In order to at least maintain the same level of contribution, we must act on several levels, the most important of which are strengthening Jewish identity amongst the second and third generation and deepen their commitment to the Jewish state and the Israeli society which

faces rather complex challenges. In addition the Israeli society must be constantly encouraged to contribute and wealthy people must receive incentives for contribution since it will be easier to approach the world Jewry to continue their long-lasting support if we apply the principle of contribution within Israel.

Sixthly, the Israeli philanthropy should reconsider the channels of investment, contribution and favorable areas and domains. According to studies the main areas are education, welfare and health (Schmid & Rudich, 2010). These important domains should be supported by public financing and the government should be responsible for the costs and needs of the people who use these services. In such cases, philanthropy should not replace the government and cover for its failures and impotence which derive, inter alia, from the policy of privatization and the adoption of models of capitalistic markets which do not fit the Israeli reality. There is no doubt that philanthropists' contribution may assist in such cases, especially contribution of foundations that provide food supplies on holydays but these should not replace the government. Needy people receiving food supplies is a shameful scenario which is unacceptable in a country whose economy is sound and strong. Philanthropy in Israel has several roles. It is already involved in creating innovative and creative programs and social projects. In addition, it is highly important to channel the donations into fields where the Israeli philanthropy is not common. These fields include advocacy activities, promotion of citizens' rights, social justice, social change and strengthening of democratic discourse in Israel. We claim that philanthropy is not common in these fields which mostly get support from governmental funds which leads to a situation that the organizations are dependent upon the government and their civil activity is being sterilized (Schmid et al, 2008). The support of philanthropy in the civil organizations might release them from the dependence on such source of financing and enable them to act independently which will further contribute to social, conceptual and ideological pluralism which is needed in the Israeli society. Collaboration between philanthropy and the organizations that promote social change and civil rights might serve as alternative to the governmental bureaucracy which often neutralizes social and civil initiatives which might improve the welfare of the citizens and their quality of life.

In spite of all of the aforementioned with respect to the need to taking steps in order to strengthen the Israeli philanthropy, the working assumption of the author of this document is that the increase in the scope of philanthropic contribution will be quite moderate during the

next years. This assessment is based upon the philanthropic reality in the U.S and England where it is more developed than in Israel and which remains stable without significant changes in the scope of contribution (Cowley et al., 2010; The 2010 Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University).

Bibliography

- אלמוג- בר, מ., זיכלינסקי, א. (2010). "זו אמורה היתה להיות שותפות"- יחסי הגומלין בין קרנות פילנתרופיות לממשלה במיזם יניב. ביטחון סוציאלי, 83, 161-194.
- בר- צורי, ר. (2008). אחריות חברתית ומעורבות עסקית בקהילה. מינהל מחקר וכלכלה, משרד התעשייה, המסחר והתעסוקה.
- ברנר, נ., חזן, א., רודיך-כהן, א., שמיד, ה. (2010). סקר קרנות פילנתרופיות וגופי מימון בישראל. הלשכה המרכזית לסטטיסטיקה והמרכז לחקר הפילנתרופיה, האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים.
- הלשכה המרכזית לסטטיסטיקה (2010). הכנסות והוצאות מלכרים 2006-2009. הודעה לעיתונות מיום 23.5.2010.
- זיידאן, א. (2005). התנדבות, תרומות ועמדות כלפי ארגוני החברה הערבית- פלסטינית בישראל- בחינה מחודשת. הוצאת המרכז לחקר המגזר השלישי, אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב.
- חסקי- לוונטל, ד., קבלו, פ. (2009). מהנדיב הידוע ועד הקרן החדשה לישראל. ירושלים: המרכז לחקר הפילנתרופיה בישראל, האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים.
- כץ, ח., לוינסון, א., גדרון, ב. (2007). פילנתרופיה בישראל, 2006: דפוסי התנדבות ותרומה של הציבור. הוצאת המרכז הישראלי לחקר המגזר השלישי, אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב.
- סילבר, א. (2008). עידן הפילנתרופים? המקרה הישראלי. חברה אזרחית ומיגזר שלישי בישראל, ב(1), 9-32.
- שי, ש., לזר, א., דוכין, ר., גדרון, ב. (1999). פילנתרופיה בישראל: דפוסי תרומה והתנדבות של הציבור. הוצאת המרכז הישראלי לחקר המגזר השלישי, אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב.
- שמיד, ה., רודיך, א. (2008). סקר עמדות הציבור הרחב ביחס לפילנתרופיה ופילנתרופים. ירושלים, המרכז לחקר הפילנתרופיה בישראל, האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים.
- שמיד, ה., אלמוג- בר, מ., ניראל, ר. (2008). פעילות סינגור פוליטי של ארגונים לא כוונת ריווח המספקים שירותים חברתיים. ביטחון סוציאלי, 78, 11-37.

שמיד, ה. (2009). התמורות בסביבה הפוליטית, הכלכלית והחברתית והשפעתן על הזהות הארגונית של המרכז הקהילתי. בתוך לביא. צ. (עורך) להיות שייך. ירושלים, הוצאת החברה למתנ"סים, 32-68.

שמיד, ה., רודיך, א. (2010). פילנתרופית העלית בישראל: מאפיינים, מניעים ודפוסי תרומה. ביטחון סוציאלי, 83, 225-261.

שמעוני, ב. (2008). עסקים ופילנתרופיה חדשה בישראל- אתנוגרפיה של תורמים גדולים. ירושלים, המרכז לחקר הפילנתרופיה בישראל, האוניברסיטה העברית.

שמעוני, ב. (2010). "מה המדינה מצפה מעצמה?" פילנתרופיה חדשה וממשלה בישראל: נקודת המבט של תורמים גדולים מהמגזר העסקי. ביטחון סוציאלי, 83, 137-160.

Bekkers, R; & Wiepking, P. (2007). Generosity and Philanthropy. A Literature Review. Working Paper Series. Retrieved May 1st http://papers.ssrn.com/so13papers.cfm?abstract_id=1015507.

Cowley. E., Smith, S., Mckenzie, T., & Phoroah (2010). The New State of Donation: Three Decades of Household Giving to Charity 1978-2008. Cass Business School and the University of Bristol.

Frumkin, P. (2006). Strategic giving: The Art and Science of Philanthropy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hess, F. (2005). With the Best Intentions: How Philanthropy is Reshaping K-12 Education. Cambridge. Mass: Harvard Education Press.

Noonan, K; & Rosqueta, K. (2008). "I'm not Rockefeller: 33 High Net Worth Philanthropists Discuss Their Approach to Giving". The Center for High Impact Philanthropy. University of Pennsylvania, 1-26.

Payton, R.L. (1988). *Philanthropy: Voluntary Action for the Public Good*. New York: American Council on Education. McMillan.

Payton, R.L. & Moody, M.P. (2008). *Understanding Philanthropy*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Prewitt, K. (2006). *American Foundations: What Justifies Their Unique Privileges and Powers*. In: Prewitt, K., Dogan, M., Heydemann, S. & Toepler, S. (Eds.), *The Legitimacy of Philanthropic Foundations: United States and European Perspectives*. New York: Sage.

Schervish, P.G., Havens, J.J., & O'herlihy, M.A. (2001). *Agent- Animated Wealth and Philanthropy: The Dynamics of Accumulation and Allocation among High- Tech Donors*. Social Welfare Research Institute. Boston College. Retrieved April 14, 2007, from: <http://www.bc.edu/research/cwp/meta-elements/pdf/hightech1.pdf>.

The 2010 Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy. The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.

Wolpert, J. (2006). *Redistributional Effects of America's Private Foundations*. In: Prewitt et al. op.cit., 123-149. New York: Sage.

Publications of the Center for the Study of Philanthropy in Israel:

- Not Only the Love of Mankind. Philanthropy – A Theory and Research Overview – **Avishag Rudich**
- Business and New Philanthropy in Israel - Ethnography of Mega Donors – **Baruch Shimoni**
- A Public Opinion Survey on Philanthropy in Israel – **Hillel Schmid, Avishag Rudich (Hebrew)**
- Jewish Foundations – **Jeffrey R. Solomon**
- About Philanthropy, Effectiveness, and Education – **Gedalia Auerbach (Hebrew)**
- A Historical Overview on Monetary Philanthropy In and For Israel in the 20th Century – **Debbie Haski-Leventhal and Paula Kabalo (Hebrew)**
- Elite Philanthropy in Israel: Characteristics, Motives and Patterns of Contribution – **Hillel Schmid, Avishag Rudich, in cooperation with Hanna Shaul Bar Nissim**
- The Relationship Between Governmental Funding and Private Funding of Third Sector Organizations – **Osnat Hazan (Hebrew)**
- Advocacy activity of American Foundations and their Impact on Public Policy – **Joel L. Fleishman**
- Philanthropic Foundations and Government: Interrelations and Involvement in the Development of Social Initiatives in Israel – **Michal Almog-Bar and Ester Zychlinski (Hebrew)**
- Survey of Philanthropic Foundations and Funding Institutions in Israel – **Brener Nava, Hazan Osnat, Rudich-Cohn Avishag and Schmid Hillel (Hebrew)**
- Psychological determinants of motivation for philanthropic activity: The Identifiable victim effect in different social categorizations – **Tehila Kogut and Ilana Ritov (Hebrew)**
- Individuals' and corporations' donations to NGOs and tax policy influence on these donations – **Osnat Hazan (Hebrew)**