Mandell L. Berman Institute
North American Jewish Data Bank

THIS PUBLICATION IS PROVIDED BY THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH DATA BANK WITH PERMISSION FROM THE STUDY AUTHORS.

THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH DATA BANK IS A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT OF THE JEWISH FEDERATIONS OF NORTH AMERICA AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT'S CENTER FOR JUDAIC STUDIES AND CONTEMPORARY JEWISH LIFE AND ROPER CENTER FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH. OUR MISSION IS TO:

PROVIDE EMPIRICAL SURVEY DATASETS ABOUT THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY FROM NATIONAL AND LOCAL SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC STUDIES AS WELL AS OTHER TYPES OF CONTEMPORARY AND HISTORICAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH.

MAKE AVAILABLE SUBSTANTIVE AND METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS ON THE JEWISH COMMUNITY, IN PARTICULAR, REPORTS BASED ON DATASETS THAT ARE PART OF THE ARCHIVE.

PROMOTE THE DATA BANK TO JEWISH FEDERATIONS, COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS, FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER GROUPS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH CONCERNING JEWISH LIFE IN NORTH AMERICA.

ENCOURAGE ACADEMICIANS, STUDENTS, COMMUNAL PROFESSIONALS AND OTHERS TO UTILIZE DATA BANK HOLDINGS AND TO SUBMIT THEIR STUDIES TO THE ARCHIVE.

SPONSOR SEMINARS AND PROVIDE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCHERS AND PLANNERS TO DISCUSS ISSUES, IMPROVE METHODOLOGIES AND EXCHANGE IDEAS BASED ON QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH.

PREPARE PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER FORMS OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION CONCERNING SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ABOUT NORTH AMERICAN JEWRY.

PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE TO JEWISH FEDERATIONS, RESEARCHERS, COMMUNAL PROFESSIONALS, JOURNALISTS AND OTHERS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH ON THE JEWISH COMMUNITY.

PLEASE NOTE THAT OUR DATASETS AND REPORTS ARE PROVIDED FOR NON-COMMERCIAL USE ONLY.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT
HTTP://WWW.JEWISHDATABANK.ORG

Mandell L. Berman Institute North American Jewish Data Bank, Center for Judaic Studies and Contemporary Jewish Life
University of Connecticut, 405 Babbidge Rd, Unit 1205, Storrs, CT 06269-1205
info@jewishdatabank.org
phone: 860-486-2271 fax: 860-812-2032

A Handle on the Future — The Potential of the 1990 National Survey for American Jewry

CONTENTS

Introduction
by Barry A. Kosmin iii

A 1990 National Jewish Population Study: Why and How
by Sidney Goldstein 1

Jewish Megatrends — Planning for the Twenty-First Century
by Steven Huberman 299

Introduction

Barry A. Kosmin
Director of Research, Council of Jewish Federations
Director, North American Jewish Data Bank

The two authors whose papers are reproduced here are both members of the Council of Jewish Federations' National Technical Advisory Committee on Jewish Population Studies. (Dr. Goldstein is the Chair of the Committee.) This Committee has been the main force behind and the instrument for planning the National Survey of American Jews which will take place in May-June 1990. This study will be the Jewish community's largest and most important research initiative in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

The Council of Jewish Federations and its member federations are sponsoring this study in the firm belief that there is both a theoretical and practical need for reliable and up-to-date national data on the population composition of American Jewry, its social, educational and economic structure, as well as its religious and cultural attitudes and behaviors. The output from the national survey will reflect this concern. It will provide descriptive national statistics and specially commissioned monographs in the North American Jewish Data Bank's publication series on topics such as (1) regional and city-size differences, (2) marriage, family and fertility, (3) geographical migration and distribution, (4) Jewish identity, (5) income, economic status and education, (6) the life cycle, (7) Jewish women and (8) communal service needs and implications.

A public use data tape will be available through the Data Bank for further analysis by interested academics, federation planners and communal agencies.

In this manner we shall educate ourselves in order to prepare for the challenges the future will undoubtedly produce for American Jewish society and its communal institutions.

A 1990 National Jewish Population Study:

Why and How

Sidney Goldstein
Population Studies and Training Center
Brown University

At a time when the demographic, social and perhaps even economic structure of the American Jewish community is undergoing rapid change, there is a crucial need for a continuous monitoring of the situation and an assessment of its implications for the future. Changes in size, composition and distribution, as well as in the patterns and levels of births and deaths, have tremendous significance at both the local and national levels. The demographic structure of the Jewish community also greatly affects its social, cultural and religious viability, whether judged by the composition or by the population density necessary to support an educational system, to organize religious life or to ensure a sense of community. Knowledge of demographic factors is also clearly essential in order to plan whether a community should provide certain services, where facilities should be located, how they should be staffed and who should bear the funding burden.

Moreover, to the extent that migration and dispersion are major features of American Jewish life, the viability of both the local and the national community may very well be affected by the success achieved in developing an institutional network that facilitates linkages of mobile Jews to the community, and smaller communities to larger ones, as part of a national community. Because the socio-demographic structure of the national Jewish community, like that of the larger American community, is both a product and a cause of change, we clearly need to have comprehensive, current data available on it, as well as on local communities. The presentation and deliberations at the 1987 Sidney Hollander Colloquium, sponsored by the Council of Jewish Federations, stressed the importance of full recognition of the existence of such a national community in our planning and research efforts. The participants emphasized the need for new methodologies to assess the national society and for new structures and institutions to cope with its evolution.

Because the United States Constitution calls for separation of church and state and thereby prevents the federal government from inquiring into matters of creed, the mandatory decennial census has never included questions on religious identity. In fact, when efforts were initiated by some groups to introduce such a question in the earlier decades of this century, representatives of the Jewish community were among those voicing the strongest objections.

Today, there is greater recognition that religious identification is a key to understanding a host of social, economic and political behavioral phenomena. As a result, a question on religion is frequently included in sample surveys. I even suspect that, unlike several decades ago, there is much more sentiment for inclusion of a question on religion in the census and less resistance in the Jewish community to doing so. I believe it unlikely, however, that the census will include such a question in the foreseeable future (it definitely will not in 1990) since its general policy is to reduce rather than expand questions that are seen to infringe on private matters; even if such a question were included, I have serious doubts about its value for research and policy purposes. For a variety of reasons, too, many Jews may opt not to identify themselves as such; the Jewish origins of persons not currently identifying themselves as Jews would not be ascertained; and the wide range of information on Jewish behavioral and attitudinal variables would not be collected. Consequently, the available data would be limited, likely biased in coverage and possibly misleading, and therefore of questionable value. As before, then, to understand ourselves better, we must look to alternative sources of data and particularly to our own efforts to create the types of data we need for assessment and planning purposes.

A variety of alternative data sets are available, but most of these have their own limitations for purposes of an analysis of U.S. Jewry. For most states, birth, death and marriage records, like the census, collect no information on religion. Nor do school censuses or such widespread listings of households and population as telephone and city directories. Their use, at best, can only be indirect by reliance on distinctive Jewish names (a questionable procedure because of potential bias; see Lazerwitz, 1986) or by linkage with survey materials in which known Jews are included. The best alternatives are surveys in which information on religious identification is collected. Three types of such surveys are relevant to our concern: (1) national and local omnibus surveys; (2) local studies of the Jewish population; and (3) a national Jewish population survey.

National or local surveys which are designed to represent the general population and which, as a result, also include Jews, are frequently undertaken by marketing or public opinion organizations. But because Jews constitute only about 2.5 percent of the American population, and because such surveys seldom exceed 2,500 respondents, the number of Jews included in any single national survey is very small (Fisher, 1983); Jews seldom exceed 40 to 60 cases in such national omnibus surveys. An exception was the 1957 Current Population Survey sponsored by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1958) which sampled about 35,000 households and which, because of its voluntary character, was able to include a question on religion on an experimental basis. Based on the 2.2 percent of the population identified as Jews, the Jewish subsample must have numbered about 1,100 cases, thereby allowing separate, detailed analysis. Regrettably, very few data were tabulated, and the raw data have never been made available for further analysis. A question on religion has never been repeated in a CPS.

For smaller surveys that are taken repeatedly, the results of several surveys can be combined. A considerable number of such surveys may be required, however, to

achieve the minimum number of Jews needed for a meaningful analysis. Furthermore, the changes in behavior and attitudes that could occur over the span of years encompassed by a combined sample could make the Jewish sample too heterogeneous for reliable analysis.

Local Jewish communities have increasingly recognized that if meeting service needs and planning for the future are to be effective, they must be based on comprehensive, accurate assessments of the population. Individual communities have therefore turned increasingly to the community population survey as a source of information for self-evaluation and planning. Since 1980, about 45 such studies have been initiated. As a result, about three-quarters of the total Jewish American population has been surveyed. Some communities have already surveyed themselves twice and a few, like Boston, have done so three times. Through these surveys, we know more than ever about ourselves.

Yet our knowledge is incomplete. In part, this is because we have not yet fully developed or adopted standardized procedures for asking questions, and for tabulating and analyzing the survey data. In part, it reflects the variation in sampling designs that are used. Some surveys rely exclusively or heavily on lists of families known to the local Federations, and these tend to be strongly biased in favor of those who contribute to fund-raising efforts or are otherwise closely identified with the community. In others, and fortunately a growing number, efforts are made to obtain a fully representative sample by reliance on random selection from within the larger community. This heterogeneity in approaches makes it still difficult and sometimes impossible to compare results across communities, either to get a better understanding of a particular community or to obtain insights into the national American Jewish community. Concerted efforts to correct this situation are in process through the activities of the Federation-sponsored National Technical Advisory Committee on Population Studies (NTAC) and the North American Jewish Data Bank (NAJDB) (Goldstein, 1985).

While standardization of concepts and methods will go far in allowing better assessment of both the local and the national situation, exclusive reliance on local community studies still fall short of fully meeting the needs of a comprehensive assessment of the national situation. Not all communities undertake studies or do so within the same period of time. As a result, gaps still exist in our knowledge of the situation in medium and small sized communities and of the effect of regional location. Also, to the extent that the situation in Jewish communities is a dynamic one, it may be misleading to compare or to aggregate communities whose surveys were undertaken more than a few years apart. Moreover, the key role that migration plays in affecting local characteristics, as well as the national distribution, requires national data with information covering both in- and out-migration from different types of communities.

To rely on data from individual surveys gives only a one-sided picture; such surveys encompass only those living in the community at the time of the survey and therefore provide no information on how many and which types have left, where they have gone or whether they are likely to return. The great advantage of the U.S.

decennial census is that it concurrently serves the needs of both the national society and the multiplicity of local communities. A national profile of American Jewry, based on a national survey complemented by community surveys, would serve similar purposes.

Recognizing the need for a national overview, the Council of Jewish Federations in 1970-1971 undertook the National Jewish Population Study (NJPS). This was an ambitious, important and promising attempt to conduct a nationwide survey that would be fully representative of the United States Jewish population. As a report in the 1973 *American Jewish Year Book* (AJYB) indicated, the resulting data "constitute a repository of information that will require 'mining' and interpretation for years to come" (Massarik and Chenkin, 1973). The NJPS remains largely just that — a repository. To date, comparatively few published reports, limited largely to the number and basic characteristics of the Jewish population, have been prepared based on NJPS data.

NJPS undoubtedly represents a milestone in the development of Jewish demography in the United States and the comparatively small number of analyses that were undertaken of its data have yielded important insights into the dynamics of population change (e.g., Della Pergola, 1983; Goldstein, 1982; Lazerwitz, 1978). It is also clear that it did not achieve its full potential through fuller tabulation and analysis of the most comprehensive set of data yet collected on American Jewry as a whole. Any future comparable effort must be certain to provide for fuller and more expeditious exploitation of the data.

In the absence of another NJPS, but with keen recognition of the need for national assessments of the Jewish population, individual groups and scholars have attempted to develop national samples. Steven Cohen has been in the forefront of such efforts with the studies he has undertaken for the American Jewish Committee. A number of these surveys (Cohen, 1983a, 1983b, 1985) have employed samples based on distinctive Jewish names listed in telephone directories. These names had been identified earlier from lists of persons affiliated with a wide range of Jewish organizations or activities. Whether a national sample based on such lists of strongly identified and affiliated Jews constitutes a reliable source for a representative sample of the entire American-Jewish population and especially of those at or near the margins of the community remains questionable (Goldstein, 1985). Cohen (1987) himself recognizes this danger, especially for studies that require sensitive measures, but argues that such samples are acceptable in research that attempts to delineate only broad differences or changes in attitudes or characteristics, as in the political arena.

In the more recent surveys, a stronger effort has been made to achieve less biased representation by relying on a different base for developing the sample. A Consumer Mail Panel of 200,000 households developed by a marketing and survey research firm contained 4,700 households which had been identified earlier as containing at least one member reported as currently Jewish. From the total 200,000 sample, a demographically balanced subsample (based on region, income, population density, age and household size) was developed containing over 2,000 Jewish households. A mail-out sample of 1,699 households was drawn from this group. The data collected suggest that this sample "succeeded in reaching a slightly larger number of marginally Jewish respondents" than did earlier samples based on distinctive Jewish names (Cohen, 1987).

The new sample over-represented those with a college education and under-represented those with only a high school one, as well as people in their 20s, especially those under 25. It also under-represented Orthodox households. Thus, while overcoming some of the concerns associated with the use of DJNs, this sampling approach, particularly given the self-selective character of participants in the panel, gives rise to new concerns. As Cohen (1987:91) stresses, "there is no completely satisfactory way to sample American Jews nationwide, and no single method yields a representative group at a reasonable cost." This presents a major challenge to any effort to undertake a national survey.

Nevertheless, any future national survey that is undertaken will benefit immensely by the vast improvements in sampling and survey procedures that have occurred since the 1970-1971 NJPS was undertaken and by the experience gained from the large number of Jewish community surveys completed since then, as well as from other more limited efforts to collect national data. Moreover, the much stronger professional credentials in recent years of the planning and research staffs of local agencies, the CJF and other national agencies means that there is both a greater appreciation of the need for data of high scientific quality and a far greater potential for knowing how to use such data effectively for research and planning purposes.

Based on both our experience with community studies and our recognition that, in fact, a national Jewish community has evolved in the United States that requires national assessment, a strong case exists for undertaking around 1990, and on a regular basis thereafter, a national survey of the Jewish population. Such a national profile is essential for planning by national Jewish organizations. It is also crucial for use by individual communities as a standard against which to measure their own populations so as to better understand the dynamics of local change, the ways in which the local structure helps to explain unique features of the local community and the directions in which the local community may change as indicated by developments on the national scene.

Such a national profile is also essential in any assessment of the position of Jews worldwide and in evaluating concerns expressed about future growth patterns of the American and the world's Jewish population. The results of such a national survey would provide the foundation for research and for formulation and evaluation of policies to cope with the demographic challenges faced locally, nationally and internationally, particularly in areas of concern related to the strength of Jewish identity and the vitality of the community.

A national survey gives rise, of course, to an infinite number of concerns related to sample design, questionnaire contents, tabulations and analysis plans, relation of the national survey to community surveys and financing. These can be touched on only briefly here.

Given its purpose, a national sample clearly has to encompass communities of all sizes, from large through small cities down to small towns, and ideally even to isolated Jews. A major goal, therefore, has to be to cover Jews operating in the core of the community as well as those at its very margins, as judged by degree of identification. This presents major challenges with respect to how the universe to be sampled can be identified.

Alternative sampling techniques are being explored. One approach would depend on combined use of Federation membership lists and RDD (random digit dialing) to insure coverage of unlisted Jews. Another approach is exclusive reliance on a custom designed RDD sample, but this would not be the most cost effective alternative due to the very large number of households that would have to be screened to identify a sample of approximately 2,000 households containing Jewish members. A third possibility, and one which seems the most economical and optimal alternative, is to rely upon a weekly or biweekly national omnibus survey regularly conducted by selected survey organizations to screen for eligible Jewish households and to use the sample cumulated over a 10-12-month period (with proper tracking to maintain contact with units over this period) as the basis for the in-depth survey of the Jewish population. The initial screening will identify households containing (1) persons who currently consider themselves Jewish; and (2) those who do not regard themselves as currently Jewish or had a Jewish mother and/or father. In this way, the survey will encompass the fullest range of "Jewish" households and persons, allowing through appropriate tabulations comparisons of subsegments of the population which vary in the degree of their Jewish identification.

The NTAC of CJF has already drafted a core questionnaire to serve as a standard instrument in community surveys; it can also serve as a core for a national survey. It represents the consensus of a group of experts (scholars and planners) on the basic data needed to undertake assessment of the population and, through standard wording, to pursue comparative evaluations with census data and across communities. Individual communities and any national survey are, of course, free to add to the core in directions dictated by their own data needs. This core encompasses the range of census-type questions related to age, sex, household relations, marriage/divorce, fertility, labor force, education, income and migration. It also includes items related to Jewish identification and behavior: Jewish education, religious practices, intermarriage and conversion, organization/synagogue membership, philanthropy and ties to Israel. The core, which is estimated to require 30-35 minutes to administer by telephone, should serve excellently as the basis of a national survey questionnaire. It covers the key socio-demographic concerns and, by its standardized character, would provide national data with which the information collected in individual communities can be compared, once such communities adopt use of the "core questionnaire." (A number have already used questions identical or quite similar to those proposed for the core.)

The creation by CJF and the effective functioning of the North American Jewish Data Bank and the National Technical Advisory Committee on Population Studies augurs well for the success of any effort to undertake a National Population Study. The Committee, consisting of leading scholars and planners concerned with the Jewish population, provides a reservoir of expertise for the design of a national study and a pool of committed scholars who are prepared to undertake analysis of the resulting data, partly through an overview assessment of the study population and partly through a series of monographs focussing on particular aspects of the demographic features and the Jewish identification of the population.

The Data Bank has already gained considerable experience in the collection of

The Data Bank has already gained considerable experience in the collection of data sets from individual communities, in enhancing their comparability, and in their use in comparative analysis. Its staff has cooperated closely with members of the NTAC in developing the core questionnaire and can be counted upon to support all efforts to launch and successfully complete a national survey.

Execution of a survey in or about 1990 has the particular advantage of enhancing the value of the survey results by allowing maximum comparability in contents and timing with the data from the 1990 federal decennial census. The core questionnaire already resembles the census in areas of overlapping concern. Calvin Goldscheider (1983) has argued strongly for the need to assess the Jewish population in comparison with non-Jews in the community of which they are a part in order to provide us with a standard against which to measure the structure and dynamics of the Jewish population. Simultaneous or near-simultaneous execution of a national survey and the census provides an opportunity to do so, and at no additional cost to the Jewish study.

Such simultaneity may be particularly important for local communities, where the number of cases covered by the census is adequate to allow comparisons. It might otherwise be difficult to fund a special non-Jewish survey large enough to permit meaningful comparisons. Still another argument favoring a survey in 1990 is that the 20 years between it and NJPS would serve as a good interval for assessing basic changes in the characteristics of the national population. Scheduling the survey in 1990 also contributes to regularizing such a survey by enhancing the likelihood that it will be taken concurrent with succeeding decennial censuses.

A final point favoring a survey in 1990 is that internationally, most countries conduct their national censuses around that year. If, in turn, national Jewish surveys worldwide took place at about the same time, comparability would be ensured not only with the respective censuses in each country but internationally with other surveys of Jewish populations.

It must be stressed that a national survey does not preclude conducting community surveys concurrently. To the contrary, two strong arguments can be cited for doing so: (1) As Waksberg (1987) has pointed out, we cannot rely exclusively on local studies to produce national statistics due to the selective omission of smaller places and rural areas from the roster of community studies; however, a plausible statistical system might cumulate the sample data for a group of communities and conduct a national sample survey in the balance of the country. Standardization (comparability) in sample design and in core questionnaire contents would, of course, be essential, as would assurance that the local data would be available for integrated use with the national survey materials. Coordination would be a key to the success of such an approach. (2) Simultaneity and comparability of a national survey and a series of community surveys would enhance the value of both for assessment of the Jewish American population. It would allow the cooperating communities to assess themselves more meaningfully in the context of the national community and to compare themselves with the concurrent situation in other communities of different or similar size and regional location. At the same time, it would add depth to the

national assessment by allowing attention to intercommunity variations that would be masked in a national sample that is necessarily too small to allow breakdowns for individual communities, except perhaps the very largest. To understand how migration, city size, regional location and other factors effect demographic structure and dynamics, as well as Jewish identity, requires information on a more local level. A national survey in conjunction with local surveys in a number of communities offers the best opportunity for such complementary analysis.

While the cost of a national survey remains to be fully determined, the general consensus is that, overlooking the costs of any local community surveys undertaken concurrently, a national survey can cost considerably less than did the NJPS in 1970 The costs will, of course, reflect the size of the national sample and the sampling procedure used in selecting it. Initial discussions have suggested that a national sample of about 2,000 would be adequate; this could be reduced somewhat if local studies are integrated, although needs for cross-tabulations by city size and region may argue against this. A national sample of 2,000 is not much greater, and in a few instances smaller, than samples recently employed by individual communities. A very preliminary estimate is that a budget of about $420,000 may suffice to cover the data collection, tabulation and analysis. The CJF, through its endowment grant program and through contributions from its local constituents, is expected to provide the major portion of the funds needed to execute the survey and to prepare the data for analysis. A larger sample to allow separate regional and metropolitan analyses would, of course, raise the costs. This assumes, too, that members of both the NTAC and the NAJDB will be committed to sharing their expertise at key stages of the research process.

Preliminary contacts with a number of scholars indicate a strong interest in preparing analytic studies in their particular spheres of interest (e.g., the family, fertility, migration, women, Jewish identity, philanthropy). A series of monographs covering these major areas of scholarly and planning interests are envisaged as the end product, with the initial analysis of the data to be used as input to the summary report to be prepared for the community at large. Of course, the data tapes will be available upon completion of the survey for use by local communities, by national organizations and by graduate students pursuing dissertation research on the Jewish population.

In sum, a national perspective is clearly essential in both research and planning. Only by recognizing the key role that has been assumed by the national community and the ways it interacts with and complements the local communities will we enhance the likelihood that national and local agencies will achieve maximum effectiveness in serving the needs of the population, in strengthening the community as a whole and in ensuring its future by providing a firmer, more realistic basis on which to plan. To achieve this goal requires a national population survey at the same time as we continue our efforts to assess and plan for local surveys. Together, the insights gained from the local and the national studies will help assure the continued vitality of the community as a whole and of its component parts.

REFERENCES

Cohen, Steven. 1983a. "The 1981-82 National Survey of American Jews," *American Jewish Year Book,* Vol 83. Philadadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, pp. 89-110.

_____. 1983b. *Attitudes of American Jews Toward Israel and Israelis: The 1983 National Survey of American Jews and Jewish Communal Leaders.* New York: American Jewish Commitee.

_____. 1985. *The 1984 National Survey of American Jews: Political and Social Outlooks.* New York: American Jewish Comittee.

_____. 1987. *Ties and Tensions: The 1986 Survey of American Jewish Attitudes Toward Israel and Israelis.* New York: American Jewish Committee.

Della Pegola, Sergio. 1983. "Patterns of American Jewish Fertility," *Demography,* 17 (August):261-273.

Fisher, Alan M. 1983. "The National Gallup Polls and American Jewish Demography," *American Jewish Year Book,* Vol. 83. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, pp. 111-126.

Goldscheider, Calvin. 1984. "Including Non-Jews in Jewish Community Samples: Substantive and Methodological Issues," in *Perpectives in Jewish Population Research,* Steven Cohen, Jonathan Woocher, and Bruce Philips, Eds. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 107-117.

Goldstein, Sidney. 1982. "Population Movement and Redistribution Among American Jews," *The Jewish Journal of Sociology,* 24 (June):5-23.

_____. 1985. "American Jewish Demography: Inconsistencies that Challenge." Paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem.

_____. 1987. "The Role and Work of the North American Jewish Data Bank," Occasional Papers No. 3. New York: North American Jewish Data Bank, pp. 3-10.

Lazerwitz, Bernard. 1978. "An Estimate of a Rare Population Group — the U.S. Jewish Population," *Demography* 15:389-394.

_____. 1986. "Some Comments on the Use of Distinctive Jewish Names in Surveys," *Contemporary Jewry,* 7:83-91.

Massarik, Fred, and Alvin Chenkin. 1973. "United States National Jewish Population Survey: A First Report," *American Jewish Year Book,* Vol. 73. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, pp. 264-306.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1958. "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States, 1957," *Current Population Reports,* Series P-20, No. 79. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Waksberg, Joseph. 1987. "Considerations in Developing a Design for a National Survey of the Jewish Population." Unpublished memorandum to NTAC.

JEWISH MEGATRENDS—PLANNING FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

STEVEN HUBERMAN, PH.D.
Executive Director for Community Services,
Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles

As we move toward the twenty-first century our unfinished business demands attention. Better solutions must be worked out to promote affiliation, strengthen Jewish education, increase our financial resources, expand our leadership base, and reach out to those most physically at risk.

"Scientists alone can establish the objectives of their research but society, in extending support to science, must take account of its own needs."

John F. Kennedy

Either Einstein or Santayana reportedly said: "We cannot know who first discovered water, but we can be sure it was not the fish."[1] But why not the fish? It is because water surrounds them. They swim, breathe, and taste the water. Water is too commonplace to be noticed. It may be that only when the fish is trapped in the net of a fisherman, out of its element, that the revelation occurs.

We in Jewish public life are sometimes like the fish. We are so caught up in the routine of the workday world that we neglect to pause to see the big picture. The purpose of this paper is to look ahead, to identify several of the key overarching planning issues that we must confront over the next fifteen years and to isolate policy domains that can be illuminated by research.

In particular, I will plot out, from my perspective, central community planning needs of United States Jewry. I begin with an analysis of how research can make a difference and the required shift from classic demographic studies to need assessment. The key research priorities I will underline are Jewish identity and affiliation; Jewish education; financial and human resource development; and at-risk populations.

CAN RESEARCH MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

The cynic defines social science as the quanitification of the obvious. Community experiences over the last decade have forced the cynic to rethink his position. Case examples from Los Angeles and New York City show the utility of action-oriented research.

ITEM: The Jews of America are "graying." Take Southern California. Through a population forecast, the Los Angeles Jewish community has determined that its elderly population will increase from 62,000 in 1981 to 93,000 in the year 2000. Based on linear interpolation, it is calculated that the greatest increase will be Jews aged 75 or

---

Based on the author's presentation to the Conference on the Demography of the Jewish People, sponsored by the Government of Israel, World Zionist Organization, The Jewish Agency, Hebrew University and the World Jewish Congress, Jerusalem, Israel, October 21, 1987.

I express my appreciation to Wayne Feinstein for reviewing this essay.

1. Harold Schulweis, "Coronary Connections—From a Hospital, Some Secrets of the Heart Revealed," *Moment* Vol. 12, No. 5 (July-August, 1987), p. 24.

over. They should grow from 21,000 in 1980 to 42,000 in 2000. These "very old" have the most physical impairments and require long-term attention. More than two-thirds of these Jewish elderly will be female, mostly widowed and living alone.

Based also on City of Los Angeles geographic data, the Federation charted new residence patterns. Today, one-half of the Jewish elderly reside in metropolitan Los Angeles, especially in the Beverly-Fairfax area and West Hollywood. In the year 2000, these areas should witness a 38 percent decline among those over the age of 55. The Northwest San Fernando Valley, on the other hand, should experience a 48 percent increase and the West Valley a 38 percent increase by the year 2000. Geographic clustering will be replaced by greater dispersal. Locally based services therefore will become important.

Today, 80 percent of the care provided to seniors comes from families. The Los Angeles studies show this trend reversing itself. More geographic mobility will result in children being separated from their parents. There will be fewer adult children due to the current and past lower birthrates. Since Jews are living longer, care must be provided over longer time spans. Adult elderly children will be called upon to take care of elderly parents. With more women in the work force, these traditional care givers are less available. Such trends mean that by the year 2000 elderly Jews will become more reliant on the community to help them.

Utilizing such data, coupled with economic and health care trendlines, the Los Angeles Federation instituted an Aging Services Action Plan for the year 2000. The result is a comprehensive Jewish Services for the Aging Association and the formulation of concrete plans for care coordination, community-based services, residential care, and housing. Scientifically collected data provided the essential foundation for this innovative effort.[2] The focus is beyond today. The focus is on tomorrow.

ITEM: Arrive at JFK International Airport. Your taxi driver will frequently have the name Ya'akov or Shmuel. Purchase a diamond ring on 47th Street in New York. The jeweler will often speak Hebrew. Shop in Brooklyn or Queens or visit Columbia University. You will see and hear Israelis.

The first step in reaching out to New York's Israelis was to learn more about them. Based on the New York Jewish Population Study and the Public Use Microdata Sample of the 1980 decennial census, there are at least between 35,000–40,000 Israeli nationals living in the New York area. They tend to live in the suburbs; are aged between 25 to 44; are in the United States since the 1970's; are likely to be married—about one-half married to Americans—and two-thirds are U.S. citizens. Many Israelis who felt underachieved at home are willing to risk becoming self-employed in the States.

Their Jewishness is complicated. (see Table 1)

Israelis in New York are likely to be more clannish and "Orthodox leaning" than American Jews. Although they selectively practice rituals, many are not affiliated and only one in four children of Israelis are in Jewish educational programs. Public schools are seen as vehicles for social integration and economic advancement.

In response to these statistical realities, the New York Federation established a Subcommittee on Services to Israelis. The stress was on children's Jewish education and their parents' community involvement. Recommendations have included Hebrew-language day schools in existing American institutions to promote interaction; establishment of a Hebrew community library; Israeli outreach events in Jewish community centers; supplementary schools for Israeli children in Great Neck and central Queens; and High Holy Day services conducted in Hebrew.

---

2. Andrew Scharlach and Larry Siegel, *Aging Services Action Plan—Final Report*, Los Angeles Jewish Federation Council, 1987. Also, *Jewish Population Forecast* prepared by Professor Georges Sabagh of UCLA.

Table 1
JEWISHNESS OF ISRAELIS IN NEW YORK AREA (IN PERCENTILES)

	Israelis	*Other New York Jews*
A. Social Indicators		
1. 3 closest friends are Jews	89	68
2. Very important to live among Jews	76	49
3. Orthodox	42	11
B. Ritual Indicators		
1. Passover Seder	93	87
2. Yom Kippur fast	86	65
3. Sabbath candles	78	35
4. Kosher meat only	52	31
Jewish Education of Children	25	40

DATA SOURCE: The Table and this section of the essay are adapted from Paul Ritterband, "Israelis in New York" and Linda Levi, "Israelis in New York and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies," and associated articles by Steven Cohen, Marcia Freedman, and Josef Korazim; in Arnold Dashefsky, editor, *Contemporary Jewry* Volume 7. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1986, pp. 111–180.

Despite the ambivalence that U.S. leadership has about Israelis, Jewish education and affiliation are non-controversial responses. This is a classic approach to planning—develop a population attitudinal and behavioral profile, establish an overall policy direction and implement/evaluate programming. As in the Los Angeles illustration, research data were the underpinning for this proposed intervention.

Jewish communities across the United States have undertaken such population studies and have integrated them into their policy-making. In every area of service delivery, demographic research provides a rational foundation for planned change.

GOING BEYOND DEMOGRAPHY

The previous illustrations deal with unmet needs. For population data to be useful it must result in:

Need Identification—describing the health and social service requirements in a geographic area, and

Need Assessment—evaluating the extent of those requirements.

In constructing need questions for surveys, we keep in mind that *perceptions* of needs may be as important as the reality. For example, a Russian Jewish immigrant may not objectively need a job placement counselor to help him find a job as an engineer. Yet his perception that the counselor can be of help may aid him in overcoming low self-esteem or vocational adjustment problems that he cannot deal with on his own. Human needs are multidimensional requiring interdisciplinary responses. As we have learned from absorbing Russian émigrés, they require a network of integrated services such as training in English as a second language, assistance in navigating the government benefits maze, and access to medical and Jewish educational facilities. Community needs are also constantly in flux. The family support network which helped older Russian émigrés become absorbed into American society in the 1970's may erode by the year 2000.

To overcome these considerations, *convergent analysis* is called for.[3] That is, a

3. To do meaningful program planning the limitations of demographic studies must be grasped. They are a form of social and health indicator analysis which must be supplemented by a review of service resources. Community views on service requirements should also be ascertained through general community forums and consultations with "key informants"—experts in the human services field. Such panels are frequently queried through the nominal group or delphi approaches. See C. Clifford Attkisson, *et al.*, *Evaluation of Human Service Programs*. New York: Academic Press, 1978 and Keith Neuber, *et al.*, *Needs Assessment—A Model for Community Planning*. Beverly Hills: Saga Publications, 1980.

variety of data sources must be used, in addition to classic population data, to design solutions to unmet needs. We set up false expectations if we view a demographic survey as a substitute for good program planning. The survey is the beginning, not the end, of the planning process. Despite this caveat, I believe population surveys can be more helpful by being more *solution oriented.* One distinguished international lay leader recently wrote to me her comments about the problems confronting Jewish education. "The challenges (confronting the Jewish community) are terribly disturbing. They cry out for action. But stating the concerns has become like the cliché about the weather—everyone talks about it but no one does anything about it. The question is not merely "can the Jewish community become sufficiently concerned to be mobilized to do something (provide the resources) about the serious threat to our future . . . But does anyone you know have ideas for solutions which, if funded, you think would have a chance to turn around/change the dismal trend?"

To deal with this lay leader's insight, we need a revised approach to our policy development. Good population studies should query Jewish residents about their awareness of existing Jewish and public services, their perceptions of those services, and their feelings about needs and problems. For example, since we spend so much money on mental health counseling for Jews, every survey should ask respondents: (a) how they would rank order the seriousness of general Jewish and community problems; (b) where they would turn for help with each of these major problems; (c) which mental health problems cause them the greatest anxiety; (d) what are their attitudes toward using non-Jewish sponsored services; as well as asking them; (e) to give a history of mental health problems in their own families; (f) to define the help received for those problems; and (g) to state the degree of satisfaction obtained from the services provided.

My view is that Jewish social and educational blueprints must emerge from such systematic, scientific need assessment efforts. Attempts to measure the extent and degree of need for specific services should be multiplied. This necessitates a careful blending of population study feedback, agency client views, and professional personnel judgments in the planning enterprise. The alternative is uncoordinated and loosely tied together programs that are duplicative and compete for limited finances.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE FUTURE

My remarks in this paper reflect my belief that we must have a strong social service delivery system in the American Jewish polity. Population studies can help chart the contours of that system. But what about the health of Judaism itself? Population research must also address the concerns of affiliation, education, and financial/leadership development.

Pockets of Jewish Energy

In previous generations, scholars such as Charles Silberman maintain, Jews were Jewish because that is "what God required"; they lived in closed communities with a set of rewards and punishments. Anti-Semites made them remember they were Jews. These basic reasons do not work today. I grew up with my *zaydeh,* Louis, in my home. My *zaydeh* went to *shul because* he was a Jew. In the year 2000 my children, Daniel and Shira, will go to *shul* to *help* them become Jewish.

My own city of Los Angeles is a precursor of changes in the making. The City of Los Angeles does herald a crisis for America's Jews.[4] In Los Angeles,

4. The warning signs of communal distancing are noted in Steven Bayme, "Crisis in American Jewry," *Contemporary Jewry* Volume 8. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1987, pp. 125–128.

- 74 percent of the Jews are not affiliated with a congregation;
- 73 percent do not belong to any Jewish organizations;
- Almost 40 percent are marrying persons born non-Jewish.

A priority for research should, therefore, be Jewish identification projects. Subsets of persons who have been selected for a population study should be resurveyed at regular time frames. It would be especially useful to oversample Jewish communal drop-ins and drop-outs. The drop-ins or *baalei teshuva* (B.T.'s) and those who are distancing themselves from Judaism can illuminate what we are doing, right or wrong.

We read in Rilke's *Seventh Elegy*, "Each torpid turn of the world has disinherited children, to whom no longer what's been, and not yet, what's coming belongs."[5] Many of these B.T.'s, protesting youth, are looking for a sense of community and spirituality. *Yeshivot* for newcomers use aggressive marketing and salesmanship. These people-changing institutions provide an alternative to the "emptiness of life." They give purpose, order, and direction to the seekers. Jews who have gone through such transformations should be studied and the learning transferred to other venues.

The hunger for community has led Jews to Jewish weekend retreats, family life programs, and *havurot*. There are many as 3,000 synagogue-based havurot and hundreds of independent ones. These are concrete examples of Jewish living. Persons who have participated in such groups, who appear in population surveys, should also be resurveyed. Charismatic rabbis and teachers are returning Jews to Judaism. Research can tell us if this is more than a passing episode.[6]

Recently, the Cleveland Federation established a Commission on Jewish Continuity. Work groups have been formed on parent and family education, non-formal programs, personnel, and a "blue sky" task force which is examining the structural configuration of the system. Such local activities could be enhanced by national Jewish identity research.

OUR CHILDREN ARE OUR GUARANTORS

The "world of our fathers" was not the golden age of Jewish religious education. For example, in 1909, when Eastern European Jewish immigration was at a peak, a mere 25 percent of New York children received any Jewish education. "Making it" meant the socio-economic climb. Public education, not *yiddishkeit*, was the passport out of the ghetto. In the 1930's the situation was no better. Today, about one child in two receives some religious education.

Table 2 reveals the trends. 1962 was the peak of Jewish school enrollment. From then until 1986, supplementary schools (mid-week, afternoon, once-a-week) dropped by 55 percent. Day schools dou-

Table 2
UNITED STATES
JEWISH EDUCATION ENROLLMENT

Year	*Number in Jewish Supplementary Schools*	*Number in Jewish Day Schools*
1962	540,000	60,000
1986	240,000	130,000

5. Janet Aviad, *Return to Judaism – Religious Renewal in Israel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983, p. 1.

6. For insights on these trends see Charles Silberman, *A Certain People*. New York: Summit Books, 1985, and Harold Himmelfarb, "Research on American Jewish Identity and Identification: Progress, Pitfalls, and Prospects" in Marshall Sklare, ed., *Understanding American Jewry*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1982, pp. 56–95. My Jewish education and affiliation historical and contemporary data are based on *A Certain People* citations, unless otherwise noted. The American Jewish Committee's Communal Affairs Department has produced a monograph on these organizational innovations, "New Pockets of Jewish Energy."

bled in size. They now receive $26 million in support from local Federations, contrasted with $5.5 million for the supplementary system. Day school enrollment is growing by between 1 percent to 3 percent per year and their annual expenditures are almost $400 million.[7]

Despite this massive investment, even the day school will not succeed unless the Jewish family succeds in terms of being positive examples for their children. Jewish children in day and supplementary schools are frequently the offspring of assimilated parents, one-parent households, divorces, intermarrieds, and two working household heads. These are among important ingredients that have an effect on the ability to concentrate in class and the motivation to do well. Having grown up in a divorced, one-parent household myself, I know that home support is a critical influence on educational attainment and eventual adult behavior.

Culturally deprived Jewish children need parental Jewish reinforcement for what is learned in the classroom. Jewish parents must become full partners in the process of Jewishly educating their children. Jewish children will be better motivated to live Jewishly when they see that their parents are committed to Jewish life.[8]

Here is where specialized research, on subsamples of Jews who have been in a larger survey, is essential. The dynamics of ritual observance must be clarified. Our goal should be to know why and how parents observe certain rituals and practices—what is important and what is trival to the celebrants. People learn how to behave through the impact of role models. We should ask these parents subsamples after whom they are seeking to pattern their lives. Are rabbis and educators perceived as religious role models?

In demographic survey followups, I would also zero in on teenagers. Ask them to describe in detail *successful* experiences in Jewish schools, youth groups, and camps. We have been preoccupied with failure and should replicate educational success more. How many Jewish school graduates care deeply about Israel, or study Judaism five years after graduation? Why do some sustain their behavioral patterns in later life? Questions at this level of detail can drive decision-making. We can then configure a family support system that will nurture Jewish schools.[9]

TO GIVE LIFE—IS TO LIVE!

Elie Weisel has observed,

> Recently history has shown us that whenever he is forsaken by his own, the Jew is lost. But when he is supported by his own, he can begin again. Together, we share an extraordinary adventure, which with its joys and tears confers meaning on all of Jewish life.[10]

---

7. The tabular statistics and trendlines are based on Alvin Schiff, "The Jewish Day School—The Next Half Century," *Judaism* Vol. 36, No. 2 (Summer, 1987), pp. 220–225. The entire volume deals with "Jews and Judaism in the Twenty-First Century." It contains seminal essays.

8. Thoughful recommendations include transforming the thrust of the synagogue from supplementary education for children to Jewish family education; increasing informal educational exposure for all pupils; introducing weekend fellowship programs involving study and recreation; training and retraining family educators; and upgrading personnel career opportunities. I recommend Alvin Schiff's papers: *The Milender Lecture in Jewish Communal Leadership*. Waltham: Brandeis University, March 1986 and *Jewish Supplementary Schooling: An Education System In Need of Change*. New York: Board of Jewish Education, June 1987.

9. Refer to the articles in Sklare, *op. cit.*, particularly those by Charles Silberman, David Resnick, and Chaim Waxman. It is fascinating to contrast the troubled Jewish school system with the Japanese educational approach. Education succeeds in Japan because it means four things—high standards, sufficient financial and human resources spread evenly across the country, teachers who are esteemed, and a push for constant betterment. See Thomas Rohlen, "Why Japanese Education Works," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 65, No. 5 (September–October, 1987) pp. 42–47.

10. Abraham Karp, *To Give Life—The UJA in the*

With this theme in mind, Federation/UJA Campaigns have had sterling achievements. In 1986, 147 federated campaigns in the United States and Canada raised over $735 million. Typically, 30 percent to 40 percent of American Jewish households contribute, 50 percent when Israel is in jeopardy. In older established communities, 50 percent to 75 percent of the Jews often make commitments. In smaller Jewish populations, more Jews know each other and giving is almost universal. For example, approximately 75 percent to 80 percent make a commitment in a midwestern city which has 900–1000 Jewish households. In addition, by the year 2000, there may be as much as a $3 billion pool of Federation endowments and individual philanthropic funds. Through the vision of campaigners, *tzedaka* has taken on new giving horizons in North America.[11]

Table 3 traces the major revenue sources for the Jewish community. To finance local, national, and international obligations, such campaign resources must continue to grow. United Way and endowments must also rise. The Council of Jewish Federations Campaign Planning Advisory Committee has pinpointed ways and means to strengthen campaign resource development. The aspects of the Federation's structure which are basic to fund-raising success are these:

1. Federations which are perceived as the "central address" of the Jewish community do well each year. Good public relations is backed up by performance.

2. Veteran leadership continue to be prominent in the annual campaign and in key decisions.

3. Systematic leadership development is conducted for all age groups. Key potential leaders receive special targeting.

4. Past presidents and past campaign

Table 3
TOTAL CAMPAIGN ACHIEVEMENTS

	1977 Achievement	*1986 Achievement*	*Percent of Change*
Atlanta	$ 3,980,000	$ 8,610,000	116.3
Baltimore	10,275,656	17,691,802	72.2
Bergen County	6,100,952	8,200,000	34.4
Boston	14,035,440	22,310,000	59.0
Chicago	27,985,995	44,404,822	58.7
Cleveland	16,502,425	22,795,816	38.1
Denver	4,400,000	6,339,000	44.1
Detroit	16,490,000	23,500,000	42.5
Los Angeles	27,236,017	44,122,060	62.0
MetroWest	11,878,869	17,047,000	43.5
Miami	14,500,000	20,519,610	41.5
New York	83,400,000	124,000,000	48.7
Philadelphia	16,649,684	27,127,012	62.9
Pittsburgh	6,120,461	8,900,000	45.4
St. Louis	5,602,200	8,348,086	49.0
San Francisco	10,000,000	17,100,000	71.0
Washington, DC	9,825,760	16,500,000	67.9
TOTAL	$284,983,459	$437,515,208	53.5
CPI 1977 = 100; 1986 = 177.5			

NOTE: Table 3 is reprinted with permission of Barry Kosmin, *Special Tabulations for 17 U.S. Large-City Federations—Comparing 1977 and 1986 Statistical Returns to CJF*, New York: Council of Jewish Federations, September, 1987.

Shaping of the American Jewish Community. New York: Schocken Books, 1981, p. 75. Karp's book chronicles the UJA's history, its far-reaching achievements in raising money and Jews.

11. Stanley Horowitz, "Fund Raising in the Future," in *Judaism, op. cit.*, pp. 158–161 and Silberman, *op. cit.*, pp. 159–220. Both pieces elucidate how the slogan "We are One" has been operationalized. The latter has the source material on campaign and leadership participation trends to which I refer in the essay.

chairs are held in high regard and are given special developmental tasks.

5. New board members are recruited as a reward for excellence. New campaign prospects are constantly sought and workers are esteemed for their help.

6. High quality staff are cultivated.[12]

The best achieving communities are very planful. Six to nine months before the conclusion of the current campaign, next year's strategies are formulated. The Federation boards are the pacesetters for the overall effort—giving from 20–25 percent of the total result and taking on major assignments. Large contributors play an especially vital role in solicitation and policy-making.

In one recent campaign, the first 74 gifts in a major city were more than $9.7 million, an increase of 4 ½ times over the previous year. About 7,000 people in the United States give $10,000 or more to Federation/UJA. This 1 percent of donors accounts for 60 percent of the funds collected.

Building on these accomplishments, long-range campaign planning should be initiated in more communities. Organizational goals for the next 3–5 years must be in place. Blue ribbon committees need research data to help them move ahead in setting multi-year plans to enlarge the financial base.[13]

Research data can be instrumental in answering a variety of long range campaign planning questions:

- What are the community's specific unmet service and capital needs?
- What changes are occurring in the distribution of wealth? Occupations? Female work force participation?
- What are the attitudes toward Israel? How are these feelings impacting on fundraising?
- What are the perceptions of the Federation? Its annual campaign? Local agencies?
- Who are the undergivers? Non-givers? What would motivate them to give to capacity? Who are the best giving prospects in the donor market?

Research can be of aid in facilitating the raising of more dollars, obtaining more commitments and involving more people in the campaign.

LEADING OTHERS

Saadia, the Jewish philosopher, declared 1,000 years ago, "God never leaves his people without leaders to instruct and elevate them, that thereby their condition may be improved."[14] A key element in our "unfinished business" is, in addition to campaign, leadership development.

Between 50,000 to 75,000 Jews are active participants in Federation/UJA campaigns. Thoughout the country over 3,000 individuals are in Federation-sponsored leadership training programs. In one recent month, 38,000 volunteers in 135 communities took part in Super Sunday (a pledge solicitation event). Missions to Israel have exceeded 4,000 annual participants.

We must insure the expanded flow of these volunteers to Federations, synagogues, and other communal organizations. How can it be done? Interestingly, excellent lay leadership gravitate to excellent professionals, and vice versa. Jewish organizations with the most dynamic lay people also have the most dynamic professional

12. Wayne Feinstein, *Building Stronger Federation Campaigns*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.

13. I appreciate Robert Hiller's sharing with me his knowledge on the evolving levels of community financial building. The questions which can be illuminated by research are discussed in *Long Range Campaign Planning*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations, 1985.

14. Robert Gordis, "Scanning the Future," in *Judaism, op. cit.*, p. 134.

expertise. Extremely busy and prestigious volunteers want to make sure decisions are carried out with skill and success. Likewise, self-assured professionals seek out the highest achieving volunteers. The best attract the best in what has been described as a process of "shared fate."[15]

Federations have excelled in this effort by identifying and training Jews aged 20's and 30's, attracting those in their 30's and 40's who have achieved in areas other than the Jewish community, and deepening the commitment of those already involved. A key has been learning through doing—community service is seen as a training experience.

Research can provide direction in this area as well. We should conduct in-depth interviews with selected target groups that emerge from a more general demographic survey. We need to know more about Jews who have dropped out of leadership; Jewish leadership in non-Jewish community institutions, such as museums and universities; children of past and current leadership; and leadership-capable Jews who could be encouraged to "transfer" from one Jewish organization to another. *Focused group research* on Jewish currently involved should deal with their:

(a) Motivation—what sustains their continued participation and how did they enter the system;

(b) Training—what do they see as the ingredients for productive leaders; what do they need to know to function better; and

(c) Outreach—what could be done to broaden the leadership cadre?[16]

WHERE THERE IS NO BREAD, THERE IS NO TORAH

In our quest to bolster our knowledge foundation on Jewish affiliation, we should bear in mind the Talmudic caution. A vibrant Jewish community must be certain its members are Jewishly connected and live in dignity.

In my estimation, two groups merit special investigation in the next decade—the elderly and the disabled. They are most at risk.[17]

As noted previously, it is expected that the proportion of chronically ill elderly will grow over the next 15 years. They will be discharged from hospitals more quickly because of medical reimbursement policy (DRG's). Today, the elderly spend about $1,700 in out-of-pocket health care expenditures. By 1990, the old, especially those over age 75, will be forced to pay for almost 40 percent of all health care costs, 66 percent of drugs, and 55 percent of nursing home care.

If current trends continue, third party payers, such as insurance companies, will use pre-admission screening, nursing homes, and social service providers to reduce inpatient and expensive long-term care. Cutbacks in public funding will result in a greater reliance on the Jewish sector.

In response to these conditions, some Jewish communities are establishing separate independent corporations for the *non*-poor elderly. In one city, a Jewish hospital, a public university, a Jewish family service, and a Jewish home for the aging are joining together in such an

15. How Federations function in human resources is assessed in Philip Bernstein, *To Dwell In Unity—The Jewish Federation Movement in America Since* 1960. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1983.

16. A systematic approach is developed in the *Report of the Task Force on Human Resources Development*. Los Angeles: Jewish Federation Council, 1987. Steven Cohen's recent focus group research on senior Jewish educators is a prototype for this data gathering approach. Professor Cohen's work was carried out for the Jewish Agency.

17. In previous publications, I have articulated my views regarding our knowledge base on the elderly and near poor. Although I am reiterating the attention which should be riveted on the aged, vigilance with respect to the Jewish impoverished should continue. They are growing not decreasing in number. See Steven Huberman, "Jews in Economic Distress," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. 62, No. 3 (June, 1986) and Steven Huberman, "Growing Old in Jewish America," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Summer, 1984).

association.[18] They will seek private sector financing to market a range of residential, in-home, and medical services. Reimbursement will be secured from third-party payers. Profits from payments by non-poor Jews will be used to subsidize services for the Jewish poor and near-poor.

These business experiments for the aged require population research in phase one. Jewish elderly, who appear in our surveys, should be questioned about their current use and need for the specific services being contemplated. Research on market demand and potential utilization are necessary for a complete business plan.

In addition to the elderly, the developmentally disabled merit special attention. Their needs only recently have become prominent on the communal agenda. I would not presume to speak for them. Sarah, in *Children of a Lesser God,* declares:

> "Nobody is going to speak for me anymore . . . For all my life people have spoken for me." *She* says; *she* means; *she* wants. As if there were no "I".[19]

Consequently, I will pose the questions which we should ask the disabled themselves. Their plight was set forth in a poster produced by NETWORK. A magnificent temple is pictured. It has steep, big, concrete steps on the way up to its huge doors. At the bottom is a Jew looking up, puzzled and angry. He is in a wheelchair. He cannot get into the synagogue. The poster has the ironic 118th Psalm found in Hallel, *Pithu li sha'arei zedek* ("Open to me the gates of righteousness"). The reality is far too often that disabled Jews are segregated. They frequently cannot get into organized Jewish life.

Preliminary study indicates that there is a significant number of disabled persons in the Jewish community. They are spread across socio-economic and denominational segments. In caring for them, families experience a substantial degree of monetary and emotional challenge. Jewish education often is secured only through expensive private tutorials. They must have daily in-home attention and programs constructed for their special needs. Before we can more properly service this group, we need a better profile of the disabled.

In order to have a frame of reference, there are components to a working definition of developmental disability. (1) it is attributable to a mental or physical impairment, or both; (2) it is manifest before the age of 22; (3) it is likely to continue indefinitely; (4) it results in substantial limitations in three or more major life activities, such as self-care, receptive and expressive language, learning, mobility, self-direction and capacity for independent living or economic self-sufficiency; and (5) it requires treatment or services for an extended or lifelong duration. Examples include mental retardation, autism, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and neurological impairments.

Jews who participate in our population studies and who meet these criteria should be resurveyed in greater depth to assess their needs. An excellent model to explore the concerns of the group has been developed by the United Jewish Federation of MetroWest (New Jersey) and the Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University. Their instrument asks the disabled and their families: who provides assistance; what type of help is not being received; what are the blockages to synagogue attendance and Jewish education; what employment limitations exist; and what services are needed. The New Jersey inquiry found that the most critical services, in order of importance, are counseling; social and recreational programs; and

---

18. Scharlach and Siegel, *op. cit.*

19. Alan Henkin, "Visions of Interdependence," *Judaism*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (Fall, 1983), p. 452. Rabbi Henkin cites Judaic sources on why the disabled should be integrated better into the community.

a group home. This analysis should be replicated throughout the United States.[20]

IN CONCLUSION

I am amused by this story. A rabbi tried to convince a gentleman to join his congregation. The man told him, "I appreciate the importance of religion, but I don't believe in *organized* religion." To which the rabbi replied, "You'll love our synagogue; it's completely disorganized."[21]

In reality, the American Jewish polity is very well organized. My view is that population research can add greater depth and understanding to our organizational structure. Demographic studies and follow-up research have made a major impact on how we do things. Illustrations to which I have referred from New York, New Jersey, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and elsewhere, substantiate that scientific data can make a decisive difference.

The Jewish people and Judaism in the United States have never been stronger. Larger numbers of Jews are engaged in a cultural and religious revival. Conversion to Judaism is on the upswing. A Jew can secure virtually any job, including that of chief executive of the Dupont Corporation or U.S. Secretary of State. And over 40 percent of Jewish households in many cities—four times the percentage of non-Hispanic whites—earn $50,000 or more. That is the good news.

Conversely, we *are* experiencing major problems that undermine Jewish life. As we move toward the twenty-first century, our unfinished business demands attention. Better solutions must be worked out to promote affiliation, strengthen Jewish education, increase our financial resources, expand our leadership base, and reach out to those most physically at risk. Need assessment research can drive this decision-making. It can promote rational social change.

When I study the biblical portion *Kedoshim*, I recall the statement of Dag Hammarskjold,

> "In our time, the road to holiness necessarily passes through the world of action."[22]

For us Jews that has always been the road to holiness.

---

20. The abbreviated working definition and the policy recommendations are in Gary Tobin, *A Needs Assessment Study for the Developmentally Disabled Jewish Population of MetroWest, New Jersey*. Waltham: Brandeis University, 1987. Note Peter Schaktman, "UAHC Network for Special Needs," *Reform Judaism*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Fall, 1987), p. 14.

21. Sidney Greenberg, *Lessons for Living—Reflections on the Weekly Bible Readings on the Festivals*. New York: Hartmore House, 1985, p. 67.

22. Greenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 98.