



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE  
**AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES**

**MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.**  
Series B: Commission on Jewish Education in North America (CJENA). 1980–1993.  
Subseries 2: Commissioner and Consultant Biographical Files, 1987–1993.

---

Box  
5

Folder  
11

Bronfman, Charles, 1988-1989, undated.

Pages from this file are restricted and are not available online.  
Please contact the [American Jewish Archives](#) for more information.

---

Commissioner Contact SheetName Charles Zornfman Assigned to SF

Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_ Off. phone \_\_\_\_\_

Home phone \_\_\_\_\_

Fax \_\_\_\_\_ Telex \_\_\_\_\_

Comments Influential, Chairman of the CRB Foundation;  
interested in informal education, Israel;  
potential funder

Date	Nature of Contact/Status	Next Steps/Action Needed
7/4/88	SF Visit - pre 8/1 interview	
10/6/88	SF Visit - follow up on 8/1	
12/?/88	SF Call - pre 12/13 interview	
2/18/89	SF Visit	
3/89	MLH Mtg.	stated to host small group meeting

### COMMISSIONER CONTACT SHEET

Name	Charles Bronfman	Assigned to	SF
------	------------------	-------------	----

Mailing Address 1170 Peel Street Off. phone 514-878-5201

Montreal, Quebec H3B 4P2 Home phone \_\_\_\_\_

Fax \_\_\_\_\_ Telex \_\_\_\_\_

Comments Influential, Chairman of the CRB Foundation, interested in informal  
education, Israel, potential funder.

Date	Nature of Contact/Status	Next Steps/Action Needed
7/4/88	SF Visit - Pre 8/1 interview	
10/6/88	SF Visit - follow up on 8/1	
12/ /88	SF Call - Pre 12/13 interview	
2/18/89	SF Visit	
3/89	MLM meeting	Slated to host small group meeting

INTERVIEW WITH  
CHARLES BRONFMAN

SEYMOUR FOX  
JULY 4, 1988 IN MONTREAL

After an initial conversation about the Israel experience and what had taken place, Charles went on to describe his vision of where he thought Jewish education should concentrate its efforts. To him, Israel is a very great source of impact for Jewish education. He is concerned about Jews waking up in the morning and feeling happy about the fact that they're Jewish, and he sees Israel as being a great resource for that. He is supportive of pluralism, and he says if the ultra orthodox find meaning in their approach to Judaism, wonderful, but is concerned about the vast majority of Jews to whom religion, and certainly the extreme forms of religion, do not make any real impact. He is really looking for a way to effect the non-identified, and he sees Israel as being an enormous resource because he sees the impact that Israel has had on him, on his children, and in all people he sees that you can see that the bible is alive there, he sees contemporary Jewish life.

He also is concerned about teaching through informal education, the holidays, and heroes. In essence, it's an approach which emphasizes the use of history in contemporary Jewish life. He sees Jewish education as trying to reach different argots. I offered the medical analogy that was presented by Mort of having many different experiments going on with networking. He liked that. He talked about the fact that Jewish education would have to touch the insides of young people. A major

interest of his, of course, is secular Jews where he sees himself as one of them. He described a project that his own foundation is supporting in the area of Canadian television to do something about Canadian heritage.

We discussed the issue of personnel and he saw personnel as being a key issue, if not the key issue. He spoke about the importance of marketive research, about the present and the future, and then we went on to talk about informal education. He sees informal education as being voluntary as compared to schools. He saw the power of informal education in terms of the use of the arts, sports, and he was very much concerned also that we develop the interest in Jews throughout the world.

This, of course, is another emphasis of the concept of history in contemporary Jewry. He talked about traveling art exhibits, and he told me about a photographer by the name of Frederick Brenner who lives in Paris and Israel, who has done photographic essays of dying Jewish communities, and the impact.

I asked him about formal education and he admitted that he had little interest and lack of knowledge in that area, concerned about the ghettoizing effect. Asked about the afternoon school, he also didn't put very much faith in that. Then a very interesting possibility came up with the use of nursery school and then catching the parents as a result of the nursery school experience, and then using some combination of informal education plus some form of possible schooling. Parent education turns out to be an important area to work in.

He is willing to speak at the meeting about his conception of informal education. He asked to be told about this, and for a time limit. I think it's important for us to do that and I should take this responsibility. I said I'd call back and be in touch with his secretary. He asked how long the meeting would be. He has to get back to Palm Beach that day, and for him the best would be something like 9 a.m. to 1 p.m., so we ought to consider the various time constraints of various people.

I made a comment at the beginning about whether, in our work in Israel, we were going to be somehow connected to new authority that is being established at the Jewish Agency. I made the distinction between our work here in North America and the work in Israel, but said that if we were going to work on the Israel experience, we certainly would be in touch with this authority.

Again, I want to emphasize his deep commitment to pluralism and the fact that he thinks that new and different experiments ought to be tried out. The ones that interest him are for the less involved and those who don't go to day schools. He brought up the question of the impact of day school education by referring to something that Manny Batshaw told him about the inner-marriage rate and of products of day school education.



Added to my meeting with Charles Bronfman was a short conversation I had with Manny Batshaw. He emphasized two points. One was that we ought to show some connection with the Jewish Agency so that we are not thought of as a new show with the same cast of characters, and he suggested either Mendel Kaplan, Erwin Field, or Dinitz. He emphasized the importance of Erwin Field.

The second point that he made was the one that he made to Annette about this having roots in the organized community, and in feeling that this not be a commission of the Mandel Foundation only.



Bron10.88-2MN-W

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

TOWARDS THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

1. COMMISSIONER: CHARLES BRONFMAN
2. INTERVIEWER: SEYMOUR FOX
3. DATE: OCTOBER 6, 1988
4. SPIRIT: VERY POSITIVE AND INDICATED DEEP INVOLVEMENT
5. SETTING: MR. BRONFMAN'S OFFICE IN MONTREAL
6. DURATION: 3 HOURS
7. COMMISSIONER'S CURRENT STAND:  
  
PERSONNEL: SUPPORTIVE, PROVIDED IT INCLUDES THE INFORMAL  
SECTOR AND THE ISRAEL EXPERIENCE.

THE COMMUNITY: IN FAVOR OF THE IDEA.

8. SUMMARY:

MR. BRONFMAN BEGAN THE MEETING BY SUMMARIZING WHAT TOOK PLACE AT THE COMMISSION. HIS SUMMARY WAS ACCURATE, UP-BEAT AND HE EMPHASIZED SEVERAL TIMES THE GREAT CONTRIBUTION THAT MORT MANDEL MADE BY ESTABLISHING THE MANDEL COMMISSION. THE ENCOURAGEMENT HE RECEIVED FROM SEEING THE VARIOUS PARTICIPANTS IN THE COMMISSION AND THE DIVERSITY OF PEOPLE WITH THEIR DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT JUDAISM, TRYING TO WORK TOGETHER ON JEWISH EDUCATION. THIS IN ITSELF WAS A SOURCE OF GREAT ENCOURAGEMENT. HE CLAIMED THAT HE LEARNED A GREAT DEAL FROM THE MEETING.

HIS SUMMARY EMPHASIZED THE FACT THAT THE COMMISSIONERS INDICATED MANY DIFFERENT WAYS OF CUTTING INTO THE PROBLEM.

I DESCRIBED IN A VERY GENERAL WAY THE WORK OF THE STAFF, SINCE THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION. THIS MEETING TOOK PLACE BEFORE OUR MEETINGS IN CLEVELAND, SO I DID NOT HAZARD ANY MORE. HE WAS VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THE PROCESS, PARTICULARLY OF THE NOTION OF A RATIONAL APPROACH TO OUR PROBLEM. HE LOOKS FORWARD TO RECEIVING ADDITIONAL MATERIALS WHEN I MEET HIM BEFORE THE NEXT COMMISSION MEETING.

HE INDICATED SEVERAL TIMES THAT HE THOUGHT THAT IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA IF THE FOUNDATIONS COULD FIND A WAY TO WORK TOGETHER SO THAT EACH FOUNDATION'S EFFORTS COULD BE USED TO LEVERAGE THE EFFORTS OF OTHERS AND TO INCREASE THE IMPACT OF AN INDIVIDUAL



FOUNDATION IN ITS CONTRIBUTION TO JEWISH EDUCATION. HE ALSO INDICATED THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO ARRANGE FOR SOME SMALLER GROUP MEETINGS ON THINGS THAT PARTICULARLY INTEREST HIM, LIKE INFORMAL EDUCATION. HE INDICATED THAT HE LOOKED FORWARD TO MEETING INDIVIDUAL COMMISSION MEMBERS TO CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION WITH THEM, SUCH AS FLORENCE MELTON. I BELIEVE THAT HE WILL BE WILLING TO PLAY A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION.

5  
brnf/1FOX-W

TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: MR. CHARLES BRONFMAN

INTERVIEWER: SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: MAY 4, 1989

PLACE: MONTREAL, CANADA -- LUNCH 12:30 P.M.

Summary:

Mr. Bronfman invited the new director of his foundation, Mr. Tom Axeworthy, and Mr. Stan Erman, a member of his staff who has participated in previous interviews, to join us at the meeting.

Charles Bronfman listened carefully as I described the demonstration site and the possibility of a demonstration site being a full community or something smaller than that.

Upon hearing that, Mr. Bronfman made a distinction between his role on the Commission where he wants to be a good commissioner, and his own "selfish" interest -- that is, in the work of his own foundation. Mr. Axeworthy and Mr. Erman then described several of the projects that the Bronfman Foundation has decided to undertake, such as twinning Diaspora schools with Israeli schools, particularly in the area of schools; doing work in the teaching of Israel in the Diaspora; increasing the number of groups that come to Israel as well as improving the impact of these groups. They are also talking about a training program for the staff of Israel Experience groups.

We then considered the impact that the Israel Experience could have if it were related to other aspects of an educational program in a demonstration site, such as the community center, the day school, or the supplementary school. Those schools could introduce the Israel Experience into the curriculum and take advantage of the youngsters' experience when they returned. Charles thought that was an interesting point and seemed to be supportive of the idea of demonstration site.

We then proceeded to the issue of the ii, and Charles began to ask questions about how much it would cost. I told him I had no idea. He asked some perceptive questions about whether this should be a separate entity or a part of JESNA or some other organization. I left all those matters open. He felt that the funders ought to get together and begin to discuss the total package. He asked whether others, such as Mona Ackerman, were interested in participating in a demonstrate site. I said I did not know as I hadn't seen her. (As you will see later in my

interview with Mona Ackerman, she's very much interested in doing this, perhaps more so at this time than any of the other people that I have interviewed.)

Charles then used a part of the meeting to talk about problems of Israeli education. I believe this was in light of several of the possible projects that his own foundation is considering.

I found Charles to be very involved in the work of the Commission and very complimentary about the "Mandel" Commission. I believe that a good deal of time should be invested particularly in Mr. Bronfman and also in Mr. Axeworthy and Mr. Erman. I think Mort must continue to meet with Charles. He will be attending the meeting on the 14th, although he will have to leave after lunch to go to Kansas City.

I think that we should be in touch with Charles one more time before the meeting and possibly suggest a role for him at the meeting, including some comments that he might make that would be useful. He certainly wants to play that role.

COMMISSION  
ON JEWISH EDUCATION  
IN NORTH AMERICA

4500 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44103  
216/391-8300

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel  
Chairman  
Mona Riklis Ackerman  
Ronald Appleby  
David Arrow  
Mandell L. Berman  
Jack Bieler  
Charles R. Bronfman  
John C. Coleman  
Maurice S. Corson  
Lester Crown  
David Dubin  
Stuart E. Erzenstat  
Joshua Elkin  
Eli N. Evans  
Irwin S. Field  
Max M. Fisher  
Alfred Gottschalk  
Arthur Green  
Irving Greenberg  
Joseph S. Gruss  
Robert I. Hiller  
David Hirschhorn  
Carol K. Ingall  
Ludwig Jesselson  
Henry Koschitzky  
Mark Lainer  
Norman Lamm  
Sara S. Lee  
Seymour Martin Lipset  
Haskel Lookstein  
Robert E. Loup  
Matthew J. Maryles  
Florence Melton  
Donald R. Mintz  
Lester Pollack  
Charles Ratner  
Esther Leah Ritz  
Harriet L. Rosenthal  
Alvin I. Schiff  
Lionel H. Schipper  
Ismar Schorsch  
Harold M. Schulweis  
Daniel S. Shapiro  
Margaret W. Tishman  
Isidore Twersky  
Bennett Yanowitz  
Isaiah Zeldin

In Formation

Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Ariel  
Seymour Fox  
Annette Hochstein  
Stephen H. Hoffman  
Arthur J. Naparstek  
Arthur Rotman  
Carmi Schwartz  
Herman D. Stein  
Jonathan Wocher  
Henry L. Zucker

Director

Arthur J. Naparstek

Staff

Virginia E. Levi  
Joseph Reimer

May 30, 1989

Mr. Charles R. Bronfman  
1170 Peel Street  
Montreal, Quebec H3B 4P2

Dear Charles:

I am pleased that you have agreed to chair a group discussion at the June 14 Commission meeting. Several hours will be devoted to these groups, making them the principle setting for the day. Each group will be asked to discuss the enabling options agreed upon at the December 13 Commission meeting: community and personnel. From these groups we expect to generate some concrete proposals upon which to base the future work of the Commission.

There will be a discussion guide prepared for you to follow, and you will have the assistance of a co-chair, staff members to serve as resources in the areas of community and personnel, and a recorder. I have asked Seymour Fox to meet with you prior to June 14 to fill you in on our general plans for the day, and to review the discussion guide currently being prepared for your use. I understand you will need to leave about 1:30, and we will ask your co-chair to take over when you depart.

I look forward to seeing you on June 14, and send my warmest regards.

*Mort*

Morton L. Mandel  
Chairman

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
TOWARDS THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE COMMISSION

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONER

1. COMMISSIONER: CHARLES BRONFMAN
2. INTERVIEWER: PROF. S. FOX
3. DATE: JULY 9, 1989
4. DURATION: ONE AND A HALF HOURS
5. SETTING: JERUSALEM
6. SUMMARY:

In addition to Charles Bronfman, two members of his staff were present: Janet Aviad, who is the director of his Israel office and Stan Urman, a consultant to Mr. Bronfman in Montreal.

Mr. Bronfman reported on his positive reactions to the third meeting of the Commission, though he indicated that he had to leave early to fly off to Kansas City. He was pleased with the way the small group meetings were handled, and was particularly impressed with the contribution of several members of his group, Dan Shapiro, Prof. Twersky, Prof. Gottschalk and Harriet Rosenthal.

Charles repeated his concern about tachlis, when the Commission would be able to take decisions. He also brought up the question of how we could solve the problem of funding -- when each of the foundations had their own particular agendas. "Is there some way we can all work together?" was a theme that he returned to several times in this conversation as he has in previous conversations.

I had met with Stan Urman the night before and Stan suggested that we try and find a particular area of focus for Charles within the agenda of the Commission where he could take leadership. I asked Stan whether he thought that a proper approach would be to ask Charles to chair a group that would deal with the Israel Experience and come up with a report on how to increase the number of young people and the impact of Israel programs for Jewish education in North America. Stan thought that was a very good idea. Therefore, at the meeting I asked Charles



what he thought about the possibility of taking leadership in the area of the use of Israel as a resource for Jewish education. He broadened this to Israel-Diaspora relations (he was not clear as to exactly what he meant). He indicated that he was willing to take leadership in some area related to Israel; I might even say that he was a bit enthusiastic about the possibility. I mentioned that if he took leadership, I believed that key members of the Commission might be willing to join with him to discuss this matter. He thought that this was a good idea and worth pursuing.

It was clear that Charles was looking for a way for his interests in Israel to find an appropriate role within the agenda of the Commission and yet for him to be able to keep his foundation's identity.

I returned to the concept of how the Israel Experience could make a significant difference in a community action site, and how the work in a community action site could then be replicated in other communities throughout North America. He seemed to like this idea, and indicated that he was ready to pursue the suggestion of a small group, taskforce, etc. that he would lead or chair.

Charles indicated that he wants to come to the next meeting of the Commission, was concerned about whether it might compete with the World Series. He finished the meeting in praise of the Commission and the impact that it is having on its members and on the agenda of the North American Jewish community.



TO: Morton L. Mandel and Henry L. Zucker  
FROM: Seymour Fox  
DATE: September 18, 1989  
RE: Your meeting with Charles Bronfman

In this memo I will attempt to summarize my impressions of Charles Bronfman's attitude toward the work of the Commission thus far, based on my various meetings with him, his participation in the meetings of the Commission and my consultations with members of his staff (Stan Urman, Manny Batshaw, Tom Axworthy, Janet Aviad, Barry Chazan).

Attached is the report of the latest interview I conducted with him as well as transcripts of his comments at the second and third meetings of the Commission.

Charles has made it clear from the onset that what moves him and attaches him to the Jewish People is Israel. The motto of his foundation, "the unity of the Jewish people whose soul is Jerusalem," reflects that conviction. He is uncomfortable with formal Jewish education and technical academic matters.

He has an excellent memory and is able to succinctly summarize what the Commission has done and where it stands at the moment. He admires Morton Mandel for having had the wisdom and for taking the initiative to create - what he calls - the Mandel Commission.

While he is very positive about the Commission, he is impatient with several matters:

1. The length of time it is taking to get to "tachlis". He is anxious to know how we will divide the pie and see to it that every foundation gets involved in a specific area and yet contributes to an overall plan.

2. The "politics" involved on the local and national scene. This makes him skeptical about the Community Action Site, as he doubts that the denominations could work together. He is also concerned about the federations being able to "pick up the bill" in light of the current difficulties of the annual campaigns. His impatience with the politics has also affected his view of the IJE - which is somewhat fuzzy - and he asked whether the IJE shouldn't be part of JESNA.

As you can see in the report of my interview with him on July 9th, he is willing to take a leadership role in the area of Israel as a resource for Jewish education. I believe that he is looking for a more focused mission for his foundation and would like to play a leading role in the strengthening of Israel-Diaspora relations, particularly the impact that Israel can have on the Diaspora.

It is difficult to know how much he cares about informal education. It appears to be number four on his priority list, after Israel, the arts and culture, and Israel-Diaspora relations.

I believe that your plan of a "set-aside" could be ideal for him. Charles needs to have a clear role and identity for his foundation's contribution. Therefore, I think that he should be asked to chair a committee or a task force that would offer a vision as well as a plan for the use of Israel as a resource for Jewish education in North America. This opinion was confirmed in my most recent discussion with Avraham Infeld who just met with him. Our challenge, I believe, is to make clear to Charles that his foundation could change and enhance the role that the Israel Experience plays for North American Jewish education.

I believe it will also be necessary to explain to Charles how the idea of a "set-aside" is different from what his foundation is doing right now, namely entertaining requests for support for the Israel Experience. What are we asking from him that is different? I think we need to fine-tune this for Charles and for those foundations who already have a Jewish education component or program (e.g. Ackerman, Revson).

Therefore, I recommend that Charles be asked to set aside funds for:

1. the Israel Experience aspect of all Community Action Sites,
2. the diffusion of the results of the Community Action Sites to communities throughout North America,
3. helping to convince national and local organizations to adopt the appropriate policies as regards the Israel Experience.

Thus, the CRB Foundation would become the address for enhancing Jewish education through the Israel Experience.

Note: In a Community Action Site, we could demonstrate how the Israel Experience will affect the lives of young people - in JCCs, in schools, in adult education programs, on the college campus. We could demonstrate how to prepare young people for Israel and follow up and build on their experiences. Though the Bronfman Foundation is doing some of this, there is no comprehensive program for all young people in a community. The impact of the Israel Experience will also be evaluated in Community Action Sites.

QUOTES FROM DECEMBER 13TH MEETING

CHARLES BRONFMAN (First Time Speaking)

I have a problem and I don't know if that problem is shared or not shared. I worry a little bit that we're sitting around this table trying to reach a consensus and I don't know if consensus in this group is necessary or whether concise are more appropriate. There are those of us interested in one aspect of Jewish education and those in another one, and yes personnel is important and yes fundraising is important. But, when I think of th fundraising and other bodies that are around this table -- you have foundations here, you have CJF here, JWB, JESNA, the universities -- there are funding groups and I know that one of the ideas is to get us all interested in doing more funding and to influence people in our communities. I was also reminded at the last meeting you clearly said -- if my memory serves me correctly -- that what we were about was to get into some viable programs, that your foundation would commit itself to one and you hoped other foundations would also commit themselves. So before Seymour discusses his paper (on personnel), where are we headed? It's very nice to talk about personnel but we're not going to be doing an institution for personnel, probably. We may, but I don't think that that's going to happen. Is there going to be an opportunity for those of us who would desire to do things in education to work either under an umbrella, or do our own thing and make sure that nobody steps on each other's toes? Is that where we are headed? And if so, is that going to come out of



today's discussion? Or the next time? How do you see the timing of this?

MLM'S RESPONSE TO BRONFMAN:

Let me take a stab at this; we really haven't worked it out. What I hope happens today is that comments like yours are made -- partly asking questions, but really stating an outcome that you would like. I know some of the areas you're interested in and I happen to be interested in some of them too. But I am reserving judgment on where the Mandel Family -- I think I tried to clarify that with Yitz Greenberg -- as one funder, Charles Bronfman is another funder. I want to end up committing Mandel Associated Foundation funds to something that is both a high priority for me and a high priority for this group. I want to be instructed by the findings of this Commission. And so whatever the findings are, I'll listen to. I hope the same thing happens, Charles, with personnel and with community, and other things that we're going to get into. So that there may well be an umbrella under which, for instance, taking kids to Israel, may fit very nicely into both your interests and what seem to be important conclusions, findings of this Commission. Eli Evans and I had that same conversation. I hope that we will all be informed by the findings of this Commission, one way or another, and my guess is that by the next meeting we'll have made a lot more progress.

CHARLES BRONFMAN (Second Time Speaking)

I have yet to hear a symphony orchestra play well without a distinguished conductor. I think that the quality of any

enterprise is determined by the caliber of the senior actor. Therefore, my own personal view is that the principal of the school is where the action must be because the principal does not necessarily have to be only an administrator. A good principal works up the morale in his organization, as any good manager does. He or she will train the teachers and the whole upbuilding of the caliber of educator will be determined by the type of person who is at the top, not by the person who is filling out the bottom part of the pyramid.

SUGGESTIONS, COMMENTS, QUESTIONS OF COMMISSIONERS  
Taken from the tapes of June 14th

(Excerpt from group meetings.)

Bronfman's Group

(B.Y.) Can existing models of good programs be used as basis for CAS? i.e. give more money to things that work

notes  
Bronfman

(C.B.) The community paper suggests additional financing by federations. Is this practical?

(C.B.) What does the staff mean by "community"? You go beyond geography, demography. Need a clearer definition.

(C.B.) For next meeting, we need a full description of CJF's role in the CAS.

(J.E.) Need a balance between implementation of and thinking about CAS. Get ball rolling on data gathering needed for CAS, but start implementing as soon as possible.

(J.E.) Read Ann Lieberman's new book Building a Professional Culture in Schools (U. of Washington, Seattle) Bring Lieberman together with Jewish educators - see what's applicable.

(H.R.) Providing national guidance and setting standards should be two of the Commission's goals.

(I.T.) We're over our heads in research. We have enough experience to know what our needs are.

(J.E.) CAS is needed because there is a lack of coordination among all of the different pieces. Need a full-time effort (like Sizer at Brown); can't just shoot from the hip.

(?) For next meeting, need full description of CAS, what kind of national set-up is needed, how to get communities to buy into it.

(J.W.) Contract with the CAS has to include guarantee of rigorous documentation.

(?) Put out a "quasi-tender" - make a clarion call to communities to see who is interested in being a CAS. Commission will choose from among those who respond.

(H.R.) Contract with a CAS could include requirement of "twinning" with another community - teach them how to do it.

(M.M.?) We can't just create a funding source. Don't let researchers chase the money. Local community leaders must engage the professionals in the enterprise.