

## What We Know and What We Need To Know About the Status of Jewish Social Research\*

DR. DANIEL J. ELAZAR

Professor and Director of the Center for the Study of Federalism,  
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania†

*Jews in general tend to be mavens. For mavens by their very nature research is usually something unnecessary. If you are a maven you already know all the answers and paying somebody to write them down in a monograph or with statistics does not seem to make much sense. The problem of anybody engaged in Jewish social research is that he has to convince mavens that there are limits to mavenology. I believe that the Jewish community has just reached the point where it is possible to demonstrate properly that there are such limits. The reason that the Jewish community today has reached that point has to do with the character of social research as an enterprise.*

### Why Social Research?

There are some who think that social research is simply an indulgence of an affluent society, that is to say, enough money is available in our society to enable some people to get other people to provide funds for them to do social research instead of going fishing or collecting pictures of antique railroad trains. I would suggest that, quite to the contrary, social research is a very necessary part of modern society. (Indeed, it is because the United States is the first—and most—modern country in the world that it is the country *par excellence* for social research.)

Social research as we know it is a modern phenomenon. Not that people before the modern era did not study social phenomenon. We know that at least going back to Aristotle there were systematic studies, but they analyzed social phenomena as philosophers and not as researchers. Research is a different kind of activity. Hopefully, some researchers are intelligent enough to be philosophic about what they do, but research itself is a different

\* Presented at the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Miami Beach, Florida, November 22, 1975.

† Also: Professor of Political Studies and Director of the Institute of Local Government, Bar-Ilan University; Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Center for Jewish Community Studies.

activity, one that emerges from the modern setting precisely because modern society is a very complex phenomenon, requiring highly systematic and professionalized exploration even to keep track of all that goes on within it.

Until about the middle of the nineteenth century it was possible for a very intelligent man with the proper philosophic bent to look around at the world and to be a kind of *super-maven*—to analyze currents and trends and to pull together what information was necessary to understand the world in which he was living. Since then, this has become less and less possible. The heightened complexity of the modern world has required people who devote themselves professionally to examining what is happening within it.

### Social Research as Exploration

One of the principal characteristics of the modern world is that it is a world in which the conquest of frontiers have been an integral part of the human enterprise. Exploration of those frontiers has been an absolute necessity for progress to continue to be made. This frontier phenomenon was originally manifested in the exploration of the great land frontiers of North and South America, Australia, and Southern Africa by Europeans who came to discover what was there and by doing so opened the doors to the settlement and to the taming of those frontiers—the

classic land frontiers so celebrated in the mythology of America. Later this kind of frontier enterprise was continued in the realm of technology on an urban-industrial frontier that was an outgrowth of the land frontier. Scientists explored steam in the eighteenth century so inventors could invent steam engines and entrepreneurs could use those engines to build railroads and transform the world. In the nineteenth, scientists explored other sources of energy leading to the invention of the internal combustion engine and the automobile and, ergo, another transformation of the world. Over the course of the past centuries, this kind of frontier exploration has become vital to the continuation of social and human progress, even multiplying in its impact in the twentieth century.

Social research is another form of frontier exploration which is part and parcel of the modern scene. Contemporary man is engaged in a constant movement into the unknown. Whether that movement represents progress or not is a matter of debate, but we can all agree that it is a movement into the unknown. And somebody must chart that unknown in order to enable us to cope with it. That is the primary task of social research. Thus it is no accident that social research emerged in the world in the last one hundred years, precisely at the point where the world became so complex that it was impossible for *mavenology* to provide humans moving into the unknown with sufficient information, with sufficient sense as to who they were and where they were, to enable them to begin to cope.

In short, the problem of complexity has given rise to a knowledge problem which requires people to devote themselves to social exploration in systematic ways so that those who are coming along as the pioneers, as the settlers, will have the information necessary at their disposal, to know where to go and to have some idea of what they are going to find when they get there. The social researcher is one kind of explorer, one of the explorers of the unknown into which humanity seems to be continually moving. And as the reality of this

unknown has become more apparent to policy makers, social research has become more widely supported and its products have become more widely used (even if not always in the ways that social researchers would hope).

Until recently, the Jewish community remained small enough so that it did not reach this stage of complexity. It was still possible in a community of some millions for a good *maven* to have a good understanding of what went on. But the Jewish community in the world, and in the United States, has now crossed the threshold past which social research—systematic exploration—is an utter necessity. I think that the record speaks for itself in this regard.

### Social Research as Check and Balance

There is one other goal of social research that is more particularly geared to the Jewish community, although it applies elsewhere as well. Precisely because knowledge must be acquired systematically, it has become easier for those who are engaged in the day-to-day activities of conducting the public's business to monopolize what knowledge there is. They may not have good knowledge, but whatever knowledge they have, they tend to monopolize because they are working with it every day. The rest of us are not.

One of the major problems that legislators have encountered all over the world is that when they confront the executive branches of government, the executive branches have knowledge, information—intelligence, as it were, in the military sense—and they do not. That is doubly true of the relationship between publics and governments. Governments have intelligence, information, and the publics do not. Hence a second role for social research has begun to emerge, to serve as part of the checks and balances system that keeps the leadership attuned to the people whom it is designed to serve by providing information, not only for those who are making the decisions but for those who are watching the making of decisions. Given the structure of the

Jewish community, that is a particularly important role for Jewish social research.

Thus social research is acquiring a political as well as a sociological function. In the Jewish community where we do not have representative government and the relationship of the Jews to the community does not even allow the institution of representation except indirectly, social research becomes an important element, it seems to me, in the creation of checks and balances for the community.<sup>1</sup>

### The Development of Jewish Social Research

Jewish social research began as an offshoot of the scientific study of Jewish history, the so-called *Wissenschaft* (science of Judaism) school of Jewish history founded in the nineteenth century. One of the purposes of the study of Jewish history along scientific principles was to summarize the Jewish experience before the Jews disappeared. Most German and Central European Jewish scholars of the mid-nineteenth century saw Judaism on its way out, following on the heels of the demise of the Jewish people as a corporate entity. Hence they saw it as their contribution to Jewish history and to mankind to summarize the record of the Jewish experience as systematically as possible to give the Jewish people a decent burial, as it were. As a result, their work had a certain apologetic tone, as if to say, "Here is the record of our civilization in the several thousand years that we were around; keep it in your libraries so that when you study the glory that was Greece in the future, you will also be able to study the glory that was Israel."

Systematic research into Jewish society grew out of that effort. The research itself produced several important results, among them a body of Jewish scholars who knew what systematic research was and, at the same time, an

<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere I have discussed why the American Jewish community cannot be constructed on a representative basis, see my chapter on "Decision-Making in the American Jewish Community" in David Sidorsky, ed., *The Future of the Jewish Community in America* (New York: 1973).

increasing awareness that it was too early to bury the Jewish people. By the turn of the century, more or less, this led to the emergence of applied social research into the contemporary condition of the Jewish community. In other words, once a few of those people who had learned to study systematically Jewish matters recognized that the Jews were likely to be around for a while, following their explorers' inclinations, they began to ask questions about the problems and activities of their contemporaries as well as of Jews in the past. The effort to answer those questions led to the emergence of applied social research on the Jews.

Three forms of applied social research emerged. One was demography. As Jews became free to move around and did so, changing their locations in the world and within their respective countries, and also as they became free to decide whether to affiliate with the Jewish community or not, it became necessary to try to find out systematically who identified as Jews, what was their economic status, their birthrate, their age distribution, where were they living, where were they moving, and so forth. Out of this emerged what we now know as demographic research. While initiated by the researchers themselves, for the most part this research was designed to help Jewish community leaders simply to know where the Jews were and what they were doing. In most cases, it took the leadership a long time to appreciate its value. Demography was the first and still remains the best funded form of Jewish research because it deals with a problem that is interminably with us, particularly in the United States where, lacking "Jewish" questions in the U.S. Census, we cannot easily know who are the Jews and what they are doing. The fact that the largest American Jewish social research project to date has been the national Jewish population study is testimony to the degree to which applied demographic research is considered high on the agenda of the American Jewish leadership. I haven't counted, but I would estimate that almost 50 percent of the pub-

lished Jewish social research materials that have appeared today are on demographic topics.

The second form of applied social research to emerge was what we might call the education and welfare survey. This is the kind of research that the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds helped pioneer in the 1920's. The first such research projects were undertaken by the New York Kehilla after 1909. In recognition of some specific functions the Jewish community had to undertake even in a free, voluntary society—particularly Jewish education and the provision of certain kinds of welfare and social services to the new immigrants then flooding in—and in recognition of particular problems the Jews faced in undertaking these functions, it was considered advisable to go out and study the situation. These studies were all applied in focus; they did not start by asking "Where do we want to go?" They really asked, "Where are we?" They were surveys of specific current situations in particular communities or neighborhoods at a particular moment, designed to provide some elemental tools for community planners in the Federations and their constituent agencies, to enable them to better deal with immediate problems. These surveys generally helped in determining the siting of new buildings and priorities in certain budgetary allocations. They did not generally address themselves to anything like the causes of the problems they studied but they helped in the efforts to ameliorate them.

The third form of applied research consisted of anti-anti-Semitism research. In other words, the Jewish community, as it became more sophisticated, decided that it was important to begin to understand who the anti-Semites were, where they were located, why particular situations were more prone to generating anti-Semitism, and why particular groups were more prone to anti-Semitism than others. In many respects, the anti-anti-Semitism research was the first Jewish social research to attempt to go beyond the superficial and to begin to ask fundamental questions. The American

Jewish Committee funded the famous Adorno study on the authoritarian personality back in the 1940's which was perhaps the first Jewish-funded social research project designed to get at causes. Since then, the anti-anti-Semitism research has tended to at least partly combine this effort to get at causes, at fundamental problems, with efforts to understand the current situations.

These studies marked a step forward in Jewish social research and had a very important effect on combating anti-Semitism. Part of the very good work of the community relations agencies in the post-World War II period was based on the fact that they, unlike other Jewish agencies, had some applied and even some basic research at their fingertips which enabled them to move in certain directions. I would not want to claim that social research provided the key for them to go out and correct authoritarian personalities or the like. It does not happen like that. And, of course, the situation after World War II was conducive to anti-anti-Semitism. On the other hand, the fact that the tools were there was very important in charting the way, in performing the exploratory function mentioned earlier in this article, that enabled the Jewish community relations bodies to make very substantial gains in the community relations and human relations fields. The impact of this research spilled over into American society as a whole and was substantially responsible for the success of the civil rights movement before the Supreme Court of the United States and subsequently. The Supreme Court of the United States has relied very heavily on social research, including research funded by the Jewish community relations organizations, in its decisions affecting segregation.

From applied social research we began to get the emergence of Jewish sociology. Put in an oversimplified way, there were those people who were attracted to the problems of the Jews through applied research, perhaps simply by reading applied research, who began to recognize that there are fundamental questions deserving exploration, questions that were

intellectually interesting and socially useful, and they began to study those questions.\* While there were studies before his work, it is not unfair to say that Marshall Sklare is the father of American Jewish sociology. European Jewry had had its sociologists even earlier, men like Jacob Letschinsky, Arthur Ruppin and Arieh Tartakover. They went through this whole process about a generation or two before we did. But Marshall Sklare was the first to say to the American world, as it were, "Jewish life is a subject deserving of systematic investigation for its own sake and, like any other aspect of sociology, its study can be both intellectually interesting and socially useful." A number of other people began to come forward at approximately the same time or shortly thereafter who, while making less of a career in the field than he did, did do studies, particularly community and identity studies which represented a step forward in the effort to understand how Jews were living in their communities. There were many of these studies, most focusing on such questions as inter-generational differences in Jewish identity, belief, and observance and the manifestation of those differences in different community settings. From them emerged concepts such as "the gilded ghetto" which entered the popular terminology of American Jewry. American Jewish sociology of this kind remains a very powerful and growing field; some would say that it is still in its infancy. However, it should be noted that while individual scholars were willing to undertake studies, teaching in the field was still not respectable. Between the period of the late 1940's and the early 1950's when Jewish sociology emerged as an area of research in the United States and the time when Jewish

\* I have purposely excluded studies of Jews by people like Louis Wirth who were not at all interested in the Jews as such but in other phenomena which they investigated through studies of Jews, among other groups. Many of these studies were important and even useful for Jewish social research but they did not directly advance the cause of Jewish social research, as such.

sociology became a part of the teaching curriculum of the American university and, to a lesser extent, of Jewish institutions of higher learning, something like 20 years elapsed.

Jewish sociology has become established by now and what we know of the American Jewish community today beyond the applied surveys is generally derived from it. Several genres of studies can be identified within the field. There are the community studies like Sklare's "Lakeville" series which tell us how suburban Jews live in the Chicago area; the "Crestwood Heights" study about Jews undergoing suburbanization in Toronto; or the several studies of identity and settlement of the Minneapolis Jewish community, which was a particularly attractive target for Jewish social researchers in the 1940's and 1950's. There are the institutional studies which document the emergence of the synagogue as the central point of Jewish affiliation in post-war America and how those synagogues had come to serve essentially social rather than religious functions for their members. There were the identity studies probing the psychological attachments of Jews as Jews and how Israel had become centrally important in the scheme of Jewish identity. Some of this we could sense through "mavenology" but only social research could give us a more comprehensive picture. One problem facing the social researchers is that as soon as their information gets circulated, the *mavens* appropriate it as if they knew it all along.

Sociology has been the major field for Jewish social research. It has been supplemented by social psychology and a few anthropological studies of Jewish communities. There have been less than a handful of studies of Jewish economic behavior, so little that they need not be mentioned.

We are now seeing the emergence of yet another element in the Jewish social research package, to be added on to the others, and that is the emergence of Jewish political research. Studies in this discipline have taken two forms. One is policy research, the study of how Jews as a community should cope with the political

problems that face them externally and internally. The landmark work being done in this field is that of the Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research, under its director, Ira Silverman. The kind of work they have been publishing in *Analysis* represents by far the best we have achieved to date in this field, and they are just beginning.

The second form involves research into the structure and dynamics, the organization and functions, of Jewish communities, their processes of decision-making, budgeting and the like. It, too, is just beginning to emerge, primarily through the work of the Center for Jewish Community Studies.

With the emergence of Jewish political research, we have come full circle since the Emancipation. Jewish political research has emerged because the Jews have rediscovered the Jewish polity, have rediscovered the degree to which the Jewish people is not simply a religious or cultural grouping but indeed a grouping that has its own internal lines of organization and which has political interests of its own as a group. And this, of course, comes full circle from the days of those *Wissenschaft* studies which attempted decently to bury Judaism as a community to a new time when we are looking forward to long and continued history, not without its troubles but one that requires us to explore our character, our tasks, our interests as a community and, after identifying the unknown, to move ahead into that unknown, and to confront it as best we can.

#### What Has Been Done and What Has Not

Now that we have created Jewish social research, what do we know and what don't we know? I am not going to try to provide any digest of knowledge about the Jewish community here. Time does not permit it. However, I can give at least a general description of what we know and what we do not know about certain topics.

With regard to population demography, by now we have a good idea of who we are and where we are, even if not as fully as we would

like. Perhaps the publication of the results of the National Population Study will fill in the major lacunae. However, although we know something about the trend in the Jewish birthrate (it is down, down, down), inter-marriage (it is up, up, up) and the migration of Jews (it is out, out, out), we really do not know very much about demographic trends in general.

*Identity:* In the area of Jewish identity, there have been quite a few studies of individual identity, particularly adolescent; there have even been some studies of inter-generational patterns of identity. While many specific questions remain to be answered, we have come to know in general terms what the content of Jewish identity is today. (It happens to be so shallow in most cases that it is very easy to explore). At the same time, we do not know much about what creates Jewish identity or lack of identity, and very little about trends.

*Intermarriage:* By now we know something about the rates of intermarriage but nearly nothing about its consequences. A study of the consequences of intermarriage has been launched by the American Jewish Committee but is running into unanticipated difficulties. So the latter remains an unknown area that needs to be charted.

*Anti-Semitism:* Studies of anti-Semitism have been among the very best examples of Jewish social research, both methodologically and in terms of utility. Hence we now know more or less who is anti-Semitic, how much anti-Semitism there is, what latent anti-Semitism exists, and who is prone to anti-Semitism. We do not know much about the implications of all this. The Jews were surprised, pleasantly surprised, during the last two years by the lack of anti-Semitism in American society. After the Yom Kippur War, we expected the worst and found that to most Americans oil embargoes did not make any difference in their attitudes towards Jews.

At the same time, research in this area provides us with a good example of how research results tell us one thing and then are used to communicate something else. The

ADL-sponsored University of California study of anti-Semitism in the 1960's revealed that some five percent of all American gentiles were hard-core anti-Semites, some 20 percent were open to anti-Semitism, 40 percent were really neutral, another 20 percent had moderately positive attitudes toward Jews, and some five percent were philo-Semitic. Spokesmen for the community relations agency that sponsored the study waved it around saying, "My goodness, five percent of Americans are hard-core anti-Semites, and 20 percent don't really like us very much; we've got to mount a massive campaign." Of course, the social researchers could have told them that what they had was a classic curve with the standard five percent at either extreme, 20 percent more moderate, and so forth. Given the likelihood of such a curve with regard to any such set of questions, it should not provoke any excitement. It was possible to interpret the data in two ways—the scientific and the political.

*Community Organization:* We are finally beginning to know the least little bit about the organization of our communities but still very little. We know a lot more about the Jews of Moscow than about the Jews of New York and we are expending much more time, energy and money on learning about the former than about the latter. We do not know very much at all about how the organizations work, or why particular institutions work the way they do. Here the plethora of "mavenology" has provided us with enough ideas so we can go on with our work without getting into too serious a problem at the moment. But in the long run, I do not think that is a very good way to have to deal with our problems. We know almost nothing about the implications or consequences of particular structures or forms of community organization. We do not really know whether certain structures attract certain kinds of people and exclude other kinds. For example, there has been considerable talk about how synagogue dues-structures limit membership but we really cannot say that those who are not members because they claim they cannot afford to be would want to be

members if they could. That is the kind of question that can be answered, even partially, only through research. At the present time all we have to rely upon is journalism to get some sense of people's responses to such questions. There have been no studies of the Federations as functioning organizations to see who participates and how, to examine recruitment and advancement patterns, decision-making styles, and the like. We are now beginning to explore Federation-synagogue relations but we are discussing them and only peripherally doing research into the questions they raise. In sum, we know less about Jewish community organization in the United States than we do about organized Jewish life in the USSR or in the ghettos of medieval Italy.

*Jewish Education:* We know something about who gets what. We have some statistics about how many Jewish children go to school, for how many hours, for how many years, and so on. We know much less about the implications and consequences of their Jewish education. An occasional study does try to correlate subsequent Jewish behavior, intermarriage and activity in the community with level of Jewish education, but usually on the basis of did you have any or did you have none? And not on the basis of how much did you have, under what conditions, etc. For example, we have been putting a lot of money into day schools lately but, in all honesty, we really do not know what the effects of day school education are. There have not been any really systematic and substantial follow-up studies of people who have gone through day school to see how they relate to Jewish life as compared to others. The Jewish community has accepted what may amount to a ten-fold increase in expenditures for Jewish education, because day schools are far more expensive to maintain for what in the end is nearly the same number of hours of Jewish instruction as provided in an intensive afternoon school perhaps because the latter are few and far between today and are considered too great a burden for the American Jewish child to carry.

Not only that, we also have not studied

whether the day school is the only option. For example, I am prepared to argue on the basis of very fragmentary data that we need to provide day schools even if they do not do much better than the old afternoon Hebrew schools because the contemporary American school situation does not permit the kind of intensive afternoon Hebrew schools that we once had, to which children would go four or five days a week for several hours to get as many hours as their counterparts now get in most day schools. Therefore, we have to invest much more in a day school in order to provide that kind of education at all, even if the results are no better than the afternoon school results were then. But no one has examined that either; nobody has examined the position or the possibility of Jewish education within American society, how the parents feel about that, why they send their children, why they don't, under what conditions would they. To what extent do the public schools work against the possibility of Jewish education? Nobody has even surveyed, for example, school closing hours in the afternoon, or extracurricular activities after school to see to what extent they are interfering with the possibility of sending children to a Hebrew school. We do not have simple kinds of information like that, and that is a job for social research.

*Other functions of the Jewish community:* We have scattered knowledge of specific operations but we know nearly nothing about overall needs or the effects of even specific functions. We have scattered knowledge of general patterns of decision-making in the community but little sense of the basic questions. There has emerged in the United States a Jewish civil service of major proportions, consisting of thousands of people who are employed full-time or part-time by the Jewish community. We know next to nothing about them. How did they get there, what are their interests, what attracts them, what excites them, what discourages them, what are their career patterns, how do we make certain that we have a Jewish civil service for the next generation? Fortunately, the community has

moved ahead to try to develop programs to encourage people to enter the Jewish civil service but these programs have had to be based on a hit-and-miss approach.

*Dimensions of Jewish Involvement (not only identity, but involvement):* We know next to nothing about them. We have some data now about synagogue membership. We do not even have much data over time; that means we do not know much about when people join synagogues, who leaves, why they leave, do they ever come back, what do they expect from their synagogue? We are just beginning to scratch the surface.

*Budgeting:* The Jewish community in the United States now spends hundreds of millions of dollars on its own functions, raises well over a billion dollars, and controls the expenditure of an equal amount (including federal grants to hospitals). Yet we have almost no information about budgeting processes. In this respect, we are still "flying by the seat of our pants."

This brings me to suggest in a few lines what needs to be done. We need studies of current social problems, e.g., divorce or single-parent families and their relationship to the Jewish community. The Jewish community is not normally geared to such situations but they are upon us, we have to deal with them and we have to know more about them. Since we are now alert to the problem of intermarriage, we are beginning to get some studies of its effects, but they are quite limited for lack of funds. Alcoholism is something that has been increasing in Jewish communities. These are problems that require study. Another area that needs investigation is who should support Jewish education and how? What are the effects of different forms of Jewish education? Why is synagogue membership dropping, and, indeed, is it still dropping? What is the future prognosis?

We need to broaden the scope of the research we do. Take the question of what facilities and services are needed for the aged. Individual institutions have studied this problem on a local community basis but the problem has become countrywide in scope. A

congressman from Montana once said that rural-urban migration in Montana means moving from rural Montana to Los Angeles. Now for the Jewish community, in some respects, retirement means moving from cities in the north and northeast to cities in the southern climes, the "sunbelt." Journalists have made us aware of the masses of aged Jewish poor in Miami Beach. Is there any available knowledge which would enable us to help Miami and Phoenix and Los Angeles in planning for this influx, some notion of what they can expect of an influx of people who are going to require services from the community sooner or later? Phoenix can project what exists in Phoenix, but can it figure out what is going to come from Chicago?

Similar problems exist with regard to integrating other newcomers into our communities. The Russians represent the easy case. What about the many Sephardic and Oriental Jews, some tens of thousands who have come to the United States since the 1950's? They are unknown in American Jewry because nobody has looked for them. "*Mavenology*" does not normally know of Egyptian Jews and does not bring them to the attention of the Jewish community leadership; hence they remain outside, estranged and assimilating. We have reason to believe that many of these people are assimilating rapidly and are being left out of the Jewish community entirely. Only social research can uncover their situation, their needs.

Basic issues also require study. In my opinion we must shift the focus of our studies from identity to involvement or participation. I think we have measures of identity in sufficient quantity. We have not even begun to explore or answer questions of involvement and participation. Why are some Jews involved and others not? Why do those who participate choose to do so in one arena or in another, in one set of activities or another? What do we have to know in light of this about decision-making, representation and the structure of communities? What is the influence of settlement patterns on Jewish participation?

As the Jews reach exurbia, what does this do to Jewish participation? These are questions that deserve very serious consideration.

What do we have to know about the countrywide versus local roles and services? The Council of Jewish Federations has been witness to a debate for about eight years now regarding the degree to which it should take on countrywide functions in the field of Jewish culture and education either directly or through some subsidiary agency. It is quite clear that there are differences of opinion in the American Jewish community as to how necessary countrywide action is. By and large, the larger cities say "who needs it, we take care of our own needs." And the smaller cities say "we desperately need it because we can't take care of our own needs." But nobody has systematically attempted to map out what kinds of needs are there, which are being met, and by whom? And, most important, how, what is the best way to fill these needs? Perhaps then we will be able to answer the question, do we have to develop a countrywide structure in order to serve many small communities? In this connection, one of the things that we have found out from Jewish social research is that the Jewish population is spreading more evenly around the country, moving into smaller and smaller communities all the time, and not only into suburbs but into far out exurbias and the smaller metropolitan areas as well.

To do all this we have to build certain research capabilities. Up to now Jewish social research has been essentially hit-and-run; an occasional person who is interested manages to scrape up a little support here and there, frequently more from non-Jewish than from Jewish sources. A Jewish institution or organization gets interested in a particular problem and so allocates a small budget for studying it. Most of it goes for staff so there is very little money available for field research, of course. We need to move beyond this and to systematize research functions sufficiently so that the wherewithal is there to tackle these problems. We need to strengthen social research institutions working in the Jewish field

and we need to provide better ways for the diffusion of the results. These are tasks which are eminently part of the mandate of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture and

eminently important to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and its constituent Federations.