



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MS-763: Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman Collection, 1930-2004.

Series H: United Jewish Appeal, 1945-1995.

Subseries 3: Conferences and Committees, 1947-1978.

Box
30

Folder
8

Executive Committee. 1965.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

-a-
U. J. A. - Friday evening - May 27

Tape 1 - Side 1

(Numbering of pages will be by letter up to the point of Gott Hammer's speech, since that was requested first, and therefore that point begins with page number 1.)

CHAIRMAN: Look, can you all hear over here?

I want to welcome you here. This is really a wonderful turn out. You know, we went over the list of people who couldn't be here because of illness or somebody being out of the country, but outside of one or two people, everybody is here and of course, tomorrow, there will be four or five people up here from New York and I think it's wonderful to have such a group here because it gives us an opportunity to really discuss the problems we have in detail.

I particularly want to welcome my old friend -- I mean, my young friend, the Vice Chairman of the Jewish Agency, Rose Halpern, over here.

(Applause.)

There is only one thing, Rose. I want to tell you, Rose always tries to sit next to me. I don't know what happened to her --

VOICE: You didn't invite her.

CHAIRMAN: I didn't invite her. Well, anyway, Rose, it's good to see you. .

We've got a lot of serious business here. I think this is one of the real opportunities that we have to really discuss in depth some of the problems that we're facing this year. Some of them are good. Others are knotty, but at least one thing, this problem that we seem to have always is the fact that at our meetings we never have an opportunity to really get down to some of the meat of the problems.

Last year, this conference was a wonderful one. Unfortunately, I wasn't here but I read the Minutes of the meetings and from what everybody tells me, it was a tremendously successful one and I am sure this year, with the Agenda that we have, we surely will come out of this with a great many ideas that will be very helpful to us.

Now, I want to speak a minute about the Agenda. The Agenda is very flexible. Very flexible. We have a proposed Agenda here; we're in no hurry. We want to cover the problems. We want to cover the specific items in depth. We are not restricted to these because basically, our objectives are this: how to run more successful campaigns because we're going to be in business for a long time. There is one thing I must tell you. We signed this loan with the insurance companies and I remember one thing -- we signed a

bill for fifteen years. We know we are going to be in business for fifteen years and I'm afraid we're going to be in business for a great deal longer than this.

To me, the big problem that I think we have facing us is how we are going to get off the plateau. This is the year we are going to try to really tackle this problem in depth.

My own feeling about what I've found out around this country this year is this: that I'm really much concerned about attacking the problems that face us and building for the future. Sometimes we spend so much time working on the problem of fund raising every day because we are all concerned with it that we really don't have the time and opportunity to sit around here and try to understand how we can build long range.

We've got to build long range. Our job is not going to be done in this generation. I'm afraid we will still be facing the problems and they are good problems, for many many years to come, because any time you can deal with saving lives and building lives, these are great problems. These are fun problems.

But I think this gives us the opportunity to approach these problems and in depth - and get a better understanding of how we are going to face them in the future.

-d-

So I say to you this: let's while we are here at this meeting, take our coats off and talk freely. Everybody is going to have an opportunity to say exactly what's on his mind. And we're just going to talk -- I thought we'd start off.

Today, at this evening's session, I think it's appropriate that we start off by having a short resume of what we are faced with for this coming fiscal year. This gives us an idea of what the problems are of both the Jewish Agency and J.D.C.

So I think, to start off with, I'd like to have Gott Hammer give us some idea of what problems we are facing with the Jewish Agency.

Gott, do you want to take over?

By the way, Gott is the Admiral. We took him away from the dedication of the new Italian Line, but I am sure he'd rather be here.

Go ahead, Gott.

You said what you said about ten years ago. So you know. But then --

(Several speak at once. Laughter.)

ROSE: Wait a minute. Ten years ago, and fifteen years ago, I've been at tables and the same question was asked because there were times when you asked yourself how can we go on?

Now, some of us tried to say the Agency. Some the Government. It was neither the Agency nor the Government that set the policies. I'll tell you what set the policies. Jewish history.. Nothing else. No table could have gone against an open door immigration. And closed the door of Israel. It just was never possible to do it and it never will be possible and if tomorrow Russian doors are opened, you won't sit and worry about whether you are going to have the money in your pocket or not. All of us together will open the doors of Israel.

You have to think of Jewish history and all of the forces that exist and that make it possible for Jews to go out of Roumania today when yesterday they couldn't and maybe tomorrow they won't again. That's the answer. Not what they will decide. The same thing happened in Morocco. They could come. The door was opened --

(Several speak at once.)

ROSE: Now, the answer is that.

The answer is as true as the facts of history, namely that you cannot say to Israel that it can be viable and able to defend itself with a population of two million. It is not possible to be viable with a population of two million. And if you have taken the first step, you must take the next and the third and the fourth and the fifth. Viability requires at least an industrial and defense base. This means an increased population.

VOICE: Let me comment, Rose. The first was the most important -- what you said. History makes for these events. If people want to get out and can get out, we've got to provide for them. Period.

ROSE: That's true.

VOICE: Are there any more questions on the need -- on the basis of these figures, because we want to have a presentation here on the J.D.C. side. They are the partners. I mean, as to the detail or the need of this. I think this is the thing --

VOICE: There is only one question I'd like to ask, Max, which is, if we're talking ahead about 1966, is it fair or correct to state that 1966 will again be a year of what we can call high immigration?

Doc used the figure of 47,000. That's not 50,000 or 55,000, but I still call 47,000 a very, very high figure.

When the days that we used to call normal immigration of 25,000 or 30,000 -- 47,000 is still twice what used to be called a normal standard, so I'd like to have it clear in my mind in terms of thinking ahead about 1966. Are we again talking about a projection -- nobody can guarantee anything, I understand that, but -- there are political factors that may come in the way to upset it, but looking ahead, six, seven months from now, when we talk about 1966, do we talk again as a year of high immigration.

GOTTHAMMER: I think we certainly do have to recognize the facts that if we're taking out 47,000 this year, the number of Jews left in the area of emigration has not decreased by as many as we had hoped at the end of this year. That what we have done is simply postponed the time of getting them out, that if anything, there will be a continuation of this plateau of high immigration 47,000, 55,000, 60,000, 48,000, 49,000. Look over the figures of the last four years and go back to '61, 47,748. Then the following year, it jumped to 61,502. In 1963, 64,000. Last year, 54,000.

There is no indication that this is drying up. It is not, because the reservoir of Jews in these areas, North Africa, Eastern Europe and those in South America are still there.

We must resolve these problems.

VOICE: Well, I think we might say this.

We talked with Louis Pincus last time -- with the Jewish Agency -- obviously, if we could maintain the level of immigration for the next five years, we would pretty well -- we would be doing a great job in rounding up the amount of people available -- personally, I remember discussing this thing with the Jewish Agency. I hope it is true. I wish we could get most of them out and start worrying about absorbing them and turning them into good citizens.

I think that's what we're looking to.

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: It seems to me that really, the numbers of immigrants really do not matter. We are discussing a budget now. Obviously, the great number will come and will be accommodated -- the greatest number that want to come.

We are faced with a tremendous shortage and I'm not surprised. Actually, we've been facing it every year. Some years ago, Abe Harmon came before us at the Waldorf -- I think it was five or six years ago, and used practically the same numbers. With the same type of (unclear.)

And we really did not take seriously and we did not commit ourselves -- and I am not speaking about the people in this room. I think everybody here is

committed. Unfortunately, the American Jewish community is not, and we have never tried to commit them. We've been pussyfooting; we're afraid to tell them the facts, and its opposition, were it to come. I've done it many times at meetings -- when you tell them about a deficit, you don't tell them about the implications of it, and how do you solve it.

Gentlemen, I know that this is not the place to come to conclusions, but I'd like to table something for you now so that in the course of this weekend, there will be some discussion and perhaps you will come to some conclusions.

Allan here has said we can't raise ten million dollars more. We're all realistic and we know it. It's not there, and if we continue to operate in the same fashion that we have been operating in the past years - gentlemen, it seems to me that if we're serious in our commitment to this cause, and if we can, as I believe we can, tell the American Jewish community that your choice is an additional hundred and fifty thousand dollars in my community for research to expand the research center at Montifiore Hospital or three hundred dollars perhaps for a number of Jews coming from North Africa, then you have pushed them, -- it's not the Jewish Agency that makes the decision then and you

don't ask the people on the Jewish Agency to carry that responsibility. You are now saying to the Jews in Pittsburgh, "Where do you stand on this five hundred people at \$300 you can't add on your research center."

The trouble with us is that we will not let's say it realistically, either we're not strong enough, and we don't feel strong enough, or we will not challenge the established institutions in our communities, our Welfare funds, the local agencies and the national agencies. They are taking too much money out of our campaign. We are raising sufficient money; we can't raise more. Not substantially. And I believe -- I for one, for example, I can't fight in Pittsburgh. I can and I would, and I might succeed, maybe I won't but I can make a hell of a fight, but I cannot do it without the total commitment, the total support of this organization.

And if we want to play footsie with national agencies who are not deserving, let's recognize it and let's be realistic. Just because they come in with a budget, we automatically put our stamp of approval because this man represents them or that man represents them. Then I think we're begging the question and we're placing the responsibility where it does not belong.

And I agree with Allen that no matter what you say to us, and what you make us do, - and I think

everybody here will do it. There is not a question in my mind. It does not spell success if the campaign in the coming year for the numbers that Doc talked about -- and I'd like to suggest that some time, at an early date, that we -- after this meeting, that we come up with some resolution to strengthen everybody's hand at the local level.

(Several speak at once concerning schedule of meetings.)

VOICE: One question, and it's more than a remote contingency in the minds of most of us at this point. Years ago, perhaps, we thought it was a remote contingency, but what provisions have been made by the Jewish Agency for the possibility of large sized Russian immigration?

VOICE: Financial?

VOICE: Financially, I would say to you that if this thing were to suddenly open up, the only provision we have made is a borrowing power under this new loan which we made -- there is a provision that states we have the right to borrow ten million dollars short term, over and above our indemnity to the insurance company, and that would have to suffice until we would get together, gear up, set our plans and attempt to meet the emergencies of the particular --

VOICE: How about the Jewish Agency?

037601701

The Jewish Agency of Jerusalem.

VOICE: Let Rose speak for the Jewish Agency of Jerusalem.

ROSE: You know that we have deficits. We can't put aside money while there are deficits.

VOICE: Mel knows very well. He is trying to bring the point out. He's on the Finance Committee of the Agency.

VOICE: Joe.

VOICE: I'll ask Joe to finish. Then I want to go to Moe.

VOICE: Can you ask(name unclear) if in his judgment, is there any further details or plans that he can give us regarding the ability of the Israeli economy to meet any deficit? Other than borrowing.

VOICE: Well, I don't think--

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: What their balance of trade is --

VOICE: I'd like to say in one word, in one sentence, increased immigration imposed on the Israeli economy has weakened it to a dangerous point and has lessened their capacity to absorb newcomers without substantial outside help.

VOICE: What is the balance of these deficits? I think it's about 600 --

037601702

VOICE: \$530,000,000.

VOICE: Well, the next question we're going to go to, because we've got to -- we've got Moe -- one joint partner is Joint Distribution. So Moe --

VOICE: Well, I want to say --

VOICE: Senior Colleague. All right.

MOE: All I can say is I don't travel in this company. We're a very old and a very conservative organization.

VOICE: Not so old and not so conservative.

MOE: Oh, yes. Fifty odd years of age, and then we were faced in 1964 with a loss of seven and a half million dollars. We cut our budget. And we cut it by seven and a half million dollars. Although we still will have a deficit of about \$750,000, the first deficit the J.D.C. has had in many, many years. We don't go in for deficit financing, as we just don't believe in deficit financing. We don't have the ventures that the Jewish Agency in Israel has.

But you might be interested to know how we cut that amount of money. It represents 25% of our budget. In the European countries, we had spent \$5,850,000 in '64. We cut it to \$3,546,00. We cut it in all countries of Europe, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Holland, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

037601703

We cut out of that -- those countries, \$2,300,000.

VOICE: Out of a total of?

MOE: Total of \$5,800,000. In the Moslem countries, we had spent \$5,850,000 in '64 and we cut it a million dollars. To \$4,850,000.

VOICE: How much was that budget in '63?

MOE: '64. \$5,850,000, which was cut to \$4,850,000. Another million. That means \$3,000,000. Now then, our operation in Israel, we spent \$6,450,000 in '64. We cut that a million dollars. To \$5,450,500. That's \$4,300,000. There was only one thing that we could cut and that was the program of relief in transit, the program behind the iron curtain, the program where the need is probably the greatest and in any of the countries that I've mentioned, and that was cut from \$6,300,000 to \$3,250,000, a matter of \$3,000,000, and that brought it a little over \$7,000,000 -- about \$7,000,000.

VOICE: What was that? \$6,000,000?

MOE: \$6,300,000 -- we call this relief in transit, but it's the work behind the iron curtain, in Roumania, Hungary, Russia. Well, when you make cuts, vertical cuts, not horizontal -- these are vertical cuts, you cut programs. We didn't give percentage cuts to the communities.

0 3 7 6 9 1 1 0 5

We cut out actual programs. We were giving, for example, in Russia -- we have about 40,000 families to whom we send parcels. We have been sending them one parcel every two years. Now they are going to get one parcel every three years. Just as simple as that. So you cut out. Say \$200,000. We used to clothe the children with a pair of shoes. 25,000 - 30,000 children. In the Moslem countries. Cost us about \$600,000. We're just going to give them the shoes. We're not going to give them anything else.

And so on down the line. We cut programs. We cut our program in Israel. By reducing the number of beds. Just not taking in. We changed our eligibility requirements. We had an eligibility requirement -- we said that any immigrants who came into Israel since the start of the state remains eligible for (unclear) services.

It's now 17 years since the start of the State, and if he were sixty years old when he entered the State, he is now 77 years old, - more and more of them are becoming infirm and need infirm and nursing care. We're the only ones who have kept up that kind of long time eligibility because how long is a refugee a refugee? The Jewish Agency says one or two years and turns them over to the Government. We kept them for 17 years. Until we took this loss and we changed it to a five year, - eligibility

role, starting as of the beginning of this year.

Saying that anybody that's come into the State in the last five years will be eligible. Those who came in before that are not eligible.

Now, despite that fact, and I will talk about these various countries, despite that fact, as Gott has said and it's indicated in our own applications and admissions to Homes for the Aged, we have twice as many applications in the first four months this year as we had last year, when there was a 17 year eligibility, and now there is only a five year. So that it means that the new immigration that's coming in is coming in with a much larger proportion of social cases. Aged people. Handicapped people. Sick people, etc.

And we had thought that we would be able through natural attrition reduce 250 beds to 350 beds during the course of 1964, because we still have to continue in terms of a phasing out program. But we don't see how it can be done if this rate of admissions keeps continuing.

We cut out countries. Completely. And some countries -- Denmark is out. Germany is out. Holland is out. The other countries are getting very small amounts of money. We've reduced Poland from when we started a few years ago, from a million dollars to \$300,000. Not that there

isn't need. There is need. But we just had to make the cut. In order to get by.

Now this question of Moslem countries. And the question of what is the reservoir. Never count all the Jews in a country. As constituting a reservoir. It just doesn't happen that way.

VOICE: For immigration?

MOE: For immigration to Israel or to any other place. Because the Moslem countries were emptied out as much to Israel as to France. After all, from Algeria, about 120,000 Jews came in and from Morocco, during that same period, probably not more than about 70,000 came in during that same period.

There remains always a remnant. That remnant can be 3,000, 5,000, 25,000, it can even be 50,000. And you have only two countries where there is any significant Jewish population left. That's in Roumania and still in Morocco. Roumania, nobody knows how many Jews are there. Anybody's guess is a good one. And a bad one. But as close as you can make it, if you said 100,000 to 110,000 Jews, you'd come as close as you probably could get. To the real number. In Morocco, on the basis that we estimate population, on the basis of the number of children that are in the schools, in the primary grades, our people say now that there are under 70,000 left in Morocco.

So you take the two figures -- total of 170,000. But those two countries which have been the bulk of your emigration to Israel have taken a tremendous drop. Tremendous, comparatively speaking, in the four months of this year. Five months. It's been going on.

We are told that the immigration will continue at a substantial rate for the balance of the year, out of Roumania. And it may. Or it may not. One doesn't know. One has no way of telling when the Government is going to open the door a little more or close it a little.

Similarly with Morocco. But in Morocco, you've got pressures on the Jews which are far greater than the pressures on the Jews in Roumania. Because in Morocco, the people are finding their children going to school with Moslem children. Any family that's got a girl will not let that girl go to school where there are Moslem boys. Because they just won't.

There have been too many tragedies in that regard and the people are panicky. This is happening more and more. The Moslem population is coming into the Alyar schools and there is a very serious problem that we have of reducing the school and the classes, so we can concentrate the Jews in the classes.

Jews also don't all live in the same neighborhood. They are now scattered all over Morocco,

and the result is that you've got a problem which is a cause for emigration of Jews that has nothing to do with their economic situation. Or they just want to get out to a place -- it may be France or it may be Israel.

In the case of Morocco, the attraction is more to Israel for the group of, I would say, the lower middle class, and the poorer elements of the population, because they've got their families in Israel.

The middle class, upper middle class don't have their families in Israel, but they have their families in France and there the attraction is to get to France.

And each one is waiting to see how can he transfer some of his assets from Morocco to France. In the case of the people who go to Israel, they don't have much chance of transferring because they don't have much to transfer.

But there is a pressure on the Jews, because there is a pressure from the Arab on the Jews, both in the economic field, -- they are being driven out of many economic places and positions in the country, as well as the antagonism and the hate of the Arabs of Morocco towards the Jews.

I expect that there will remain a hard core -- there has been a hard core even in a country like Iraq,

where certainly Jews who had an opportunity of getting out didn't get out. We still have 5,000 Jews left in Iraq. Or Libya, where a Jew can't get out anymore from Libya, and if he does, he's got to leave a hostage behind, a mother or a father. Or a child. Otherwise, the family is not permitted to leave.

But Jews still stay, because nobody wants to give up the little bit of security that he has in a house or a business, or a -- in a bank account, whatever it may be, and the cost of transferring of any assets gets more and more -- gets higher and higher and may run up as much as 50 to 60 or 70% of the value of the asset.

We are carrying on what I would say is a holding operation. Our budget in '66 will be fairly close to what it is in 1965. I don't see any drastic reductions in need in the country. We've cut them. We're holding to these cuts. It may well be there may be emergencies that we don't know anything about. And there never is a year where you don't have emergencies. And we may have to do something more than we have budgeted for. But we budgeted everything plus \$750,000 of a deficit in order to try to meet the needs as we see it, on a minimal basis.

Now you ask Gott, what happens within that gap, you always have a gap. I'll tell you what happens.

People don't services. People suffer. They don't get the services. That's all. This is a budget. You're not going to spend \$105,000,000. You may be sure he won't. Because he won't be able to get it. He won't be able to get it either from the U.J.A. or from borrowing. He just won't have it. And if he hasn't got it he just won't spend it.

Now, this is basic to what you -- and how much of it he isn't going to spend will depend entirely on what he gets. What comes in. This is a minimal budget of need. But when you say minimal, then you don't do it. You just don't do it.

I am trying, I am trying very hard in Israel and the J. D. C. is, our whole staff is geared in Israel to try to do something, put in some money and try to reach the handicapped children problem which is a serious problem. It's never been tackled on a coordinated basis as it should and on a national basis. Just the parents of some of these cerebral palsy children or the deaf children or the blind children or the polio children have gotten together in little voluntary agencies and they are doing the best they can for their unfortunate children.

But it's not being done properly and they are not getting the newer work that's being done in this country and in other parts of the world. They are not

getting the advantages of that.

And the Government of Israel has a different problem. The first problem is security. And what -- so you have retarded children? So what? They are going to be retarded. What do you do? You do nothing.

Well, I don't say nothing. There is a program for retarded children. Run by the Welfare Agency -- the Minister of Social Welfare. But it's a minimal program. It's not being done -- and you can do a lot of things to prevent mental retardation, as we've discovered and the doctors have discovered, and if you had proper case finding and you've had proper tests made to the newborn child, you can reduce the incidence of mental retardation, very, very significantly.

These are the things that we try to do with a small amount of money, because we can see our money getting less. And we feel that if we can turn into indirect rather than direct services in this -- in Israel, we can give them as much of a -- make as much of a contribution as we have up till now.

I just want to say something which is to me, a great satisfaction. I came back from the meeting of the Board of Governors of the Hebrew University in March and I was very pleased with the progress made by the School of Social Work.

I think if we've done anything in Israel, in setting up this school for Social Work, which has now become well known throughout the world, where the people are being -- where two of its graduates are teaching in a school right outside of Nairobi, Kenya, where the Director of the school goes to Singapore and where he goes to Hong Kong and where they go to other places around the world, where the staff is being known and where there is a whole field of social work education, the Israeli school is probably the best undergraduate school in the world today.

There is a very devoted group of staff, excellent staff, as good as any staff, as good as any you will find in any school of social work in the United States, and we're going in for a Masters and Doctor's in the next two to three years.

I am saying this to you because I think you ought to have some nachis out of what is being done. We are not producing enough social workers. We are producing 60 - 65 social workers a year and we need about 250 a year. Because with the attrition of the social workers, getting married, going out of work, dying, stopping and with the increase, especially in the development towns, the need for social workers keeps growing, much faster than we can turn them out.

And if there were money present and Tel Aviv would have a school of social work and Haifa has been begging us for five years to set one up and it should be done, but there are things that you don't do because you simply don't think of it as an urgent priority, and yet, in the long run, it may well be that you can save an awful lot of money by having a corps of a couple of thousand trained social workers do a job for Israel in the development towns that will save the country untold millions of dollars.

Now, we're going to continue along more or less the same lines, trying to consolidate our position, trying to bring as much aid as we can behind the iron curtain, because whatever money we have, that we can spare, we feel the needs of the Jews behind the -- in the satellite countries, are much greater even than the needs of the Jews in Morocco today, where the bulk of the indigent population has been moved over into Israel.

VOICE: Now, you have the figures in front of you. Moe has brought out his point that they've operated on their budget, except for a deficit of \$750,000 which is a very drastic cut -- I want to give you these figures so that when you start asking questions, based on an estimate of \$60,000,000 to \$61,000,000, we will raise,

this will provide approximately \$19,000,000 for J. D. C. and out of that he is operating on a budget of about \$20,000,000.

MOE: \$22,000,000.

VOICE: Well, as far as we're concerned, the amount of money we make available to you. So, if you have \$19,000,000, and what he is saying in effect is this, that it took \$20,000,000 to do this job. He hopes to be able to get by on less. Which means that we would have less, on what we are raising this year, \$38,000,000 for the Jewish Agency. If we take away \$5,000,000 for the debt service, that leaves \$33,000,000.

I want to give you these figures, because I said to you before that we didn't even meet the \$35,000,000 that we had. You all have these figures, because I think they're important in terms of what we're going to be talking about next. About the item that we have, so we have the Jewish Agency. We can't meet the \$35,000,000 need which is not what they need to get by. We're only raising \$33,000,000 this year.

We are a million dollars short on the J. D. C. because they went into a deficit of \$750,000. That leads into the next question, unless you have some things here that you want to talk with Moe about and it gets down to some very fundamental facts. What are we going

to do in 1966?

As far as a realistic budgetary program.

Now, I want to bring this subject up.

We've had a running debate here for several years, as to whether we ought to be talking about a realistic budget or whether these budgets that we come out with, \$109,000,000 which we never achieve. I want to say this to you now. I want to say this with respect to my good friend Mr. Meyerhoff who has been our Chairman because I've argued with Gil all during the years with the idea of having a realistic budget is all wrong. If you start doing anything different then this budget is wrong.

Since I travel around the country, Joe, I have to admit that they keep asking the question, "Why don't you tell us what you need, and we'll try and raise it."

I mention these things to you because the next problem is the big one and that is this: what are we going to be talking about, what can we hope to achieve in the way of actually raising money in 1966. A) How much do you think we can raise. Or should raise. Secondly, should we talk about a realistic budget or should we talk about the budgetary approach that we've had in the past? This is the question that we should hit now and the meeting is open for anybody who wants to take it. Some position on this thing. It's quite a big problem we have to face.

You've heard the needs. Now we can have the speeches. Who wants to start off on this?

You all have the figures in front of you now? Do you want to put it on the blackboard? Is that a blackboard on the other side?

This will probably raise about \$61,000,000 this year, just about as close -- within a million or half a million dollars. That will be a shortage of three quarters of a million dollars for the J.D.C. on their actual expenditures, and we will not meet that \$5,000,000 for the Jewish Agency which is not anywhere near what our obligation is.

Does somebody want to say something?

Do you want to put those figures up there?

The thing that we're talking about is what happens if we raise approximately \$60,000,000 - \$61,000,000.

VOICE: Well, Max, look. Since nobody is leading off the discussion, let me try to start it by saying this. I don't think there are any figures that have to go on the board. Because there is only one figure, to talk about.

We've got to try to decide here, as we do every year, the question of a goal for the campaign. We've argued the thing year by year and most of us are familiar

with the arguments that have been put on the table. If we would like to try to give the Jewish Agency \$36,000,000 a year, if we'd like to try to give the J.D.C. \$18,000,000 - \$19,000,000 and we have to give the Nyama (?) a million dollars and we need 3.1 million for the expenses, you can add it all up and get to a certain figure whatever it is, and then you say it would be very good if we could have ten million dollars more and you always come up into the range of somewhere around seventy one, seventy two million dollars.

So our argument over the years has been, should we come out with a so-called realistic goal, of seventy two million dollars -- let me use that for the sake of the discussion, because that's the one that's come up year after year and go out to the country and say, "We need \$72,000,000. That's what we really and truly honest to goodness need. As a rock bottom minimum. And we're not kidding you with any inflated figures. If we got this, we could get by."

And implicit in it, in the presentation of that point of view is the fact somehow that some magic would occur and that if you came to the country with this so-called realistic figure, that because it's realistic, there would be a tendency for people to attempt to try to meet it.

037601718

Then their argument gets knocked down by the other set of arguments that we've had on the other side and we've all heard over and over again. That what we should do is not try to guess as to what the American Jews will give or not try to believe that there is any magic in the realistic figure, that what we really have to do, as responsible officers is come out and tell them what is the budgetary needs of the cause we're trying to serve -- plural -- you add together the budgetary needs of the organizations we're supporting and come out and tell the American Jews that that's \$109 million or \$111 million or whatever the figure is and whether they raise \$60,000,000 or they raise \$50,000,000 or they raise \$70,000,000, they should know what the budgetary needs are.

And that really if they took a goal for themselves which they should try to reach, they should try to reach that figure of \$109,000,000. There is a second argument that goes with it, that for years and years and years, you've been giving them the big figure, the big budgetary need figure, of \$110,000,000, \$111,000,000, or five or eight, whatever it was. If suddenly you came out and gave them a figure of \$72,000,000, everybody would say that there would be the confusion, "Well, Al, you only need -- you need less money, so I'll give less money."

Now, we've rehearsed the arguments over

and over again. Only once did we go -- do we have an experience with that realistic goal, and that was the year of 1961, where 1961 we came out and the goal, the national goal of the U.J.A. was \$72,740,000. And we wound up that year approximately the same, in the range of sixty odd million dollars. There were sixty two million or --

VOICE: When was that? Sixty --

VOICE: No. No. It was the same. Let me get this table of figures for you.

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: That was 1962. I was giving 1961. \$61,765,000. And a year later, we shot the goal up to \$95,000,000. We restored the special fund. In 1961 we did not come out with a national special fund. That was the only device we could employ to bring the figure down. And we didn't call for a special fund in 1961 and brought the figure down to \$72,740,000 and experience showed that there was no difference.

Now, the last thing I'd like to say is, everybody is sophisticated enough to know and to repeat over and over again, that whatever figure you use as a goal really doesn't make any difference, whether you use the higher figure or the lower figure. Because people don't give in relation to the goal. They give in relation to what they gave last year or how much more you can get out of them this

year.

So that argument always comes out, what's the sense of spending a lot of time. It doesn't really matter. Now, I'm just rehearsing and putting on the table again, everything that you've all said every year that we've debated this. It may seem futile to have to go through the exercise all over again. But it really isn't because we've got to decide, and this is the first order of policy for 1966, we've got to decide a figure. We've got to preen the budget books. We've got to get it out to the public. So that this is the background that I wanted you to have and we've got to come to a decision.

MOE: You see, there is a paradox. The communities set goals. They set so-called realistic goals. As a rule. The bigger communities. Cleveland. Detroit does. All of them. And most of them --

VOICE: But unrelated to U. J. A.

MOE: That's -- that's the point. That's the point I want to make. That's why it's a paradox and has nothing to do with the U. J. A. budget of need. And so, therefore, if what we do is related to the goals of the community, we come to the \$61,000,000 goal. That's all.

VOICE: Well, before we get started, gentlemen, you are all going to have an opportunity to talk. Before we get to goals, please, we can't direct our attention

-- we realize what the needs are --we've heard them, what we think we can realistically -- this is something I'd like to know, what you think we can really do, because this is something -- and then we'll talk about how to -- Joe?

JOE: I think that what we can realistically do, I am not at all certain, is a decision that we around this room ought to make. Because I like the idea that Dave and Allen said -- because basically I think there are a couple of questions which perhaps you people have discussed a number of times but which may be new to me and if I may, I'd like to ask these questions.

Because I think we've truly got -- this goal is so big and I heard an old story. How do you cook an elephant? An attorney of mine, now passed away, he said, "How do you cook an elephant?"

Well, the way you cook an elephant is a little piece at a time. You cut off a bit and cook it. We've really got such a tremendous amount of money to raise that the only way we're going to ever solve it is to take a little piece at a time. I've got to think about Cincinnati. He's got to think about Detroit. We just take it and say, "What can we do in these cities," because I think the problem and the decision of whether we see somebody or bring someone else in or whether we take care of a C.P. child in Cincinnati

or a C.P. child in Israel is basically a decision that some way, somehow, we've got to direct our attention with some kind of a creative approach and let the decision, the moral decision which they don't want to make in these communities, they don't want to hear of it, because if they don't hear it and they just go to their hospital or just go to this thing -- you know, their conscience is clear.

But I think the basic decision is we've got to try to see if there is a way to let them make the decision, because unless we can get them to make the decision, we can set any goal we want to and we won't raise the money.

My question is, how do we get and how do we try to bring this directly to each community to raise the money?

VOICE: It seems to me that we are starting off this entire session with a question that ought to be the one that we should end with. Rather than start with.

It seems to me that after we spend a couple of days talking about how we can raise more money, that we may come up with some idea after it is all over, which is an indication that we can raise more money, and if we can, then we're justified in thinking in terms of what our goal ought to be.

We know now that no matter how much we raise, the needs could be beyond what we will raise. If we raise \$70,000 or if we raise \$170,000 -- million -- we know that there is no limit, there just is no limit to how much money we could spend if we had the money to spend.

So that to talk about what our goal should be, really has no relationship to the needs in the final analysis. We must talk about the basic fundamental needs which we must meet, not needs that we would like to meet and should meet.

I think we should spend some time talking about the various factors that should go into fund raising this coming year. I think we can then begin to determine how much money the national community can raise and I submit that the time to talk about it is just before we adjourn and not at the beginning of our stay.

VOICE: Joe, just so everybody knows around here -- remember I told you this agenda is not fixed. We went around the room here and talked about this thing. There is no priority. If this is going to be the feeling --

I'd like to have a good deal more expression. I'd like to go right around the room.

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: Before you pass it up, what Joe said makes a lot of sense.

VOICE: But I want to go around.

VOICE: I'd like to take exception with Joe. I think part of your problem and we went through this last year, as Herb pointed out, everybody who was here last year knows, and I think we came up with a fairly reasonable solution, in terms of goals versus needs. And primarily, for the benefit of those who weren't here, I'm going to repeat what I think was a proper solution.

It's our job to present the need, and we should stay with the needs and we admit that the goal is not a goal but a presentation of needs. I'm going to tell you why I differ very strongly from Joe and maybe this comes a wee bit from some of the sales training I've had over the years.

I think this so-called realistic attitude is a defeatist attitude. I think when we start being realistic, this reminds me of quite a few incidents in my life where people came back and told me what could be done. They'd made a survey. They'd made a canvass. And this was the way it was going to be done.

No thought being given to the way you can change people's minds and the way you can sell.

And I think the best thing we can do is let's deal with these needs and let's decide if they're meaningful and if we believe them, here in this room, if we believe them, by God then we've got to go out and do the best job of selling that we can do.

And I don't think this thing of a goal -- I have in mind a particular incident right now in Philadelphia and it's something I want to talk to you about Herb. I almost forgot. About Philadelphia. But here is a community and oh, they were going to do this thing proper and for the first time they established a goal. And believe me, they are going to break their backs to meet the goal. And they are realistic. The goal is \$4,500,000 as compared to \$4,200,000. And what do you think happened? Everybody in the whole damned town is thinking in terms of a park for(indistinct.)

VOICE: More than they got the year before.

VOICE: Well, Joe, you can argue that way. Wait a minute. Let me finish. I know all the arguments and all the cliches and all the things we've listened to year after year. So they'll raise a little bit more. But I say that it's high time we started to think in terms of potential. We started to think in terms of maybe our whole approach has been wrong. We've got to think of qualitative giving a lot harder than we've been doing.

Instead of quantitative and percentages.

Just as we do in our own crowd and maybe come up with a technique. And I think the thing we should do, Joe, let's decide is this realistic? Are these really the needs? And let's go on then and if we feel that these are the needs, come up with a lot of maybe answers on how we go out and raise this.

027601121
I think this realistic attitude, and I've listened to it year after year -- and I know how it applies to myself, if I want to be realistic and a lot of guys in the room want to be realistic, we couldn't make the pledges we make in October and we couldn't make the pledges we make for the year and a lot of us are still struggling to pay them, and if you want to be realistic, this is the way you're realistic.

We're not realistic with ourselves.

And why do we have to walk out of these rooms and feel that we have to be realistic with the others and realistic with the community, I don't know, because in my opinion, you are giving up the fight when you are so-called realistic.

VOICE: Iz?

IZ: You know, this emphasis on realism remind me and I think Moe will recall, I am sure he was there -- the first time this really came up in a debate, realism against

what is practical was in '46. I was still in uniform then in Atlantic City. I had just come out of the Army. And we fought -- there was one side -- and this man here reminded me that his good friend Sam was the guy who raised the issue of realism. "Be realistic," until it got too much for Governor Lehman, I recall. "Talk about what needs are."

Realistic arguments in 1965 is an academic question. Let's forget it. I think the person who came the closest to putting his finger on the issue and I don't know whether it's on the Agenda or not, is Dave over there.

The difference between \$60,000,000 and \$71,000,000 is simply, and I am putting it very elementary, do you need it positively? Do you really mean it?

Now, we haven't been -- we pass resolutions. And as an example, we saw the possibility of the of the club dollar in special funds. Right. The only way we could move individuals in our communities to special gifts so that it wouldn't be dissipated into another Federation distribution was special gifts. Right?

I am going to be honest with you. I don't know how many, outside of myself, have followed that rule with their own communities and have stressed it in the communities where they have spoken or campaigned. I haven't heard much of it.

Now, if we mean it, and if we -- I use the

word in this sense, if we are really realistic, if we want \$71,000,000 or \$72,000,000,

(End of side 1 of tape 1.)

(Side # 2)

.... We ought to be very honest about the thing and say this is the fund with which we do for the U. J. A.

And I can tell you, Max, the people with whom I've talked, - I've told them very plainly, it's not a case of emergency, because when you deal with people, you're dealing with emergencies.

We progress from emergencies to a crisis and again to emergencies. That's normal. They're people. But I think what's important is that we get the money into the coffers of the U. J. A. And I think we ought to stay with this special fund and get the money right where it belongs, because by and large, that's where most of the people really want it anyhow.

They really don't know where the money goes. Lots of these local people. They really think it all comes to us anyhow.

CHAIRMAN: The floor is open. We've got all night on this one. We'll go right around the room.

As we said here before, we're going to ask you to save lives. The most vital message, the most vital program. I don't think there can be any compromise. We listened to a report, an analysis and we're told if we're going to do any kind of a job in saving their lives, rescuing these people and giving them a minimum of a start, we need -- that figure was \$71,000,000. That's the figure.

We can't compromise that. I don't think this is the time to compromise. I think this is the time to go out and get it. We'll answer with a compromise if we don't make it.

I think, therefore, this is the time to be realistic, and factual, with the truth, the need. And I am for establishing that as a goal -- the figure that we must raise. If we're going to do a full job, and not an incomplete job.

Because an incomplete job means that some of the people whose lives we would save, some of the people who would be at a minimum absorbed, would lose out in one form or another. And this is not the mission of the U. J. A.

CHAIRMAN: Next.

VOICE: I just want to ask a question of Al. You mean that we should have our goal the advertised goal the \$72, 000, 000 that we need or do you mean the goal

of our --

(Several speak at once.)

I thought that's what you were saying,
that --

VOICE: I say that we should have that
as a goal, not \$61,000,000 but \$71,000,000.

VOICE: That's what we should try to get.

VOICE: Our public goal.

VOICE: I don't think that you can cut
down on the figure that you've used in your presentation. I
spoke on this last year. Because --

(Several speak at once.)

CHAIRMAN: Al? Why don't we go around
here. We'll give you all an opportunity.

VOICE: I just wonder what the reason for
a goal is. I don't think 100th of 1% of the people know what
the goal is. I think it has no meaning. And -- once you
link this to the community, there wouldn't be any purpose
at all to a goal. It is something that you use as a tool.
So you have something concrete to talk about as their share
of this responsibility.

This is our realistic goal based on
last year and it does not cover our idealistic goal at the
realistic level that we must have. However, your share is
so much of this, and we have something concrete to argue about

-- whatever kind of goal, when it gets down man to man, or two men or one -- this is how you raise money, and as to whether you have a goal or not, this has no meaning.

It is a tool. In pre-campaign budgeting -- a realistic optimistic budget -- might have some purpose.

VOICE: (Remark made away from microphone.)

(Laughter.)

I listened to Pincus' comments -- and I don't buy it. Even if we -- spent weeks and weeks analyzing this, this presentation to us, I am sure that the need would be greater regardless of whether it would be \$105,000,000 and we bring it down to \$80,000,000, and as far as Moe and the marvelous job he did in cutting down his budget to seven and a half million dollars, God bless you, Moe, but I am sure that it will be easier to control it because you've got less people to serve, due to the fact that there are 56,000 a year coming out of your territory, Moe, into Israel, which should cut down your budgetary requirement.

Be that as it may, there is a tremendous need for more money. Because even as I said, if we bring this down to eighty million or seventy million or sixty million, we're a long way with our thirty three or thirty four million dollars from our requirements.

Now, Herb Friedman said that they should be informed of our budgetary needs. I don't know

who they is, or are.

I feel that we're talking of people. And we could only reach them through emotional or humane appeal. This budgetary need of \$105,000,000 is very much esoteric, strictly in this room. If you talk to one or two or three fellows and talk in terms of budgetary needs, he is going to laugh in your face. You've got to get him in some other way.

After listening to all of this, why don't we assume and take for granted that we must raise a lot more money? I don't think we should talk on the basis of how much should we raise to meet budgetary needs. I don't think we should work on the basis of how much can we raise based on budgetary needs. But I think in terms of one simple sentence. How can we raise more money? It's that simple. As much as we raise, it won't be enough.

That's it. How can we raise more money? Now, let's go back and look at more successful years. During the Sinai campaign and during that year we raised an awful lot of money. Well, we're not anxious for Israel to get into a war to raise more money.

We did a good job on the Roumanian question and we got into trouble. Roumania closed the doors, so then we began to get the story around a little bit just to contributors, and I think we went the other way too much. I think we toned down

our pitch too much.

I think what it boils down to is not analyzing budgetary requirements at all, but how can we raise more money and are we using the proper sales tools, the proper promotion, the proper pitch, to get these contributors to increase their budgets. I think it's that simple.

I don't feel that by taking \$150,000 away from one of your local requirements, - I know, if you take Detroit, we are not overstrained in any of our local agencies, the fact that we -- (unclear.)

It's very simple. We have to reach our contributors on an emotional appeal, for dollars for a humane purpose -- to raise more money.

Now, how we do it is our problem, I think.

CHAIRMAN: I want to go around the room here. I'll get to you boys over on the other side. On the right side -- now, wait. Do you have anything to say?

VOICE: I'd like to just toss this out. I think \$109,000,000 is rather meaningless to the average Jewish community in this country. I think we ought to become realistic. If we honestly want \$72,000,000 I think we ought to set out -- if Moe needs \$21,000,000 of that and HIAS needs whatever, five, seven million, --

(Several speak at once.)

U-7 31133

I mean the kind of reports that we, in the Executive Committee receive every other week on the question, on the whole bit, are highly informative, business-like and -- a few of you were here last night and I very much by accident, wandered in on a broadcast of Martin Luther King -- ten o'clock, we heard King -- transmitted from Washington -- and watched 2,000 or 2,500 people sitting there. During the roughly two hours that we sat here, I don't think I heard ---

(Question asked away from microphone.)

VOICE: I suppose so. I think we should. I'll throw this out as a query. Could we assign each community -- you say Moe has roughly 100,000 people left and you are estimating roughly -- don't hold me to these figures, they are round figures -- we might get 20,000 of these. And we might get 7 or 8 or 10,000 from Morocco, so let's say that we're going to get 47,000 people.

Now, could we take the 47,000 people, to which we say U.J.A. money is going, and divide it up by communities. Tell each community that they are responsible -- we are going to take just 47,221 people, and Milwaukee is responsible for 4,000 and this city is responsible for 3,000, and this community is responsible for so much. We could divide this up, at so much a person and then we keep weekly track of

this. I am wondering if a whole new approach to each community wouldn't have some new merchandising value. This is the way we, as the Executive Committee are receiving the figures of the collection and what's needed.

So I would take the position strongly. Let each community know each week how they are coming and at the end of the campaign, let's see what we did, and let's see how many people may have trouble getting to Israel, because we couldn't do it.

CHAIRMAN: Who's next here? Joe, you've been -- Well, now we'll go to the right. Phil, you wanted to -- Charlie. Phil.

VOICE: I just have one or two notations I made in my own mind. Listening to the very good report by Gott Hammer and Moe Levin, I think we all become convinced of the actual necessity of the \$72,000,000 figure, and Moe, I would like very much to chat with you later about a full and sufficient mental retardation program --

Now, it seems to me that it would make good sense to deal a little with realism in figures. --

VOICE: Where did you get the \$72,000,000 figure from?

VOICE: Well, it's about \$71,000,000.

VOICE: Where?

(All speak at once.)

VOICE: It goes back to the fact that you had a hundred and five million dollar figure, is that right?

VOICE: Yeah, I --

VOICE: And you got that --

(Several speak at once.)

CHAIRMAN: (Rapping gavel.) It was \$71,000,000. We talked about raising -- we needed \$10,000,000 more than --

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: Now, there is no secret about it.

You could make it nine million or ten million or five or eleven.

VOICE: But it's closest related to what Gottlieb was talking about.

VOICE: We talked about ten million dollars being a minimum requirement.

VOICE: In the past few years, you stated to the public that you need \$104 - \$109 - \$103 million. And the answer has been, \$60 to \$61 million. We've missed by about forty odd per cent.

If we went to our communities with some of the suggestions made here, and I like Ollie Edelman's suggestion, for example, and we said, "For real, the need is \$71 to \$72 million and we can demonstrate it to you. You have been helping us to raise \$60 million. We are \$12 million

short.

We're about 14 to 15% away." And you go to your communities. Communities that have been giving you 38 - 37%, instead of giving you a fifty-fifty break, and you relate the 14% to actual needs. You talk to community leaders. You talk to individuals. I think it becomes realistic. You are now asking for \$12 to \$14 million throughout the entire United States.

You are no longer asking for \$45 million which people feel is highly improbable and can't even cooperate in thinking in terms of such a large figure. I believe then, if we adopted the various methods suggested here, I like the method that my friend Philly here spoke of, where you get face to face with the fellow and you say to him, "you gave \$10,000 last year, and now we need an extra 15 - 18%," I think you really get closer to the heart of it this way.

And I would approach it from that point of view..

CHAIRMAN: Phil?

VOICE: What I want to say is this. I don't believe that the American Jewish community is really responsive in the form that it should - according to their needs.

You must be realistic. If we consider the figures, of the earning capacity of the American Jewish community, what we are given is actually a fraction of 1%.

Not even 1%. This is something --

VOICE: One per cent of what?

VOICE: One per cent of our annual income.

The American Jewish community, according to statistics, have an earning capacity of between sixty and seventy billion annually. Yes. Ten per cent of the product. It's off the record, but it's all right. We can speak freely. This is what it is. And we have figures to prove it. Sixty million is one tenth of one per cent. So there is nothing really this hard in the job that we are doing.

And many times, when we talk of a victory, I often wonder what kind of a victory. In the light of this. I say that without any question, that we must raise more money. We have to find ways. I don't believe that Israel can continue borrowing to the extent that they are. They have exhausted practically all of their resources.

And frankly - I want to be blunt. I am ashamed of the amount that we owe. Because it is very little. I don't really believe in borrowing. Why? Because if you owe money you have a responsibility to pay. This is one thing.

The second thing (rest of sentence unclear.)

I have been preaching this for many years. The story of U.J.A. is not well known. I can only say that to many people it is a highly kept secret. The greater number of people don't know anything about what we are doing. And this is something that needs to be corrected now.

What I am trying to say is this. We have to come up with very realistic figures. What our needs are. And I am in full agreement with the former speakers. That what's the use kidding ourselves? I think a minimum of \$72,000,000. We have a small obligation.

Max, I will never forget, your meeting in Chicago. I read it over many times. Why? The title itself had a certain magic. (unclear) generations.

We are living in a world, in a time that few of us, neither realize nor can appreciate. The very same people have seen the greatest destruction, the humiliation of ourselves, of our people. We have yet to see the day when you can make that statement, the generation, and I believe for that privilege, what we are giving is ridiculous. It is almost shameful.

And it is for us, we who are responsible leaders of the American Jewish community, to correct and to rectify. And to do something to see that the burden should not fall upon the people in Israel.

Through responsibility of ours in their affairs.

CHAIRMAN: Max, are you on the right, here?

VOICE: I'll try and add to the confusion.

(Laughter.)

First, I think the question of realism relates only to one subject and that's the question of what the needs are.

I think the rest is simply a matter of what is good public relations in the various contacts. It's one thing at a meeting. Another thing when you're talking to a prospect. And you never talk in terms of percentages. Any time you ask anyone for a percentage increase, you are putting a ceiling on it and that is the one thing we should not do.

I think we're spending an awful lot of time on the least important subject. If there is a budget and we believe it, as we've said before, that's the thing we try to raise money to meet. Meeting it may be in part, when you are talking about the welfare fund. So much comes from the government and the rest we have to supply. Then there has been mention made of special fund. You know, we believed in special funds throughout the years and we've used them. They have been helpful.

And I think we have a perfect reason for special fund, both in terms of what happened this year through the loss of the German reparations and what will happen again in the next year with the loss of eleven million dollars of German reparations.

And I think we're justified asking for a special fund all over the country. I think, though, that our principal problem gets down to the how we make a change in the way in which we are raising our money. And the how gets down to people.

I am going to say something that's unpopular. I've said it before and I am going to keep saying it because I believe it's true. That unless there is a sense of the priority in what U. J. A. is trying to do, I mean priority in relation to hundreds of good causes, unless we get that priority across, by what we do, we are never going to succeed, either in raising more money in campaigns or getting welfare fund leadership to consider giving more money out of the total take.

VOICE: Well, how do you do it then?

VOICE: By the way in which we ourselves act. By setting the example in what we do. By not proliferating our activities to the point where it affects our ability to do all the things that can and should be done in U.J.A.

VOICE: We've had this discussion through the years, and really what we are arguing about, as I see it, in 1964, we had a budgetary requirement of \$105,000,000 and there seems to have been a suggestion made that it would be more constructive to -- we raised \$61,000,000 -- to set a realistic goal of \$72,000,000 and, as Henry said, some people suggested talk about percentages and then go out and raise it.

I can see so much danger in setting a realistic goal of \$72,000,000 against a budgetary need of \$105,000,000 that I think it would be, in many fields, it would be very disastrous.

If we could really talk to a few of the top level people of the country and could explain the situation, one person to the other, without directly or indirectly talking to Federation, this could be a problem that could be solved.

But where we're dealing through Federations and then reaching people around the country, setting a realistic goal of \$72,000,000 on the theory that you are only asking for approximately 20% more, could be very disastrous not only insofar as fund raising is concerned, but it could have a very disastrous effect in pre-campaign budgeting.

It could also have a disastrous effect in terms of selling special funds to certain communities and

I just don't think -- it's the intelligent approach, but I don't think it's the tactical approach.

I think that we have to stick to a budgetary requirement. If a budgetary requirement in 1965 isn't \$105,000,000 but \$109,000,000 or \$110,000,000 that is the need and we have to go out and sell the communities on this need and as far as pre-campaign budgeting is concerned, so far as setting goals are concerned, and one thing that was said by someone here, if we could do this -- if we come near raising the \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 more that might be available in the country, if we could say to the communities at large today, that we absolutely require the community to have a special fund, I think this is part of the goal.

If you say to every community that you absolutely have to have a special fund or we can't allow you to campaign in our name, which I know we can't do, because there aren't enough men around the country that have enough courage or enough ability to convince their own communities that this is an either or choice. So we're really -- this can't be done from a practical standpoint. I would be the first to be for it. And it could be disastrous maybe for a year, but in the long run, I think the United Jewish Appeal would receive a lot more money if we forced the communities

to accept a special fund so that you could give the giver the prerogative, if he wants to make a gift, to give it completely and totally to the overseas needs.

As long as we can't do this, now I say there is only one thing -- one alternative left and I think all of these things have a relationship to either a realistic goal or working toward the budgetary requirements.

I think the lesser of the two evils as far as J. D. C. is concerned, as far as the Jewish Agency is concerned, as far as the United Jewish Appeal is concerned, is to set our budgetary requirements whatever they are, and that should be it.

This is what we did in 1964. It's not an ideal answer but it's the only solution we have in the trap that we're in today.

VOICE: As I said before his speech, I think I would like to say a few words.

I've been sitting here and listening and I've got a lot of questions. I don't have the answers. But it seems to me that what you're really talking about is techniques in fund raising. How do you raise more money?

I'd like to throw something out for consideration.

I don't think anybody really knows what the goals are. Honestly, I don't. I think when you go out to solicit a guy, he doesn't know U.J.A. goals from a - say a hole in the ground. But when you relate it -- Moe put his finger on it. When you go to a community they set a goal because they think if they get close to it, if they have a figure that they could attain, even the last week or two, they can make an extra drive to get there, because there is a definite satisfaction in achievement.

So if we raise \$6, 100,000 in Cleveland or wherever it is, and we're short a hundred thousand, we know in the last few days, the guys are going to pitch in to get that hundred thousand to make the goal. But you can't relate the U. J. A. goal to the community goal.

I've heard people say, "Well, we ought to go to the communities and say we need \$12,000,000 or whatever it is, or \$16,000,000 and let's allocate 20% to this community. That's totally unrealistic. Because, and I can always relate to my own community. You couldn't get 20% more out of Cleveland if you jumped off the Tower. It just isn't there. And yet, there are some communities that you ought to get 50% more. So what are you going to do?

Go to one community and say, "You ought to give 50% more, and you ought to give us 2% more." Why not

determine what each community ought to do?

VOICE: What I'd like to throw out to you is this suggestion. Did you ever stop to think of a possibility of going to the country and saying, "We need \$15,000,000 more."

Don't relate it to a goal. We have to raise \$15,000,000 plus dollars. We campaign on \$15,000,000 -- whatever the figure is -- this is what we need. So much plus dollars. Don't relate it to what we raise -- a goal. Relate it to plus giving. We have to go out and raise plus dollars. Whatever the figure is. And campaign on that. We need this much plus dollars. For a goal. Plus over what we got last year. And just build up that plus giving, plus giving in terms of the amount needed.

Every community has a special situation. In Washington, a special fund works. I think a special fund's a great thing in certain communities but I am not going to sit here and tell you that a special fund will work in Cleveland. It won't. But we've been successful without it. So if you come into Cleveland and say, "You ought to have a special fund," is again, totally -- if we're talking realism, totally unrealistic.

If we give the U.J.A. three million four hundred thousand dollars, we're going out job in terms of

percentage allocations. If we give 60% to the U.J.A. then we're doing our job. But you can't go into Cleveland and say, "Let's have a special fund," because you just won't get it.

So that in Washington if that's the way they can raise the most money, they ought to have it, and in many communities they probably should have a special fund. I would say Chicago could really use one. Because they aren't raising the money. But to adopt a program and say we are going to force our way into a special fund, it just doesn't make sense.

I would like again to say to you, consider the idea of talking about plus dollars.

Plus dollars. Plus giving. Whatever it is. Let's go out and get the plus dollars. And it might work. It might be a different approach.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, Max. Do you want to talk?

VOICE: Everybody said what I was going to say.

(Laughter.)

But I wrote it down at the beginning, so I --

(Laughter.)

VOICE: You know, I don't want to brag, but I talk last.

Last year, I was the one who voted for using the word goal of \$109,000,000 and I've heard all the arguments and I think what we should address ourselves to is the number which is what I think Herb looked for last year and which I think is what he is looking for this year.

And I would like to suggest that instead of using the word goal, \$109,000,000, we should simply advertising and he knows how we could do it, by saying, "Last year we raised sixty million so many dollars, and this year we must raise seventy one million four hundred thousand dollars."

I think this might reflect really what we are trying to do and I think this is not going back and reducing the goals and I think this would give us a target which means a certain type of increase to which we could energetically go out and use all these schemes and suggestions in order to raise this higher figure.

CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. Everybody is going to have an opportunity. Moe?

MOE: He said in essence what I --

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN: So we've got a target -- we have three more -- Moe. Gott. Joe.

And then we're going to close it --

Moe?

MOE: I would like to sum up.

First of all, I agree with everybody,
we ought to raise more money.

(Laughter.)

VOICE: Hear, hear!

MOE: Period. From everything that
everybody says.

VOICE: Now that you're in debt, Moe --

MOE: Now, all I say to you is, that
we're arguing with ourselves. This has been an old experience
in futility.

If we were the people who go to the
contributor and asked for money, we could argue the way,
and talk about realism, no realism, goals, needs, but we
don't. There is somebody that stands in our way. And that
is Federation of the Welfare Funds, and this has no -- any
discussion of raising more money has no merit in reality.

Now I am talking reality. Without the
Welfare Funds being in the picture. How we're going to do
it, and how we're going to change that situation? There are
patterns that have been set up and you cannot bring -- go back
and start history all over again. History has taken place.

There was a time in the United Jewish Appeal, some of you may be old enough to remember, where we used to have quota committees and we used to assign quotas to countries -- to cities and there was a big fight about the quotas and every -- some of the communities said, "You gave us too big a quota." They never reached the quota. But they always complained they got too big a quota.

Your problem is the how, instead of why we need the money and it's true, it doesn't make any difference whether you call it a need. We used to call it need and the newspapers preferred the word target or preferred the word goal and before you know it, it reads goal, even though it says needs on the book and we say these are the needs. We said it.

I think there is a problem; the way to deal with this and I'm going to make a very drastic suggestion. Let there be a committee of the United Jewish Appeal to sit down with a group of the Council leadership, in some of the larger cities and take up this problem of how do you do it. How do you do it?

If we go out to the country as this group goes out and solicits the big givers as you have done it and done it so successfully, the question is, shouldn't the United Jewish Appeal receive more than it's been getting?

And how do you do it? Now there, if we can involve the Welfare Funds in this project, but for us to break our necks in order to raise another million and a half dollars and get \$100,000 out of it, is a frustrating experience.

And therefore, I say that we must bring our partners into this thing. Otherwise, we are just talking with ourselves.

CHAIRMAN: Gott?

GOTT HAMMER: Max, I'd like to restate that if the U.J.A. raises approximately the same amount of money this year and next year, that it has in the last few years, all that we're going to be able to do is to bring over a number of people -- it may vary by a couple of thousand some years, it won't matter, we can take care of their very limited initial requirements and we will add to the burden that we have.

That's all that we're going to be able to do with the thirty eight million or thirty three million net that we're going to have available for work in Israel.

And I want to suggest to you that a special fund is very much in order and I think we ought to stop playing the numbers game as we have in the last few years.

What do I mean by a numbers game? We came up with a quota, based upon normal immigration of 25,000. We anticipate so much more therefore the special fund went for the emergency need created by that.

And this was merely a contrived situation.

I am suggesting to you that we approach American communities with the Welfare Funds, through the Welfare Funds, and to the contributors on the basis of work which has to be done. An area of work about which nobody is saying anything at all.

I want to point up to you that we ought to invoke this special fund to relieve the hardship cases, the care of the aged, the blind, the mentally ill, for the handicapped, for all the things that we're not doing because we don't have the money to do it.

And I'm most anxious to do it because this also includes programs which Moe has been cutting down. And Moe forgot to mention that when he cuts back because he hasn't got seven and a half million, part of that load is going on our backs, as it was in the so-called relief in transit business and in Israel, and therefore, I am most anxious that Moe's budget be increased not decreased.

I am concerned with people; I'm concerned with a job being done. And if he's going to get more money, it will be so much better for the Agency.

And I think that we ought to devote our special funds to all of the items -- there are forty million dollars worth of items here which could be done. There is absolutely no question about it. You are not going to -- if you consider I am talking about something that's nebulous, it is something you can understand. It is something that we haven't done. This is true merchandising, if you will. This is the kind of thing for which we have a right, we have a responsibility to ask for plus dollars.

VOICE: Are you asking that this become a requirement in every community?

VOICE: Nobody is trying to say that it become a requirement in every community, because this --

CHAIRMAN: Phil, do you have something to say?

PHIL: I'm afraid I can't add very much. I am devoid of ideas. All this is just a rehash of all the things that we've talked about certainly for the last several years.

I wonder and the reason I agree with Joe Shane is I think that after you hear all the things that we have done in the past year and all the results that have been achieved in the various communities in amounts of money, and how much has been raised on a special fund and how much

has been raised in communities without a special fund, whether we might not be in a better position to judge, based -- this is exactly what Joe Shane was saying, as to perhaps we might get some ideas out of it.

I think also, I wonder why our pros haven't come up with any ideas or any suggestions or advice. After all, we're sitting around here and we're doing a lot of hashing and rehashing of things, and I think if there is going to be any kind of a campaign technique or some new ideas we can try that they might come up with, I'd like to hear about it, because I am devoid of ideas. I don't think that a special fund as suggested by you, Gott or as has been suggested here, will raise any money.

I think that a special fund at this point, under the present circumstances, as I see it, and the present appeal that you can make for special fund money, is going to raise much money. It's true that if you take Los Angeles and if you take Washington and take Baltimore and perhaps Chicago, and from that point on you can just drop the special fund because you're not raising any money. I've made an appeal for a special fund and I know how little an effect it has. It's put a floor under our normal contributions that we receive from the various communities,

but there is no real zip to it anymore. And I'm not at all sure that we ought to even continue the special fund. People don't come out with a special fund -- for what? It's because you've got these unmet needs. That is just a different word for a thing we've been talking about for a number of years.

And I'm not at all certain, I'm not at all certain that we can get anywhere to any extent, unless we come up either with some new idea or a new reason to raise more money that will have a ring of authenticity to it, that will cause somebody to move and I don't know what it is.

It's just that tough. It's tough enough to just explain the reduced immigration and the fact that you're still trying to raise more money, despite reduced immigration. That's going to be difficult enough in itself to explain. But how are you going to raise more money in 1966 -- that we're talking about -- I don't know. I am devoid of ideas. It may be late and I may be tired. I don't know which, but I sure don't have anything I can contribute.

VOICE: May I ask a question of Joe through you?

VOICE: You can ask me direct.

VOICE: All right. I'll ask you direct. Joe, if it's assumed that we try to raise ten million dollars more than we did last year? Under the present form of operations -- Federation allocations etc. How much will we have to increase the campaign by, to get a net of ten million for ourselves?

JOE: Well, that's a debatable subject here. I am not sure. My impression is that if we want to raise ten million dollars more you don't have to raise too much more to get ten million.

VOICE: Do you think the communities will give us the advantage of all the overage?

JOE: Well, that's the second question you're asking.

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: Let's be entirely realistic about certain things. You know, we seem to sit here and we seem to think that we're the only agency -- no matter how we like it, we're dealing with a whole broad spectrum of agencies and community services and we must realize this is the situation.

If you're going to raise ten million dollars more -- you're going to raise ten million dollars more, you've got to raise more because it costs more in the

037601757

local agencies and in the local communities and we have to provide it. So I mean, let's --

VOICE: (Remark made away from microphone.)

VOICE: (Continuing.) Just a moment. I mean, I think there are certain facts here -- I just want to put into focus. First of all, we are not going to raise money by fighting with each other. This is an established fact. You are not going to raise money by thinking that because you get a small percentage out of communities, that this is the answer.

The only way you're going to raise money in communities is to raise more money on a net total basis. And this is the problem that I've approached the communities on. Now, you bring up this problem. I've been talking about this problem with all the communities that I've been visiting and I've visited most of the big communities of the country.

I've talked to the Council of Federations on this problem and I've talked to the Board of Directors, Directors and the communities, and they face a problem, too. They face the same problem, because how are they going to handle the problem of handling their increased costs of hospitals, and homes for aged, and look, I live in the community of Detroit and I feel just as much responsibility for taking care of my institutions at home as I feel overseas.

So the problem basically that we've got

to figure out with communities is how to raise total dollars more.

Not how are we going to fight for the dollars. You're not going to get any bigger -- if you've only got ten dollars and if you think for one moment if you're getting five, that you're going to get six, you're all mistaken, because you're not going to get it. What you've got to do is to figure out how to raise more than ten dollars.

I know this. There is more money in the country. Phil brings out this point - there is more money. People have more money and people are giving away more money. Unfortunately we have been as competitive in the total package of the dollar. Now, I mean, this is a fact. Brandeis has been getting it. Maybe they've done a better job of selling. There have been other instances.

There is money. People have money. You find that out. I know that. You've brought that out yourselves when you said you went to these people and there is more money available. I think one thing is certain. We know that we have to raise more money. That much is for sure.

As far as the budget's concerned, let me say this: I've heard all the arguments and everything else. It's pretty well established. We'd better not change the methods that we're doing on this budgetary approach --

VOICE: I don't agree with that.

VOICE: (Continuing.) Well, I think this is pretty well the consensus of most of them -- you and I are in the minority on these things, Joe -- I say this. I think it gets down to this. I have talked with these communities and I have talked with Welfare Federation and we have to make ourselves part of the communities. We have to work with them on this problem together.

Now, I'll tell you how important this is. I had a meeting on this thing here with Phil Bernstein, and Lou Stern and Irving Kane. We talked about it. They brought up the same problem to me. How are we going to raise more total dollars in the community?

They asked me this question.

VOICE: Because they need it.

VOICE: (Continuing.) You happen to be in a situation where you don't have local agencies.

VOICE: No.

VOICE: Just a minute. You don't have the local agencies the way the communities out here, the big cities have. So I think we're not facing up to the problem, and I think we're going to have to work with the Federation, and I think after thinking about this thing a little more, maybe we could come up with some ideas on how to do that. There is money there. We are not getting to the market we want

to get. And I think it's a question of how we go about this. I don't know. I don't have any ideas on this thing.

But I think as far as the goal is concerned, I do want to say to you this. I think we do know this. We are going to have to have a bigger goal. We know we are going to have to have increased needs. And maybe what we ought to think about is how the devil we are going to get these dollars with whatever new methods we can use.

But I don't think the idea -- I disagree very thoroughly with Dave and yourself -- on the matter that you're going to get it by going into a community, and tell them that you want a bigger share of the total that is now being raised. You're not going to get it. And I tell you, this isn't the way you're going to get it.

VOICE: Max, could I get in on this point?

(Several speak at once.)

CHAIRMAN: Please.

VOICE: Max. Max. I think I agree with you. I can recognize the fact that there are growing requirements in every community. It's only natural. But if you just take the history of it and look at cold figures, if you're hypothetically speaking, if you go back five years, and if the community has raised a million and a half dollars more a year, over a five year period, that's talking about

seven and a half million dollars.

Now, if we were getting half of that seven and a half million, it leaves the Federation \$61,000,000 we'd be raising sixty four and a half million, which isn't the answer to our total problem, but it would -- an additional three and a half million dollars out of the communities over a five year period would be a step in the right direction.

And our problem here is that we continue to worry ourselves on how to raise more money and we do everything public relationswise in the communities and try to do the job and when we reach the end result, we find ourselves with the communities getting the money and we're getting a pittance out of it.

And, it's true the communities need it, but the United Jewish Appeal also needs it. And if there is a fair distribution of the increase that's raised in communities, if we weren't outmaneuvered at the pre-campaign budgeting level, or somewhere along the lines either by the Director or Federation Board or the Budget Committee, we'd be getting a better share of this and this is the point in question -- do we raise more money for ourselves along with the communities getting more money?

VOICE: Let me say this to you fellows -- I want to say it to you because this is a very firm feeling of my own.

VOICE: Are we calling for a meeting with them?

VOICE: (Continuing.) Yes. We're going to call them. Now, I say to you this right now. If you think for one moment that you're going to sit here as a group and say to the community that they're not going to get the amount of money to run the agencies that they have -- just a moment --

VOICE: I never suggested that.

VOICE: (Continuing.) Wait a minute.

Mel brings up this point, and I've heard the same thing. You're going to find local communities are going to have to take care of their institutions and they're going to come first whether you like it or not. This is a fact of life.

VOICE: I don't buy this. Really. Really, I just can't subscribe to that at all. I don't think the community wants it.

(All speaking at once.)

If this has been made available after the allocations --

(Many speak at once.)

No. No. No. I know what you have here. But is there any data available of the allocations of that which we do not get? In other words, the community allocations?

The different categories. Is there anything like that?

(All speaking at once.)

VOICE: You mean in the communities?

VOICE: That's what I'm talking about.

VOICE: Let me answer your question.

(All speaking at once. Chairman raps with gavel.)

VOICE: The man asked a direct question. We have to give him a direct answer.

VOICE: We haven't got the answer.

VOICE: (Continuing.) The answer is we do have the data -- not here. There is data in the office. We can correlate the data for you or give it to you in detail. Depending on how much time you want to study it.

What we've got in the office is a breakdown of all of the local and national allocations made by the major communities. We don't have it for every city in the country but we've got it.

(All speaking at once.)

CHAIRMAN: We have a couple of announcements here.

VOICE: How about letting Max --

VOICE: What's going to be the agenda? Are we going to get back to starting on special problems --

VOICE: Yes. Tomorrow morning.

VOICE: Well, how are we going --

VOICE: Tomorrow morning what we're going to do --

(All speaking at once.)

VOICE: (Continuing.) Gentlemen. Let me just tell you -- let me just try to answer the question. Izzy Bretweiler is standing here a very frustrated person. Max wants to close the meeting. We're going to start in the morning at the following point.

Tomorrow morning's agenda that we printed calls for a full discussion on the question of allocations.

Before we get to that, we've got to finish the topics that we haven't concluded tonight. I've got a lot to say, but I'm not going to say it at eleven o'clock at night.

We've got to finish the question of this matter of the budget and the goal. We've got to finish the matter of a discussion of a special fund, which is very serious. We've got to finish the question of whether there are any new ideas as to how we can raise money for next year.

And that's what we'll start with tomorrow morning. And then we'll go on to the topic that was assigned for tomorrow morning -- Max talks about flexibility -- we'll just keep postponing from session to session, what was scheduled

for a session, until we finish what was scheduled for the session before.

(Laughter.)

VOICE: Until next year.

VOICE: (Continuing.) So we'll go on tomorrow morning with what we haven't finished tonight. Hopefully, we'll get through the budget discussion, also tomorrow morning, the allocations and budgetary problem. We've got a lot of charts and tables to go over and some conclusions to offer.

By tomorrow afternoon we'll get on to the education thing. Tomorrow night, the topic was listed for the whole public relations and advertising program of the organization. And Sunday morning, there was the topic of how to increase the number of contributors, for which we've got a very specific plan that we want to offer to you.

Plus a couple of business items that we have to conclude Sunday morning, the question of taking in bonds. Now, you see, I would suggest --

VOICE: Save it for tomorrow morning.

VOICE: (Continuing.) I think so. I think so. So we'll open with you tomorrow morning and that ought to ease the question of frustration tonight.

CHAIRMAN: I've got a couple of announcements.

Look, we've gone around the room. We've got plenty of ideas and we're going to crystallize them.

(All speaking at once.)

(Announcements made as to Saturday morning committee meetings.)

(Whereupon the session was adjourned.)



007231167

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

ONCHIOTA MEETING

AMERICAN JEWISH
ARCHIVES

Saturday Morning

May 22, 1965



זכר אלה יעקב וישראל

Tape No. 2

CHAIRMAN: Ladies, please .. you know, can we have a little order in the place can we have any order in the place. You know something, everyone was talking last night and they seem to think that we are going to continue this way. Can we get serious for a moment?? I don't know what happened with the Gin Rummy players .. or what happened last night ..

VOICE: All the Gin Rummy players are here. Some of them are a little broke.

VOICE: Was there a game here ...?

CHAIRMAN: Alright. Can we get started now? I am glad to see that everybody is so full of beans this morning. Yes, all the pep .. by the way, at 12:00 we all take a little hike around the lake; everybody ... around the lake. Now, look .. seriously. I'd like to be serious a moment with you. You know last night when I left this meeting, I was a little bit disturbed by disagreement and a little bit of provocativeness. But you know, after thinking it over .. instead of playing Gin Rummy .. which is not that I lost money, instead of making money, I realized that ..

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIRMAN: O.K., O.K.

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: That is what is discouraging ..

CHAIRMAN: Alright. But after thinking it over, I think that we accomplished a great deal, and the more I thought about the meeting last night, the more I felt proud of this group..because I think that it is really a wonderful group, and this is what makes UJA go; and I would like to tell you just some of my thoughts for a moment. You know the frankness and the opinions of each one of you throughout this room makes me understand that we have a group of rugged individuals. And this is important, because these are the kind of people that can make a great movement like this go. And I tell you, your frankness and your dedication and your enthusiasm is what gives the blood, sweat and tears and money to this great cause - and I think this.. I just felt very good. It took me until 2:00 in the morning to realize it that this was a great, great organization, and it was because you are willing to talk frankly - you are not going to become a "Yes Man" to anybody, but when we weld together this kind of a group -- I can understand what makes UJA tick for over the last 25 years. So I say to you, "I am really proud of all of you." It made me realize, last night, in talking to many of you, and one of them ...I wanted to talk about.. was Joe Shane, last night, in front of the fireplace..it was about 1:00 o'clock.. which is true.

We are the leaders of the biggest fund raising activity in the world, not the United States. We are the

037601475

life-saving arm in American Jewery, and we must face up to that responsibility. And I think that last night we were coming to grips with some of the matters that bother us; we'll be getting into these problems still further. So I'd like to reconstruct some of the things that happened last night!

First, here is what we did agree on. We agreed that Jewish Agencies need at least \$10 million more from us. I think that after listening to the needs, there wasn't any question on this.

Next, we agreed that JBC needs more money; because they went into the hole for the first time in many years.

Then, we tackled the matter of Goal, and we had no sharp concensus on this thing; but I do think this - Herb and his staff feel very keenly that we must come to some formalization of this ... along the lines of last year. But I think that Joe Shane was probably right that we ought to leave this formulation of goal 'till the end. And that to me seems to make a lot of sense.... we have agreed on the need, the goal will finish that up with ... But we did come to one basic understanding on what was the real goal. Do you know what the real goal is? Because the real goal is to raise more money - because we need more money - and to me this is the real business of the morning. That is one thing that we all agreed on. You know, Joe Cantor said last night ... we talked about how to cook an elephant. You cook an

elephant a piece at a time. And that is how we are going to be doing it at this meeting. We are going to be cooking a piece of the elephant at a time, and when we get through with this meeting, I think that we are going to have the elephant pretty well cooked!

Now - last night, we came up with some ideas on raising some more money. Let me go over some. Eddie Ginsberg stressed the idea of having a "Plus-Giving".. a \$15 million fund. Al Aderman sent a lot of number of imigrants to communities. Phil Stollman pointed out one important thing. We must tap the great potential of the American Jewish Communities, who only give 1/10th of 1% of their earning power. I was really amazed at that! And Henry Bernstien talked about leadership priority. And my good friend, the Turk from Detroit, talked about emotional merchandizing instead of figures. Dave, over here, Dave Lowenthal got gritty on the platform, and said that we have to tell the people more facts; tell the American Jewish Community the whole story; that we have got to face it!

Because as I said -- what we are doing is taking this whole thing apart -- one piece at a time. So I think that when we put all these things together - I think that we can feel good. I think that we started off this thing in a very, very good tone last night -- and I think that we have something to look forward to, because from now on we will be

037601477

talking about the positive aspects of this thing -- which is this: We need more money -- and how are we going to raise more money!

So this is the first order of the business, and, by the way, I want you to remember that there was one fellow whom we wouldn't allow to say a word last night!

(LAUGHTER)

CHAIRMAN: Herb! So I think it's the first order of the business -- I think that we ought to call on Herb to talk about two things. He wants to talk about the special fund; and he wants to talk about some ideas about how we can raise more money; where we can raise it -- and should! And on that tone I think that we'll really start to know a real part of the business; we'll cook a piece of the elephant right now!

Herb -- how about it!

VOICE: Isador Breslau didn't get to ask his question

CHAIRMAN: We've already Herb, will you take over?

HERB FRIEDMAN: O.K., Max.

MAX FISHER: You'll forgive me now now ..
(Chairman)

(LAUGHTER)

HERB FRIEDMAN: This isn't going to be .. this

isn't going to be any ceremony, Eddie. I think that Max is putting the meeting on the track now.. and .. what happened last night was that we started to talk about a Goal.. we really wound up feeling a little frustrated because we wanted to get to talk about how we can raise more money.

There are a lot of things that I want to try to say this morning; but I want to try .. I want to end by proposing a couple of concrete things, and I'd like those to become the basis of a discussion to analyze whether you think these things are feasible and practical. If they are then we can make the plans now to put them into operation.

Rightly or wrongly -- and I don't want to go into the whole quarter of history of how this campaign is organized -- rightly or wrongly; our fate rests in the hands of a very few people in the United States. And they say it's wrong that such a large percentage of our money comes from such a small number of people. But there is no point in discussing that any more, because that is a fact in history of a quarter of a century. Our success rests on a very thin edge of what a very small number of people do -- or are given an opportunity to do!

I put a few selective figures on the board in order to make the point clear. In Baltimore 425 people make up gifts in the range of \$1000 and over... \$1000 and

over. There are 425 gifts of \$1000 and over. That represents 2.2% of all the giving in the city. 2.2% of the people raise 71.8% of the money. 425 gifts make up \$2 million 280 thousand dollars out of a little over \$3 million in the whole campaign.

I want to point this out because sometimes we make the mistake of saying -- 20% of the people raise 80% of the money; 30% of the people raise 70% of the money. We always use figures like that. They are not true! 2% of the people make up 71% of the money -- that's how important those 425 gifts are in Baltimore .. from a thousand and up .. that's all that there are! Out of a total of \$1000's and \$1000's of gifts.

Boston! There are 893 gifts above \$1000. 2-1/2% of all the givers make up 65% of all the money.

Cleveland! The highest in the country. They have got just over one-thousand gifts above \$1000. It's 3.4%!

The biggest, best coverage in the country is only 3.4% of the contributors - making up 70% of the money.

And so down. I didn't even bother to list all of the cities, because the pattern is identical!

. We are talking in each term about 2% or 3% of the people. We are talking about a few hundreds of people in the whole United States. ... the whole United States!

007601480

We say that maybe there are 1 million people contributing to this campaign. The whole fate of the campaign rests upon what 10,000 people do - 12,000 people - in all America.

The reason that I'm stressing that is - and I say rightly or wrongly - I am not going to go into past judgement - you could say it's wrong - that so much depends upon so few, but it's silly to say that because that is the fact of history; the fact is that this is a manueverable number of people - a reachable number of people - this is a small number of people to get to -- and that makes our job easier. If we will realize that by concentrating on that number of people, we can alter the course of the campaign substantially - and I would like to define that. That is the next point that I would like to make.

Altering the course of the campaign substantially in my judgement is a matter of anywhere between 2 and 5 million dollars!

I would like really to elaborate that point for a minute, because I think that we all have to get over our frustrations, and we all have to have sense of values as to what constitutes a success and what constitutes a failure! Barring historic changes, there is no possibility in my judgement of raising \$10 million more in any given year's campaign from one year to the next, under the present historic

circumstances. There is no motivation for American Jews to operate differently from the way they have been operating. They see no reason why they should. All the conflicting images of Israel put in their minds a doubt as to how really urgent the needs are. They have a success story of Israel that is given to them from the investment end -- the financial point of view. They have a success story of Israel given to them through their own two eyes, when they go there and they look at it! 50,000 American Jews a year go to Israel. Every year they see it -- it gets better and better -- it looks happier and richer. All the testimony from what they see, and hear, and read, leads them to the conclusion that Israel is progressing and succeeding, and the sharpness and the poignancy and the urgency of what we feel to be the needs do not penetrate, and no matter if we were to try in the most successful way to write detailed memoranda, and hoping that those 15,000 people in American would read those memoranda, as we hear them here, nevertheless I say we could not substantially change their conception that Israel is a successful project and going and they would see no reason why they should give \$10 or \$15 million more!

. And I don't think that we should berate ourselves as having a failure in a campaign if we can't push the thing up by \$10! My notion of success and failure is within a much narrower range --- \$2 -- \$3 -- \$4 million, and I do

think that it is possible to raise that much more! And I would consider it a very great success - if the campaign in 1966 could raise \$3 million more than the campaign of 1965, which is going to raise \$1 or \$1-1/2 more than the campaign of 1964! Now, the \$3 million somebody said last night doesn't really represent much of a contribution towards solving these horrendous \$100 million problems. But the fact of the matter is that a \$3 million extra kick into this thing would represent a very great easing of the situation, both for the Jewish Agency and the JBC -- it is not to be minimized, and all the plans that I want to talk to you about are geared towards seeing if we can raise \$3 - or \$4 million more! Not more than that! And if we could do that I think that everybody would consider it a very great success. At least I would. And I think that you should.

Point No. 3 is that I think that we ought to look not only on the \$1000 and over gifts -- but I think that we ought to look at the \$10,000 and over gifts -- and I put them on the back of the board. Just swing the board around and we can see it!

VOICE: You don't have those by cities, do you

HERB FRIEDMAN: The \$10,000 no! But we have it in the office and we can take it out.

This group on the top, here, represents national...

and this group, here, represents New York City, and here are the totals.

There were 437 increases in \$10,000 and over gifts ... thank you..... 1965, 437 gifts produced \$9,892,000 against \$8,354,000... for a plus of a million and a half!

There were 234 repeats -- \$5-1/2 million worth. Repeated at 5-1/2 million ... no gain and no loss.

There were 57 decreases that brought in only \$888,000 this year, compared to \$1 million 260 thousand last year -- so it was a minus 372. Now, on this number which is approximately 700 gifts -- worth \$16,187,000 this year; \$15,21,000 last year, or a gain of a \$1,165,000 -- 7.8%.

VOICE: Does the bottom line represent .. decimal.. (indistinct) on card?

HERB FRIEDMAN: No! Decreases on cards.

VOICE: (Indistinct) That's because (indistinct) .. definiteother losses and figuresyou have those figures???

HERB FRIEDMAN: I have it city by city and I can give you the total of it. It is over here. Alright, I'll throw that in!

In New York City, you had 36 increases -- \$1,181,000 against \$898,000 for a plus 283. You had 51 repeats -- \$1,300,000 worth. You had 13 decreases --- \$254,000 against \$338,000. So you wound up with \$198,000 plus on 100 gifts and the same

037601434

percentage -- 7.9 -- very interesting. The total of the National in New York: we've got 828 of these gifts tabulated; by the way there are only about 1,100 all told; so we've got 828 out of the 1,100 recorded so far. \$19 million's worth: \$18,913,000 - \$17,548,000: a plus of \$1 million free: 7.8%! You have here in 828 gifts \$19 million's worth of money -- out of the total raised in the whole campaign -- Welfare Funds and New York City -- of something like \$110 million. In other words, 828 gifts are \$19 million's worth. By the time you get the whole 1,100 gifts recorded in this \$10,000 or over category, the whole 1,100 gifts in my judgement will probably show \$23 - \$24 million dollars!

One-fourth -- maybe 23% -- of the whole campaign of over \$100 million (bucks) -- National and New York UJA -- 20% to 23% of that money rests in 1,100, not even the 15,000 that I am talking about on the other side of the board. It will focus the problem down even that narrower!

VOICE: Will there be an increase down there at the bottom (indistinct).....

HERB FRIEDMAN: You'll run down there to the bottom in the whole 1,100 you'll run an increase of 7%.

VOICE: ...should there be an increase of over \$1 million in those years

HERB FRIEDMAN: Yes!

037601435

VOICE: .. in the \$10,000 and over gifts?

HERB FRIEDMAN: Yes!

VOICE: Well -- where is the loss???

HERB FRIEDMAN: I'll answer that in a minute.

Now, I'm taking this point and I'm making it quite specific, in order to reach the bottom line of the proposal, as I see it, which is the way that we can make money in 1966.

I think that I have demonstrated the fact that the number of people we are talking about that can influence the course of the campaign is such a limited number of people that between us in this room, we could see every single one of those men personally! Certainly, the 1,100 we could see personally. We could probaly go much deeper than the \$10,000 we could drop to the \$5,000 level, and it might turn out that that would be 3,000 or 4,000 people. It is not inconceivable that we could manage to see all of them personally!

Now, the second general point that I want to make here is that after studying the figures all of these years, and after taking into account the fact that there is no new historic fact to produce motivation for compulsion increase in 1966, the only way that I say that we can get this extra few million dollars is to see these key people personally and to give them a vehicle by which they can give extra money to the UJA -- if they want to!

Every time that we have had cooperation from the

communities in terms of the vehicle - which we call the special fund - the 100 cent UJA Dollar, we have managed to make an increase in the campaign. We are talking today about a \$16 million level, which all of us must realize - if we'll think back for a minute - represents a \$10 million built-in increase, into what we now call the regular, which we have built-in, because those were gains which we made in the years that we ran good and big special funds, and gradually they became "consolidated" -- do you remember that word -- and were considered part of the regular, both in the way a community thought of the money, and in the way an individual thought of his own money that he contributed. You remember back in the days when we first began the special fund that we used to call the regular \$50 million, \$51 million, \$52 million -- that was what we were getting prior to 1956, which was the first year of the Special Fund. In 1955 we got \$52 million -- \$53 million, maybe, and we added the special on top of the base of \$52 or \$53 million, that we called the Regular; we shot it up as high as \$80 million. We did as high as \$27 million one year in the Special Fund - and it broke back -- and it fell back. Communities in their bookkeeping consolidated the gain - and called it "Regular." The contributor who was giving - would increase his giving -- and go on from 5 to 10 began to call the 10 "Regular" in his mind also -- and the sharp

037001487

year of distinction, if you look at our bookkeeping, was 1961, when we didn't have a National Special Fund, and we consolidated our own figures, and from that point on we began to call \$16 million "Regular". And in 1962, when we reinstituted the "Special Fund" and worked hard at it -- in 1962 we picked up another \$4 million (bucks) -- we got almost up to '64 -- but we were always considering psychologically our base was 60. This is a long term, built-in gain that we made from the days that we instituted the "Special Fund" and it's a permanent \$10 million gain! Both in the way the communities allocate the money and the way the contributors give the money.

I am giving that background in order to lay another premise for my conclusion that what we have to do in 1966 is take a big, kick forward -- a \$3 or \$4 million kick forward, through the vehicle of the "Special Fund" -- I see it as the only way!

Now! What is the exact state of affairs of the "Special Fund" today???? It is operated in four communities: of the big group - the main cities - and in about 25 communities of the middle level cities! It is operated in Chicago, Baltimore, Los Angeles and Washington -- those four!

It produces in Baltimore approximately \$335,000 -- \$350,000; it produces in Chicago, something around \$300,000;

it produces in Washington something close to \$600,000 -- and produces in Los Angeles -- this year my guess would be something around \$300,000 or \$350,000! As for last year, it was \$500,000 in Los Angeles. It has gone as high as well over \$1 million.

I would like to make the proposal that for 1966 we concentrate in a practical way -- and I'll be specific -- on getting the "SPECIAL FUND" reinstituted, where we can as The Vehicle by which we can get more money, and that we solicit the money for the "Special Fund," after we have worked out clearances with the communities. Now, I will give you the details of my scheme in a minute!

Izzy Breslau said last night that we walked away from our meeting a year ago, having taken a decision to do that, and if you will recall, and if you don't, if you will read the minutes, we did take the same decision last year to re-activate and re-motivate and re-crank-up the machinery of this "SPECIAL FUND," -- and, then, he said last night, "after we made a resolution here, nothing happened, and we didn't do anything about it, and the whole thing died!" He is quite right -- except for one fact which maybe he doesn't know, or nobody knows.

I left this meeting last year, and went to the Council Federations and Welfare Funds.. and I asked them if they would help us by endorsing the decision that we had

made here. I made for the Council -- for Phil Bernstein -- the same analyses that we made here, which led us to the conclusion that this is the way for us to get an extra few million dollars. He did not disagree. He couldn't disagree. The facts are impressive. But what he did say was that he couldn't do what I was asking him to do. The Council of Federations could not endorse the UJA's request. His reasoning was that The Council of Federations doesn't tell the communities what to do; the communities are autonomous; it doesn't guide them; it doesn't direct them; and it never passes resolutions in support of any one particular fund raising organization. I guess this is the point at which our conversation became a little bit rough, because I said, "What do you mean any one particular fund raising organization? Aren't we the most important? Aren't we really generous? Aren't we different? Don't you, the Council, send Missions over to Israel periodically, and don't you also testify that the needs are enormous?" So he said: "Our rules forbid us from endorsing campaign methods of any particular organization." And the conversation stopped!

It may very well be that he had no choice.

It may very well be that because the Constitutional framework of the Council of Federations is such that he really can't do what we were asking him to do. And, therefore, my proposal which I want to make this year does not

constitute putting the Council of Federations on any kind of a spot. I don't want to ask them to do something that we asked them to do last year -- and that they said they can't do! I would like to say that we go directly to the communities, keeping the Council informed, obviously, but that we go directly to the Communities -- and ask for a meeting with them, and I've got the list of communities here, where it makes a difference, and I would like to propose that this group come together with the Executive Director and the President, in order to keep the meetings small of the following named list of communities that I have here -- the first week in September, right after Labor Day, to ask for the cooperation of the specific Executive Director and President of the specific community involved, to impress upon him in depth -- as it is impressed upon us -- that we have got to raise more money; that we want to; that the way that we can do it is through soliciting extra money from any Contributor who wants to give it -- but we need the Vehicle by which he can give it -- and that we will offer to come in and do all the soliciting -- or as much of it as is possible - if they'll have us - and that we will do this in October, and November, and December -- and here are the lists of communities that I would like to invite to this meeting and the rationale for each one!

I would ask:

Baltimore

and Chicago

and Los Angeles

and Washington - if they wanted to come, but I wouldn't press them to come, because we already have the vehicle in those four communities! If they want to come -- fine. But they don't need to be convinced because they have already given us the vehicle.

I would not invite Cleveland or Detroit, because I think that it would be a -- an exercise in fruitless frustration -- and I think it would harm the meeting! In Cleveland we are not going to get a SPECIAL FUND -- and I don't care if we stood on our heads; nor can we refute the figures by which a Special Fund in Cleveland wouldn't necessarily be to our advantage. I am not arguing a theory in the abstract, Gentlemen, I am arguing something practical, where it doesn't pay to fight for the thing, because you get protected anyway -- then don't fight for it; you don't need it!

If the situation in Detroit for 1966 can be repeated for what it is in 1965; then, we don't need it there either, because in 1965 we have a situation where in Detroit, we estimate, will raise \$473,000 more than the year before, and we'll get \$366,000 of it! Now, we couldn't

improve that situation by going in and asking for a "Special Fund" by which we could solícite money all for ourselves! We couldn't gain anymore that way than we are gaining this way; and if the 1966 thing will be repeated in Detroit this way on this basis -- then we are just batting our heads against a wall unnecessarily infuriating them, and gaining nothing! Therefore, I would not invite Cleveland and Detroit to this meeting, because if we invited them they would come -- and they would have to say that they don't need it, and that they don't want it, and that they are taking care of us in the normal way, and by saying that, they'll sour it for all the rest of them! So I wouldn't invite them!

The ones that I would invite are the following cities:

Boston

Miami

Newark

Philadelphia

Pittsburgh

St. Louis

San Francisco.

• Of all of those cities, San Francisco, is the one that I might question because San Francisco this year will raise just over \$2 million and will give us (probably)\$1,150,000

of it.

One of the very good, high percentages, very comparable to Cleveland, and I am not sure that I would make a Federal Case with San Francisco about it. I would invite them, however; it might be that by a Special Fund vehicle in San Francisco we could pick up a little bit of money, but because that community is so uniquely saturated with influence by 14 families, which raised 25% of the money, there is not much extra to be gotten from them, and I think that I would just leave a question mark there.

In addition -- of all the cities in the country, I would confine the meeting to the following:

Milwaukee
Denver
Atlanta
Cincinnati
Minneapolis
Buffalo
Dallas
Hartford
and Kansas City.

And if you ask, "Why this criterion??" It's because everyone of these cities raises at least \$750,000 and

037001494

above. That secondary group goes from Hartford, which raises about \$750,000 - \$800,000; up to Milwaukee, which raises \$1 million, 500 thousand -- \$1 million, 600 thousand. And everything ranges inbetween: Kansas City is over \$1 million; Minneapolis is almost \$1 million; Denver is \$800,000 or \$850,000; Cincinnati is \$1,100,000 or a \$1,200,000 - something like that. That is a maneuverable group of cities, Gentlemen. That is 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 -- and if San Francisco weren't invited -- that is 15. If the four that have the Special Fund come -- that would make it 19. Eh, always New York. You know we are talking where we have a problem. In New York we have no problem with the Special Fund.

So you are talking within somewhere between 15 and 20 communities. I wouldn't bother beyond that because below that you are talking about ^{little} tiny bits of money where we don't have to take and make a National project out of it as we do. In these 20 cities -- ^{massive} that's where the money is; the rest of it, please be assured, the ^{mechanics of the} normal/campaign procedures can take care of it -- I don't want to bother you with it.

BILL ROSENWALD: Would you repeat the first 5 .. the first 5 or 6

HERB FRIEDMAN: The ones I would invite, Bill..

Boston,

Miami,

Newark,

Philadelphia,

Pittsburgh,

St. Louis,

San Francisco,

... and San Francisco with a question mark!

I would call this meeting; I would have this meeting in Chicago; there are two reasons for that: there is in the heart of the United States, West of the Hudson River, an antipathy to New York. Don't ask me to explain it. Because sociologists and psychologists have spent 100 years trying to figure it out. New York dictates! This immediately sets up hackles in everybody .. in Nashville, in Dallas, and some places. I would like to have the meeting in Chicago for that reason.

The second reason that I would like to have the meeting in Chicago is that Chicago is the city in which we have the greatest chance to make the greatest amount of money, if we really can prosecute this Special Fund with vigor;

And thirdly, we have a better chance of getting

attendance, if we put the meeting in the center and the people can come from the West and from the South, as well as from the East.

I'd like to have the meeting arranged physically in a way that we can all talk to each other like this; it means just setting up a double flair. I think that it's always significant and important. I'd like to have the meeting long enough -- so that everybody can talk the way that we do here! I'd take 2 days to hammer this thing out. I'd like to have enough time in advance to prepare the material to send to everybody to show them why we feel that this is the way we can make some money. I'd like to iron out -- as many hours as it takes at the beginning of the meeting -- a common philosophical approach; they have to agree with us that this much extra money is needed and want to do it! There has got to be persuasion. I'd like to have them have plenty of time to explain why this is difficult for them and see if there are valid objections which we can maybe help overcome. I would like to come out of it with an agreed upon plan that they will work together with us with their local people, cooperating with our National people, to solicit as many gifts as we can for the "Special Fund" where the built-in guarantee for them

is that at the same time we are helping to get the basic gift repeated for the 1966 Campaign in which they are also interested, for they know by now we are not going to violate our own rules on the special fund, and it's got to be an extra gift above last year, anyway, so there is gain in it for everybody.

VOICE: Will you answer the one question I'll ask ... I have a question ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: Yes.

VOICE: How do you arrange for us to get the increase that we need?

HERB FRIEDMAN: The increase that they need they will take out of the budgeting procedure of the regular money -- and we have answered this thing a hundred times in the past. We are bound to lose a few hundreds of thousands of dollars in the allocating on the regular money. We are bound to -- we always do! We'll lose no more than that we lose normally.

VOICE: There is a difference between them taking it away from you -- and giving it to them!

HERB FRIEDMAN: I would be very delighted without any argument to give them \$500,000 in return for making \$3-1/2 million! I don't think that there has to be an

037691498

argument. I don't conceive of this meeting to be an argument. I conceive of this meeting to be one in which we try to persuade them of something; and if they raise this point and say, "What do we do about the normal growth that we need for our payroll ..." There is no denying it. If it begins to get fancy: what do we do about adding new beneficiaries; what do we do about taking on new services; what do we do about new construction ????? That is where I fight! But you don't fight on the question of payroll. You can't! And the question of payroll comes up too accumulatively: \$500,000, \$600,000, \$700,000 in the whole country, if everyone were to be disciplined about it. You act in a statesman-like way and you give away \$700,000 -- if you can raise \$3,700,000 -- and come out with a net of \$3 million plus.

VOICE: What about deaths and removals ..
(indistinct) ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: You can't answer everything -- deaths and removals occur now. (Indistinct) We are going to make \$1-1/2 million plus this year -- and there were deaths and removals in 1965. There will be deaths and removals in 1966. This will show up in the budgeting procedure of the regular money.

VOICE: It will have to be an increase in the regular as well to make up the deaths and removals ..

037601500

HERB FRIEDMAN: Correct! Will you go in -- how many times have we gone in, and the case is most notable in Los Angeles where for years we really had the best clean-cut Special Fund of all the big cities, where we would go in - we National UJA People, and we would solicit increases for the Regular. Not as much. We would go to a \$5,000 man and say, "Give \$6,000 to the regular and give \$10,000 to the special; give \$5,000 to the Special. This was a testimony of good faith on our part. The community saw that. This was also protecting ourselves so that the Regular should keep up as high as it could, so we shouldn't have to suffer too much contrition (?) on the Regular -- with common sense on both sides; and if it had then benefited us -- and that type of soliciting worked! In other words, I am taking all of the experience of all of the years that we have had in the Special Fund, ironing out all the wrinkles, the answers which we have discovered by now after all these years of experience, and am simply saying that what I would like to do would be to pin-point the cities where there is a chance to make this effective gain in 1966 -- and leave out those cities where by now we know there is no chance.

And I am saying that I would like to put to work all of the experience that we have had over 10 years. We know most of the answers to most of the questions they'll bring up. The Council of Federations as an Institution

simply is a by-stander, a participant, a witness, they are informed --- but they can't maneuver it for us. We have to maneuver it by direct relationship with the cities. The essence of what I am suggesting here is that instead of our going around to 20 cities separately to try to sell this in the length of time that it would take for us to get a team of each one to go -- I am asking us that we, for the first time, take all of our collective power and bring it to bear about these 20 crucial -- or as many of them as we can get together.

I think that there is a great chance of success; I would like the meeting to come out not with the decision to have another meeting, but I would want the meeting to come out with the decision - "Yes! We agree with you, the Executive and the President; we will go back and call a meeting of our Board; pass the necessary resolutions authorizing this; and we invite you to come in and start soliciting on October 1st, October 15th, November 1st ..." We have our own deadline which we have agreed upon. The \$10,000 Inaugural Dinner is going to be held on December the 9th. That Dinner will be a great success -- or a great failure -- depending upon the amount of soliciting that is done prior to it!

October and November soliciting culminating in the December the 9th Dinner will tell us, when we put the figures on the machine the next morning -- December the 10th,

11th, I'll tell you whether we have got a chance of raising \$3 million more in 1966 -- or not. We won't be in suspense very long. It would take 48 hours to process the figures, and I'll make a prediction that will be within 1% or 2% of being accurate.

If we mean business, Gentlemen, this is the way to pick up extra money.

There is a second procedure -- which is a defensive one. This one that I am talking about is an offensive one.

The second one is a defensive one -- and that is in those cities where -- and I want to think of it now -- in those of the 20 cities where we will fail on the September the 8th meeting - or whatever the date may be -- to get Special Fund permission, I want to get ready now Plan "B" - 2nd procedure - Defense Procedure. Where we fail to get approval of an affirmative Special Fund I want us to move right in with a very powerful approach to get in the budgeting procedure as much protection as we can get.

We eliminate Cleveland and Detroit from this Special Fund approach, because they take care of us in the budgeting procedure. I would eliminate any city from the Special Fund approach that will take care of us in the budgeting procedure as handsomely. And raising as much money, because that is really a clue to the whole business.

037601502

0370012003

You don't make money in the budgeting procedure fighting over 1%, 2% or 3%. You don't make money fighting over how to divide percents. You only make money when more money comes into the pot! But if they won't have a Special Fund to bring more money into the pot and they say, "No!" - then I would like to go to them with the second proposal, and not go as we go now with one man, or two men as spokesmen. I would like a five-man delegation - 5 of us - to go in and not have a 1 hour meeting; I want a whole day meeting in that community that won't give us the Special Fund; and I want to talk with them on how to increase giving into the regular; and we want the 9 to 10 split on the overage.

I am referring to the same group of cities.

Our whole problem is in these 20 cities; no place else; no need for us to run around, at this point in October and November to all the Passaiacs and all the difficult places. We have got to do that anyway; we'll do it. So that this plan has got the affirmative and then the back-up, in case we don't get it, we've got a second request that we make!

What I would like to do is throw this open for discussion now and say, very simply, that I don't care if this whole thing gets kicked in the head, so long as we

get something to substitute for it. The one thing that is clear to me with the best economic climate that America has ever enjoyed - and with as hard a campaign as I can remember our fighting in many a year - we're making more money in 1965. But the more money is about \$1 million - or a \$1-1/2 million more. In 1966 if the economic climate continues the same --- and some people say that it might not -- but if it does, and if we have got the strength and energy to fight as hard in '66 and we did in '65, we might make another million dollars in '66 -- we might. But that would be doing business as normal. This plan that I am proposing is not "business as normal" -- this is an effort to shoot for another \$3 - or \$4 million, instead of \$1 million. And if this gets kicked in the head -- O.K. -- but, then, what we've got to do before we leave here is come up with some kind of a substitutue that will give us a chance to make that kind of money.

CHAIRMAN: Before we start on this thing, I would like to add a couple of things to what Herb said on this thing. First of all, a great many of his ideas made a great deal of sense; and I think that he is being very realistic. I think that we have a little better opportunity for getting some favorable action -- if we

realize one thing. I think that the weakness that we have had in this whole thing is that our whole program for the Special Fund has been geared to the fact that we are only thinking of ourselves -- and in the case the Council, and I must tell you this because I have had recent discussions with it -- we have got to come up with an idea how this will affect the whole ^{/total} community -- not just ourselves. And what I think that we are trying to talk about -- now this -- if we can raise the level of giving to the Special Fund, or whatever it might be (indistinct).. and this will work to the advantage of the whole community. And I think that if we can do that we can get some support. Now, I agree that the Council does not have quite the machinery, but they can make it possible to make some changes wherever they can be. If we talk about "togetherness" on this thing; and here is what I am thinking about, ^{/I am going to toss this in here} because this relates to the Detroit situation.

I want to tell you what we've done because this may be something that you may think about.

We don't object to the Special Fund -- but this is what I have found in Detroit. I have had this formula battle every year. In the case of the Special Fund in Detroit there are people who take the position that you

shouldn't have a Special Fund that only takes care of one group 100% -- that the Fund becomes better if there is some division.

Here is what we have been able to do in the last couple of years. We have taken the position that if we raised the same amount of money; the money is divided on the same basis -- this is the formula for the last two years. If we raise less money the percentage is the same way. The partnership principle. If we raise less money the local and the national agencies have to take the same percentage less as the UJA. This is what we have done. If we raise more money and the community needs more money for salary increases, they have to raise that money; / or \$40,000 when it's \$30,000 we have to raise \$30,000 or \$40,000. Then everything above that is divided on a 90/10 basis. This is where the 90/10....

Now, what does that do? That eliminates automatically a lot of objections from people on the local or national level because they then have some objective and some percentage in participation in the extra dollar is raised, but the UJA comes out with 90% of the total.

I worked that formula out .. have quite a ..

VOICE: We.. this is quite a lot of objectivity (indistinct) ... and finally when we got all

0376012003

through, I think that this makes a whole lot of sense.

VOICE: In our experience.....I don't know what Cleveland is ... but this is what we are doing. We raise the same amount of money; it is divided the same. If you raise less; partnership, first of all, is based on the fact that if you have a partnership principle, we all take less. If you have to raise more money, and you do have to for the community; look, everybody knows the salary increases that are there.

I think that taking your idea there is some combination that makes a whole lot of sense in what you have to say on this thing here. I think that the Council now .. I wouldn't give this thing up at all; without taking another crack at it. But I think that we might have to do it on some basis where if you get people to join in with you - on divergent points of view - that you give them some incentive of getting something -- whether it is 90/10 or whatever it is. Then you might find then that you can eliminate some of the opposition you have in certain cities. Now, what he is saying in effect; at least as far as Herb and I have discussed this -- we have got to tailor our whole program to meet whatever the situation is -- we have certain cities that do it this way, and certain cities that do it that way. Herb has come along

and said that there are 20 more cities here, and that we can get more money if we have a different arrangement. That is what you've said?

HERB FRIEDMAN: Right!

VOICE: Beyond that I will say one thing; that Herb mentions that.. which he has gone over lightly; that it still is going to take manpower and people to go out and do the work. You know after you get the resolution, and after you get the proposal on this thing; it's going to take a hell of a lot of work to go out and get the money, whether you have it on a Special Fund, or 100%, or 90/10! This is something that we can't overlook. Well, anyway with that I just throw this .. because the meeting is open to discussion on this.

Marty Greg (?)

VOICE: With whatever plan you come up with designed to raise more money, all of us will agree is a good idea. I don't think that we have addressed ourselves in the years that I have been associated with UJA .. that really is part of the key in my opinion to a genuine increase in giving outside of the \$1,000 and \$15,000. is a fact. Today, works on the level of the Executive Committee and quits there on most .. and then relies on the community. You and I were in one city;

6037601303

I've been in a couple of cities in the South, where you see the communities are bankrupt for leadership. We have a UJA Cabinet that is not used. We have the formal leaders -- who go over to the Council of Federations; the Council of Jewish Women; to the Council of something else -- because we had no means of continuing to really enlist these people to do part of the soliciting job, which is, in my opinion, part of the reason that only 1,100 of these give and 15,000 of these give It seems to me that we need to do really address ourselves to the more important question of using (1) past leaders actively; (2) to use the Cabinet for a purpose - and one where you might do it is if you put in any cooperation with all business men, and none of us would prevent our sales forces to get out from under our control, as we permit this one, simply because it volunteers. That is to take Executive Committee Members and assign certain Cabinet Members, with whom they have worked together. Take a Cabinet Member and let him create a Cabinet within an Area where people who have been leaders can be leaders.

We can go into Dallas -- into Houston, Texas -- and -- you and I once a year and make a speech and get exactly the results that we got last year -- where they made their goal -- and raised their goal to \$600,000 -- and little Kentucky much less than half, and lower income

lower basis, can raise \$550,000 -- it doesn't make sense.

It can't make sense. We are bankrupt for leadership there -- and we are not doing anything about it because they say, "Well, all the old leaders died!"

There are young leaders. But they have got to be developed and we have got to work with them to develop them. And I think that the way to do it is just like you would with any other business organization -- you take the various echelons of leadership, and have a continuous contact with them. You talk of that in a business, but you don't talk of it here.

We need to use the Executive Committee to improvise with the Cabinet and then to create a Cabinet within the Areas for training schools, and then none of us can get into Atlanta, Georgia to talk to some of these people; we can talk to the one or two that give us their \$1000. But in proof of what I believe can be done, you saw it this year in a little town like (indistinct). We had a \$1000 and over a year Dinner this year, and you, Herb, were there at the first one when we couldn't get 20 people there -- you and I -- This year we got 70 odd people and we had over a 100 gifts of \$1000 and over. Now, this is the cause of continuing to enlist and having a wholesome Cabinet and using them! If you don't use these people and

you let them drift away - sure they'll give you their whole gift -- but they are not bringing into us the additions that we need for manpower and for the working of these figures; because this is proof of the weakness of our system.

CHAIRMAN: Barney --- tomorrow morning for breakfast, if you will notice on your Agenda, that is a very specific idea ... and I think that ...

BARNEY: ... I don't think that there is any difference ...

CHAIRMAN: No. I'll tell you why. We have here .. "How To Increase The Number Of People Involved," and this we scheduled for tomorrow morning and I think that it is good that you bring it in; but I think that what we are trying to do now is to come up with some specific proposals of how we can raise it.

I think that Herb brought up a point here I'd like to tackle this point because we are going to ... get to this one tomorrow morning. Phil ...

PHIL STOLLMAN: I'd like to direct my talks at this moment to most of the men around the room .. about something that is very serious and frankly, Herb, I'll have to criticize your field people .. whether it comes from the top, or whether it comes from the field people,

I think that this is the answer to your problem individual gifts.

The more that I go around the country, the more I am convinced that I don't care whether you are the greatest skull-binder in the world (and I don't happen to be) .. I work much better with a close group, none of us can walk into a meeting and charm or skull-bind the people to the degree where you are going to get \$5000 from the biggest audience in "Plus-Giving."

You do your job by seeing individuals, prior to the meeting. Now,.. you can't do it, as I had the Director in Hollywood call me I should go see Ben Tobin (?) and three other guys, whom I don't even know -- alone -- or call them on the phone, which is certainly wasted effort!

I think that we can get a tie-in here. We can't make a special mandator - but I think that we can say this to any community: "You want us to come in and help you? Then we will send either one or two or three people into your community, provided that you have a "Special"... no "Special"... no group ... no solicitation. Tie it in with a "Special" with this extra effort, and then we are not using any club, and then maybe you won't be as successful this first year ... but when the results will be shown in the other communities, they will!

Now, going back to the other point which I thinks ties-in with it ... I think that for any of us to go into the community, spend a couple of hours before the meeting with one or two people - or the usual technique - hit a guy at a cocktail party and how much conversation can you give him, instead of sitting at the desk and giving him a real workout, and, incidentally, at the same time you are giving a workout to the guy who is going with you, which I think is almost as important as calling on somebody, and I think that we ought to change our technique, Herb!

Unless a man is willing to go into a town, and as long as I'm spending a day and a half in travel, I think that I'd rather spend a full day and a half in that community, in other words, the day I arrive and the morning of the following day before the meeting, and actually go around in solicitation, exactly as you say, and not listen to .. the ladies will excuse me .. the ordinary crap that you get: I want you to go see Joe Blow, because we can't get a nickle out of him.....

This community is worked over for 15 years and the next stranger is going to come in and charm them!

And make the communities aware of the fact that we are going to do our best work with our best givers!

Now, I think that the organization and the waste of our manpower represented to men in this room has been atrocious, because they arrange a schedule and, look, we take a line of least resistance and I am as guilty as anybody in this room!

They arranged the schedule; I get in there 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon with a meeting; I picked up the Director .. and what have you got to see .. and nobody knows! And it is hit or miss whether you go in and see anybody. And I don't give a damn about an appointment because I have been trying to arrange prior appointments and it is for the birds!

If they have 15 top givers, if I can't see this one, I'll see this one! And you pick up the phone and you call they guy - "is he in" - I come over and see him!

Now, I think that there is -- and I'm throwing it out -- there is a tie-in here; I am not quite satisfied with my own thinking; I just feel that we can force these communities.. and I say "force" in the sense not of absolutism.. but force them because they realize it.. an increase in the level of giving.. when they stand up at the Main Meeting, and they announce that Joe Blow gave \$25,000 - compared to \$15,000 ... it is a fact that we

the extra \$10,000 for Special, as it doesn't mean
to the community and has to be observed.

I am going to illustrate. I went to Newport
and Newport News, as you know, has been a lousy
town, because they couldn't break the three top givers
for a period of 5 years. I worked ... they've got a
wonderful, young group and I challenge everybody in this
room to think of most of the towns that they go to today.
Thanks to Allan and Joe -- there are tremendous, young
guys in these communities, and I worked on the kids, and
then it was easier to go to the other fellows and say:
What the Hell, is the matter with you Birds; you have
been yelling for years, you have no leadership, and now
you have leadership, and these guys are working their tails
off, and you won't back them up with extra-giving! And
this, incidentally, was after the kids, themselves -
the way, it will interest you to know that Dave (...?)
went from \$700 to \$2000 and now his old man couldn't stay
\$4000 .. he had to go to \$5000, which was nothing.

Now, what happened? At the meeting twenty-two
people present -- 21 increases -- and I repeat, and this
in the face of and believe me, it wasn't
that I stood up and said or the pictures, I mean that
I accomplished something, but the feeling was there!

Why??? I had over a day and a half to work in Newport News. Now, I've said this; I've said this 2 years ago, and, again, I want to say that I'm as guilty as anybody here; I am not going to cry for more work, but I think the organization of the lay leaders who go throughout this country is atrocious. I think that the very thing that you're mentioning can be done on a much better level; if I have to go into a community -- then let me spend more time in solicitation in that half-hour that I stand up and make the pitch, or fifteen, or twenty minutes, or five minutes -- if I'm following another speaker.

Now, again, take that set-up, and you can give the cities, and they can check to find out how effective it's been, wherever it's been done, and tie your "Special" in. We only do this in the communities that give us a "Special!"

Or, taking your generalization (?), actually go in an appeal for the "Special." There you're going to have trouble. There you are going to have trouble! Because each community wants to raise their whole level of giving. When I am making the pitch, I am not making it specifically for the "Special."

Now, to the second part of the story. You come in and you make your pitch and what happens??? And I made a pitch for the "Special". Each guy stood up and

announced the total giving, because, again, your field man hadn't briefed, or gotten a promise out of the Director that when their local guy stood up and made the pitch, he had to make the pitch, and this should have been a condition, he had to make the pitch and request how much regular and how much "Special." And the result is and with all this "Plus-Giving" which I thought went to the "Special", I think the "Special" damn near went down the drain!

Another example was Atlantic City and Abramson wrote to me and suddenly, though we agree to the "Special" in our pre-campaign budget and I was there at that Meeting, the card came out with one name, and the answer was that they processed through Philadelphia on the IBM and, therefore, the one card line!! And the result was that nobody bothered "Special" or the other. I got hold of Max Malerman, whom I finally got up from "575" and "75" to "10", and, again, I point out that this pre-solicitation.. this was done in Miami .. and Max's "10" was thrown into the ledger. I wrote to Max, tried to get him on the phone whamm..... back went the \$2,500 from the year before and the \$2,500 and "5" to the "Special."

Now, you can repeat this; the only reason that I relate it... I bet that you can repeat this in city after

city. Part of your problem is your own field staff. Not following through with the Director before the meeting and setting the ground rules on how the "Special" is handled.

And the second big thing is that unless you send us around the country with a definite program for pre-solicitation and the solicitation must be done with the local men, because then we get a chance to really give them a "workout" as you go around, you are wasting a hell of a lot of -- if you think it's any good -- of good talent sitting in this room! Now, this is the way you're going to get solicitation for maybe 100 or 200 of these top gifts. In my opinion this is the best and the most effective way, because now you are shooting for a meeting, the climate is there, and then you have this meeting, and, usually, when you go to "talk-call" a guy, he will come to the meeting, so you ^{'re} accomplishing a triple purpose.

VOICE: (This portion is not recorded clearly.) (Also, noise interference.)

..... I'd like to first address myself to.... Chicago ... if you are successful, you... even a minimum from these people... either their meeting local will be there without the power of

represented might have given you aa tentative statement or commitment....and I would just like to throw out the thought that it might not be able to between now andcities. I think that had you sent city men to the meeting the whole cabinet there and call a second meeting city by city so that you can have that meeting, but not with your definite commitments, I am afraid that you are going to have another if it is successful.... another story. We will be defeated even before the time we go home.... and you are out there fighting and you are the power....

VOICE: (Again, portion not recorded clearly.)

..... I can see we are sitting here on May the 20th. We make this decision now. The September Meeting will be the culmination, not the beginning. We would have to go between now and September to everyone of these20 cities.

VOICE:What is the purpose of the meeting?

VOICE: The purpose of the meeting represents the confirmation.

You have two approaches to this thing.

VOICE: you have to go after ...'

616109200

VOICE:

These are two different strategies. It may be it is a blending of both. When I was not using the Council as an organization, directly to the communities, I did say that the Council has got to be kept informed. I mean by that when I was speaking ...

We have got to go out of this morning and start talking to the Communities. We have got to get Mr. Stein and his Staff -- Mr. Stern and

We have got to go out of the building and start talking to the Mayor and his Staff -- Mr. Stern and the Committee Members -- and tell them to start to work out with them,

We have got to go out of this meeting on Monday morning and start talking to the Council -- Mr. Bernstein and his Staff -- Mr. Stern and any of his Executive Committee Members -- and tell them: "This is our plan!" And start to work out with them, city by city, on this list, where they would like to help us, if they agree with this, think through where we might want to do some preliminary work, think through where we might get a few "Yeses" --fast -- which are always good to spark the punches... when they stand up and say, "Yes!"... mean that they will take off, you know, and, therefore, it

might very well be a combination of both strategic approaches. Not try to see all 20 cities before September. Maybe try to see a few of them that will come along and say, "Yes." And then the word will begin to spread, because they talk to each other. They try to create a little bit of an affirmative climate, to start with at the September Meeting, and a few people standing up and saying, "I'll do it." -- might get a few others to follow along.

VOICE: it might be a little dangerous if you get a real, strong counter-attack in certain cities, it might lead to ... what you have accomplished with your commissions. I would like to suggest that you take whatever power... there was in the Council in .. cities in 1960 and '66 and we do it in that matter and that we start with the cooperation of the Council, and we do it city by city, maybe... we will have the best chance... and that the meeting.. and get the people there... people who .. with meetings and travelling trips as an expense of our operations ... and it could be done with the top brass going into the cities .. and I would like to make that suggestion

MAX FRIEDMAN: and not have ...

VOICE: And not have ... the council ...

there will be our Conference in the Fall; there will be our September Meeting in the Fall; there is a Mission in October; and this is not talking about the meetings in other Organizations - which are part of our Organization - I think it could be accomplished by going into the cities and doing it that way

HERB FRIEDMAN: I see a loss of sales power, Allan, in terms of the impact of this group.

VOICE: Well, I tell you, I think that he has on this point ... one of the things you must consider is this. I can see what he is thinking about.

You sell the man and sell one individual who might be the median, and then he has to go back and sell 50 of them more, and it might be a whole lot better than the

VOICE: ... now, if you have the brass that you are talking about

VOICE: Now, let's get some more discussion on this ... hold your conversation ... I think that Joe wanted to say something. Joe, hasn't said a thing all night long, the long day,

HERB FRIEDMAN: Joe is quiet because he ideas last night and he

(Several Voices Speaking)
(Indistinct)

037601522

VOICE: Quiet everybody!

JOE (?): I still think that I'm devoid of ideas, but I have some serious questions about the whole program, and this is what I want to bring up, because I think that we have to come to grips with the real essence of this problem!

No. 1 is in the light of all of the things that we know about, including some of the things that you have talked about: the obvious prosperity and a lot of other things that you mentioned in your presentation; and in the reduced immigration picture, can you make this "Special Fund" .. real convincing. This is the thing that really bothers me, because the basic justification for a "Special Fund" --as far as an average community is concerned, and as far as an average contributor is concerned -- is the, I'd say the absolute argument that unless you give the money now that you will not accomplish a purpose which cannot be accomplished in any other way.

Can we make it convincing enough, and I have very serious questions and very serious doubts about it, and I think that in your presentation you might have assumed it, but you passed it off much too lightly from my standpoint.

I think that we've got to have -- we've got to use judgement enough to be sure that we are not kidding

037001923

ourselves about being able to present this need on the basis of making it really convincing that this extra money - this year - now! - is something that we just can't be postponing, we have got to raise the extra money now.

This is the argument that I used in 1962 to put over the "Special Fund" to the extent that we did put it over; we did it without the Council's permission; and we raised \$3 or \$5 million more; I was dissappointed that we only raised that much more; but, at least, we had the convincing argument that this extra immigration could not possibly continue, unless we raised this extra money!

Now -- what kind of an argument have you got that is anywhere near as strong as that to convince me -- or any other individual -- that I have got to give more money when I am already up to here -- or at the point where I think that I am giving all that I think I ought to give to UJA.

The second thing is that I have the same uncomfortable feeling that Allan brought up, and I have it a different way.

Even if you have this September Conference, having a President and a Director there in most communities means absolutely nothing. You come to a Meeting like that and the President has no more power than I have to dictate

037601324

what some community is going to do. Most of the time, he is not the most effective person in the community. Most of the time, he is not the one to dictate the policy of the Organization, and despite what you might think in most communities the Executive Director is not the one to do it!

There are other people in the community, there are three or four or five small groups, who are the real leadership. Unless you can break down that real leadership, you are not going to get a "Special Fund."

After you have already given them the convincing argument that this is something that can't be postponed until 1967 -- or we have got to have that extra money or else -- there will be catastrophe, or else there will be something else the third ... and so I am not sure that having a President and a Director is enough. I think that we have got to go back to do what we really did -- if you really want to have this kind of a Meeting, we have to do almost what we did in previous years when we had this Refunding Loan - and we had this Loan in the beginning -- and we had the Special Fund in the beginning. You have got to get the influential whoever the community thinks are the five or the six people, who are the real strength and the power in the community, you

have got to get them instead of the President and the Director. But you can't leave the President and the Director out. You can't leave the Director out. Sometimes you can leave the President out ... and there won't be any loss. But you have got to have the ...realism..

VOICE:a former President ..

JOE SHANE: I say that as a former President, I agree with that!

(LAUGHTER)

JOE SHANE: No. 3 .. I question the wisdom and the tactics of leaving out Cleveland and Detroit!

I think that the worst thing that you can do is leave those two out. Because, obviously, Hy (?) Zuccor and Detroit, because Max is from Detroit, you just can't leave them out! You haven't got Sobel up in Detroit, but you have somebody else in Detroit; what's the difference who it is.

The point is that they are the two big, influential communities outside of New York -- and they cannot be left out, because if you leave them out, the first thing every Director will do is call them up anyhow! Seems like you let them come out --- and face the music! If you can't convince them -- in the face of them sitting there that you can have the "Special Fund" --- you'll never put it over! So I question that procedure.

And No. 4 I also question based on my own personal experience in the last 4 or 5 years, and 5 years before that, can you -- can you confine the activities of this group to that top group of cities. And I'll be damned why you haven't done it in the previous years. I have never been able to understand it. You'd think just because the community probably wouldn't have us. If the community don't invite me, I can't go. And if the local communities don't -- don't, uh -- give you their consent to utilize our best man power in that way we are going to fail, and somehow or other you have got to find a much better procedure for getting us into these communities, let's put it that way, and not waste my time with \$200,000 communities or \$300,000 -- as you have done in previous years and as you have done with a lot of these other men - \$100,000 communities ---- and stick to these communities. And, by God, whatever Phil says is absolutely right, but you've got to prepare these communities in advance to go with us to these solicitors. And with all due respect to Mr. Henry Bernstein, I'll say that the worst waste of manpower, is to give me a card that somebody gives \$1000 or \$2000 who hasn't contributed, because I know him.

Give me \$10,000 cards and I'll go to see him in

advance of the campaign -- and I can do a hell of a lot better with those kind of people than I can wasting my time with \$1000 contributors.

Now, this applies to every community including New York. If we are to utilize our manpower then we have to solicit the people that can give you the most money -- and those who give you \$10,000 and over are the ones that you can get increases from. I can get one increase from --- you and I worked in '62... including Cleveland, including Detroit, with all due respects to / good our Chairman -- we went to Cleveland and Detroit, and because we went to those communities we got people to give us \$25,000 increases, \$30,000 increases, \$10,000 increases, \$50,000 increases, and we got it by soliciting the people at the right time and with the right people with us. When we went to Cleveland, we had Murray Saltzman; we had -- you know --- the whole gang went with us, three or four of us solicited individuals; and when we went to Detroit, we had the same thing: they had Max with us and Paul Zuckerman, and we went around to different people -- and we got big extra money.

I don't care whether we called it "Special" -- or called it "Regular" ..

VOICE: ... you never lost it

JOE SHANE: What, ??

VOICE: ... you never lost it ...

JOE SHANE: I understand. I am not complaining about raising more money, I am only saying --

VOICE: You went in on a "Special Appeal" -- and you never lost it, even though --

JOE SHANE: -- even though we didn't get what you'd call a "Special Fund," we got the extra money.

VOICE: -- \$400,000 ... (indistinct) ... steady ---

VOICE: But the point that I'm making is that my time wasn't wasted. When I went to Cleveland and Detroit -- and then Dallas -- and a few other places -- in Los Angeles, we solicited, we got four or five gifts -- with Joe Shane.

Joe was a bird dog that got us into these places.

Four gifts -- I think about \$50,000 each -- and that is why we put over the "Special Fund". We fought for two days with the Community to give us the special fund, and the only way that we convinced them to give us the special fund is that we said: We've got four gifts of \$50,000 each. Do you want it; or don't yah? If you want 'em, you've got 'em. Now, if you don't want 'em, just pass them up!" Well, it was just irresistible. They didn't want to pass up four \$50,000 gifts -- so, so, -- that was a very convincing argument.

Now, what I am saying is: "How can you force -- and this is one of the conditions, if you are going to have this Conference, is that with these communities, you say that you have this top manpower; now, you want them to come in; and you want them to solicit; and you want them to raise more money.

I am really asking more questions than I am giving suggestions.

I am just pointing out the various essentials that can make this a successful venture:

No. 1. I'll repeat these four points. I had them written down before Allan spoke and I agree with what he says and what Phil says:

No. 1 is that we make this "Special Fund" Need convincing enough to get these communities to give us a "Special Fund." I am not at all sure from what I heard last night and this morning that you can do it. You'll have to do ^{it} a lot -- a hell of a lot -- more convincingly for me than I've heard so far!

No. 2 is that is the President and Director enough -- and I say, "No!" it is not! We've got to have a much better program, a much better plan, to put this over in these communities, because is you do, uh, if you do the same thing that Allan suggested exactly what is

going to happen. After you have got all through you will have to re-sell the thing and then you'll be in a worse shape than you were before because you've ... had the wrong guy to present it to the community in the first place.

And No. 3 -- we cannot leave out Cleveland and Detroit -- or any other large community; we have got to have them in the meeting and we sink or fall -- we succeed or fail -- depending upon how convincingly you put things over and how well primed we are. You'll be doing the same thing -- you must be doing the same thing in this / kind of a meeting -- in any fund raising meeting. You have got to get three or four people sold in advance, who can speak up and say: "We think that it's a good idea."

And 4: We have got to work out a procedure where you can utilize your manpower; and you do it effively; and you can't do it effectively, unless you get the consent of the community, and unless you insist that these people -- all of us -- will not go into any other community for 1966, except those 20 communities that you named.

This is where we are re-dedicating our manpower to that purpose and you have got to find somebody else to do it

VOICE: Max, can I ask you

VOICE:

(MAX FISHER) Now, all these .. as I said

before ... these are only doubts that I have and criticism, constructive criticism I hope, of the program that was really going to raise more money. ...

VOICE: I happen to agree with many of the things that you said; but I disagree and this is my question:

Let's assume that you invite (indistinct) and the present Federation to the meeting, and say that in Cleveland we get 65% of what we raise to the UJA. And we incorporated what we got in a Special Fund and translated it into percentages, so you never really lost the "Special" because if you figure what the "Special" was in relation to the whole thing and then used the percentage.

He's going to get up and say: "Look, we've been successful. We are raising more money than we have ever raised in our history. We have the biggest campaign we ever had and the UJA is getting more money than it ever got. We are working 65% of the Net for the UJA." And he is going to hurt you. It has got to hurt you!

* The only thing that

VOICE: Well, now

VOICE: Well, wait a minute now, wait a minute

Al's point is that you avoid not calling Cleveland, if you go into each community with a group.

On the other hand, as Herb pointed out, and I think Dave Lowenthal, you lose the effect of control that you have when you have the pressure of a big group, so that no really one answer defines things that are good about having a September Conference -- and I can give you negatives -- negatives about doing what Al suggested about going in. I would say this.

If you could pre-sell three or four communities before your September Conference, as you've pointed out and have these guys really say: "We're sold on it and this is what we are doing." Then, I think that this September Conference makes sense.

Calling it without having some idea of where you stand, I think would be a mistake, because as you pointed out (his considerations) the president and his administration doesn't mean a damn thing. He is the guy whose thrown up there, and maybe they want to just

VOICE: I just would like to add one more thing ..

I think that it would be a serious mistake not to have a Baltimore, or a Washington, or a Chicago ... that is just the opposite, Herb, you have got to have them there.

VOICE: (Indistinct)

VOICE: ... we have to continue with
it.

VOICE: That's right ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: Well, I want to tell you one
thing.

I think that we for the first time have come to
hassle with the problem and the way I analyse it, we've
come down to the bottom line, and we've got nothing to
lose, because what we are doing now, isn't getting us the
job done, and we've got to make an effort.

We can't get .. do any worse than we are doing,
and maybe this is the beginning of something better. And I
for one believe that we ought to try this.

VOICE: Now, I think that .. basically ..
the Special Fund again is a very good plan, and I feel that
there are some negative points about it, but I think that the
positive far outweighs the negative.

I think that the best place to throw this
"Special Fund" conversation out is at the Campaign Cabinet
Meeting. I think that we've improperly used the Campaign
Cabinet in the past few years, and I think that they are an
effective media.

They are a standard group of the very same type
of people that we have here, and I think that getting them

to a meeting, where you don't have a purpose is a waste of time. This is meaningful and on June the 23rd, I argue that this plan should be thrown out and that we should lead with our strongest foot forward, trying to sell the idea, and to the Campaign Cabinet first, on June the 23rd, and I think that if once we get the proper people to attend this campaign test meeting, so that we can use that as a sounding board for our basic purpose ..

And the second point, and the point has been well made that local directors and local presidents, they are not going to worry about any team that is coming to their communities, as far as appointments are concerned.

Now, I feel that if we want to do this effectively, insofar as the "Special Fund" I feel that the pressure should come from without and not from within. I don't think that you can get the pressure within the community. You come to the community -- and it's like Phil said; you get the second or third rate or people that take you around; you get the second or third rate people; you get the kind of people who are impossible in that case.

I think that the pressure ought to come from our National Office. . . . I think that a letter from Max Fisher, stating that Mr. "X" or Mr. "Y" or Mr. "Z" is coming to the community and we want an appointment "A" -- is a good approach.

I think that "B", sometimes Bill Rosenwald, or Eddie Warburg, or Joe Myerhoff knows Mr. "X" or "Y" ... a call from a person of national stature, saying that someone else is coming in to work that card -- coming in to make a special appointment to talk about that Special Fund is a very good approach.

We will get further in getting our appointments, if we do it without and do it from our national office, than cooperation we will ever get within the community.

I think that local members in the Campaign Cabinet in the communities are to be mustered into this thing, so that they can help us, when we arrive at the local community level. We haven't used them properly. This is a -- a -- reason for them serving on the Campaign Cabinet, and I think that an effective job of getting the campaign people within the local community to take our teams around the local communities, will also put teeth into this program.

And I also, feel, Herb, that whenever we visit the communities that the old idea of teams of two, to three to four people coming to the community for a couple of days is the most effective approach, because two men, calling on a top person, is better than one. And the last point that I want to make:

We use this good will mission .. following:

This is the number of communities. And this is really serves a good purpose for us.. and I think that it is time well spent.

Some of us have had some doubts about it from the past. Well, I think that the "pluses" outrank the "minuses!"

0 3 7 0 0 1 9 3 7
But I think that in the Fall when the good will mission is started and men go out to call on these communities, it is alright to give a speech to a standard group in the evening, or at noontime, but I thing that coming to the community to work for a couple of days - and talking to the few top people - this is an ideal time to do it regarding -- about October and November -- this is an ideal time to go out and start talking about the 1966 gifts. And we usually send our top people on the good will missions.

And if their time can be well used - and if their appointments can be arranged by a National Office and through great pressures - normal pressures - I thing that the Program can several million dollars to our total picture.

VOICE: Alright -- now we have that quite clear why Joe asked nobody (?) questions... Herb.

VOICE: I was under the impression that this meeting that you were going to call - which I think is - has fine advtages as well as disadvantages - and which

I think should be called. Wasn't this also to show these people how we are going to raise more money .. solicited .. half of which should remain solicited (indistinct).

(Background noise)

..... Somewhere along the line, and if you are going to use the "Special Fund" ... and detail that we get here .. and I'm going to tell you about public relations use that name.

Now, somewhere along the line, there ought to be a change ... in calling .. now isn't part of this meeting with these two or three leading cities ... that they may get a part of this ..

VOICE: I suggest that ..

VOICE: ... so that they, then, are going to be able to come back to the city more enthusiastically .. because there is something in it of ... who might not be in favor of sending to all those cities.

VOICE: I would think that -- there ..

VOICE: Now, just .. let's give more time to this ..

VOICE: I would like to just ask a few questions. ... observations .. to the point that Herb made on the concentration on the 1,100 who have given \$10,000 or more.

In reality, by their very being they are our

most vital part in this whole program - likewise ...

First, what they have done certainly indicates that they have been convinced of the importance of the program.

Now, whether we approach a Group Meeting -- or the individual approach -- and I think that we all feel that in one form or another the individual approach has a great deal of merit because we give to people and, certainly people who are leaders in giving can be made leaders in doing. You have to have both working parallel to get real success. ... have any analyses that shows us what portion of the 1,100 would give the \$10,000 or more, are just givers, and what proportion are either members of the National Cabinet -- of course they are included among our Executive Committee -- or are local leaders.

In other words, there must be a great many of them who just give but do not believe that they are ready at any time .. that they will be vital to a Conference such as you have in mind, they will be vital to any program that we want developed.

I think they are entitled to the recognition. I think that they should be sold on the importance of recognition, because what they have done will speak very

vehemently (?) to the people whom we want to approach.

And I think that an analysis in that direction would be sincerely helpful to us.

VOICE: Joe?

JOE SHANE: Mr. Lwenthal has just pressed on the thing that has been bothering me about this "Special" feature.

We started off by looking for a device to accomplish - to get this. Now, looking at what the fundamental development has been over a period of years. We have been losing our leadershipin these (indistinct).

Now, I see myself going into some of our communities, and asking for a special fund and getting absolutely nowhere, because - if you come in and ask for something, without the strength and the pressure, and support you'd get, we will get nowhere.

Now, what we have to do is to begin leadership in these very communities that can accomplish for us what we want. The device will come from what comes out of the leadership.

Now...let's take for an example.. this is what I suggest we do. We go into any community that we select; and meet with those men in that community that we know are our friends. Normally, and usually, they are big

givers.

We come in .. and set out .. and our problem is as time goes on, because of the meager communities that have to be met, our needs have to be met and are not being met! Now what can they come up with which will take care of our needs? What device do they suggest?

And if we can sit down with the key men in a community, and whom we know will give support to what we are trying to accomplish, then we've got somebody to work with us when we appear before the organized community to present a plan - but just to come in to a city and say: "We want a SPECIAL FUND, because we need more money", is meaningless. You're not going to get it!

But if we can get a core of people who will be with us to say the official community: "The needs of the United Jewish Appeal are great; they are not being met; they have been drilled (?) away because we have been expanding our needs at their expense! Now, we have got to (space ?) face up to the problem -- and let them come up with the answer. And we have got to do it very early, before any of these campaigns get started!

. We have got to go out now and tell them what is happening and ask them to work with us in getting the answer to the problem. This is the fundamental of what we

are talking about.

The device is incidental. The need for leadership for a community that represents the UJA a that is going to be there all the time - whether there are a few fellows on the top leadership, or not, in the community - is what we need! Just going in and out, having the effect on a ew people, and then leaving, we've created nothing!!!

We have to create, again, a core of people in each community that we know have been our friends, and are ready to be our friends again, if they know that we need them bad enough!

I think that this is where we ought to start trying to cure this problem!

VOICE: It is. Max.

MAX FISHER: I think that ... I am sort of sorry that we didn't follow the implicit understanding that we had last night and let me get it off my chest .. "it schtempt frum hartzen" ... early at the beginning of the meeting! Because I am still somewhat "Peck's bad boy" in this situation!

Whatever decision is reached by this meeting, you can be sure of one thing, I go along with the decision and I am working hardest than anyone else!

But before the decisions are made, I have

037601542

something to say. I have forgotten what I was going to say before. In fact, I made that speech 4:00 o'clock in the morning!

(LAUGHTER)

MAX FISHER: .. and then when the party let out .. for a walk .. I said that it will remain with me and not even tell you about it ... But I made the speech 4:00 o'clock in the morning.

VOICE: Did you like it?

VOICE: ... not to your wife?

MAX FISHER: Naw - I'm very much satisfied with it!

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: Did you give yourself an increase?

MAX FISHER: I allowed myself ... Herb spoke / early to me this morning and said: "Do you object if I take your place?" And, Max ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: And I said: "Do you want to go first or shall I go first..?"

MAX FISHER: Yes, but I wasn't mad this morning about wanting to go first. At the beginning of the meeting --- I did want to go first! He didn't wait for me to answer, you know!

(LAUGHTER)

HERB FRIEDMAN: Oh Kay ...

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: now you don't want to go first!

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: Now, it seems to me that it all depends upon what ... feed. The orange juice and tomatoe juice this morning wasn't as potent as the wine we had at dinner last night.

As I recall - when we adjourned it was about 11:00 -- 11:15, last night. There was some kind of a consensus of feelings of people whom we talked about after the meeting broke up. That what we really needed this year was \$10 million! And there was justification, Joe, for that \$10 million. Justification in the fact that JBC has the protest program. I am not happy about it! Some allocated more complements on how well you've organized your budget to fit the sums of money so that you only have a \$750,000 deficit! That's nonsense! He told you -- you kept the program vertically! You took some things off; you held on to it! I am not satisfied with that!

.... points out ... points out last night very poignantly .. that there are social problems, resulting from the immigration that we haven't dealt with. There is a very ... on the community in Israel, and ... it's a specific one.

(Indistinct - very high speed voice)

... many good places too; but at the meeting last night we came to the conclusion, somehow, when we said that \$10 million is what we need plus -- right!

.. and we left with that that's a good beginning! Oh, all that we have to do now, this morning, was a little how the \$10 million!
(literally ?)

Well, took liberally. He was willing to eat the elephant in four to five years. And if we are going to make that \$10 million in four years.

Well, maybe if that is the way we are going to do it well, I'll go along!

VOICE: I did not even say that!

VOICE: But you said ... it's cut down to \$3 or \$4 million that are \$10 ..

VOICE: ... then don't talk about raising it up to \$10 after five years ...

VOICE: Alright! well it's still eating part of the elephant -- not even the whole elephant! But what I am saying is this: We have plenty justification to shoot for a plus \$10 million. And I wish that we had the courage to come out and say so and to face the community. Without personal flaws! I wish that we could make these decisions without personal considerations.

Certainly, the men of this state will really reach the top - Joe! (indistinct - very high speed voice) Possibly get it (?).

I can't say how much more I will ask you to give "Special" beyond what you give - you can't ask me I know that!

Some of us have reached a slack-off (?) - but I am not shedding any tears for any of those \$10,000 and over contributors in the United States with 1,100. They havea kind of a flash-off (?). Any kind!

I have got a chance with my own community which I think is fine. I go to a guy to get him to give \$3,500 and you ask him \$50,000! But I think that that should have been his clientele. He agrees finally that maybe with two or three to reach that! This is the

I do believe that this is the year that we ought to begin to shoot for that "Plus \$10 million" every week (?). We can justify it; and then we can document it, if you want!

(Indistinct!)

VOICE: documented literature ... and it is honest! And when I go to the community, I am being introduced. But it is not with words ... it's with the office, and what is being said about me is: that I am a Specialist in Refugees and that there is no problems (?)

Well, I believe it by this time!

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: And I, well it's coming out of my ears! We have had it documented for ourselves. And I'd stake my life on it! I'd bet on it! I'll take book on it! And it is the true thing. It's the true facts.

That \$10 million is essential - and without it we are missing the boat. We are not doing our job!

This is for us. Now, something was said with (in regard to other factors - that there are other needs - with (respective communities ?) respect to the community. We are not simply a UJA -- there are many other things.

I live in Washington - and I think that if you name a Board in Washington, or activity, and see if I am (not on it ?) not honored: whether it is the Home for the Aged; Jewish Social Service Agency; or the Friends of Hebrew Technology - Brandeis(?) ---- you name it!

And if they are not in our campaign, Max, they are independent campaigns; we still pay out of our pocket! We need the Home for the Aged \$293,000 outside of the campaign.. we do, or Hebrew Academy, or whatever it is.

When I sit on those individual Boards of diverse, different meetings, we have in this instance a need for a \$50 thousand supplementary campaign. When I sit with other people on that Board, I address myself to their

problems. We have got to raise the \$50,000 ... and that means -- I'm sorry but I can't entertain the consideration of another \$50,000 Fund at our UJA Meetings which are greater. At that meeting I am interested in that. I try to settle that problem to establish responsibility to that particular activity to that particular Board.

But when I am sitting, here, around this table - all of us - and I am sitting here -- I wear only one hat -- and that is UJA!

And I have got to find ways and means to meet this pledge -- as well as the others.

I know that there are asides -- you said that there is a built-in increase of about 1/2 a million dollars for local needs, because of salaries -- right??????

There is something similar --- the second part -- because of "built-in increase" in UJA needs: Agency; UJA; that Agency -- and everything else! On those considerations they are worth while.

That's all. I intended to but I am cutting myself short! If it's \$4 million - alright I'll go along. Briefly, Gentlemen, if that is the limit we can shoot for -- good!

But I still think - and I would like to pass around - because I want to be ...grateful .. honorable ... (indistinct)....

VOICE: Here -- here ..

On this question - I don't think that Herb

is denying the need of \$10 million. He is talking about the

VOICE: ... don't say ...don't say that ..

MAX FISHER: .. he is talking about the practical possibilities of ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: I didn't want to get into the argument of practical things and realistic figures ..

"Practical" and "realistic" - can be thrown down the drain! I don't want to hear that word, again. If we were "Practical" and "realistic" - we'd go home!

Joe, has just come back from Israel. Here is the difference. He spent most of the time on PBC - am I right, Joe???

Joe came back to and said that it is an important area of health and ...industries ...

JOE SHANE: I spent 2/3rd's of my time on it; and 1/3 of it on inter-educational!

HERB FRIEDMAN: I know - Joe.

Joe has come back and there is - he has already had the proposition. Up to now he has persuaded me to buy PBC stock at \$25 a share ... now he gives me "arf alla farteichen" to buy the same stock at \$19 a share - \$16 a share a bargain rate ...

VOICE: Joe, is involved in it, Max -- he has got nothing for himself; but he's nothing for himself,

but if he is selling something for China, he tells me that I'll get dividends; 5%; he tells me that there will be an increment; it's worth more than "blue-plate!"

But what ... this is something else altogether!

But what about that we've got to sell in UJA?????

I have got several hundred thousands of poor, miserable Jews to sell! That is all that I have! I have no deter -- no dividend out of it. This is my stock and trade and this is what I have to sell to the country, to the community and to myself! Several hundred thousand miserable Jews! See, they have heart trouble; eye trouble; "alleh glicken!" Nuh!

That is quite different than selling PBC Stock and quite different than selling Israel Bonds today, because ... an investment; it's popular; more power to them!

It is difficult not meeting my suggestion.

What I am pointing out is that we have usually any number of people who do not exist (?) who in the initial stages have the responsibility for Israel; and we talk about -- "clearing with Mil Bernstein..." Who the hell is Mil Bernstein!

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: Here! Here!

(Indistinct)

MAX FISHER: I envy you, guys. You sit on the Board and make internal policies. It's kinda' difficult -- to make missions to Israel and come back and then make decisions. This is why we need more money -- more --- and we should serve the totality of Jewish People, and then whoever - who has to worry about the totality of Jewish Needs and more! The Board.....

Nobody else!

.... and about the Federations! Who worried about the Federations - who worried about the campaign --

NO VOICE RECORDED FROM THIS POINT TO END OF THIS SIDE.

SECOND SIDE OF TAPE --VOICE STARTED IN THE MIDDLE OF TAPE.

VOICE: Can't generate the same steam I had at 4 o'clock (laughter) (indistinct) hope everybody will forgive me.

I'd like to mention, not only Chicago because--I think it's only---I'd like to talk first about Chicago because I think it's a very good instance and one I know a little bit about, of what I think we can do. And then, I'd like to get into the broad principle of what we were talking about when we into Chicago and that is the ten top cities that are above Atlantic City on the sheet.

VOICE: And the totem pole.

VOICE: Well, there's a gap there. I was

in Chicago twice, once with Finkel, represent
we met with two very helpful members we met
with Morris . I want to tell you they were
just towers of strength.. Without them we couldn't have
gotten to first base--with them we got what we ask. And,
the first time we had, really, a better deal in Chicago
than the previous year. Otherwise, it's a shade worse
and we knew that would happen. But, we got a deal where
for the first time contributed to the
special fund and say --after expenses--and those were
very nominal and fair percentage for expenses. After
expenses, come what may you can be sure that anything
given to the special fund will go 100% to the UJA.

Now, this other, we've had some good exper-
ience with that. I went up there with Joe Cantor and
also saw them on that occasion. And, we did some solici-
tation and I think that that helped to stimulate the
special fund and I hope it helped to stimulate Chicago.
Now, the situation really is worse than was depicted
this afternoon. The failure to mention at all that
the Chicago Federation gets money from the Community
Church, gets it from the subscription, gets it from the
Allied, it gets it from the deficit campaign. They also
have a tremendous number of campaigns that the Federation
backs to raise funds for special institutions.

So that's an additional drain. And anything you can say about our not getting a fair share in Chicago--whatever percentage you take--it's higher than what we really get. There're all of these sources, compared to almost any other city. Also, there are a good many obstacles in getting to the people in Chicago. It's not the social thing to do. It's hard to find the people. It's hard to get people to approach them with you.

I mean people who will be effective. The people haven't been really reached effectively. And, one of the tragic things that you get there--I don't think I've been to a meeting there, at least on an allocation, I don't think at any meeting where Sam Goldsmith doesn't talk about the pity of all the wealthy ^{people} / having moved away from Chicago. Of course, we know that's a myth. If all the wealthy people had moved away from Chicago, the Federation wouldn't even get the \$30 million a year that it's getting.

VOICE: Did you move away from Chicago?

VOICE: (laughter) Yeah. I'm not all the people, I'm only one. He mentioned specifically my family and the Laskers. Albert Lasker. But there are families there still. I don't want to try to measure their wealth but the very fact that they get the money that they get shows that the money is there.

The very fact that the bond drive raises the money it raises shows that the money is there.

It may not be there to the extent that we'd like it. We may not be able to get it to the extent that we'd like, but that it isn't being adequately tapped under the management of the present campaign is certain. Now, we have tremendous assets there. We have the deal that we worked out. I should tell you that before we worked that out, Chicago on its own initiative and I think thanks to Lem and Morris's encouragement had already launched their campaign with the idea of trying to get as much of an increase to give our special fund as they could, which shows to me a totally new attitude in the history of Chicago. As we've got a man in charge of fund-raising there under Sam Goldsmith who is extremely helpful from every viewpoint and is mentioned here only as Sam Goldsmith is not going to be --I say this with the greatest admiration for Sam Goldsmith--as an individual and as the head of the Chicago Federation --I'd like to personally say that he's done a great job--very able man--But, he certainly has not on the whole helped the position of the United Jewish Appeal vis-a-vis the total results in Chicago, the way

some of the other executives that were mentioned here, have. The setup there is in many ways a different setup. We do not have people like the Max Fischers having

a big say or having a big say in the Federation the way you have in other communities.

Now, I think there's great hope for improvement in Chicago. This year alone and and I think if successful, I think we can get next year. If we can find ways of building up the special fund, anybody who does want to give additional now has the chance to do it. You don't have to have a split campaign to make it possible for people to give to Israel. We have the vehicle right now in and Joe Cantor came up after four o'clock and said the same thing to me.

It's going to take time to build this up. You can't do it in one year. It's going to take more than that in Chicago year after year, trying to find the people, trying to enlist them. If You can't do it through the special fund...We're going to have the Israel Education Fund...I assume there's nobody to bother us from going into Chicago with that. And maybe you can tap a lot of people who are giving to Northwestern or Chicago Universities, that would be willing to give educational buildings who don't like giving to the Zionists, if there should be any such. And, I point all this out because I think it's most important for us to work out specifically how you approach Chicago.

I cannot believe for a moment that a study of

Chicago has at least the implication that it means that we're going to--Somebody says why are you making this study if there's an implication that you're making this study with helps in mind. We're making a study with a viewpoint to see how we can take best advantage for the good of the Chicago campaign and for the good of the United Jewish Appeal and the Israel Education Fund but what might be best done in Chicago. In a completely cooperative attitude and I'm sure that such a study could be very profitable and well worth doing.

It would have to be a study that would be implemented over a period of time and take a period of time. Now, as I say, I took Chicago merely as one example. Herb can say anything he wants to about the work with the smaller cities because we can do something with them. And, it's a valid point. We did do something with them last year. We should continue to do something with them again this year. But, I don't think that means we have to neglect the larger cities at all. I think his point was very well taken - that you can take almost any two of the larger cities and after they'll be as much or more as the \$3, 300,000 of the total of all of these twenty cities below the / . And it would be like going after the \$1000 increases and neglecting the Israel Education Fund where you can sell the Israel Education Fund

you go after where your money is. (indistinct) I think further studies might be made and Joe, this is one that you know more about than I would and I know from what was said today, your position. I don't know why a program couldn't be evolved to try to get Baltimore to learn this type of approach. Of course, it's not going to be done overnight. It wasn't done overnight in Boston either.

But, you're there, which is a tremendous asset

VOICE: You mean for going in and
Oh, we've been seriously considering this Fall, as a matter of fact.

VOICE: Fine. Of course, it's said that it's butting your head against a stone wall.

VOICE: No, no, that isn't so.

VOICE: Oh, I'm glad to hear that. Well, we've made progress there. Again because of the change of executive coming in, we're going to
Fine. I'm glad to hear that.

Miami, I see we're getting 528 out of one million I don't know how much of that we collect in the end.

VOICE: Phil, we're alright on that now. That straightened out finally.

VOICE: Thank you. In Newark I think there has been --

VOICE: They've improved. Oh yes.

VOICE: I don't know, of these larger cities,
that there are others that might--

VOICE: How about St. Louis?

VOICE: St. Louis? There was a big meeting
there, you said Max.

VOICE: (everybody talking at once)

VOICE: Oh, I see. If you could possibly de-
velop somebody who could sit alongside of Mel Dubitsky in
St. Louis as Lem and Morris sit alongside of each other
and we have Ned Harris in Chicago. He's a whirlwind in
certain areas. (everybody talking and laughing at once.)
The group on the right is going to have to be simulated
or broken up, I don't know which.

VOICE: Well, I was waiting for you to bring
up your Max. (laughter) I don't think we have to
try to but I do want to make one suggestion to take
three or four of them --

VOICE: What's the situation in (laughter)
There's a man there that might have some influence with
the / Federation and also might have some interest in furthering
the UJA : I should think that would be a very excellent
very good situation to see if we can't do something there.

VOICE: I wonder if we can put a needle on
the end of this and (laughter)

VOICE: I'd just like to suggest --

037691553

VOICE: Bill, I think what you're suggesting is that you give a little needle to all of us. (laughter)

VOICE: No, I think that's the mistake we made in the past. That, we tried to operate this on giving the needle to all of us and doing it on a year by year basis and I think Herb very cleverly pulled us out of that last year...with these ten communities below the---

VOICE: Is that the reason that about New York? (laughter)

VOICE: I think the problem there is allocation. (laughter)

VOICE: Can we have a little bit more decorum in this group? (everybody talking and laughing at once.) A little more decorum. (more laughter)

VOICE: I can only tell you that throughout the years, anything that anybody can do to help New York we've always not only requested it but encouraged it and pleaded for it. And I'll let him speak on that further if you wish. I do think that we could very well try to explore, I don't know, about three or four of these cities above the line --pick them carefully--and try to get them studied --not necessarily a total sociological study but have some person assigned, some competent person, assigned to go in there and try to go over all the facts, try and find out who's there and what can be done. I think that

037601359

suggestion was kind of given fairly cavalier treatment here--and should be revived.

I don't remember who --I'd be very glad to go along with that Barney if the others here feel that this is a sound approach.

VOICE: Now, who else wants to talk? Ollie?

VOICE: (indistinct) (laughter) Maybe a casual suggestion to pick up where Herb left off.

VOICE: Well, if you do you'll be off further.
(laughter) (everybody talking at once)

VOICE: There are those of us and I say this in deference to and I'm so glad that they're on this committee and I think that one of the suggestions that was made it would be either at this meeting or at a subsequent meeting the Chicago representatives committee be invited to present the picture of the city of Chicago to this group. So, everybody is knowledgeable as to A-what is going on, B-their frustrations, and C-what assistance this group could give a city of 275,000 Jews, \$17 to \$18 per capita which is my guess is awfully low--now wait, (indistinct) and I'm sure that those of us who not sure other schools. Joe, before dinner, he mentioned that his accomplishment in the City of Chicago --gave something like \$25 or \$30,000 represents the highest gift in that city. I think that it is incumbent

upon us as a group to aid, all of us to be knowledgeable about what is existing in Chicago, secondly to take cognizance of the new representation from Chicago and finally to lend our assistance and suggestions as to how to take this city which in my book after all --a lot of careful study ought to be good for somewhere around \$1½ million more for UJA without even tapping the surface of the money that exists in that city.

And I'm not by innuendos taking any bows for my city or any other city. Now, there are those of us who happen to know among the ten or fifteen families --(indistinct) I discussed it with Joe Shane coming up, people who lived in Hawaii, substantial ^{worth} there, /millions upon millions of dollars today pledged \$5000 in the city of Chicago. I'm talking about other people ^{are worth to} who /knowingly--a half dozen people in this room --a hundred million dollars--and who you sweat to get \$50,000 out of them. Only because the (indistinct) is doing (indistinct) I say I make three suggestions in Chicago--A) We ought to set aside time for the new representatives in Chicago --on this city-- time to make this group knowledgeable about the city of Chicago, all about it. Secondly, We ought to be in a position to make suggestions as to what we think they might do to help this city help U J A and finally to --if this doesn't work and I know that you'll need a year or two and I for one am

not willing to wait a year or two to start something. I don't mean a campaign there but to start getting the knowledge, getting the information across. Because, I think that if everyone in this room knew all of the facts there ~~it~~ would be much more consternation than there is here.

So, to boil it down-there are to be taken. My suggestion is that at the next meeting, hear from Chicago, get the story, get suggestions from this group, evaluate the situation, then make a decision as to what this group ought to do, about the city of Chicago.

VOICE: Would you like to add anything. I also had you on the list.

VOICE: Yeah. I would say a few words, Max. Number one, at this moment, I wouldn't worry about the percentage that we receive from Chicago. I don't think it's adequate. But, I don't think that that's the problem at this moment. I think the problem at this moment are the big givers in the city of Chicago, and I can tell you now and you know the facts and you're welcome to them to do something about it. The Crown family, for instance, was literally going to ^{get} give \$100 million for their share of General Dynamics and so forth and so on who give the sum of \$60,000. If they lived in New York, I think they'd be afraid to walk out of the door, with this \$60,000 gift which is nothing.

They gave around \$3 million to Northwestern University and just gave \$300,000 to build a school in Chicago, which is good. But, they aren't giving money. I think in the city of Chicago, the real problem and this you do not have in Detroit and in Cleveland, is that our big givers - our big givers are not our leaders. And this is the real problem. In other words, you take a Henry Crown or you take or an Irv Harris or Perlstein or or a Stone -- anyone of those really wealthy families. Someone of those should be a General Chairman. Someone of those should give a I mean a gift that means something and by the way, we had a meeting once between our welfare^{fund} and our federation and I happened to be General Chairman at the time and I got up and I said the biggest mistake you ever made was to have a little guy like me for General Chairman.

Because my gift looked like something (indistinct) But a Henry Crown can come in and give \$250,000 and call a dozen men, his peers and say--I just gave \$250,000 Harris, what are you going to do? And so forth and so on. And you have a new ball game. I think it's the dollars that really count and I think the dollars are there. How you motivate them, I'll be damned if I know. But, these men really-some are apt to explode, this is a self-protective society and it's been that for many, many years. And somewhere

along the line a bomb has to be dropped to get one of these men to really give a gift. And call these men in and talk "tachlis" and really get some money.

And at that point, you can start talking about all the things Ollie is talking about. But, first you have to get these leaders to really give leading gifts and to take a leadership role. And you come out with some money. And believe me, I would be delighted to sit down with any or all--I don't care how many men to talk about really and truly doing a job in Chicago. Because, you've got to get these top men. And as far as I'm concerned, you can take the crown goods and move her out and I'll take it. But come down the line and there's a lot of wealthy people - you talk about Gus Stratton who used to live in Milwaukee.

He's a very nominal gift today. Maybe we don't motivate him. I'd like to know how to motivate the others. And in the East, I think it was Irv Harris who gave I think \$250,000 for some little educational thing and so forth and so on in Minneapolis. And many men like that, who have millions of dollars and these are good people by the way. I'm not talking about bad people. I just don't think we've been successful in really getting to their heart and getting to the bottom. I'd like to know how to do it.

VOICE: .. he was nothing.. and he gave no gifts. He was just a new President.

VOICE: We came in and literally shamed Jim Lyndon, the President of HAIS in Milwaukee - for a \$2,500 gifts. And Herb Perlstein, who is Chairman of Board of HAIS, said the biggest year in the history of the company.

What was the proceeds we were getting in Chicago? \$36,000. I mean it's almost hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions. You multiply this by thousands of ... and where do we go.

VOICES: (Indistinct) Al... mentioned something ..

VOICE: Make comments. Here is a guy who wants us to .. and stopped giving ..

VOICE: Oh, Len, look!
Look -- I tell you don't mention names like this because I sat next to Jack Kaplan and the American Jewish Committee, and this guy told me this fellow is a "national disgrace" -- and I don't think -- he was confused.

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: I would like to make a suggestion about this .. here to you Gentlemen.

We talked about this .. By the way we got even. We sat down next to Harris Perlstein and we made 20 % increase in members that afternoon.

VOICE: I tell you what I suggest you do.

I am from Chicago, Friends! What .. why don't /I think I know what we'll do .. we do this. Instead of talking about this, why not have our own staff and our own field people come up and give us some ideas of what they think of this picture, and we'll have it on the table sometime ..

I think that this will be a good idea.

Eddie, I think ..

VOICE: .. you know the answer to the picture.

VOICE: Well, we don't know the answer to the picture!

VOICE: I earlier wanted to .. make a study. But I ...

VOICE: You don't need it!

VOICE: Now, all of you know that the (feature ??) answer to the picture is getting some top -- "A" Top -- gifts or two.. It's that simple. It's just that simple!

Max, now you can figure out how you can sit down with Henry Kraus; he's a nice guy ..

VOICE: Unfortunately, he was sick
last time ...

VOICE: Well, you just can't give up
trying ..

VOICE: No, we won't!

VOICE: I tell you what ... I agree with
you. I was over there once, and I tell you we had a
very lovely evening. We only struck out on one of them
and then we fell in with Stone; you remember this!

Oh, boy, he was a cold potatoe!

VOICE: (Indistinct) ... over one million
dollars into Trust Funds.

VOICE: Well, look you cant get money out
of a non-contributor. We have to work on the guys who
are contributors!

VOICE: .. thousands dollars ...

VOICE: Look, while we are going into
this thing here, let's ..

VOICE: I got money out of a non-contributor!

VOICE: Well, you're

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: First crack I ever watched ..

VOICE: Eddie, well,

VOICE: I would like to make one simple
suggestion which maybe Leonard can answer from there, because

695109280

it has to be helpful immediately for 1966.

The point is this.

The partners of the Combined Jewish Appeal - the Welfare Fund and the Federation: We are only beneficiaries of the Welfare Fund - have a contractual arrangement which makes it possible for Chicago to get any value from our Inaugural Fund Raising situation on December 9th. They are prohibited from doing any kind of Welfare Fund - Combined Jewish Appeal - Campaign preparation before January 1st. And it just seems to me that it ought to be pretty simple to get the Federation to grant a license (coughing - indistinct) -- and exception to the Combined Jewish Appeal to at least do the kind of carefully created \$10,000 or over Pre-Campaign solicitation to build up towards the December 9th Meeting.

You ought to have some public meetings -- but that it seems to me is a simple thing which would have a carry-over into the Campaign.

VOICE: But, I think that we are again wrong in that particular item, because if the Federation has a Campaign, they certainly do it prior and before we finish our Campaign in the UJA, and we say nothing, because we presume that it goes to the Special gifts which we already solicited have been solicited by that time, and that in the month of December, any big giver has given in June or July,

and I think that is a rationalization.

I don't think that it is reasonable.

VOICE: I think that if you can get clearance for us to do the kind of thing in November that we want to do elsewhere that this ought to be a small but significant step forward.

VOICE: What Eddie is saying, Len, and I think that this maybe a good point ..

6001007000
We have a wonderful opportunity with the Adago -- I-I am willing to go over and sit down with people if you want me to go over there.

I think that this is a wonderful opportunity, because at those meetings there is stimulation .. you remember the Humphrey Dinner that we had.

We had a wonderful stimulation and it was very successful!

There wasn't anyone there from Chicago; we did not have a single gift! If you have that, I would do this. If you can arrange that; if you think that this is the .. (indistinct).. I would be very happy to go over with you to Chicago.. and sit down and talk to whomever it is necessary. Bob, this is a constructive thing for me; you think that this could be very helpful???????

VOICE: I think that it could!

VOICE: Alright!

VOICE: ...now if you are doing this
little thing privately ..

VOICE: You know, that there is an old
saying that " az do frechts duz ready -- iz duz traef.."

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: Pardon me ...

VOICES: (Indistinct)

VOICE: I don't think that we have
an answer here ... you see with what you have already
talked with

VOICE: Alright, Artie ..

VOICE: Suppose I am getting ... from
Chicago.

We thought that ^{/(in Detroit ??)} we have something like 80,000
Jewish People.

It gave the UJA \$2,300,000 it 1965.

The .. in Chicago .. has 275 thousand Jewish
People and they gave ... less than Detroit.

Now, if this isn't an issue for this Committee,
then I want to know what the hell is an issue! Because
you are talking \$2 million -- \$3 million! You talking
20% of the \$10 million that you want. Don't you think
that this Committee can justifiably walk away from the
city of Chicago and say: "We'll settle it when they get

rid of something (indistinct).. even if it's for you!
I don't just think that it is right!

VOICE: Well, now, Max, we'll say that
we'll do this privately and we'll go twice as fast.

VOICE: Alright! Is there any further
discussion on this matter.

VOICE: Yah! I think that it is -
Chicago - I think that this is a very good position as
far as Chicago goes. But I am afraid that if we concentrate
on Chicago, we'll not get back to Chicago, and they'll
feel that we are picking on them; and I think that at
least we should decide to pick on a couple of --- for the
sake of this we could say that we want to study St. Louis
and Miami!

It doesn't mean that we have to study them ...

VOICE: Al, ... about this; we won't
leave the room.

VOICE: I won't leave the room!

VOICE: We'll, let's say that we are
going to study a few of the bigger communities.

VOICE: Well, Bill, I ...

VOICE: Well, Bill I am sorry that I must
disagree with this steady means of subject. Let's not
get involved. Let's just go to work. Joe Shane.. Shane
brought up a point; the thing that we've got to do ..

we've got ... problems.

We shouldn't ignore them! We try to take all the suggestions that we can. Let's put some intensive work on 'em.

He brings out a point that -- over here that I would like to follow-up. We've got to get some big gifts to set the pace. The same thing's true of Miami.

I looked at the list of givers and I saw Sam Horwitz, who is the big man down there, gone to

VOICE: Max,....

VOICE: \$3,500 bucks - he's a drop of ..

I think that we have some basic problems with the big individuals on this thing here.

I think that we are cognizant of the situation on this thing; and I think that let's go -- address ourselves to this thing and see what we can do in this coming year.

There is no use in going any further on this thing.

We are not going to put - we're not going to I am willing to go to Chicago; but when we sit down with Chicago and talk about breaking in on this September Conference; he'll give us some initial gifts.

I know this..... I went over there and talked very good. They had lovely dinner out of this. We came out of dinner there with every contributors at that meeting

was an increase! We averaged -- I asked them for 20% and I think that everyone almost came through with that -- din't they???

VOICES: (Indistinct)

VOICE: We have to just keep on working on that thing and make this penetration.

VOICE: How much of that increase was a.. Max, did we get.....

VOICE: This came out of the Combined

VOICE: "Special Fund"...

VOICE: "Special Fund!"

VOICE: ... and let me say one thing.

VOICE: Now, that is exactly what Bill said: if we have an understanding, now, that we can go all out for a Special Fund" --- I am wondering if this isn't anything that we can do much about.

I think that our own persons in Chicago can do something about it. To what degree still ... involved in Chicago????
(is Bill ...???)

/you
To what degree do think that he would be helpful in these gifts???

VOICE: Let Lenny tell you ..

VOICE: Now, Lenny, later ...

VOICE: Supposing that there are some

other good people.

I don't know

How heavy a wait is this situation?????

VOICE: Look, I, I made this suggestion..

VOICE: .. the whole group ought to get
(a special ??)
together for the present solicitation - in November - in
advance on the basis that we now have a Special Fund that
we can tap; and to go to the individual contributors for
the Special Solicitation -- for the "Special Fund" -- the
rest of it can go to the campaign..

VOICE: I made the suggestion that .. before;
and I would just like to call it to your attention.

I'd like to have our own staff come up with
suggestions on these big cities. Let's hear what they have
say; they are familiar with ..
(brought up ??)

Eddie just wound up one of them; he might have
several others. It might be small items we think but they
might be very constructive.

I noticed at the Western Conference, last
year, not one single representative from Chicago. It was
a very highly successful conference.

I asked -- "Why not?" -- and someone said:
"Well, the weather was bad." - or something else! Well,
maybe there are other reasons. These are the kind of things
that people on the ground may be able to give us some
answers for and we'll try to address ourselves to this
situation on this thing.

VOICE: Are there other communities where we are having the same kind of problem with connection to the December Conference.

You say that there are ????

VOICE: There is only one other ...

VOICE: New York is the only ..

VOICE: Now, wait a minute! Ed. You've got a city like Houston, Texas; you've got Dallas; you've got many cities

VOICE: I am sorry if you are not getting the point of the question.

The point of the question, as I understand it Joe, is that is there any other place where we are prohibited from working before December for the coming ..

VOICE: If you talk^{ed} to Henry Bernstein about that today ...

VOICE: I talked to Henry .. Henry and I spent a little time out on the patio talking about that very problem on this thing here; and Henry is trying to figure out some problems on this thing that he has ..

So these -- but these are the kind of things that I think that if you stack and bring to us - maybe we ..

VOICE: I think that you should, Max, because I hear nothing about this Chicago agreement, and now you are going to discuss moving it up, accelerating this

037601575

program up to December, instead of January, and we certainly ought to know that there are other places.

VOICE: The only other place where it is contractual ..

VOICE: New York has a little bit of a problem ..

VOICE: (Indistinct) .. New York ..

VOICE: .. and Washington has a ... and that is what he is talking about ..

VOICE: Yeh!

VOICE: We are talking about December. We are going to have a big meeting in December for big gifts of over \$10,000 ..

VOICE: ... that is January..

VOICE: Well, look, we've got a .. enough - the consensus of this is that we've got ...

VOICE: ... calendar ..

VOICE: That's right. Now, we all agree that there ...

VOICE: ...January...

VOICE: We all agree that there's certain areas where there is some potential for money and we ought to do something about it!

There are certain big cities: Chicago, St. Louis or Miami; there are certain other areas where we might be

able to do something about --

I think that what we are saying in effect is let's see what ideas we can come up with to do that; you've given the ball to us to be able to come up with some answers; and let's see what answers - what recommendations we can come up with to you.

We'll leave it on that basis; and then ... alright!

The next item is this:

You all have heard about the congregation effort that we have established in our last executive meeting. Phil Stollman came in to lead off on this thing here.

We think that it is a very exciting thing. I am going to let Phil tell you more about it; because we think that it can stimulate giving; we think that it can stimulate the number of givers; that it can be a very wonderful help to the communities.

And by the way, I want to tell you one thing, talking about Chicago because it brings up something that took place there. When the word got out that ... I got a letter from Morris Glasser that came to me about the Congregation Effort and I .. Sam Goldsmith wrote a very blistering letter about -- about this thing.

I called Sam Goldsmith on the phone and I just

pointed out that what we are trying to do is to find out how to help him stimulate giving and find non-givers or people who haven't done the job, and we aren't fighting with anybody; we are trying to help the community in this effort, well, for whatever it is worth.

When I got through on the phone, he said that he appreciated now knowing a little bit more about this; and your attitude. Whether you are correct or not time alone will tell. And he said: "I will cooperate." And this is where he finally ended.

I finally went to his steamship ... Poor Sam! I asked him the state of his health; that was the wrong thing to do, because when you mention the state of his health, he gets very sensitive. Because he is sometimes a little caustic. But he was very friendly that day. But I just mentioned that because the reaction that we sometimes get from people when we are trying to help the total effort; they get very antagonistic about this sort of thing. And I think; by the way Lenny, I wrote Sam Glasser about this thing and I think that it will explain a little bit more!

VOICE: ... we have a very good congregation to work from...

VOICE: Yeah, by the way....

VOICE: ... more money from a lot ..

VOICE: Yeah. Well, I mentioned that this... we know this; we talked to the Council of Federations - they are excited about it. We think that it has a tremendous potential!

And I think, Phil, that you ought to tell us a little about it.

It's your moment. Not the moment of truth, but it's your moment!

(LAUGHTER)

You're on your own!

I limited Bill to 33 seconds; and you have 33 seconds!

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: I am afraid now to come down ..

PHIL STOLLMAN: /Mr Chairman - and members of the Executive Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen...

I consider it a privilege to sit on this committee. It is an honor and /an opportunity to serve with men like you ... and opportunity to do more.

And I want to do more! And let me tell you why. I want to go back 20 some odd years ago.

First, the years of desperation. Years that we all felt that the whole world was coming down.

Especially the Jewish People!

(Indistinct) ... from our seats and on our time. we could hear the Gents .. (indistinct names) preaching hate towards our people. And you felt ... and forlorn.

Many a night I used to pace the floors. My children were small then; and I used to look upon them and wonder. What there is in store for them? What is their future in this type of a world? ...

That night I made a commitment! God willing and the people survived; and if there will be then again a future for our people, I will dedicate myself to do everything within my means to help my people and made a better world for my children and all children of Israel! For our people a better world -- and a better future!

And this is why - maybe - I am giving a great deal of my time ...

Max, I always remarked and I go back to the very same thing because this is my thought. We are building a privileged people. The privileged generation to live today and to see something that many generations have dreamed about, but they never had.... the opportunity to see what we are seeing!

I am not very happy with what we are doing. I think that the American Jewish Community by far The benefit that is in the right - now I will ... for the sake of Israel, much later than what we can figure (?)..

Forgive me if I get off the subject on hand, because this is very essential for me.

I just returned from Israel from the plane and not any -- not the UJA Mission, or anything of that sort. It was a trip that my daughter that after she graduated from the University of Michigan asked me as a present for her graduation to taken to Israel. And she insisted upon me going with her.

And I want to tell you that here the young standard American - very much American - and her observation about the State of Israel.

This is very peculiar.

She was very much impressed. She didn't believe that the thing that she saw really existed.

On the other hand, she ... very much concerned. That that's something that is done. The youth of Israel are not getting the proper training - for she graduated from college. Shows you something about human behavior. Now that is something that is done very bad! We may have the very, very same

. This afternoon I was very much impressed with what is being done in the educational. I think that it was - that it is wonderful. I'll say again it's

Let me say one more thing. I with my good friend, Joe Friedman, yesterday, on the projection of our meeting; but you can get advice. I honestly believe

that we made a great deal more. Much more! And as I said last night -- "The money is here!" It is unbelievable the little percentage we have here.

You take it as I seen it yesterday. We are giving only to the UJA - 1/10th of 1%. (indistinct) who is an authority on these matters stated.

If we would give just 1/10th of what we don't make more in 1965 and we make in '64, we would be

10% only or the money we would make more ..

And this is why we make more! So that nothing really that we can be very proud of our giving.

Now, I am coming to the basic, fundamental thing that I am supposed to talk about.

I feel that the UJA has been a very well kept secret on a good part of our community. And it is almost unbelievable! The religious element who are today the most organized segment of our Jewish Community have no part of this big effort -- and it is almost shocking when I speak to some of the leaders of Zionism - and even to the Rabbis - and finding how little they know.. about what's taking place; about the job that we're ...

I feel that the potential through that effort is so great that we are to do something about it.

Here are these -- we have seen figures:

1,100 of \$10,000 givers, just like ...givers, some of them maybe not! But the majority of them are giving, I would

say possibly to the maximum!

I am not special myself - am giving more -
and I try to give more - and especially are giving the
maximum ----

But we - where we have failed on is
not broadening our base .. getting more givers, getting
more contributors. And here is an instrument, an organized
party of reformed congregation of -- that have the
manpower and the organizations to do a job for us and, so
far we have not utilized that effort.

And that is what I told our Chairman!

That I would like to attend to find some business..

Organize the various congregations, when we have
started to investigate what are the percentage of givers
(never ???)
from congregations have again participated -- a good 15%
who are members of religious institutions are not giving
anything to the major effort of the Jewish Aid. And this
is something that we have to do.

Now. You will probably ask me: "How do we
go about it???"

(in brief ??)

Let me explain to you in English. This is a
big job. We do not get done in a year. It will take time.
But we have to get started now. It is our feeling and our
belief that we cannot start with every community -- at least

... therefore, we will pick some of the important and major cities and set up there to implement this thing.

In every city, we hope, in time giving is up
(body ?)
to you and up to this party, to sanction this; we will try
/ who will be the General Chairman
in every city to get a Chairman and then we will have

3 Co-Chairmen: 1 for the Reform Movement; 1 for the Conservative; and one for the other one! And they should create the Committee from the various congregations.

What is our final goal???

Our final goal is that every member of a congregation should beof UJA. I believe that the leadership for the first time in years you will find ...

Let me tell you something that is very interesting. Most interesting. I can only speak about in a practical way about our own city of Israel. I have already had the opportunity to meet, there were some meetings, and to establish this.

I have never believed that we have received with kindness (?) the reformers here. (?) Do you know that what the Rabbis and some of the Ladies has told me. That build it at so - such a vacuum (?) -- something is lacking in their own congregation; the story -- that miraculous story of Israel is not being brought to their congregation
(the true light ??)
in the full impact of the truth (?) that we are expanding and they don't want to share it with us.

They because it is not a matter of the

members making contributions, but it is something that we, the UJA leadership can contribute to the various congregations!

It is something that has been told to me by a number of Rabbis.

So I thank and the wonderful opportunity; you will take time; there is another thing that we spoke about this afternoon.

We have many organizations in our organized community.. that are having conventions, and all kinds of conferences. The Jewish National Fund and Israel Bonds have utilized to some extent those conferences and conventions for their purpose. I don't believe that UJA ever did! And I think that it's high-time that we should ask, and I am almost sure that we will receive, in all Jewish Conventions and Conferences, Special Sessions should be dedicated to the United Jewish Aid .

And with this, my friends, I believe that I have touched on some of the major items. The mechanics are to be worked out; and I am positive that you will prove that we will be able to get literally many thousands of new contributors, and far more than that, new leaders, new blood in UJA.

(APPLAUSE)

VOICE: I might say to you that Phil did a tremendous job on developing from Detroit to the

congregation --- Israel Bonds! And he had the job; he had already accepted the job of being General Chairman for the Bonds for the United States; but I used a slight bit of arm-twisting to do that; and Joe Schwartz was kind enough to release him.

But here was an interesting thing which was hard for us to figure out which we did figure out!

Phil was able to find through the congregation hundreds of people who bought bonds in Detroit in substantial amounts of money --- but never gave a dime to the Organized Community, and if they did give any money, it was so small that it was hard to figure out.

Now, there is something wrong. If a man can buy one, five or ten thousand dollars worth of Bonds every year, there must be something wrong -- why he couldn't afford to give some money. And I think that this is the area -- there is potentially a tremendous amount of contributors of that type whom we have to reach.

And I am looking forward with great enthusiasm.

Now, while we are talking about it, anybody have any questions that they want to ask Phil on this, why the floor is open?

VOICE: We all agree that this idea is a great one, and should be fully exploited.

VOICE: Does anybody have anything new that they want to ...

add ...

VOICE: We went to great lengths ---
Lou Bernstein and his Staff -- to hold approval and are
ready to join Herb in a cover note, and have the draft
memorandum sent out to the Headquarter Communities for
their cooperation ...

VOICE: Max, I wish Phil all the luck
in the world. And I hope that this venture on his part
will be - bring great practical results!

But over a long life and experience in and
out of the active "round-up" -- I have found that most of -
especially in these later years, his later years -- the
congregations have not only not been helpful, but have
offered road blocks to UJA procedures; often insisting
that performance (conformance to??) Kashruth takes pre-
cedence over a gift to UJA: making an issue of it!
/Give
Opposing the UJA Aid in Washington, because some small
.... said that she had a luncheon that wasn't perfect.
... responses on that, and so forth.

This happens and we have always tried to
... at a time .. when Rabbis were active in our campaigns
in Washington - through our experiences there. But in
these later years as the congregations built new synagogues,
new edifices, we always felt that the greatest competitor
of the doubt in the community was the UJA.

As an example, a Congregation that I belong to, Joe.

I can't go to Schule on shabbath morning; I have to go to another one. Because in that Schule there is an Eig Auditorium.

Do you know what Eig Auditorium means to me???

There is a Mr. Eig, who was president of the synagogue at one time. who some years ago gave \$50,000 to the Schule for which they gave him the mitzvah of the Eig Auditorium. This \$50,000 he paid in, I think, 5 years.

But during the period that I think he paid money to the Schule, with the first installment he stopped contributing to UJA; and hasn't contributed in the last 15 years!

AND WE ARE HONORING THIS GUY. The synagogue! I talked to the Rabbi --- the Rabbi honors him; he cow-tails to him, so what -- a wonderful guy. This is a problem that we face. And I think that -- I am glad that you ... because you know why, because you are a "koshera yied!"

If someone else would do it, he is suspect! But I address myself, because in my experience the poorest help that we got was from the Orthodox Rabbinate and the Orthodox Congregations!

VOICE: Well, all that I can say is ..

VOICE: ... conservative. We can only activate the Rabbi-System beyond making this, delivering

a sermon on the UJA.

To speak of congregational giving ... for instance ..

I would like you to make a survey of the President's of your Schules -- and the Officers -- and see how their giving relates to the non-presidents, like Max Fisher, or your own.

VOICE: Mr. Chairman, since you and I did not speak, tonight, and I promised you that I wouldn't speak tonight, I won't speak, tonight, but everybody is ...

VOICES: (Indistinct)

VOICE: Alright ... just about ..

VOICE: which is the basic problem of the UJA has, and all the Jews have; / and all of us have our really .. base of leadership, which is the thing that you are going to talk about; that, I am willing to talk about.

VOICE: Alright, tomorrow morning, you have your day.

Is there anything else on this "congregation."

Bill, I wouldn't be discouraged by our good friend, Iz Breslau. Alright, he is a good describer. Alright, is there anything else, Phil????

VOICES: (Indistinct)

VOICE: Well, look, alright, Gentlemen, have we anything further. Phil????

VOICE: Gentlemen, I believe that the motion would be in order that ... meetings should be ..

VOICE: I move.

VOICE: It was already done at the last meeting.

VOICE: It was already done. You were appointed to the job ... the job was appointed .. it was done at the last meeting!

You have the full blessing

VOICE: ... full jurisdiction over the Rabbi ... (LAUGHTER)

VOICE: Yah! Alright is there anything further on this???

Because I would like to talk here about an item myself which is ... your turn comes tomorrow, Marty!

I'd like to talk about something which we have been working on for some time and which came up at the Conference last year. And that's about the image of the UJA.

To me this has been something that has concerned me, because frankly, it's a peculiar thing, but everybody thinks that the UJA thinks it is the greatest institution in the world - except the Jews that are involved in it.

This is a fact on this thing. I tell you this

I tell you this story because it involves what other people think about what we have done.

It probably was the basis for this feast that we have made over here on the "chosen people" and I feel very keenly about it. I think that we are a very fortunate group of people, to have participated in this great venture that we are doing now, the saving of all these lives.

But for some reason or other we are so close to history, we are so close to it that we can't appreciate it. And the result is that most of the Jews in the country can't appreciate it.

We are participating in it without really knowing and appreciating our feeling; and I have talked in all the cities that I've been to and made it a point to try to sample some of the feelings and some of the opinions, and I've come to this conclusion: that somehow or other we have got to bring about a situation where we make Jews of America really proud of something which they should be proud of!

I mean -- you know that I've got to tell you this because it involves the December Conference. I spent - two sessions with former President Eisenhower, the day before yesterday, because I wanted to talk with him about the December Conference, and it looks like we will be able to have him for this Conference if the Good Lord keeps him healthy, and a few other things, because the celebration

is the 20th celebration of the liberation of the Camps.

And after listening to him, and it was quite interesting because he went back in history 20 years ago, and I found out quite a bit about what took place there that really shocked me, because I haven't lived through these events. He told me this - you know the Jews are really great people. He said that their feeling for humanity - I want to get this thing to you - their feeling for humanity in what they do for themselves is something that is really outstanding.

I went ahead and told him a little bit about the fact that we have saved 1-1/2 million lives. He just couldn't believe it. It just overwhelmed him that this was happening. It overwhelmed him that we were bringing people out of the iron curtain. That's right! He just couldn't .. it's just hard to comprehend.. and the same thing is true ..

VOICE: ... don't be harsh!

VOICE: Just a minute! The same thing is true - for example of many people. I talked to the Gentile World, the Christian World, in the United Fund, and to other people in Government and high places, and it is surprising what they think of us. They think that we're the greatest institution in the world; they think that the Jews are so great; and we, ourselves, don't have the courage to build up

in our own minds the importance of what we are doing.

And this is what we have to do.

We have to place this thing in proper focus.

I have talked to the Board of Directors, the Council of Federations; just at the last time that we had the loan. And I pointed out one of the things ...

VOICE: (Indistinct) I thought that the paper Pardon me. I just wondered ... the paper was there ..

VOICE: ('em)
You know, I told him about the fact how fortunate we were that here is a non-Jewish Community of the world having faith enough to give us a \$50 million loan. This is what other people think about us and we don't think enough about it ourselves. I pointed out that in many cases I come back now from meetings in Detroit and talk to my friends in the United Fund, for example; they read about the fact that we save all these Jews, that we save all these people. Why is it that we can't give this thing to proper perspective to 5 million Jews? We should have a sense of feeling and pride with all our Jews - ranging from the little kids all the way up! And we have got the greatest thing in the world going for us! And I think that this what we need to do. Because I am concerned with this from a long range point of view.

For this reason I felt that we ought to sharpen

up our image or try to get some professional help.

You brought this out last year and you made a very firm recommendation. Since that time I have interviewing advertising people in public relations firms, trying to find the answer.

Now. I want to say this to you: None of this is just the answer. No one is going to give you a cut and dry answer to this whole problem. But we have reached the point now where we are ready now to hire a public relations firm and we have set certain criteria; down to three of them that we have interviewed and spent time with and we've even gone to the extent of trying to find out their Jewishness -- the feeling in their own heart; because if anyone wants to do this work and they don't have a Jewish Heart; they don't have a feeling for what they are doing -- they aren't worth a darn!

I might say to you one of them, for example, said to me that they'd do it on a "voluntary basis." Well, I feel that I don't want anybody on a voluntary basis for this job!

We want to have somebody do this job on a professional level that has a feeling in his heart that we can call upon to do this job!

VOICE: Did you check is they are making their contribution to us afterwards???

VOICE: Hmmm! That's different! But I say

to yoy this that we have reached this point and I think that we are going to have somebody.

We are down now with the Staff and myself where we are going to have to pick one out of the three firms. There are 3 top notch Jewish Firms:

I want to say this ...one of the points that came ..

VOICE: The firms are Jewish firms?

VOICE: All Jewish!

VOICE: Is it trouble if you tell us about them ...

VOICE: Oh, sure! I'll tell you a little about them.

There are three firms that we are looking at: one of them is Reuter and Finn; one of them is Rollard and

VOICE: Rodgers and Kahn;

VOICE: Rodgers and Kahn;

and one of them is - what is it? Colman, Druck ..

They are all top notch firms; but you have to develop a "feel" for these in interviewing them and talking to them; and we are going to make our best educated "guess" as to which one is going to do the job.

They all -- I'll give you the same questions -- we are going to be responsible to a Board of Directors that are going to ask each month ...

VOICE: I say you're not!!

You're not! This isn't the way this thing is going to work!

I think that this is going to help. I don't think that this is the whole answer.

But I do think that the fundamental approach that we've got to do is to realize -- we've got to build up the stature of an institution which to me is the greatest thing in the world that we have ever seen.

You know when I feel that I am associated with a group of people that have -- that had a part in history to save the lives of million and one-half people -- this is what we have got to make American Jews conscious of.

They have the greatest thing in the world going for them -- and we have got to impart that feeling!

I want my children to have a feeling that -- They like to wear a button on their lapel: U J A - and what the devil it stands for!

And this is what we have to do if we want to really promote this, because we are doing to be really doing this job for many, many years. You know for me the United Jewish Appeal is a life-saving and a life-building arm of the American Jewish Community. That is what it really is! This is what we are really doing - this is what we are really --- devoting our lifetime to this sort

of thing.

I think that this is -- I just think that this is tremendously important, not as it affects the situation today because today we have been talking about problems: How to raise money for '65 and '65!

But I think that we have got to do something now which will build the situation for the next 20, next 30 years, until we finish this job! I don't think that the job will be finished in our lifetime around here. I'd like to say that it would be, but I'm sure that it would not be! But I think that this is what we have to do and this image, this feeling of pride, this feeling of being part of, playing a part in history, is the job that we have to get across.

I want to tell you of an instance that happened to me:

I came back on the plane from Chicago, after that meeting; and I get on this -- the young fellow sitting next to me, going to Florida, I was on my way to Florida; and he starts talking to me.

He came from a -- his father was active in Bonds; very active in the Federation, by the way; and this kid, who didn't even know --- his father was an Orthodox Jew; he'd been interested in Bonds; he didn't even know the work of the United Jewish Appeal / had done.

He had no conception of this part in history that they had played.

I sat there and talked with him; I said: What is it that's wrong that we can't get across to this generation what part? I told him that he had some part to play: that if contributed a dollar of work that he had some part to play in the saving of a million and one-half lives -- "My God," he said, "Why don't I know about these things????"

He said: "Did I have something to do with it, and My Father?" And I said, "Yes!"

He said, "I'd never realized this."

And I mean it. We've got to -- we're playing an important part in history. I told this to -- I tried out something new in Minneapolis, which I felt. I asked Ray to work with me on this thing here. And I feel this very keenly.

I just feel that people don't realize just how close to history they are. They don't realize. You know 20 to 30 years from now we are going to -- this is when people will start appreciating the job that we've really done!

• So this is the conception! This is what I mean by a public image; this is what I mean by a realization to the grass roots of our 5 million Jews -- and we are starting it off in a very limited way and this is one of the things that I feel very dedicated about; because I

think that it is important.

I just say to you this. I want to tell you. I told you this morning that I think that you're the greatest bunch of people in the world. I think that everybody that is connected with the United Jewish Appeal is tremendous!

Because this is how important is the part that you've played in history.

So I hope that we are going to get started on this. We are going to try to do this. I would like to have you feel that you are going to have some chance to participate in this thing; you may see some ideas; things that we are going to be talking about down the next few years, because this is nothing that is going to happen tomorrow morning.

But I think that this is one of our basic problems. The realization to 5 million people from the time that they are born until the time that they have had a part to play in history; and if we can do that we can really make this great movement of ours very worthwhile.

So, I want to mention this is the part that I want to mention to you. You want to say something - Barney?

VOICE: Max, I do, but I promised that I wouldn't! .

VOICE: If it relates to this then you can talk about it.

BARNEY: I think that ..

MAX FISHER: Yeah!
(As above)

BARNEY: I think that - huh, the subject that is being terribly important to the United Jewish Appeal -- to the Jews -- but I would like to go one step further and say:

Certainly you and your business which is involved in public relations -- public image -- and advertising -- and all these things -- no!!!!

That the strength of any public relations firm is built within the staff of your own organization. And I think that we have to develop and mabe we have been niggardly about it!

VOICE: Try it -- with lots of luck!

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: 's
Marty/been giving me the business ... pardon me ...

VOICE: Maybe we have been niggardly -- maybe -- in the fact that we have Ray, here, who obviously is a very competent person; that we get complaints from our -- from members of our Executive Committee, that our Staff is not as well informed, as well trained in the areas about which you speak.

(Water glasses and water poured for drinks.)

And I don't think that the mere hiring of a public relations firms will do the job that you speak of.

I think that it's a step toward it; but I think that if you are going to really do this, I would suggest that you consider devoting at least some of the -- adding, or whatever is necessary, some personnel -- to the staff of the United Jewish Appeal to make available the basic information - make available to our whole organization that which is necessary in terms of a public image to come out with. Because in a public relations firm; and you know this as well as I do; how many -- they can only work within a framework of what we give them!

VOICE: Barney --- I happen to know a little bit about public relations -- I've had enough Of 'em working for me and I agree with you 100%.

Anything that we're -- look, one this I want to get clear. Hiring a public relations firm doesn't mean that our image is going to change tomorrow morning. It doesn't mean that it's going to be done. All we are asking is advice and council.

Everything that we are doing is within the framework of our own department! People that are acting on this thing here is Ray Levy, Irving Bernstein and myself. I mean we are acting! Because anyone who works with this has to work with the facilities that we have at hand ---

BARNEY: And - and maybe we should consider enlarging those facilities and making - so that they accomplish

VOICE: Well, let's leave it this way to our staff; and when they get ready to want to expand that, why we'll talk about it.

But I think that the idea ... we starting of ..
I want to talk about the basic philosophy of this thing; which is the image which I think is so terribly important that we have got to get across.

Does anybody else ---

Did you say ..

VOICE: Yes, I want to say a word! Uh!

I know that - what prompts you and us to want to change the public image -- and public lay spirit. And I tell (indistinct) ...now miserable for words in that area!

And I think that it would be very well for you to talk to the people who engage - Jewish Firms and Jewish Organizations - that engage public relations firms and found it to be a waste of money ^{/accordingly} and no good at all!

Now, I don't want to mention the people who were involved - I know them professionally - but I would if you venture on the thing protect yourself, at least by a period ...

VOICE: Oh, that we've done!

VOICE: But know that this -- we also
at different times - and now I think of another moment -
there were three that went to the very best and nothing
came of it!!!

(Background noise)

I know that you'll say - well, you experience
and our experience is going to be different -- but it has
been tried! And I am not at all sure that UJA does better
with a public relations firm than with its own staff --

VOICE: Well, Rose, I am going to answer
your question and tell you this --

ROSE: Alright! I did not.... say..

VOICE: No -- now I want to tell you
this that ..

VOICE: I'm glad that I stated this and,
and that ...

VOICE: No. Rose I'm glad that you
stated this ... and ..

There are certain responsibilities ..

ROSE: But it is not the

VOICE: Well, whatever it is

(LAUGHTER)

Well, whatever it is responsibility

ROSE: Well, we seem to know that --

VOICE: I think that there is -- certain things that you have to take responsibility for -- and I will say this for you.

I appreciate that there are many hazards and no guarantees; the thing may not even amount to anything; but, I say this: I feel so keenly about this particular situation that I am going to try out whatever possibilities I can.

And I may say to you very easily, a year or two from now, that whatever I may do this might be the wrong tack or approach. But I think that it is important enough --

I think that the basic principle -- I think that this is the thing that I want to say to you, Rose, and this is what bothers me. The sense of history, the sense of the image that we have is so important, we may fail on it this way, but this is the objective that we are going to try and reach!

If we fail in it it won't be because we didn't try. This is the way -- this is the way I feel.

And I know these things; because I tell you I said to you before: a public relations firm, itself, doesn't answer the questions. You have to have the ability to direct them and understand what you want!

VOICE: I must say this for Rose's outlook ... it is not easy --

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: Heh! What's going on here.

What is going on here between yourselvesyou fellows ..

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: (Indistinct)

You're supposed to talk --- ha, has it been

.....

VOICE: Quiet. Quiet. Are you through?

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: no only those related to
the questions and suggestions ... understanding ..

VOICE: (Gavel raps) Oh, I want to
point out something that Rose said in that direction..

VOICE: Yes, indeed!

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: He has to give Olie the floor ..

ROSE: I'm glad that he ...

VOICE: to give Olie the floor ..
do you mind????

VOICE: Ah, I'm sorry

VOICE: Well, go on and talk while you've
got the floor

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: Regardless of what Rose said
you mentioned three firms -- and I talked to her about
this last year --- and one of the men you mentioned I have

known for some good 10 years -- and I think that ... he can't do what you want him to do -- he will not dig the job!

The second one - I think that it's Joe Penner -- well,

Two of the firms that you have mentioned - I don't know but one of them I know; unless he feels as a Jew that he can do this job -- he won't take it.

You talk about ...

VOICE: Well, let's not mention names ..

VOICE: No! I am not! I just want to ... clear the air here that there is more than just .. more than just a public relations thing here that is being --- is what I am trying to say ...

VOICE: Well. Now. Let me say, Gentlemen.....

VOICE: Look, I think that you don't want us to ...

VOICE: Well! Let me tell you this about advertsing! firms and public relations firms!

You know this is what it reminds me of. I've interviewed -- you know, you can't do this by a Board of Directors. Here, let me finish the story on this thing!

It reminds me of the advertising that I used to do. You know, I'd walk into the office in the morning, and we spent quite a bit of money on advertising, and we'd

have a new program on television.

I'd walk into the office and the first man that would see me - that -- on the left; that door was on the left; he said: "Boy," he said, "that was the most tremendous program that I've ever seen."

My other associate on the other side, he said, when I came in, he said: "Gee, that program I saw yesterday, it stinks!"

Now, this is what happens with this. Unfortunately, or fortunately, I will be very happy to anyone of you come and talk to me about this. But I'll tell you this:

Unfortunately, I've interviewed all these people myself - for the Staff. I am going to talk to them, again. In the final analysis it is going to have to be a decision of the man that we pick by the staff and myself; we are going to have to talk it over. Because otherwise, we could never do this.

It is not the sort of thing that you can do on a democratic basis. I would welcome

VOICE: ... and further to your apologies
(indistinct) ... anyway ..

(LAUGHTER)

VOICE: I would welcome any of you coming up to me and telling me that you're .. your observations

about any individuals and I'll respect them that way -- but because we are working in this light, I would rather not have a discussion which I think is right.

I think that you ought to come and talk to me about it ... but it is one of those things, and I say this to you if you have just like I talked to you, Joe; I asked you a question about it.

About the individuals ...

VOICE: Chairman, we move and give you our full support ...

VOICE: We don't need it --- but this is alright!

VOICE: Joe, did you want to say something ..

VOICE: Yup!

VOICE: I can't!

VOICE: Well, the only thing that I would say was that I think that from the standpoint of Young Leadership Program, I think that an image-building and a public relations consultant is a must -- and a matter of fact ...

. (Water poured for a drink.)

... one of the individuals that I'll talk to you about later represented me at one time; and I think that you should ..

VOICE: That is why I like to come to the ...

VOICE: .. and I think that you should without -- this has to be a one-man decision; but I think that you might want to circulate among the dictators (?) .. that they have dealt in a business way with any of these three firms.

VOICE: Well, let me talk to any of you that want to come up.

You know that the time between now and the time of the meeting is over -- tomorrow, I would be very happy to entertain any fuss -- because I'll tell you I get as many opinions both ways; and I'll tell you something; I'll be perfectly honest with you; but the decision that we make might be the wrong one but we have to take the calculated risk - for what we are trying to achieve is a start!

Now this is what - this is what I say to you about this thing.

Is there any further -- I want to give you this, uh...

VOICE: Yes, Phil,.... sure ..

VOICE: I want to say just two things. I've got a little beef on. One has to do with the agenda; it has four items: Ameliorization; Public Relations Firms; Television Films; Advertising!

Public relations has two broad aspects; one is the aspect of image and using the media that are listed here and others; and the other: is the question of public relations in the sense of how you present yourself in trying to get stories into the public press.

VOICE: That's the strong point (?)

VOICE: I'd like to suggest that .. I'd let you approach the advertising aspect of it.

VOICE: No, we are not talking about that 'till afterwards ...

VOICE: Now, the main aspect is this .. I agree with -- I think that the presentation was excellent, and I agree with you completely that our problem is how to get our children ... to appreciate what UJA is!

I think that this is a much broader job than within just public relations.

I think that the United Jewish Appeal has been absolutely outstanding in what they have done in recent years towards this.

I give Herb Friedman great credit: he started the Young Leadership Group; ... in New York City they have a leadership council that is taking over; it is an older group now: aren't they in their late 30's and 40's!

VOICE: 40's!

VOICE: 40's and some are 50's.

They have a wonderful group of unmarried's and young married's whom they have organized, and have programs of their own. And I think that the answer to reaching the children is not the public relations or the image, although as Joe Kantor has said correctly, this can be of enormous help there!

I think that the job is to go even further than we have gone with the excellent work of getting in younger people at all stages; whether National is doing it; or New York is doing it; or a combination of 'em.
(staffing into ???_)

One can be stabbing into the other; and the other into the one; three cheers!

And I'd like to expand this concept not only from the one you presented, but because of your excellent presentation, I would like to expand it to see what can be done --

We've worked with Hillel Foundations; and I think very successfully. I'd like to see in the communities you can get; maybe even elsewhere; you get UJA Young People's Programs; Youth Programs; Young Israel Programs; Leadership Council Programs; whatever, it is going.

And I would like to suggest that ...

VOICE: I'm very glad that you brought that up and I would like to say to you ..

I think that one of the most outstanding things -- and I want to pay tremendous credit to Herb for it because of his Youth Leadership Movement.

I think that that has been the greatest -
(last ?)
single things in the past few years that has happened in UJA Joe and I were talking about it. Joe has done a tremendous job this past year when we started working out this Youth Leadership jointly with the Welfare Federations. These meetings have been absolutely fantastic. I would like to have Joe tell you a little about that.

And I told Herb this! That I think that we ought to go to whatever expense is necessary to expand that in any direction.

I have for example Bill Aurruncyan in Detroit calling me. "Why can't we have a meeting in Detroit?" See this is something that we are doing jointly -- we are doing a job together and it turns out to be UJA. Phil Bernstein and Lou Stern -- Lou Stern has been speaking --- he wrote me a letter and told me: "This is the most tremendous thing I have ever seen."

And I feel this. That on this score alone, when I talk to Herb, I say, "I don't care what it costs. This is something that we must do!"

And while you're talking I would like to have both Herb and Joe tell you a little bit about this. It is

important!

On the Hillel Foundation thing and the colleges; just two weeks ago, we met with Abe Harmon; and we've arranged to ^{/ now} further that: we'll bring over ^{/ even} I think four people. We've authorized that because -- this is what we want to reach.

So I say, that I'm glad you've got a concept that hiring the public relations firm isn't the whole picture; it's just a help to getting ideas.

I'd like to have Herb and Joe to tell us a little bit of what is going on in the Youth Leadership and the Hillel Foundation -- because for me these are great, exciting programs.

Herb, why don't you go and ... it's a very exciting thing .. and let him also tell you what he is doing with still younger people ...

VOICE: Yes, I think that that can be done ...

VOICE: Fine!

VOICE: I think that this is very important, Herb, and Henry and Joe and all of you, Herb!

HERB FRIEDMEN: Well, it wasn't on the agenda. And so we didn't have any material prepared for you, but let me just try to give you a quick oral summary, both in ideological and practical terms, because I am a dreamer, but

practical and I want to know what are you
now, as well as what are you doing for u
ing to train you for the future a
sting, practical figure is that in the 5
ing has really taken, solid organization
the giving of the membership of the You
(and in some cases it is a father and s
prised how few, the hundred fellows, who
Leadership Cabinet have raised their own
course of the last few years from some \$
ousand to \$750 thousand -- and we've set
em that two years from now they ought to

As far as the long range reach on this thing, what we are trying to do is plan for the nucleia and the seeds of enough hundreds and hundreds of people, so that they can take over the running of American Jewish Life ten years and fifteen years from now. I am absolutely convinced that out

of the 100 guys that are on the Cabinet, or the 6,000 names that we have on the Council with whom we keep in touch all the time, there will come all the future General Chairmen of this Campaign, until the Insurance Company Loan is paid off -- and, maybe, for fifteen years more after that.

I am joking --- but what I am saying is that I have a feeling in my own heart, in a practical way, looking at these men, one by one, knowing them and the duties that they come from and the way they influence their cities -- and knowing the role that they are playing in the campaign. We keep an actual tabular chart on the positions that they hold in the Campaign, and how they move up through the trades and the industries and then become the "big-gift" Chairmen; then become General Chairmen; this is all done very cold-bloodedly in a way -- and very idealistically; both at the same time, and that is the remarkable thing about it.

You keep the spirit going by feeding the soul and the heart and the mind with concepts and history and tradition and all of that; and at the same time, you have got to keep the bread and butter going; what are you going to give next year; and what job are you going to take next year; and when will you get to be the General Chairman in your town?????

As I look at this thing, I see the future National General Chairman will come out of that list; and scores of individual city chairmen who will never -- doesn't have the capacity; but he will rise up to be the City Chairman, and that is great if that is as far as he can go!

(CHUCKLES)

Federation leadership is coming out of this. I must confess that at one point when we took the turn into running these Regional Conferences, I was a little bit doubtful, and Irving will remember a long, bitter discussion between him and me; and I am just reminiscing now, about the fact that when we ran the first one in Columbus and the proposal came that it should be under Joint UJA and Council of Federations Sponsorship, I fought it like steer!

Wouldn't touch it! Didn't want to go near it! Said it's our baby; not to join with them!

And I was persuaded otherwise; reluctantly, but persuaded otherwise. The thing was a crashing success! Because the Council of Federations got in on it; their Executive Directors got in on it; and they brought people that I am frank to say we couldn't bring; and, you know, if I am anything I am practical; and once I saw that there

additional advantages in this thing for us; fine, then we go under joint sponsorship.

We have now a half-a-dozen of them and they are just wonderful!

VOICE: The one in Dallas ...

VOICE: Yes, the one in Dallas ..
(Herb Friedman)

yeah, and then there is one a couple of weekends from now up in Rochester; and you've got one scheduled; each one of these, by the way, is a couple of hundred, two hundred people.

These are not small things; they are big things to organize. They take tremendous committees, local kids to work at them. They take a lot of staff planning on our part; they take very little money; it's one of the cheapest items that is running in our budget.

The salary of one man and one secretary and a couple of pieces of paper. I don't think that this thing is running --- I'll get the figure out of the bag in a minute!

Oh, with these regional conferences really burgeoning

VOICE: Are they really (indistinct)
....and then ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: You have a what ???

VOICE: ... let's say that you have..
again .. and then...

VOICE: Regional?

VOICE:same group ..

VOICES: No, these are "regional"...

VOICE: Regional -- I know it! The one
time we can ... regional... or is it repeated????

VOICE: Annual

HERB FRIEDMAN: It started this year; we will
see whether is ...

VOICE: It's dangerous (?)

VOICES: Yah!

HERB FRIEDMAN: Yah!

VOICE: It's not another meaning!

VOICE: Well, that's what they work
on. But let Joe say it ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: I want Joe to say a few
words, because Joe, I want him to say more than a few words,
because this is his "swan song!" this year. He's getting
old; he's overage; he's...

VOICE: He's graduated!

HERB FRIEDMAN: He's graduated on to this
Board, and I don't know what Nancy says ...

VOICE: Can't we take a couple of
years off?

HERB FRIEDMAN: But we're going to have to
get a new chairman.

VOICE: Sack the man and turn it over
to Nancy. Let Joe stay here! .

VOICE: Let's sack Joe and let Nancy stay here!

(LAUGHTER)

HERB FRIEDMAN: I think that we've got going over to Israel ^{/ in} a couple of weeks - 100 and -----

VOICE: 90 ..

HERB FRIEDMAN: 90!

VOICE: What is there new to the Hillel Program ... registrations are 106 ..

HERB FRIEDMAN: Gentlemen ..

VOICE: 90 going on the plane ... but there are 16 ... on a rendezvous ..

HERB FRIEDMAN: ... journeying over there ..
... 106 ...

This is the fifth, I think, such Mission which means that we've put almost 500 through the physical experience of seeing Israel, almost 500 of them, it's no small matter by now, and then they begin to repeat; you find that the fellow comes back; 3 - 4 years later wants to make another trip to Israel.

It's a very solid thing; it is a real thing! And what we have to find, frankly, are the people who can put into it the kind of cultural and, in a sense, religious, and in a tremendous sense historical infusion, because

that is what grips the imagination of these cold, hard-headed American University young professional and business men. They are so devoid of emotion that it would shock you; and on the other hand, are so susceptible to being thrilled by the painting of an historical panorama that it would thrill you.

A funny paradox but that's it!

Now, we don't -- we're not loaded - loaded with manpower able to elevate them into -- into -- lift them up to the heights. At the Conference down in Dallas this weekend; we have got Rabbi Shulmann; he is one such person capable of doing this. And I am sure that he will give those kids a tremendous experience. But, we can use a Rabbi Lelival for a thing like this! There are unfortunately not too many men.. There is an ^{/ certain} antipathy towards Rabbis, but certain rabbis are acceptable; and the trick is to find them and get them to work with us on this thing!

I would say that there are no serious flaws in this. There was one little experience that I felt was sort of unfortunate - yet not serious - and yet, unfortunately, in a very happy sense. Do you know what they wanted to do??? There are a hundred members on the Cabinet - Young Leadership Cabinet; they have a structure of a dozen Co-Chairmen, Regional Chairmen on the top. There are 100

of them! They wanted to have permission for each of them to contribute \$1000 over 5 years, that is \$200 apiece each year for 5 years; that is \$1000 each; 100 of them is \$100,000, because they wanted to make 1 group \$100,000 gift to the Education Fund -- on top of everything else that they are doing!

We told them --- "No!" Because we are not in the position of violating our own rules; so, it was sad to have to tell them - "No!" -- but it was happy that they made the suggestion; this is an index of how deeply they are being bitten by this training thing; in the last speech that I made to them at the last retreat at the University of Chicago, a couple of weekends ago, was on the subject of the "turning point." I said: "Alright, let's stop talking about 'training future leaders'. You're trained! Now, let's make a turning point here! Israel has to make a turning point and we have to stop talking only about quantity: numbers of immigrants; numbers of towns. We have to start talking about quality in Israel. The UJA has got to make a turning point; we have got to broaden our perspective; and we have; and we have taken on the whole educational approach. You, you the Young Leadership people, you have got to make a turning point here and stop talking about 'in training'; you are trained; now, we have to talk

practically about the roles of leadership that you will start to grab in you communities, even if it means elbowing a little bit to get your way in; and, frankly, let's be realistic, it does mean "elbowing" in many cases.

There are many, many places, you'd be surprised where the established leadership is reluctant to let the new generation that is pushing from behind get in; to let them in up to a point; and we have to start opening doors for them.

I would say that thing is in good shape. They are going to come up with a ^{new} set of -- another chairman for next year; they are debating that now -- and some more officers; the Regional Conferences are going to continue to expand next year; the book reading program will go on -- and every month we send them a book - yah! -- we have got a small expense there; sometimes we pay 45¢ a copy, so it costs us \$45 --- or sometimes we spend \$1.00 a copy; we've sent them; we've got very good prices. We buy some stuff for \$5.15 and they are --- you lose the money and you treat us very well over there. These people --now each of them has got a library built up of 18 -- 20 volumes; all germained through our work!

Now, somebody, Joe - I think - or Max said:
"What are we doing one level below that?"

037691022

Again, we started tentatively and experimentally some years ago to try and get down to the 18, 20, 21 year level on the college campus -- and there, again, the principle of cooperation turned out to be the right principles. We worked out an arrangement with the Hillel Foundations. The arrangement is that we utilize their resources. They are happy for us to utilize it. It costs them nothing. We have been paying the money to bring the people over from Israel. We brought over on a very limited budget; spent a couple of thousand a year; one person; then we expanded it; we brought two people; and we get a top notch -- but top notch -- Israeli intellectual -- Moishe Shahmeer, the novelist, Professor Ahbeneri, the political scientist, Eliahv Liovah -- Eliahv from the Prime Ministers' Office, he was the Planner of the Lachish Project -- that is the caliber of person who goes around -- covers in the course of two months, three months -- if we can get him to stay in the United States that long --- 30 or 40 college campuses; and spends two or three days on each campus; and in some places gets to more kids -- and in some places gets to fewer. It isn't a uniform pattern of overwhelming success -- but we tabulated it twice, on a very, very hard-headed basis: no puffed-up figures! And two times it came out that he was reaching about 10,000 Jewish Students in personal contact... both sessions at the Hillel House; lectures in the classroom to 30 or 40 students; a so-called "mass

meeting" to which 25 students might come -- never tremendous numbers, but cumulatively the man was here and he faced and spoke with 10,000 Jewish Students.

Now there are alleged to be in the United States of American 300,000 Jews on college campuses! I say that there are alleged to be -- and I don't have the figures and I don't think that anybody does more specifically than that generalization; so you can say, well if you are reaching 10,000 annually out of 300,000, what is it "you're not touching anybody!"

That's right! Quantitatively we will never be able to develop a program, because we just would not devote that much money to it, to try to reach 300,000. We would have to saturate America with a whole battery. First of all, there are not that many qualified people in Israel!

We are expanding the program next year to try to get six persons from Israel, instead of two. With six persons from Israel, we'll probably cover 120 campuses -- 120 campuses -- that is no small matter, if each fellow can cover 20 campuses - of - per lecturer.

We'll jump the thing from a total of facing 10,000 students to facing 40,000 students! Big numbers! It is not 300!

But the point is that if we can expose 40,000 students to the problems that we are talking about, all of which really have to do with basically two or three topics:

- . Jewish Survival -
- . The Organizations that work for Jewish Survival -
- . Israel and the Role of the Jew in the future -
- . And the meaning of being an American Jew -- and it is funny that an Israelian can come and talk to him about that but he can -
- . The meaning of being an American Jew in the organized American Jewish Community and what Role this young college student should play, if he is really interested in the survival of his people!

Now that's all! But there are 20 variations on that; but that's the basic approach. I don't know how far we will be able to carry this; but if we can expand it this year and find six people in Israel who are willing: authors, playwrights, professors, philosophers; journalists; that is what we look for -- who can come here and give us a month -- or six weeks of their time. If we can find six people and Zelig Chinetz is going to be spending 30 days in Israel, interviewing 50 people, hoping to find six, then the program will take a big leap forward next year!

Now, we haven't dipped below the 18 year-old level. There are many people who come to me time and again and said: "Look, why don't you get down and develop a program for the Sunday School?"

I don't want to take you through all the headaches of that one, but it is just something too big for us to tackle. We can't try to educate all of American Jewery. We can't do it! There are Synagogues and Congregations -- thousands of them in America. That's their job; at least they've got the kids in the Sunday Schools up to the age of 13 - at Bar Mitzvah - or even 16 at Confirmation, and we can't swallow the whole world --- so I haven't even thought of made any plans about getting below that 18 year-old college level. And frankly, I am not sure that we should! If I could a viable way of doing it, Id, maybe I'd be willing to listen; but so far nobody has come up with a practical scheme.

The 18 to 22, the college level, I think that we can do more than we're doing with not very much money. The conversation that Max had with the Ambassador is interesting because "entre-nous" -- and simply for the awkward matter of mixing charitable dollars with other dollars, they're willing to spend some money on it. It's the first time that I've heard them make an offer that they are willing to spend some money on a program of this sort! It indicates

VOICE: And we've become a team on this thing because it serves a dual purpose.

If you do something -- we are doing it together. This --- I will tell you an experience that I had before July. I run into the airport at Philadelphia to make a speech and a fellow stops me.

Max, be sure that he introduces himself!

He says: "When are you going to use me more??"

I don't know who the devil he was -- and he introduces to me a fellow by the name of Bevell -- Labell is it ---????

VOICE: Yeh! Leonard Labell!

VOICE: Leonard Labell!

He says: "You know you're not -- you're not using me enough. We spent - to be utilized; we want to play a part in this Campaign."

I said: "That's wonderful!"

Sure enough -- three days later I get a letter in the mail! He points out to me that -- you know -- that he wants to.

I went to Pittsburgh at the Midwest -- at the Conference --- just about two weeks ago Sunday. And one of the most thrilling things was to hear this fellow, Ivan Millnik, one of your Young Leaders, get up and make a speech on the Jewish Values Of Life and our Responsibilities

and all these things!

It was really -- Ray was there.

It was one of the most thrilling things that I've ever heard. One of Joe's boys!

And then to top it off -- they had -- you know -- they bring up their checks -- they have their names -- a group of them come up for their checks -- you know, in all these communities.

And you should have seen these kids! From West Virginia University; from Penn State; and Pittsburgh -- three or four of them. They were all part of this program. And these young kids coming up: some of them with \$1,300; \$459; I think that it is a very exciting thing.

But I do think ^{now} that this gives some opportunity for Joe, because Joe has been wanting to talk about this thing.

Joe, I just want to tell you this. I hope -- I wish that everyone of the members of the Executive Committee could see the workings of one of these groups of people; by the way, Iz Breslau's son came to us at one of the Executive Committee Meetings; and he told us in no uncertain words what we should be doing -- and not!

You weren't there by the way. This is exciting!

Joe, we'll let you speak.

Now, this is all part of the image and the things that we are trying to build.

JOE SHANE: In the first place, I think this, that since everyone is giving compliments that I might as well hand mine to Herb to complement what Herb has been able to do.

Because the truth is that Herb has told you -- it is not money that can do this job!

It hasn't taken a lot of money. But this group of men -- and they are not all young; there are some of them (indistinct)...

(LAUGHTER)

HERB FRIEDMAN: .. what is the age limit???

VOICE: Listen to this old man!

(LAUGHTER)

HERB FRIEDMAN: What is the limit???

JOE SHANE: Most of them seem to be from 30 to

40 ..

HERB FRIEDMAN: That's right!

JOE SHANE: 30's mostly!

But basically they understand that they are hard-headed individuals, and they are willing -- and searching -- for, and I'll think that I'll use the words that I used when I first said them on Sunday Morning, nearly two years ago: they are looking for a meaningful way of life!

They are searching for something that they can

identify themselves with!

And for reasons that we all know of -- Herb Friedman personally has been able to involve them with this historic image with, perhaps, religious overtone.

And they know that he is sincerely interested in them! That means more than spending money!

And they know that .. (indistinct).. and they know what they see -- that whenever we have a meeting that we are not ^{just} put off on the side, but, Eddie Fryder, or Erving Bernstein, or the, they, in other words -- we really have the top of the staff with us at our meetings!

But, now, what I really came to tell you, or what I would like to tell you, is an idea that we had and, if this is the appropriate ...

HERB FRIEDMAN: You go ahead now and do that because ...

JOE SHANE: We have what my whole life here was that - basically the thing that I was using in my business was -- I went to the -- I went to work myself out of a job.

And this was very easy! Very frequently we had no help whatsoever! Hmm.

But basically I appointed an Associate Chairman; and we got together and decided on an Associate Chairman -- we had five regional chairmen -- and in addition we had

90 some odd Cabinet Members.

Basically they come from 61 communities -- and 20 out of the 90 some odd Members of the Cabinet are in Israel.

And before I make my constructive suggestion -- or hope that it will be constructive -- I must tell you a little bit of something of the figures that perhaps Herb knows, but didn't tell you!

But that we have three Regional Meetings during 1965 - and we will have six Area Meetings.

Now, in this group we had during the 1965 Campaign -- and these are figures which I think will be very interesting to you -- we have 27 of our Members of the Cabinet on Welfare Fund Boards in their own communities.

27 of the 90 some odd Cabinet Members are on the Welfare Boards of their own communities.....

28 were trade and division Chairmen in their respective communities. 16 were on the Allocation Committees of their separate communities.

This is not a Young Leadership group -- that is the thing that I think we have all failed to realize!

4 were actually Campaign Chairmen. As a matter of fact, (indistinct).. where someone called me and said: "You've got to call this fellow. The Executive Director says that he must be the Campaign Chairman; Joe Kantor will

call him.

He'll accept!

I called him and he did accept.

Nine were initial chairmen.

What we are beginning to see is that apparently
(have a ?)
we have been - in a sense -- a -- tear the bull by the
tail and I have been trying, and I think ...

Herb has finally realized this when they start
pushing and when they start wanting to take over; and
they are starting to elbow.

And so ... at our last Conference at the
University of Chicago, we decided that what we would want
to do is that now -- we'd break the Cabinet down on ex-
perimental basis in the Mid-West to a Regional National
Cabinet.

On the Regional National Cabinet - we will put
---- and what I would like to see is that the Cabinet
rotates.

These positions were not given for honor; they
were given for work! So I want to see that the Cabinet
turns over frequently; and I want to set the example; and
we want to have the local leadership council, sponsored
by the Federation. The Chairman each year will become
a Member of the Regional Cabinet -- and that will turn over
every year, every two years!

In addition we are going to appoint one additional man in each community.

This will not be run out of New York: for example, Gordon's absense ... in my Regional Mid-West Chairman -- the reason that the Staff doesn't have the work, is that his Secretary is part of the Staff and she sends out to everybody that he thinks and he wants his five-cent stamp, or whatever goes on it.

But he will run the Regional Cabinet -- he and his Secretary, and there will be approximately 60 people on his Regional Cabinet.

I wonder if you even know about this - Herb?

I thing I'll say about Herb --- isn't it a "fear" -- we run our own Show and I've taken that and delegated that to my Regional Vice-Chairman. I says: "Don't tell me what you want to do! If you think that it is a good idea. If it's not a violation of an overall policy. If it can't hurt us, then do it! And then write me a Memorandum, telling me what you did!"

And that's the way we've done. We've tried to delegate. And I can't tell you -- for example: a new program was started. And I haven't even told Herb this. A Sunday School Program was started by one of our Regional Vice-Chairmen ..(coughing - indistinct)

... they have a start ... and they've got 10 guys who want to do something --- so each one has made an appointment to go to a different Synagogue on Sunday and give a UJA Speech to the Sunday School Teachers.

Nothing wrong in that! It costs us no money. And now this exploratory program which I think is very exciting and, perhaps, this gives you an idea, Herb. You say that you haven't heard of a good idea.

Well, we've got a group of young clerks (?) that want to be doing something; now, unless we give them something to do; they are going to put dynamite under my chair practically.

But in either event, we plan to have in the very short time, a couple of years; we've got now a couple 100 members -- we'll have 5 Regional National Cabinets. This will now give us close to over 400 members. And what we feel is that this will give us an opportunity to educate. Because our first goal is to inspire and educate these people; but also, we will be forming Corps and what I call the "grass roots" of the American Jewish Community!

Because these people -- they are looking for a structure; they are looking for an organization; they are looking for a title.

Now, some of them were complaining - "Well, I am the Cabinet Member of Birmingham, Alabama and I don't know what is going on." And so forth and so on!

And so I says: "O.K. You know the local -- the Southern Israelite -- and you feel that you're hanging 10 yards over for a meeting to decide what you are going to do at the next Conference .."

Call up the Israelite and say:

"My name is so and so -- I am a member from Birmingham.

We are going to have a meeting in New Orleans --- and I want everyone to come!"

Because in a sense you have the authority ... and you want to



Tape # 3 - ONCHIOTA CONFERENCE

JOE KANTER: (Continued from tape # 2) --
more interested, more exciting, in our presentation on a
face to face solicitation.

The third fact, we all take the easy way.
I do it myself. I get five cards. I'll pick up the phone.
"Jack, increase your gift," or what have you. But if you tell
me, that I've got to take these 1,100 or 1,500 people through-
out the United States and you're going to give me 20 people,
I'll tell you when I go into each community, I'm going to
take one of my cabinet members with me.

In the first place, if I come there and
don't take them, they'll practically shoot me.

Secondly, I'm not going to put this off
because they're after me. When I make a commitment that
I'm going to get Herb Friedman to speak at a certain con-
ference, I mean, you know, if a week goes by and I have't
gotten a commitment they want to know why I didn't call them
up, or you've got to go see them.

I mean, tomorrow is too late. Yesterday
is better. Is that right, Herb?

There are no excuses. You can't tell them
you've got anyplace else to go. I mean, you've got to do it.
Now, this is an exciting group. So that when we go to a
community and get a special fund, and then we leave that

community, and we say to the National Campaign Cabinet, and I think Irving Ginsberg plans to utilize them in solicitations, "Look, you've got five people you're going to have in a face to face solicitation."

I want him to also say, "Look, we're also going to give you(name unclear) from Pittsburgh, who is going to join and help you because he's a member of the Young Leadership Cabinet.

Now, what happens is certainly the members of your campaign cabinet, who maybe intended to make a telephone call instead of a personal solicitation, he's received a copy of a letter that maybe you or Max wrote to the cabinet member in Pittsburgh. Now he can no longer make a telephone call. He must make a personal call. And these young men, they realize how important it is, if you really want to get the money, to make these calls.

But let me tell you the most important thing. These young men are wanting to get into positions of leadership. Because some of their gifts are say, \$500, \$1,000 or \$3,000, they are not able to make the calls. In many instances, they don't know the \$12,000 givers or the \$15,000 or \$20,000 givers.

No greater honor can come to them than if William Rosenwald would call them up and say, "Come with

me, we're going to call on a \$20,000 giver," because, in a sense, what occurred is this man, who is in the power structure of the community meets for the first time with a young man and he sees that this man has ability, and word gets around in the community that here is a young man and he's making a call on so and so who made a \$15,000 gift because he went with Mel Dubinsky or Phil Zimmerman or someone else, so the first thing that happens is they now start thinking in terms of here is a general chairman. Here is a community gift chairman.

So what we'll be doing is, we'll be giving these young man a leg up into the power structure of their communities.

That's what I have to say.

(Applause.)

VOICE: Joe, I think one thing. We don't -- I think the suggestion and idea that you have, I think what we ought to do is to utilize it wherever it's practical. It's not always -- I mean, sometimes there are cases where you can't. But I think we ought to do this. We ought to notify the people that do go out there wherever there are cabinet members.

What you're talking about is giving a training program and giving them an opportunity to -- I think there is nothing wrong with it though. I think we ought to

move forward on it.

The next thing I'd like to talk about is this --

VOICE: What of Henry Bernstein?

VOICE: Oh, yes. Pardon me. Henry, I am sorry. Would you give us a little background of your program.

HENRY BERNSTEIN: We've had a junior division of the U. J. A. --

VOICE: What age group is that?

HENRY BERNSTEIN: That covered the 18 and over by and large. It's a flexible age group and involves both unmarried and young marrieds. As a matter of fact it's a kind of self perpetuating group because the unmarrieds come out of the married and the marrieds come out of the un-marrieds.

And from there group there has developed, in more recent years, what we call our Leadership Council. Our Junior Division is called the Young Leadership Council.

The Leadership Council has been primarily the sons, the daughters and the nephews, the second generation of U.J.A. leadership in all areas. But interesting, I think, is to find, when you examine the leadership in divisions throughout the New York campaign, that more than half of these

divisions are chaired by this second generation group.

When you look at the overall leadership, there is a substantial number of those who came out of both of these groups. They have taken positions of responsibility. In both instances, we start with the Young Leadership group on a fund raising basis. It's a job of educating them to do the only job we have for them to do, that of fund raising.

We don't have any Boards to put them on. This is one of the great problems that we have. The only honors we can give them are the honors that go with taking positions in the fund raising.

I think that perhaps the greatest achievement has been the fact that in these last years, there has been a growing consciousness on the part of the older leadership of the importance of developing the younger leadership. This has resulted in bringing in many more of the younger people and getting them to take on great responsibilities.

VOICE: I think one of the exciting things about it and I only heard about it recently, was the way they program these juniors. They have speaking clinics where the kids come and talk and criticize each other. They have card(unclear) practice clinics. They have programs of social events and the kids just adore this work and they love working in it.

They get esprit d'corps. They like each other. They have fun out of it and it's perfectly amazing, the enthusiasm that you build for a fund raising group when there really is very little fund raising and very little giving, but it does enlist the kids tremendously, in the United Jewish Appeal.

VOICE: These ideas -- I think these spell good things for the future. But wait, Joe, I have one other thought for you on this thing. You know, you mentioned about getting these people enlisted in the power structure. Sometimes it's difficult.

In many cases, if the members of the executive committee are familiar with people that are working, they can sometimes drop the word to the people in the town that you've got a good man going over there and they can utilize him. I think it might be a good idea to make available to the Executive Committee the members of the cabinet over there, so we have them, because just like this, if there is anybody from Detroit working on this thing and I know he's doing a good job, you can drop a right word at the right time to see that he gets an opportunity to get placed, or even if I were in Chicago or St. Louis, and I asked them over there are they utilizing the services of these young -- you know, this youth leadership, it sometimes makes it easier for them to get in.

I think this can all help.

VOICE: That is one of the things that was talked about this morning.

VOICE: Yes. That's what he talked about.

VOICE: All right. The next item, the last item on the agenda, and I want to mention this -- the reason we are going to break right after this, we have to start early tomorrow. We'll have breakfast at eight and the sessions start at nine because many of us have to leave to catch planes and we want to be through by 11:30.

So, unfortunately, Paul will have to give up his late morning -- what's the matter, Paul -- sleep -- and I wouldn't advise you to play -- you've got that night club down there, Herb was talking about.

All right. Herb, would you give us your report on the 1966 plan for T.V. films and our advertising and this will be the concluding item for the evening.

HERB FRIEDMAN: Well, let me try to do it very quickly, Max.

Number one. We have tried for several months and now know that we have failed, to get a T.V. spectacular produced for 1966, so it's only academic to tell you that we tried and failed.

Anybody who wants to care about knowing the details of the whole interesting and gruesome episode, -- but we don't have it. We will have two films which we will offer to T.V. stations for next year and try to push like the devil to see that they get put on, one is a film that was made by(Hebrew name) in Israel, which is very, very good. It's called "Run No More" and it's the story of a family in Upper Nazareth and the absorption problems of that family, to take root in the country.

The problems they brought with them as immigrants, and the difficulty of getting started and it's a very good human interest -- it tells a good story, and it's perfect timing for T.V. It's 28 minutes and we're going to try very hard to get that thing placed.

The second thing is -- we haven't seen this one yet. It's being made now, but the J.D.C. is making a film, as I understand it, unless their plans have changed, mostly about the problem of absorbing refugees in camps and Irving Dickman's been over there. Is he back yet, Moe, or is he still there?

And that one also is going to run 28 minutes and we'll get as many placements as we can for that.

Third, we make these television spots.

and sixty second spots in color, which go on
breaks and we'll get as much exposure on
and there the trick is simply to find the
don't pay for that. You've got to get that
you never can predict in advance how much
succeed. You want good spots and you try to

That's as far as television films. Oh,
will be one other -- I'm sorry. There is
in April, right at Passover time, of
"Go" film, the Xerox film. They are
almost a year in advance, to have a rerun on
been in touch with us and asked us if we
because they did thank us very much for
large audiences for that and they know we
on that.

And they know that our work had an
listening audience.

VOICE: On that, there was a promise

I asked in New York that it be shown

VOICE: We have it.

VOICE: When are we going to see it?

VOICE: Whenever you want to see it.

Twenty, forty and sixty second spots in color, which go on between station breaks and we'll get as much exposure on that as we can and there the trick is simply to find the time because you don't pay for that. You've got to get that given to you, so you never can predict in advance how much you're going to succeed. You want good spots and you try to place them.

That's as far as television films. Oh, and then there will be one other -- I'm sorry. There is going to be a rerun in April, right at Passover time, of the "Let My People Go" film, the Xerox film. They are planning now, almost a year in advance, to have a rerun on that and they've been in touch with us and asked us if we would help promote because they did thank us very much for helping to promote large audiences for that and they know we worked very hard on that.

And they know that our work had an effect on their listening audience.

VOICE: On that, there was a promise unfulfilled because I asked in New York that it be shown at this meeting --

VOICE: We have it.

VOICE: When are we going to see it?

VOICE: Whenever you want to see it.

VOICE: I didn't see it.

VOICE: We can show it tonight. Soon as the meeting ends.

HERB FRIEDMAN: Well, let me just say this.

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: If you want to see it, you can see it.

HERB FRIEDMAN: The film is here. We can run it right after this.

VOICE: Who wants to see it?

VOICE: I'd love to see it myself.

HERB FRIEDMAN: Fellows, excuse me. Wait a minute. Let's be serious. Fellows, if one person wants to see it, we'll set it up, but we want to know now.

VOICE: I'd like to see it.

HERB FRIEDMAN: All right, Harry. Set it up, please.

VOICE: What was the reaction, Herb?

HERB FRIEDMAN: Tremendous. Just tremendous.

VOICE: And it is a great fund raising tool in small towns.

VOICE: Look, we're going to see the movie. Let's finish up this thing here.

Finish up.

HERB FRIEDMAN: The film got a very wide listening audience this spring, actually produced money for us in many of the smaller communities where they used it for fund raising and we have every reason to assume it's going to be just as good for us next year.

VOICE: Let me add that there is a possibility of another T. V. film which C.B.S. is supposed to do --

HERB FRIEDMAN: What one?

VOICE: (Name unclear.) Pamela Eylot. (?)

HERB FRIEDMAN: Is there a possibility on that one?

VOICE: Well, she's doing it now. They are taking the story of Shanghai and Laura Margolis, plus what Laura is doing now, with the handicapped children agencies in Israel and they are going to be photographed, you know, and then they'll tell the story of Laura. This is a C.B.S. presentation and we'll have it available.

HERB FRIEDMAN: The religious editor of C. B. S., a Miss Pamela Eylot is over in Israel now doing a film which Moe just described, which C.B.S. has initiated and authorized and is paying for. We haven't got any money in it. And if it's a good one and if they run it, it will be another one of those things on whose coattails we

will ride.

Now there are several campaign films that we have available to offer communities. I won't go into the details on that. I do have a question, which I'd like you to think about. Maybe we can come to an answer to it tonight or leave it over until tomorrow morning but let me pose the problem and you think about it.

As far as advertising is concerned, which Max just asked about, we've put around the room the 1965 and the 1964 full page or seven column, either one, ads which we've taken in the New York Times and in the Wall Street Journal.

Some years five ads. Some years six ads. And I'd like you to look at them because this is the result of a lot of careful work and study and cooperation between our office, New York, U.J.A., Henry's office and advisory committee of advertising experts who give us their services for free when we show them the various ads and they are the best people in the business in New York and they tell us whether something is very wide of the mark or pretty good or very good.

We design -- we don't pay any advertising agency any 15% fee -- nothing of the sort. We design and we write the copy and we get the photographs. We put the thing

together, either in Henry's office or mine and then we take it over to this advertising committee and pass it on for review.

So we've got expert advice given to us.

Now, for 1966, we're working and planning towards six ads. We have a problem of timing. New York Federation has got the time until the first of February. They raised a little bit of hell with us and I'd like you to know this. I think the matter is settled, but in case it isn't I want you to know the background.

VOICE: Where's Henry?

HERB FRIEDMAN: I thought Henry was here. Well, Ed Rosenberg, representing a committee of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York came to see me protesting against that advertisement with all the faces of the Executive Committee members in it, which we ran on January 10th, 1965, at the time of the Humphrey meeting in Washington.

We got a good newspaper story about the meeting and we ran the ad at the same time.

They protested because we were invading their time. The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies were supposed to run their campaign up to February 1st. We ran that ad January 5th. They claim that the New York Times is a local newspaper and that we invaded -- we shouldn't have

had a big U.J.A. ad -- I tried to say to Edwin Rosenberg that I didn't think The New York Times was a local newspaper; it's read elsewhere in America, and that our key contributors all read it, these 1100 people we're talking about all read The New York Times, in whatever city they live in.

And I didn't want to get into a hassle, but I really felt that we hadn't violated anything.

We're now being severely handicapped because I would like to start advertising now, in December of 1965. I'd like to start our advertising program. They won't hear of it. They're up in a terrible flap about this thing and we may really have to give in.

VOICE: How many of those faces are from Federation, New York?

VOICE: Only about four or five.

HERB FRIEDMAN: All right.

VOICE: Herb, they unstintingly ran their building fund ad, which were direct fund raising, during our campaign.

HERB FRIEDMAN: They claim the building fund is different from maintenance work.

VOICE: Oh, sure.

HERB FRIEDMAN: Yes. Exactly.

(Several speak at once.)

At any rate, we've got a problem to iron out, and when we can start the advertising program I don't know, but we're planning on six or seven ads for 1966.

Now, plus all the ads that we run in the thirty odd Anglo-Jewish papers in the country and this is pretty cheap. We can run a series of ten ads, spread over twenty or twenty five weeks in the Anglos -- that doesn't come to very much money.

I have two questions that I would like to put to you and as I say, we don't have to decide them tonight but sleep on it.

Question number one is this: Whether we should go in for a special Sunday Supplement in the New York Times, all of which -- and you've seen at various times -- you open up the big, thick Sunday Times and you've got the Magazine Section and the Book Review Section and then you see one or two extra Sunday Supplements.

I'll give you the vital statistics in a couple of minutes. You can run a 16 page supplement with a circulation of about a million four -- a million four hundred thousand copies all across America, so it certainly blankets everybody that we're -- well, almost everybody that we're concerned with, who is in the upper echelons of community leadership, who takes a subscription to the Sunday Times and gets it three days later in San Francisco or in Denver or in

Dallas. So I don't care about the circulation of a million four hundred thousand. I care about the fact that it reaches the 5,000 or 10,000 people that we care about.

A Sunday Supplement is a one shot deal. It costs approximately \$60,000 to \$65,000. Reprints -- reprints cost a matter of pennies. That's the interesting thing.

And you can take -- after you make the initial investment of \$60,000 to \$65,000, for a few thousand dollars, you can have 100,000 copies of this thing and mail them to everybody.

(Several speak at once.)

HERB FRIEDMAN: I haven't thought about that. No. You might recapture your whole \$65,000 investment if you wanted to take advertising.

VOICE: Would Council let us do it?

HERB FRIEDMAN: Sure. Council would let us do it. Sure. That's a policy decision whether you want to, as an organization.

Now, question number two is, as I say, these are serious questions and I'd like you to think about them overnight.

(Several speak at once.)

HERB FRIEDMAN: Excuse me. I'm sorry. Two people are talking.

VOICE: Does it have to be 16 pages?

be seven or eight pages and cheaper?

HERB FRIEDMAN: No.

VOICE: Take it for 24 pages and have more

(Several speak at once.)

HERB FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry. I thought you
before. I'm sorry.

(Several speak at once.)

HERB FRIEDMAN: All right. No. Excuse me.

VOICE: We've got a film going. Where is
going to be set up?

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: Do you want to ask if there are
comments?

VOICE: Well, basically, as I told the
meeting, the last meeting, we're going to try
activate the(unclear) and frankly, I looked
the names last night before I went to bed, and it seems
is another thing, Max. We ought to start graduating
of those Young Leaders into our cabinet, because if we
involve a lot of the people, and they're good people
large, I don't think we're going to get to first base.

Some of these people, many of them are

gather, have been there because we wanted to pay honor to them or give them a little prestige like Zuckerman and a few others. But seriously, there are people there who are well up in years and if we want to reactivate the cabinet and ask them to go around speaking and ask them to go around and give of their time and effort, we're kidding ourselves if we think it's possible.

So that's one of the things I wanted to say. Basically -- to try and reinvolve a lot of people who have gone away from us, and it's no coincidence that if we're going into this special fund in twenty communities, we aren't going to do it without manpower and hopefully, much of the manpower will come from the cabinet through, of course, the direction of the Executive Committee.

That is one of the things we're going to discuss, at the meeting.

I don't have a full agenda to tell you right now, what we'll be discussing. That certainly will be one of the items involved. There will be another one -- there will be a full agenda. We've had some discussions with Max and Irving and worked out a full program.

As you know, Ambassador is going to be there and we're going to try to let them feel once more that they are part of the innergroup.

And if we do get a group of people, say 40 or 50 as a cabinet, who will become involved with us, then hopefully the idea of going to communities in groups not only for special funds solicitations but for actual work during the year, and get these people to feel that they are a part of the master organization again -- as you know, we've been corresponding with them. I sent some books to them. More or less I've done it on a personal nature where I've asked them to go and speak. I have made the calls myself or contacted them myself, rather than have somebody from the staff in New York call them, because I want to get them to feel that we are forming a new team that will be purposeful and have meaning in terms of the overall operation.

And that's the whole idea of the cabinet.

VOICE: Eddy, have you thought about the possibility -- as we talked about, of moving people over from the active cabinet, either into advisory or honorary positions, so that we can add twenty or twenty five --

VOICE: I had that list from Harry Deal and I gave him my recommendations, and you'd be surprised how many people I deleted from the active to the honorary.

But I think it's the only realistic approach.

VOICE: What did you do with it?

VOICE: We haven't done it. I made the

There are people on there if you look

use this as an example. Henry Cohen.

going around the country soliciting.

So let's put him over on an honorary

as an example. But let's put

place whom we can call upon to work.

VOICE: Let me just briefly say some-

I struggled with this thing for five

we try to do -- first, I'm going to say

That the larger your executive committee

it becomes to make your cabinet

because you've got more and more people

in this inner group, so that you always

you make that choice by expanding

The next step we did was we tried,

I did it actively, to move people from

national committee. Now, last year,

national committee, we assumed that

anybody on the cabinet that you

him on this national committee.

group because the national com-

vital function to perform in every

I'm only pointing these things out because we've gone through this thing and what usually happens every year is that somebody on this Executive Committee who has the final determination as to who is going to stay on and who's going to be moved, they are always saying, "Oh, you can't move him. You can't move him."

And whoever is going to be Chairman, is going to have to be tough minded enough and tough skinned enough to make up his mind that if a guy is going to be moved he's going to be moved. Period.

You're going to make a few enemies but in the long run, you'll get some results. I'm only pointing this out to you.

VOICE: But anybody who is moved from the cabinet to the national committee will consider it a demotion.

VOICE: All right.

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: One at a time. Look.

VOICE: Now Henry Cohen, you mentioned. He's now in the cabinet. Certainly, he will come to a meeting or two now and he considers it an honor to be in the cabinet. He tells friends about it. You take him and put him on the national committee, and he'll feel let down.

VOICE: Well, gentlemen, --

VOICE: Just to show you, while we're talking here in the room, we've got Charlie Frost, a wonderful guy. Do you think Charlie is going to give us any mileage? If you want to just have a bunch of names that nobody can call on, then what have you got a cabinet for. Let's just have an honorary group --

VOICE: We have the same thing in Detroit. I think we have Abe Kassel, who hasn't done a thing in ten years.

VOICE: If you have two or people who are actively interested in coming on to the cabinet, where do you propose their names?

VOICE: Right here.

VOICE: That's what you are supposed to do.

VOICE: We want people who can work, and if we can make them work, we've really done something.

VOICE: He's been heading this campaign very successfully and is very enthusiastic -- he is raising his gift this year, and he's semi-retired and is very interested. He's been --

VOICE: Well, I'll tell you what happens, fellows. We have got a very, very serious problem of bringing new leadership out. And I tell you, my own feeling about it is I am prepared to make some decisions on it.

We did it on the Executive Committee because we had the same problem. You have to keep -- there are a couple of people put back on the Executive Committee that have never been to a meeting and I did it out of deference to the Executive Director. One of the Executive Directors -- I notified him the other day. I said he is not going to be on next year. It's just unfortunate. Because I want new blood in the Executive Committee here. We've got for the first time -- just look at the attendance we've had. We have almost 80 and 85% attendance in this group of people and there is no use having names.

The same thing is true of this, and I suggested the honorary. We may as well face that problem. We can't make the national cabinet - campaign cabinet anything worthwhile, unless we get people. So here is the situation. We have got 90 people. Forty of them are already members of the Executive Committee, so you have left, what is it, 45, Eddy?

VOICE: Yes.

VOICE: And if half of those -- if half of them or two thirds of them are not worthwhile, then you don't have a cabinet of people.

HERB FRIEDMAN: You have another problem. You have another problem.

VOICE: Take all of the Executive cabinet. They can be ex officio, but not in the cabinet.

VOICE: Let's talk about it. I want to talk about this.

VOICE: Max, I think you have another report that was given by Joe Cantor yesterday. It's pretty obvious that you're going to bring the age of 40 or 38 or whatever the age is. They really can be very valuable.

He treated them by giving them a lot of

You've got them to the point where they're effective for you and then you have to drop

You've got to keep them working by the cabinet. It's important.

VOICE: I take a little blame ourselves.

and there have been no cabinet meetings,

of entousing, of instilling the same

we do have ourselves. Let's not kid

the purpose of these meetings is not only to

on these matters, because we can do that in

We haven't really done what we should.

This is the first year you've really started to do it. You're having cabinet meetings.

VOICE: Yes.

VOICE: (Continuing.) You have a national committee.

VOICE: Oh, that's just not so, Phil.

VOICE: Well, look, Joe. We tried it half heartedly. When did we have a real honest to God cabinet meeting?

VOICE: We enlarged it to an expanded executive --

VOICE: Right. Three years ago. Come on. I'm talking about in recent times, Joe. I'm not criticizing. Let's not take it personally.

JOE: No.

PHIL: What I'm saying is take it in recent years. In the last two years. I think we ought to give it a try. Let's see what happens. I think something still needs to be done. Now whether you have a national committee meeting at the time of the conference, or the day before, I don't care.

But you've got to start to give some color to these people instead of just giving them a name which

...selves created -- these honorary positions, and then again the guys don't do it.

I think we've got to spell out what we need to do. I think you've got to have a meeting where we get some kind of a program. Not just to come to hear a speaker, but to spell out what we feel is their duty as a member of the campaign cabinet. Their duty as a member of a national committee.

This I think is one of the primary things that's happened with this Youth Leadership group. You didn't get a group together and say, "Boys, go in and lead." We've assumed that these fellows are all leaders in their communities and, therefore, they know what to do on a national level.

I think we've got to take a great deal of our share of the blame. The reason I say this, Eddy -- I see the way you started, but you know, we all do start with great ideas and then when one doesn't work, it goes off into the past.

I think you've got to keep up with it, and this is worth a thought, Herb, as much as the thoughts that are put into this Youth Leadership, and where it's going.

I think a lot of these people will work, let's give them work to do.

VOICE: Well, before you can give anybody

work, you've got to have people who are willing to work.

This is one thing that has to be done.

The list has to be expanded and the list has to be -- you don't use -- there's no use taking it if you're only going to have five or ten people, there is no use trying to do this. The program I have in mind is involvement of more people. This is a very serious defect that we have.

You know, we do that. We've got to find the means of doing it. And I say this, the thing I'd go after is this: to give a place for these -- it's going to be some hard decisions, but I'm prepared to make that, and take the chances on this thing for the future of this organization.

You know, when a man has reached the stage where he doesn't want to work, where he's willing to give some dollars, you've got to make way for the younger guys coming up.

Yesterday, I heard Joe over here talking about these fellows who want to elbow their way in. That's what we want. Let's give them a chance to elbow their way in. Barney?

BARNEY: The honorary cabinet, by the way, just doesn't have the same --

VOICE: Look, no matter how you --

BARNEY: It's better than the national

committee; I agree with Iz-- that you put them on --

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: All right. Barney, look. Just one at a time.

VOICE: This leads into another subject that you referred to this morning and I'd like to talk about a little bit.

First of all, I think what Phil is maybe overlooking is the activity of the cabinet is different than it was before, but, as Herb pointed out to me, that in the communities, you do call on them and you do use them, which is important.

I don't think that we should minimize that point. I think, though, that what you need to do is build from there, something tangibly more to what we've already got. And Max, I think it's true, first I want to talk about the Men's Division and briefly I want to discuss a little bit about the Women's Division.

VOICE: Well, let's leave the Women's Division out of this.

VOICE: Not? It's the same problem.

VOICE: I know.

VOICE: (Continuing.) I think it's something that you've got --

VOICE: Barney, just a minute. I want to

3-29

this. Myrtle Karp couldn't get here because her
was ill and he passed away just over the weekend,
sent a wire from all of us. I want you to know this.

BARNEY: The point I want to make, though,
to both divisions and I think that you need to consider
you and I went to at least one city, I was in another
this year, where the cities are really bankrupt for
partnership. And the only way that you can get a city like
Nashville, that's had a plateau all this period,
Atlanta, is to involve people who haven't been involved
who were involved and are no longer involved.

And I think we've got two areas here.
one thing happens and it happens -- it's happened in
city. It's happened in other cities. A man is
chairman of the drive. He does a good job. And then a
two goes by and he's no longer so active and there
place for him to go. There's not room on the national
cabinet. Maybe he doesn't want to be on the national cabinet.

But regionally, he would do something, be-
cause he knows somebody in the adjoining city, and would be
helping to help us involve these people. My idea would be to
as you would a business. Now maybe it's too much.

But the executive committee should have continuity in relationship with cabinet members in the areas they are located, so that the cabinet member-ship would develop your regional leadership, for regional development.

I can give you a specific illustration. For that purpose. This past year, I was able to bring Dave Stein to Nashville. Really a good citizen, a good Jew. He is president of the community fund in Nashville. He is being an outstanding citizen in other ways in the community.

Dave originates in Georgia. At the time he was in Atlanta where there was a considerable Jewish community. He knew everybody in Atlanta and in Albany. He grew up with them. It was in the close relationship and relationship that the people we had in the South and enough but they hadn't been able to involve him.

Now, you take Dave Stein and say you're going to have a southeastern conference -- I don't know what he had -- his job would be to develop a part of a regional cabinet that would meet at a conference to bring in people, get people involved and be at more meetings.

I believe that what we need to do, we assume that our cabinet members, even executive committee-- well, executive committee members left, but Eddy did what I think was a very intelligent thing this past -- just a few months ago in sending to all the cabinet members what the official approach to fund raising of the U.J.A. is this year, outlining them point by point.

I think this is the kind of training development that we're going to have to have if we're going to expand the leadership. I think what Herb said the other day -- there are 1,000 people who give \$10,000 and over. 15,000 in the country are \$1,000 gift and over. And the only way we're going to enlarge that group is to enlarge the interest. Use this study mission as a training ground to bring these people into this movement.

They're not going to come into this thing just by a letter. I didn't go to Israel the first time just because somebody wrote me a letter and said, "Come along with us." If we really want to bring these people in, we've got to be willing -- not one person, but a couple of us, who know the individuals who should be brought on, into the picture and go out and seriously work on them, because they are not going to come in here just because it's a national mission and we think it's important.

They are not that impressed at this point.

They must first be as imbued with the
 sense of the importance of this program and I think that our problem
 is to find a place for continued use of the leadership that
 we have had and I think this is true of the Women's Division
 especially. They have a women's leader -- I told you of
 one especially, who has done a wonderful job. No place to
 go for them at the Council of Jewish Women because the
 council's cabinet is closed. If they create a national com-
 mittee at that level, - you know, the people who want to
 work hard more than just a title. They want to participate
 and we should have them in our group because they are the
 ones who will continue to help us continue to enlarge the
 work force which we work.

I think this has got to be a specific
 program, not generalities but I think you start with a
 cabinet, move from the cabinet with specific responsibilities,
 move at a regional level and develop some leadership there
 in a regional cabinet and certainly there should be some
 representation in our organization.

And God knows we need the people. To
 use the leadership that has been developed and not let them
 go away because there is no place for them.

CHAIRMAN: Anybody else want to comment
 before we go on?

VOICE: Yes, I'd like to ask a question.

anybody here who has a strong feeling about deleting
executive committee -- making them all ex officio of the

VOICE: There is a discussion involved

too, and I think you ought to take it up at a
meeting for this purpose.

Because one of the reasons we kept them
is because we want to give the other people a
feeling that they are in the top group, you see, and if
we take all the top leadership out of there --

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: (Continuing.) It's something
we want to consider.

VOICE: Well, I think it's something --

VOICE: We can do that.

VOICE: Well, I don't know whether you
or not. I am pointing out that this is too long --

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: May I just say that this subject
is something that's going to take a long discussion and you'd
better not do it in a rush if you want to --

VOICE: This happens to be a question that's
important, involving people.

There really isn't -- the important thing isn't whether you take the executive committee of the cabinet or not. The question is how to get more people that will be involved, by finding a place for them, whether you take them out or put them on the executive isn't important. I'll tell you this. I feel this. If we're going to make the campaign cabinet, the reason why we have to make it worthwhile is we've got to bring in some new blood. This is what we've got to be doing.

Now, nobody can argue about the fact that we need some more people and if the old people that you've had, who felt that they are no longer able to continue the activity that they did before, then we've got to replace them or make some additions. This is the real answer to this question and I say this, we're proposing to bring some more people in.

I think this is what we have -- we can't -- I look around this table, you know, every year we all get a year older and pretty soon some of us won't have the energies, the forces, and if we don't make some room for people coming in, we are going to be in trouble.

VOICE: Max, I think that Barney did say that what should be handled in the regions is really what I think we might consider as a district manager or a

operation. I'm thinking of Essex County and
 I don't know that there is much rapport in the
 relationship between this community and Newark on the lay
 It may be on the professional basis, but I think
 a few members up in Newark that could be
 a local relationship, vis a vis this group
 we could contact more people, I think, if we
 them as being part of our district office,
 that they would be able to communicate with
 and we could go through the motions of
 the information and the lists and the
 think this would give them - the former
 a chance to feel that they are responsible not
 I would be responsible for some relationship there

We should be able to go through a
 there. We've tried. I've been trying to
 I'd like to call Balabatim there --
 that they are connected with us so much.

HERB FRIEDMAN: Let me ask a question.
 then, Larry, that you would be in favor of
 district or regional set up? Where you would
 create a committee of ten or fifteen
 county or less, and by their being appointed
 office, they would feel some sense of

responsibility to it and they'd give you a working group to use for a variety of purposes in Essex County.

LARRY: That's right. But they have to be purposeful. Now, sometimes I try to do something there, but I don't get involved with the local council. I am on it, but I don't know, are they supposed to report to me, to report to this committee? It isn't true. We don't have that kind of organization, and that is what I am trying to talk about creating.

CHAIRMAN: All right. Joe Kantor
First.

JOE KANTOR: It seems to me, Max, I'm beginning to get a very good, solid, progressive, constructive feeling about this whole thing, as I've sat here over the weekend. It's beginning to take form and perhaps this is something new with me. I'm just saying the same thing that's in everybody else's mind, but it seems to me, Max, that this whole idea of the Young Leadership again, the whole idea of a new image, this whole idea of a regeneration, revitalized M.J.A. where we are now, as I brought up at the last cabinet meeting, future planning, that's what we're talking about.

We're talking about future planning.
Planning and growth and this gives us a unique opportunity since this in a sense your first administration that you say you are willing to be tough minded about this, to talk in terms

of the broadest concept, give the staff our ideas, because this can't be worked out at this meeting, because they have to think in terms - they have to plan it, they have to go over the thing public relationswise, but it seems to me that here is a perfect opportunity to present to some of our very old and very honored friends in the campaign cabinet, and Eddy Ginsburg looks at them and says, "I'm going to work --" "Who, me?" "And I'm going to call Mel." "Who, me?"

Well, you can't expect him to do this anymore than I can work with a group you give me of honorary people and the Young Leadership cabinet. And it seems to me that we can develop this as a broadest concept, that here is the new image. Here is the Young Leadership coming up. And present this to these various people, now in the campaign cabinet, with an idea of organizing ourselves with a structure, -- it's just like any other business structure, and just as we are experimenting, I think that we must have two things.

First, you must have some title -- you can't let these people drop out after assuming campaign leadership and after they've been in the Young Leadership -- you must have a title and a place.

Secondly, after you've given them a title and a place, you must have a program. It seems very

simple to me. We've said this to our cabinet. To any number -- ten or twenty cabinet members this year. I said, "Look, Jack, you're going to be put on the cabinet. We expect two things. One, we expect you to attend at least one or two of our conferences and two, we expect you to be our ambassador to repledge all of your conversations at the Welfare Board allocations committee, the U.J.A. policy, which means overseas needs, and when you can't do those two things, we will expect you to come to us and say, 'Look, I can no longer perform in this position.'"

And I don't know how this can be done because this is mechanical. I'm absolutely certain that Herb and some of the top people can get together -- we're presenting a whole new thing. You can't go to one man and say, "Get off, because --"

Blame it on the Young Leadership if you want to. Blame it on the new conditions, that we can't get off the plateau. But this is a perfect opportunity to say, "We're a whole new organization -- a reorganization --" just like you do in any reshuffling of a business. Sometimes you come to the conclusion now is the time that you're going to make some clear cut changes and if you present it not to one individual, that this is a broad program, we'll find less ill will.

VOICE: I'd like to ask Mel, if I may.
He's a former -- then I'll call --

MEL: I think the problem rests in -- we all recognize that the cabinet has to be reactivated. Because the very members who are here, many of them, are people who -- well, while I was serving as campaign chairman, I was put on the cabinet and it is perfectly obvious that in a sense, this is the lifeblood of the U.J.A.

If you don't have people on your executive committee, you don't have cabinet members, you don't have groups for the young people, the women and so forth and so on in your organization -- I think the problem really rests only on one point, Max. I think the problem rests in trying to get a working force compared -- not offending certain people who are presently members of the cabinet who just lend their names and who are sizeable contributors and perhaps just help us in their local communities.

Now, I think there is a way of getting around that, public relationswise that will not hurt the feelings of the people who are involved.

If Eddy Ginsberg were to address a simple questionnaire to the people who are presently serving on cabinet, who want to continue and ask them a couple of questions -- and tell them in a letter what we intend to do -- that we want a cabinet reactivated as a working force, that

to go out and travel, that are willing to do the
 they are called upon, to give their time to the
 if they feel so inclined, to indicate by telling
 they feel that they simply want to serve in their
 position, and certainly we want them to continue as
 in the cabinet, they can be put in another category --
 in the honorary category.

I think if you'd send this kind of a
 to the people that are involved in the cabinet,
 that the Cohens in Washington and the Yellens
 and many others that are in the other states
 want to lend their names and don't want to lose
 their position, they'll be happy to answer that ques-
 tion in such a way so that you're more or less taken
 care of, and you can almost make the division.

I venture to say if you send that letter
 if we've got 80 members in the cabinet today, you'll
 get 30 of them will answer to simply put them into
 position and they'll do it themselves and save

Then, it will open up, where Eddy can
 get a list of the names of the people who are coming up
 from the Kantor's group or other people we know around the

country, like Larry's is talking about in Newark. You can open up -- you'll have twenty or thirty openings and we'll have a cabinet that will actually be meaningful that will have a job to do, will meet maybe four times a year and indicate what we expect out of them, meet four times a year, accept assignments, and work in their own communities.

And I think if you send this type of letter out the cabinet would open wide for thirty names, and that's about probably what you need.

CHAIRMAN: Phil.

(Several speak at once.)

CHAIRMAN: Pardon me. Phil.

PHIL: Max, I want to relate to you and to the men here, something that took place in Jersey in 1959. I went over -- how the thing started -- and this is in answer to you -- a state organization -- it was a New Jersey state organization of the U.J.A. and on a Sunday morning in a snow storm, 160 people showed up. In Newark.

Now, listen to the whole situation. We formed a group and they were all enthusiastic. Why? There was supposed to be a task force formed out of this group and we go into any community, instead of using so-called outside speakers and this task force was supposed to deal with any

problems in the communities.

You know what happened to that? That was the first meeting. At another meeting two years ago, nothing happened. When I questioned -- I don't know whether it was Herb or Irv or Pete -- we didn't have the money to continue it.

Now, it's costing the U.J.A. very little because everybody paid for their own lunches. It was a 1 day session. Now, here's my point. We should have picked that up, and it could be picked up again. This is the success part, incidently, of the organization in New Jersey. They have a New Jersey organization, and there are a lot of lay people who want to get involved because they're intertwined, their own problems in community fund raising in U.J.A. -- we're partners, and we haven't used it.

Now, whether it's the budget or what it is, I don't know. But there is an involvement here, where your cabinet men, to be the key, for instance, in New Jersey, in an area where you don't have a state, and we've missed the boat, and believe me, the people want it.

And the proof of the pudding was in that morning and there weren't a hell of a lot of telephone calls made to get them to come.

160 people showed up and in a snowstorm,

Larry, and a lot of people -- the Goldmans and the Giddings -- these were co-chairmen, and I brought it out here for what it's worth.

But I think that you can take this cabinet meeting and this cabinet group and filter it down into use within areas, - for an area meeting, if there were a big meeting in New York, I think you can put it to damn good use and you will find the communities want it, and the people in the communities.

VOICE: Well, just a minute. Larry.

LARRY: I think as well as this thing we're talking about here, that Mel is talking about, I think the cabinet should be elected on a three year term. We should tell them that they are put on for three years. Then if you want to get them off at the end of three years, you thank them for having their service for three years and then go on to put someone else on.

But I think to carry out the other comment, what Phil said here, I think that if we use some of these members of the cabinet, as a local representative, and make some of us responsible, for that group, I think we can do a job on it.

I don't feel that I can do anything in Newark, even though I'm the legal chairman, but I think I could do a lot more if -- in Newark, representing the Newark --

this section, on the Executive and if I could talk to these people locally. I don't know who - to ask. We have a few people. Bernie Sprung is on this cabinet. He's a lovable fellow. He has a lot of money. You never saw him? He's up to about \$90,000 for the U.J.A. --and he's such a wonderful guy. I talked him into being a bond chairman a few years ago, but I can't -- I don't know what to tell him. If he's on the cabinet, it isn't working for me. He'll do many things I ask him to do, but I don't activate him.

VOICE: All right. Eddy. Just one more.

Look --

VOICE: Maybe we are saying and it's something we ought to consider, is whether we shouldn't make the members of the Executive Committee responsible for certain regions and assign people in that area and break it down. I understand that.

But Max, what I'd like to suggest is that if we're going to have a meeting on the 23rd, then we ought to invite people we want to be on the cabinet to that meeting, or we're going to waste it because many of these people we aren't hearing anything from.

So if you have ideas as to people let us know immediately, so that we can take some action if we want to involve them, otherwise we've wasted part of that meeting on the 23rd.

VOICE: Max, I just want to say one thing. I think --we're all talking about the same thing. And we lose sight of what Herb has said to me, because I agree with him. This is fine to generalize, but come up with a specific plan, a program. And part of the program that I referred to here, is to operate it just like you would any other business.

Take the executive and say, "Now, if you're going to serve, you've got to do more than lone wolf."

It's hard and it takes a lot of time, but you've got to -- be willing to assume burdens. Conceivably, I live in little Kentucky. You've got Nashville, Atlanta, Memphis and towns that are really bad at the moment, simply because you are not permeating more leaders through there, getting more leadership.

You say, all right, fine. Your responsibility is Kentucky and Georgia. Tennessee. Wherever it may be. Then those cabinet members, it's my responsibility to create there, to kind of bring them together once in awhile, to say, "What are we going to do?" Just what you're talking about. To keep this local regional leadership, because that's what it's going to be. A district sales organization. I know in a lot of companies, we have regional

manager and then we have the district manager and the state manager. Now, you can't deviate far from this kind of organization if you're going to develop organization.

Our job now, as members of the executive, is to develop more organization. That's principally what I have to say.

VOICE: You know, gentlemen --

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: All right.

I'll tell you, gentlemen. Look.

VOICE: May I say a word.

VOICE: Sure.

VOICE: What you're saying is nothing activates unless somebody activates.

VOICE: That's right.

VOICE: Therefore, you've got to have an augmented staff and without a staff, all of your organization cannot go to work.

VOICE: That's right.

HERB FRIEDMAN: Well, now, let me just pick up that point because I'd like to answer just the one thing that Phil said, where he referred to a previous New Jersey experience and said that the answer that he got was money. It isn't the money. It's calling the meeting.

VOICE: But the money to follow up --

need a professional --

HERB FRIEDMAN: It's what he's talking

You've got a basic problem here, gentle-

man. In terms of organization. In a business sense, you
 get payroll, profits, and you decide whether it
 pays to keep expanding districts and district managers, in
 terms of what they produce.

And if the profit is sufficient, it
 warrants expanding the payroll.

Rightly or wrongly, I've been running
 this thing on the basis of the following concept, and I
 think you have to know it.

A static bottom line. Three point one
 million dollars. You can say it's arbitrary. You can say
 I'm rather proud of it, because it's a question
 of allocation of public money. When we talk about hiring
 relations counsel and it will cost X dollars, I must
 take it off of something else. Because I don't
 want to go from line to go beyond three point one million.

Now, that's a policy decision. As

her day said, "Why don't you increase the field
 now in -- spend another hundred thousand dollars
 for."

If you fellow say, "Take off of yourself,"-- if you say to me, "Take off of yourself this self imposed restriction of three point one million and go and spend three point two million or spend three point two and one half million,"justifying it to us, obviously -- I'm not talking about a blank check. I'm talking about if you say, "Expand the organization. It takes ten more field men to service this thing,"because nothing is a self starting operation. Phil Zimmerman has said over and over again in the course of this meeting, "I'm to blame --" no, he said to me, "Your staff is to blame because they don't push the button on me," I'm to blame because I take the way out of least resistance. If nobody pushes the button on me, now --

You all realize that. If you're talking about an expansion of an organizational apparatus, then you've got to talk about an expansion of a button pusher. We are down, in the history of the U.J.A. to the smallest field staff ever..

I mean even talking back before the 1948 campaign. We're running a field staff here of under 40 persons. When I came into this job, ten years ago, there were 88 men on the field staff. Now, how in the hell do you think I can keep the budget at three point one million dollars,

and in the course of ten years, postage stamps go up
and salaries go up. And the only way you keep it up is
by cutting personnel.

VOICE: Well, maybe we cut too far,
too, Herb.

HERB FRIEDMAN: That's why I'm raising
the question. I can't do anything -- let me put it the
other way. I don't promise to do anything that I can't
do.

I've never fooled anybody. I've never
made any promises that I can't try to fulfill. To con-
template an expansion of this network is going to take
people to keep it going. The reason that things die is
because nobody presses for functions. An organization
will die, meetings will drift off, if you don't keep them
busy doing something. To keep them busy doing something
you need more people to do it.

Now, that's a basic policy. If you
want me to, and this is within our professional to do, if
you want me to, I can draw up a proposed plan of an expansion
of regions and districts. I can figure out how many personnel
that will require. I bring it back to you, let you look it
over and discuss it. You'll see what it costs. And decide
whether it's worth it.

VOICE: Wait a minute, gentlemen. Let's --

just a minute. Wait a minute.

(All speaking at once.)

We're not ready yet to talk, Herb, about budgeting. We're talking about some matters of principal here and then we're going to have to take a look at it and come up with suggestions.

I think the basic thing we're talking about here which I'm concerned about is the same thing we talked about in our Youth Group -- when you came to me and I said, "Look, let's spend whatever money it is to generate all the meetings we can."

I said you can spend the money for that. Now, we have to find the -- our problem -- every man around this room came up in the Cabinet. The first job I had was to be put on the Cabinet. Then I moved up to the Executive Committee.

Now, if everybody on the Cabinet is not potentially a membership for this Executive Committee, where are you going to get your Executive Committee members?

HERB FRIEDMAN: You don't have to convince me.

VOICE: All right. Now the point we have is this --

(Several speak at once.)

VOICE: All right, now wait a minute. The point we have is this. Just a minute. Let's not get too far afield.

You've given enough suggestions -- there have been enough suggestions from the boys here -- I think that Herb -- that you and your fellows here can come up with suggestions of a concrete nature. Eddy has taken on that responsibility -- we've had enough suggestions thrown at us --

VOICE: Just a minute. I want to say simply this. At this stage, we must make a value judgment. I think you are asking our advice. We're experienced in the field. I listened to what Barney said, what Phil said and I'm very much impressed. I'm in business. I have to make a value judgment. All right. You say, "We may get a supplement in the New York Times." Sixty thousand dollars.

"We may engage Public Relations Counsel." It's going to be costly.

That's an expense which will be cut from somewhere else. Now, I'm making a value judgment. I'm going through Barney's bills. That will be cut from somewhere else. Now, I think we must follow through on these things which have been proposed, organizationally. Because those of us who are not in the New York office and don't see it

from -- simply the broad planning, in specifics, feel that this is where the present need is. I know it is.

Barney's suggestion about regional development. That's important. And I would rather spend money in that direction than elsewhere. That is why I said, -- I spoke to some of you personally -- I said in passing, I would like to increase field staff another hundred thousand dollars because it's necessary. It's a damn good investment. I think one hundred thousand dollars in field staff with this kind of work will produce more than sixty thousand dollars for a supplement. That's my judgment.

VOICE: That's one thing, though I think Herb needs the direction on now. I don't think there is any magic and you don't think there's any magic in three point one million. On the other hand, it is important to know whether 40 men can't do the job for us. Then I think he does need to come to us with the price and say, "I need five more men." I'm one who would certainly vote for it. Not that I want to throw money away, but I think that you can take a sales organization down too small and you lose sales and that's what we're doing in terms of the field, because I've been out in the field. I got into Tulsa, Oklahoma early in the morning, as you did, and they said they were going to set up five appointments that morning

for me to go see people I've never seen before, because the field man only got there the day before. I mean, this is understandable. We can't do but so much with so many people.

VOICE: Well, we'll come up with some thoughts for you and meanwhile, before any of these monies are spent, we must realize we have two partners in these funds that we have to consult, so it isn't quite this simple.

Let me tell you something about this matter of people that you mentioned about the staff. You know, we can over do this. I think we have a very fine field staff. We have 40 people -- you haven't got 40 geniuses on the payroll anymore than you'd have if you had 40 salesmen, and all of them are top notch salesmen.

As a whole, I've been impressed and I've been around the country, I've been impressed with the calibre of people. You know, they're dilligent - in their application and their ability to really get out and work, and I don't like to have myself the feeling around here that we haven't got a competent field staff --

VOICE: I didn't say that --

(All speak at once.)

VOICE: I think they are competent. I think they are doing a job -- but if they get there the night

before you get there -- I am talking in terms of numbers not quality. Numbers.

VOICE: All right. Gentlemen, we have enough on this. Anybody who wants to say something on this, because I want to go on to the next item.

VOICE: I can raise the opposite and getting into a town and not having a person there. I've never gotten to a town where the field man had set the thing up. But if Herb cut from 88 to 40, I'm not going to take that literally because maybe the effectiveness of that type of organization wasn't as good as some other methods of raising money.

Now, he's not going to sit there for ten years and cut 40 men out simply because he wants to be a hero and have --

VOICE: There are a lot of other aspects to this.

(At this point, the tape is no longer recorded.)

* * *