

Building a Jewish People Perspective on ‘Ways and Means’

Steven Popper and Dov Maimon

© JPPI, 2012

- *Are we satisfied with the present level of funding of Jewish people activities and the uses to which these funds are put or do we see evidence of “market failures”?*
- *If we are dissatisfied, how do we create a vision for where we wish to be in 10 or 20 years’ time?*
- *If we can conceive such a vision, how do we determine priorities and pathways that, in turn, will shape the actions and programs for achieving it – and how can we measure our progress along the way?*
- *In a Jewish world lacking central or centralizing institutions, what benefits can be achieved and what dangers might arise through collaboration and coordination, what forms could such collaboration take, and how could collaboration take place?*
- *What is the relationship between Israel as a nation-state (and increasingly prosperous economic engine) and Jewish people priorities, needs, and resources?*

Introduction

This paper lays out several propositions and questions for discussion regarding the funding of Jewish activities and Jewish life. Jewish communities exhibit great differences in structure and what they may require to maintain sustainability and continuity. Yet, despite their differences and the lack of any widely recognized central authority there are some issues that all identify, with perhaps varying emphases, as being necessary to sustainability and continuity not only for their own communities but for the Jewish people as a whole. Some issues of ways and means may go beyond the ability of communities to address on their own – or would remain unaddressed if the local focus were the sole object of concern.

This gives rise to the paper’s central premise: there may be value in exploring what

might be gained from seeking a Jewish people perspective on sources and uses of funds in the Jewish world. In a few brief pages we put forward issues that would benefit considerably from wider explicit consideration and discussion. The first section explores the possible value of a Jewish people perspective. The second part considers our collective knowledge about the current state of affairs in funding the programs of the Jewish people. In the last section we raise several issues in thinking through a path toward a more integrated view of Jewish people 'ways and means.'

Ways and Means Among a Dispersed People

Asking about ways and means could be viewed as a straightforward exercise: what are the stated needs of various Jewish organizations and activities and what are the sources of funding to support them? Clearly, there is a market mechanism that matches sources and uses and determines both scale and allocation of effort. But asking about ways and means from a larger, Jewish people perspective yields a more complex picture that raises fundamental questions.

Jews consider themselves a people but represent a majority (or even a significant minority) in only one of their many countries of residence. Actual nation-states go through formal processes of ways and means planning and possess the appropriate institutions for doing so. The Jewish people lack a central budgetary authority along the lines of a national Ministry of Finance, Department of the Treasury, or Office of the Exchequer. Ways and means planning in every country is also deeply embedded in the political process. In the final analysis, it is this process that provides the final allocation of funding: generally, priorities and budgets are the result of being able to generate political action in their favor.

The one national entity of the Jewish people, the State of Israel, is responsible for defining and meeting the needs of its own citizens.¹ Beyond this, Jewish communities are organized on the national level in most countries with the notable exception of the large communities of North America where community organizations exist on the local level with few recognized national institutions. Even at the city level, there is no recognized body that may authoritatively define needs and the uses to which funds should be put.

Both at the community level and at the national level (largely typified in North America by organizations with a particular mission focus rather than responsibility for the broad range of Jewish people endeavors) the various institutions themselves are entirely responsible for determining and attempting to meet the needs they wish to address, and for raising the funds required to do so. In other words, the fundamental

decisions determining sources and uses are largely transacted through a market mechanism. Groups, organizations, institutions articulate their demands (formulated as community needs), and then solicit governments, funding organizations, and individuals for the required supply of resources.

Markets are not as good at determining goals and priorities, especially across a wide range of interests and criteria not all of which can be expressed in monetary terms. Particularly when we consider social welfare outcomes and the existence of non-traded goods, market failures may arise.² This is why there are always non-market institutions charged with weighing priorities and setting policies. In the Jewish world, how certain are we that the full set of needs are being articulated in this market and can we perceive market failures?

Markets and Market Failures

Citizens of a state make demands upon their government. **In the Jewish world, some of the most crucial issues have no one to give them voice.** The increasingly significant number of young unaffiliated Jews or the children of intermarried couples, for example, do not loudly demand avenues for access to the Jewish community. Jewish youth of unaffiliated families do not petition for the opportunity of a Jewish education. Instead, they drift away. If the structures existed to provide them with entry points appropriate to their situation and stage of life, they might avail themselves of them. In their absence, they are simply lost to the Jewish people. In Western developed economies where most reside, their individual Jewish identity is not an existential necessity, but the Jewish people's need to stem the resulting outflow very well may be.

There is a subtler dynamic at work, entirely in line with the market failures model. The leaders of Jewish organizations understand better than anyone that they operate in a market, and may have a long-term incentive to halt this slow leakage from the Jewish people. Jewish organizations know that those who exit will never mature into the donors and funders of the future. Over the short term, however, when funds are limited and the "return on investment" from serving a marginal population is unclear, the incentives move in the other direction. There is a strategic economic incentive to invest but there may be a market failure precisely analogous to that of the under-production of R&D: the benefit to the Jewish people collectively may be greater than the expectation of gain to the individual organization.

In a similar manner, even for those who remain affiliated or otherwise self-identified as Jews the quality and availability of Jewish experience is in most cases not a matter of primary concern.

If, then, the balance between sources and uses, means and needs, is conducted through the mediation of market mechanisms, do we detect market failures in the sense that the outcomes we see are in accord neither with our desired vision of the Jewish future nor the needs we perceive to achieve that vision? Is there an appropriate alignment of demand, need, and priority being articulated by the individual Jewish organizations in their individual pursuit – to say nothing of the alignment of adequate resources consistent with that need? Quite simply, in addressing needs are we happy with the situation today? If not, what might be the effects of market failures over the longer term? Where do we wish to be in 10 or 20 years? What can be done and what should be done to get us there?

What Do We Know About Jewish People Ways and Means?

The short answer: not much.

The value of applying a Jewish people perspective, and the obstacles that prevent our doing so, become clear when we address the foundation issue of reconstructing the present tally of sources and uses. We have only limited insight when it comes to taking a general ledger approach to understanding the Jewish world's non-Israel government budget. Data don't exist (or, more often, have not been collected), or are not made available, or are not comparable, or are of unknown or uneven quality. This is troubling. If decisions are being made by a market, and if there is at least the potential for market failures to occur, then the first step toward thinking through priorities and policies to address these failures is to actually understand this market.

Where Does it Come from and Where Does it Go?

How much do Jewish communities and the Jewish people as a whole spend on: 1) Jewish education, for youth and for adults; 2) social welfare; 3) its religious institutions; 4) general communal life including community preparedness and security; 5) the arts; 6) direct and indirect support to Israeli institutions; 7) Israel advocacy and Arab/Israeli/Jewish relations; 8) memorials; 9) TikkunOlam; and 10) non-Jewish people purposes? We certainly lack data comparable across communities, and in several major Jewish communities it is difficult to say anything at all.

The community where this question has been examined most directly is in the U.S. There is no guarantee that this is necessarily representative of the Jewish world as a

whole, but it provides a start. Several recent studies have attempted to illuminate the situation.³

Ludwig (2012)⁴ is a study of a non-random sample of 56 philanthropies with Jewish donors that have donated to Jewish causes.⁵ Of the amount they disbursed during the study years, **only 25 percent went to Jewish people endeavors** with the rest going to general philanthropy: to hospitals, universities, arts organizations, etc. Of this amount, two-thirds of the Jewish giving was to non-Israel causes with the remaining third going to Israel-related activities. From the data presented we can construct Table 1.

Table 1. Pattern of Jewish Giving by selected Jewish Foundations in 2009 or 2010, Percentage of Total Funding

Activity Area	Non-Israel Related	Israel Related
Arts&Culture/ Public Benefit	7 %	13%
Education	14%	20%
Federation/Funds*	29%	30%
Human Services	18%	--
Israel Advocacy	--	24%
Jewish Life	13%	3%
Religion	8%	--
Youth Development	--	4%
Other	11%	6%

* Source: Ludwig (2012)

In this study and others that look at the “supply” side, the intention of the authors is not to get an overall picture of Jewish ways and means, even in the U.S. alone, but rather to better understand the nature of Jewish philanthropy. Therefore, these studies would have more difficulty in accounting for those smaller-scale sources of funding that are below the level of attention of their inquiries. It is in the nature of these

things that it is relatively easier (but by no means clear cut) to attack these issues from the supply side, that is to look at the major funding sources to determine their pattern of giving, than to do so from the demand side, which would involve somehow understanding the funding of the myriad Jewish organizations of all types that exist in the U.S. alone. On the other hand, the potential value of these efforts would be improved by having a common framework and terminology to use in structuring the analytical problem, making clear the relationship between the focus of any study and the larger question of Jewish ways and means, and in presenting their results.

Such an analysis of the demand side was conducted by Pearlman (2009) of “over 400” Jewish non-profits.⁶ The total shown in Table 2. does not include funding of *Haredi* religious institutions and so would clearly be a lower bound.

Table 2. Philanthropic Donation to Jewish People Causes in the U.S., by End-Use

End-Use Allocation	Amount in USD, millions	Share of Total
Federation	\$2,664	27.3%
Social Welfare	\$2,394	24.6%
Education	\$1,918	19.7%
Communal Life	\$1,144	11.7%
Communal Funds	\$680	7.0%
Umbrella	\$464	4.8%
Advocacy	\$266	2.7%
Arts	\$138	1.4%
Religious Organizations	\$60	0.6%
Arab/Israel Relations	\$17	0.2%
TOTAL	\$9,743*	100%

* Actual total of \$9,743M does not equal sum of amounts due to rounding errors.
Source: Pearlman (2009)

There are obvious problems in comparability between these two illuminations of Jewish ways and means in the U.S. There are also questions of representativeness. According to Ludwig (2012), almost 10,000 foundations in the U.S. donated to Jewish causes in 2009 (although many surely would not be classified as Jewish foundations). The list of 400 or so recipients of philanthropy must surely include the major organizations of Jewish America. But this, too, could skew our perspective toward one end of the spectrum. The data in Pearlman (2009) show that only ten of the organizations he examined account for 30 percent of total funding in the sample. 30 of them account for fully half the total, and a quarter of the entire sample of 400 or so organizations receive 80 percent of funding.

If we look at the Pearlman total of nearly \$10 billion, and apply the same proportion of 25 percent funding to Jewish causes as found in the Ludwig study this suggests, very roughly, some \$40 billion in Jewish philanthropic resources in the U.S. alone. No matter the shortcomings of these two analyses (shortcomings the authors themselves have pointed out), this is about as good as it gets. It is difficult, for example, to find French-language material on the world's third largest Jewish community. This is all the more striking because of the much greater centralization of organization in France as compared to the United States. What this tells us is that Jewish communities, large and small, do not feel obliged to tell us who they are, how they are organized, what activities matter to them, and how these activities are supported. With this level of comparative ignorance, we are at a loss in trying to gain a more sophisticated understanding of needs, opportunities, and options for addressing them.

Data and evidence are not very high on the list of Jewish people policy priorities. This is understandable; it is also a problem. The principle that without measurement there is neither meaningful strategy nor the reasonable prospect of purposeful action is one that should be regarded more forcefully by Jewish people institutions. It may well be an issue that potential donors and funders may wish to consider as they decide to whom and upon what basis they should direct their giving.

What Can We Do?

The preceding section laid out some of what we know (or think we know) about sources and uses of Jewish people resources. If this is where we are, where do we wish to go? Can we have (and ought we even seek) an integrated perspective on material support for the Jewish people individually, regionally, and as a global community of shared interests? If we perceive “market failures” how can we envision where we wish to be in 10-20 years and how do we get there? What may be done on a general, Jewish people level to reverse unfavorable trends and patterns both in sources and uses?

The problems in achieving such a perspective are many. Not a few of these barriers arise from the problems of organizations, each of which sees itself as possessing a defined stake it would not wish to see encroached upon, working together in some type of supra-organizational format, if only informally. Some past experiments in doing so have been successful. Many have not. We will touch upon this theme below.

There is also the question of costs versus benefits. If the short term costs are too great in terms of time, resources, good will, and other opportunities foregone, the prospect of a longer-term benefit is often an insufficient motivator. Certainly, one of the problems with data and measurement is that of cost, both the fixed cost of putting in place a data collection apparatus and the recurring costs of operating it.

In this final section we explore these and other issues. In doing so, we make some further assumptions. Even if some type of widely acknowledged, Jewish people perspective on ways and means is not fully achieved, proceeding partly along that road is of value. Dwight D. Eisenhower once said that plans are worthless: planning is everything. The process and the questions that are raised and addressed along the way are of at least equal value to any formal statements of the results.

The Value of Vision

It may be too much to expect a detailed, unified vision of a future for the Jewish people that all elements of that diverse group would ascribe to. Prior work by JPPI, however, suggests at least two broad elements for such a vision.⁷ The first relates to factors outside the Jewish world per se. Even in Israel, Jewish life is affected by forces, attitudes, perceptions, trends, opportunities, and challenges that arise from outside. These may be either specifically related to activities or interests of Jews and Jewish communities or entirely directed toward other concerns but with collateral effects

on Jewish people interests. So a first broad set of elements for a vision of the Jewish people in the 21st century would be for either an external environment conducive to sustaining those aspects of communal life deemed by Jews to be important to them or means and resources sufficient to allow Jewish life to persevere and flourish despite objectively adverse external conditions. In the absence of any reliable guarantees that the former will hold true, prudence suggests the value of latter. We will return to this theme below.

The second broad set relates to the inner dimension of Jewish life itself and those aspects that contribute to a sense of “Jewish momentum,” a set of internally generated capabilities that sustain Jewish life and propel it forward. Clearly, those elements that contribute to Jewish momentum are neither generated nor operate in a vacuum. Aspects of the external environment will affect the scope and nature of these capabilities. Yet, to a very large degree such norms as the quality of Jewish people leadership, the state of Jewish education, the availability and attractiveness of portals for Jewish identification and so forth are set through the scale and scope effects of active measures undertaken by Jewish communities and the Jewish people as a whole.

Putting these two aspects together, a satisfactory vision for the Jewish people from a ways and means perspective would be the ability to marshal resources to support activities and meet needs intended either to ensure satisfactory outcomes from interactions with external forces or to generate and sustain aspects of internal Jewish momentum, or both. This still leaves considerable room for interpretation, but does provide two broad lodestones for strategy and policy.

Guidelines and Priorities

Inputs, Outputs, and Outcomes

Moving to the level of determining actual priorities, and thus making choices, becomes more complicated. Is the current match between sources and uses and the shares of the total allocated to those different uses seen as appropriate and well-balanced? It is not difficult to find voices calling either for a greater application of Jewish wealth to Jewish people causes (calling into focus the phenomenon of large sums being donated to general causes without a commensurate propensity by some to consider Jewish avenues for philanthropic action), for shifting the balance of funding priorities, or increasing the allocation made to critical needs that are currently underfunded.

But these voices must be given critically cautious attention: the internal debate over Jewish ways and means is as liable as any other to suffer from insufficient and asymmetric information, special pleading by advocates, and uncertainty over the relationship between the uses of funds and the ultimate effect of those activities that receive support. There are fundamental issues of evidence that again refer us back to issues of measurement.

In the ideal, the fruits of the market for Jewish sources and uses would be measured in terms of outcomes.⁸ As a practical matter, however, the competition takes place as a matter of amounts of money raised and not as a competition in making Jewish lives better. This is not a criticism of these institutions or their leaders. It is an illustration of the problems to be faced. We can usually measure inputs, if we care to take the trouble, because of the relative simplicity of the dimensions (money and time) involved. We can also look at outputs such as numbers of students sent to study in Israel, numbers of meals served to the elderly, and so forth. But how can we be assured that the ultimate outcomes in terms of the quality of Jewish life as well as goals of Jewish continuity are well served by present efforts? In this respect, another possible result of explicitly placing the discussion in these terms is to not only raise awareness of the need and value of thinking in such terms but to allow that discussion to then result in greater agreement on what outcomes we should seek to measure and how we can do so.

This question of assessing priorities reflects, and the search for potential answers receives a boost from, trends already becoming more broadly current in the worlds of both private philanthropy and publicly funded effort. Though evidence-based policy was already becoming a focus for attention in both worlds, the recent global financial crisis has pushed the concept more forcefully into the councils where decisions about priorities occur. Is the Jewish world well-placed to employ such scrutiny to its own efforts? We have already highlighted the well-known problem of defining and agreeing upon goals. But there is also the issue of evidence itself. Though well-placed to do so, Jewish communities are not as effective as they could be either in collecting fundamental data about their communities or in making such data as do exist more accessible and widely disseminated. Data in themselves will not solve the problems raised in this paper; yet, there are few issues that would not benefit considerably from a more fundamental understanding of what exists, what has been done, and what outcomes have been achieved.

Jewish Giving: The Active Ingredient

The nature and trends of Jewish giving is a very large subject in itself, one well beyond the scope of this paper. However, it might also be an issue that could benefit from a more macro perspective. In particular, to the extent that there are transitions occurring in the nature of such philanthropy for reasons that stem from generational, social, cultural, and economic changes, the issue is raised to the level of Jewish people concern rather than only the aggregate of the frustrations experienced by myriad organizations seeking funding.

We have cited above some recent examples of studies attempting to measure the health of Jewish philanthropy today. One advantage of placing this issue in the larger, Jewish people perspective is that it focuses attention on two related questions: Are there systemic trends emerging that should cause concern about the continued reliability of this source for funding Jewish people needs in the future? If so, what may be done on a general, Jewish people level to reverse unfavorable trends and patterns?

To answer these questions, once again we need to know more not only about large-scale philanthropy but also giving at the individual and community levels. In some communities, funding by local governments also comes into the equation. But in most Jewish communities during most of the course of Jewish history it has been the large-scale philanthropies that have usually powered the community's agenda. As Jewish life and communities change, is there still sufficient awareness among potential donors of the existing needs? Are the motives for giving changing and do we know enough about what motivates such giving in the 21st century? The philanthropic literature certainly suggests generational and societal changes in patterns and forms of giving in both the Jewish and non-Jewish spheres. Therefore, do generational, social, cultural, and economic changes, as well as changes in the nature of Jewish communities and needs themselves, require new modes of donor engagement?

It is possible that a Jewish people perspective on the sources of funding in the future would, as paradoxical as it may seem, result in taking a less comprehensive, campaign-based approach to making certain that this lifeline is secure. Some of the most successful (or at least the most notable) programs of the Jewish world in recent years were carried out by individuals and groups who had no desire to coordinate with the existing forms of Jewish organization. It may well be that formal coordination on such matters is not desirable. Certainly there is a case to be made that the relative

anarchy that exists, as in any market, allows its various niches to be most fully explored. On the other hand, this may be a straw man: It is most unlikely that any formally coordinated effort could be made practicable in such a highly particularized environment as exists within the Jewish world. But it is not clear that a degree of greater mutual awareness of how these various pieces may provide a source of mutual leverage in the absence of any formal or hierarchic coordination would not allow each of the constituent organizations and efforts do better in meeting the particular needs each has identified.

Instruments and Actions

As we consider next steps it is useful to consider some elements and concepts that might allow a more Jewish people consciousness to emerge when considering local issues of ways and means.

Steps Toward the Vision We Choose

Jewish Experimentation

A discussion of Jewish people ways and means operates on a conceptual level but also on the level of organizations of both the supply side and the demand side, those of long duration and those just coming into being. Both threads require some new approaches to avoid merely following in the ruts of the past without first being able to assess if that route will lead to the future. In this spirit we offer some initial thoughts for discussion.

The first is on the level of conceptualization. The programs and activities of Jewish organizations should be recognized for what they are: experiments. They are not necessarily controlled experiments, nor are they consciously designed as such but that is what they are. In a world of dynamic and even accelerating change, what else can they be? Too often in the world of Jewish policy, and in the more general policy environment as well, programs and policies are wrapped in the fiction of immutability.

We can take an alternative view. **Jewish institutions and the programs they put into place are themselves elements of a larger strategy of hedging and shaping of Jewish life and circumstances.** We spoke above about an internal and external dimension of Jewish existence shaped by multiple drivers. What are the efforts of Jewish institutions if not to take active measures to shape these drivers to provide

favorable circumstances for Jewish life, or to put in place hedging actions to provide some measure of insurance against unfavorable turns of events? In this sense, it may be possible to achieve a more general perspective over these many hedging and shaping efforts and ask how well these pieces articulate with each other to provide mutual support and ensure a comprehensive approach to the needs imposed by the challenge of achieving the objectives of individuals and communities who wish to continue living Jewishly in the future? We should wish to seek a flexibility and adaptability that have been the key to Jewish survival and thriving. We can ask to what extent the collective response of the purposeful disorder that is the Jewish world today provides an assurance of that thriving in the future. How well does this market thrive in view of the outcomes we hope it can bring into being?

Organized Disorganization

A second thought is at the level of organizations and institutions. It is possible that this organizational stew serves the Jewish people well. It provides the space and motivation for creativity. Indeed, in many cases it is difficult to conceive of such a wide assortment of groups and efforts agreeing on any common agenda especially in as much as that agenda is by some seen as being driven by those associated with the status quo. How is it possible to conceive of any mechanism that would allow conversations of general interest to take place or of a venue where this might be possible?

One thing that can be done is to draw upon useful experience from elsewhere. The European Union is not an appropriate model and may seem to be a strange source of lessons for the Jewish people. Nevertheless, it is interesting to consider how a group of individual countries who have warred with each other for centuries almost unceasingly have found it possible to emphasize that which is common among them and to erect mechanisms for addressing those interests in a common manner.

When viewed this way several potentially interesting aspects emerge. First, the EU started small. It did not even begin as a union but initially as a handful of states who put in place a mechanism to further their common interest in the coal and iron resources they shared. Only once this demonstration was in place was there momentum toward an expanded agenda and an expanded membership.

Second, the EU as it now exists is a system of mixed institutions. Some of these, but relatively few, are the supranational independent bodies such as the European Parliament. But the EU consists of many other consultative bodies and councils for

coordinated action and joint effort toward meeting common goals. That is, there are many different forms that the practical application of the concept of cooperation could take.

Finally, in many ways the fullest benefit of the EU experience has been to agree upon and disseminate standards of best practice. There are certainly the standardized systems of laws that apply in all member states and make a single European market possible. Such a thing is unlikely to occur and may be precisely the wrong model in the Jewish world. But the various councils of Europe also provide a venue for a great number of discussions on wide-ranging policy issues that benefit from a mutual sharing of experience and models. These are not imposed upon the member governments or their national institutions. Rather they provide a means for disseminating models of process that in themselves are often persuasive. And they provide a means for addressing those concerns that would benefit from a more collective approach.

The Israel Dimension

The 21st century is witnessing the concept of Eretz Yisrael itself becoming a major factor in the generation of Jewish people wealth for the first time since the Roman era. Many of the activities that have been and continue to be the focus of communal Jewish people concern revolve around sustaining communities in the Diaspora, economically, spiritually and culturally. This raises at least three related questions. First, may the beginnings of significant wealth generation and accumulation in Israel be properly viewed as a potential resource for Jewish people activities outside the borders of the State of Israel itself? If so, in what specific activities, to what extent, and to what end? These questions raise the issue of how Israel should operate as a nation-state versus as the civilizational capital of the Jewish people. The case for Israeli public involvement in Jewish life abroad is probably a weak one if it is viewed as some form of payback for the support Israel has received from those communities in the past. However, to the extent that the Jewish communal life of those communities may affect Israeli national interests, not the least in its identification as the Jewish state, the rationale becomes more persuasive.

Second, much of the discussion that has been presented in this paper implicitly relates to problems of sustaining Jewish life in the absence of local and national governmental structures that themselves have a Jewish character – the conditions of Jewish communities outside of Israel. What are the aspects of Jewish life within the borders of the state that are the proper focus not just for Israel itself but also of the

larger Jewish world? If there is to be a Jewish people perspective on the sources and uses of available resources and in the creation of new sources, the changing nature of Israel in the larger Jewish world may prove, if not transformative, certainly a break from the pattern of the first century of the Zionist enterprise. What is the appropriate role for Israel's private and public resources to play in sustaining its own Jewish life into and beyond the 21st century?

This last point raises the third broad question for consideration. Israel's economic success has not been generated equally across the full range of its industry and service sector. It has instead come quite noticeably and specifically as a result of Israel's emergence as a major global innovation hub, particularly in the information technology and communications (ITC) sector.⁹ This rise to prominence had much to do with Israeli internal conditions, but there has also been an important connection with private Jewish capital resources outside of Israel, particularly in funding new ventures. If, as seems likely, advances in ITC and in general innovative activity drawing upon new intellectual property formation remain principal drivers of wealth creation in Israel and elsewhere, and if Israel itself comes to assume a greater role in supporting Jewish people priorities and activities both in Israel and beyond, then to what extent can this engine for growth within Israel benefit from involvement by, or be to the benefit of the larger Jewish world? Should this be made more a matter of policy by opening channels of potential collaboration and finance to ensure the Jewish capacity for generating ways and means will remain equal to the priorities of the Jewish people in the years to come?

Endnotes

- 1 Israel does claim some responsibility for the safety and well-being of world Jewry and has increased allocation of funds (around \$90M in 2012) to these purposes.
- 2 Unregulated markets notoriously “fail” by under-producing goods such as scientific research for which the public benefit usually far exceeds the private benefit that can be gained, while over-producing non-traded “bads,” such as pollution.
- 3 Among these are Erik Ludwig and Aryeh Weinberg (2012), “Following The Money: A Look At Jewish Foundation Giving”, Institute for Jewish and Community Research, <http://www.jewishresearch.org/quad/01-12/following-money.html>; Mark Pearlman (2009), “Jewish GDP Study: Initial Findings”, [PowerPoint presentation; at the time of this writing we were unable to find a publicly available paper] <http://www.jinsider.com/gdp>; Eric Fleisch and Theodore Sasson (2010), “The New Philanthropy: American Jewish Giving to Israeli Organizations,” Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies; Gary A. Tobin and Aryeh Weinberg (2007), *Mega-Gifts in Jewish Philanthropy: Giving Patterns 2001-3003*, Institute for Jewish and Community Research.
- 4 Op. cit.
- 5 Jewish recipient institutions were defined as any charitable organizations that serve the Jewish community directly or serve the general community with an explicitly Jewish mission. All grants made to organizations in Israel were considered Jewish.
- 6 Op.cit. It is not clear what year or years are covered by this analysis but clearly not the same years as in Ludwig (2012).
- 7 For a detailed discussion of Jewish people futures see Avi Gil and Einat Wilf, (2010); *2030: Alternative Futures for the Jewish People*; Jewish People Policy Institute. For greater detail on the concept of Jewish people interests, see the discussion on pages 26-30 in “A System of Indicators for Measuring the Well-Being of the Jewish People,” 2010 Annual Assessment, Jewish People Policy Institute, 2011.
- 8 The level of Jewish cultural knowledge might be such an outcome. This is notoriously more difficult to measure than either inputs (e.g., the dollars spent on Jewish education) or outputs (the number of students completing Jewish education programs).
- 9 This sector has been responsible for a share of income and export generation that is disproportionate to its size in terms of workforce employed.