



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
6

Folder
11

Mandel, Morton, 1988.

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

COMMISSIONER CONTACT SHEET

Name Morton L. Mandel

Assigned to _____

Mailing Premier Industrial Corporation

Off. phone 212-391-8300

Address 4500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio

Home phone _____

Fax _____

Telex _____

Comments _____

Date	Nature of Contact/Status	Next Steps/Action Needed

UNEDITED
CONFIDENTIAL

INTERVIEW WITH H. MANDEL

-- June 27, 1988 --

ANNETTE: There are two reasons for wanting to interview you. One reason is it would be a wonderful baseline for the other interviews, in order to understand where everybody stands in relationship to the goals of the person whose idea and initiative this is. The second reason is of course my desire to know, to have the pleasure of hearing you express in a systematic way, what your views are about this. Though I believe I have a fair idea, it is something that has never been explicitly discussed nor very often discussed in details. So I thought this might be a good time.

MANDEL: Sure. You know, I don't have the outcomes all clear.

ANNETTE: You don't.

MANDEL: No. One of the projects that we need to undertake between now and August 1st -- I guess I'm digressing a little bit, but I think it's important -- is to have a piece of paper on which we've written the outcomes, like there were no Commission. The steering group is to decide in advance of the whole process what some logical outcomes of the process might be. And start out with that destination in mind, as we convene our first meeting. And allow the meeting process to steer us wherever it steers us. But given zero impact of the Commission, we have our answers. That

there will be zero impact, is virtually impossible. There will be some impact. But, if we are directed even in the wrong way -- it will be a more effective process than if we are just wandering toward no direction whatsoever.

In other words, if I'm steering toward Haifa, and the group takes me to Nabius -- fine. But if there's no impact from the group, at least I know I'm going to Haifa.

ANNETTE: Would you like to begin with that? Is that something you'd like to continue to elaborate on, the outcomes?

MANDEL: I'll tell you the truth, as far as the outcomes are concerned, I really think I need to sit around a table, with a big blackboard, and half a dozen people, and do some very free rolling brainstorming. Because I don't have a clue, except in very macro terms, as to what the specific planks of the outcome -- of what the specific outcomes need to be. I've got some generalized thinking we all do. And I think we need to sharpen that. I don't think I have a set of outcomes. I don't think I have some -- you know, I could dictate a set of outcomes. It is not the product of the process I feel I need to engage in -- namely, take our little 6, 5-6 person group and take a couple of hours and really brainstorm. Because it's very clarifying and instead of my list of 12 outcomes, and your list of 12, and Seymour's and Art's and anybody else's list of 12 -- of which may have 6 in common and all this -- we'll come up with a list

between us different than if we were simply to merge each of our individual lists. That's always the case.

ANNETTE: If we're not going to talk about the outcomes now, well maybe we should begin then with the process in the following way. You've been involved in a large number of commissions. The one I know most about is the JWB Maximizing Commission. Is this commission going to be different? And if yes, how is it going to be different?

MANDEL: I'm not sure it will be different. I think there is a standard method of operation that applies to virtually every such process, where certain basic elements need to be in place for the process to be effective. And as I think about this one, as I think about the JWB Commission on "Maximizing the Jewish Educational Effectiveness of the Jewish Community Centers." I think the process of JWB was very effective. It resembles in almost every respect, the process that -- another Commission I chaired most recently for the Council of Jewish Federations on Jewish Education, which was also a very effective process, and then I still chair at Premier, even though they're not called Commission -- have pretty much the same basic fundamental approach. Smart group, defining the problems, developing alternative solutions, with careful staff work, getting the facts, developing alternative solutions, shooting the solutions down, and if they don't get shot down -- they survive. And ending up with a group process in which there's been a lot of participation, ideally, by

good, clear minds. And producing the end product. Now that -- you know, that's not very startling by way of a definition, but it works. And I don't see anything different here.

What makes this Commission a bit different to me, maybe almost unusual to me, is the great care with which we've assembled the commissioners, and the amount of thinking we're doing about assembling staff. So what you have here maybe is the difference between a chef and a cook, a gourmet chef and a cook. They both make fish, but in one case it's a trip to the moon; and the other, it's simply refueling, you know. So that I think, I think maybe the only unique aspect of this as I think about it, is quality. There may be even a substantial qualitative difference. I don't see the methodology being much different.

ANNETTE: I'd like to take, to stay a moment with that qualitative difference. Is that qualitative difference likely to yield a difference in the scope of the outcome?

MANDEL: It will -- it will -- one of the fruits of that qualitative difference will be the confidence we have in our findings, the sureness with which we proceed. They will be less tentative -- it will be less tentative. It will be a bit bolder. Big visions are never achieved by people who have no self-confidence. Bold moves are never undertaken by people who have no self-confidence. It's that self-confidence that permits you to take a risk. And I think there may be enough self assurance

around that table -- maybe not -- you know, I'm just thinking out loud with you -- that there's every likelihood that we'll reach as far as we ought to reach; that we won't be too timid.

ANNETTE: O.K. Going on with that, we are -- we're talking about bold moves and taking risks at the end of the road?

MANDEL: It could be. It could be not. We may agree on very safe, yet exactly right ideas. The Israel Experience was a safe undertaking. Success and failure was a qualitative function only. Not whether this is a good idea -- that was not risky. Senior Personnel was not risky, as an idea. Vacation Village is a risky idea. And I don't think we need to titillate ourselves with risky ideas unnecessarily. If we come up with ideas as sound and as appropriate as the Israel Experience and Senior Personnel, the game then is a qualitative game. The game then is making a difference in those areas. But not -- it won't be a bold agenda in the sense that when people read these five subjects are the undertaking of this group -- they'll say: "hey, what's the big deal. The big deal is not, getting to be in our ability, to do the as we go through this, ways of approaching senior personnel, or ways of approaching the infrastructure needed for senior personnel, training capability and so on. I mean -- do we want two more Melton Centers in America, one at Stanford and one at Harvard? Or one at Brandeis and one at Ohio State? And if we do, then what is the definition of a Melton Center? It is not merely a donor who is going to endow a chair in a program. It's a defined need, a defined opportunity. A person to run the Melton --

- the Smith Center -- a program, a set of goals, why we need it. And so when we tackle senior personnel in North America, it seems to me the special character of our group will permit us to get underneath that heading, in maybe very bold, creative ways and come up with a piece of work -- 2 Melton centers. For which we need Lester Crown and Mort Mandel, or Lester Crown and Charles Bronfman. And if they are participating with us and riding along with us, they should see this as a fine buy -- My God, you mean I can get that product! It's like buying a piece of jewelry, you know, the pleasure of wearing it (if you wear jewelry) is why you spend \$1,000 for something you can buy for a dime. Well the pleasure of having your name on something like the Melton Center is a great treat to a philanthropist who is seeking to put his money someplace.

So, I would think Annette, that our agenda when it's finally finished, the outcomes thereafter when they're finally finished, by themselves are going to be rather simple sentences.

ANNETTE: O.K. I think I'd like to come back to that -- and I'll tell you why.

From my point of view, what is tremendously impressive in this Commission besides the process that you have spoken about, is its civic scope and the breadth and the scope of the commissioners, and therefore of the commission. And I think that means, if I translate it, the potential for change.

MANDEL: The same thing. There is power there.

ANNETTE: Right.

MANDEL: There's not only brains; there's power.

ANNETTE: There's an enormous amount of power there.

MANDEL: There's power both human and financial.

ANNETTE: And institutional?

MANDEL: And institutional.

(Tape out for a few minutes)

[Annette: Invitation to talk about what is the problem...]

MANDEL: Diminishing sense of identity between this whole unit called the American Jewish community with Jewish tradition, Jewish thought, Jewish history and maybe even the sense of Jewish peoplehood, the sense that there is *Klal Yisrael*. And that's evidenced by things like inter-marriage, it's evidenced by volunteering -- sometimes in some voluntary organizations, it is harder to get volunteers -- you know, in the organized Jewish community, it is harder to get volunteers. The reasons for it ... I don't have to tell you the reasons. You know all the great success we've had in the American Jewish community and opening of

doors, getting the general community to look at Jews as people, and not as Jews. With that success are the seeds of all this drifting away on the part of young people from a narrow set of choices to a wide set of choices, and therefore -- because even a random distribution among this wide set of choices, looks like they are drifting away, because everybody always went only into Jewish life. Now one can be in the Symphony and you know, whatever one wants, just random saying yes to these things may have nothing to do with disaffection with Jewish life. What decreases is the number going into Jewish things. (Interruption)

restaurants in town and everybody goes to those 2 restaurants, and then 20 restaurants open up -- and now people still go to those 2 restaurants, but they also go to a Chinese restaurant one day, and because they go to this -- they never had that opportunity before -- the 2 restaurant owners could claim disaffection, could claim there's a loss of identity, could claim -- hey, what's going on here.

In fact, there are more choices and the normal distribution as between say 10 good restaurants and 2 good restaurants is one-tenth instead of one-half. So, to some extent, I think our figures are not as bad maybe in terms of how people really feel about the Jewish connection.

ANNETTE: Are you saying that essentially they have different Jewish connections?

MANDEL: No. I'm saying, that Americans growing up in America, who happen to be Jewish -Americans -- now in addition to choices that have a Jewish orientation -- good choices -- have good choices in a general society. They didn't have those choices when I was growing up. Have those choices now, and as they make a positive choice towards being on the Board of the Symphony, they are not making a negative statement about choosing that instead of a Jewish organization; it's in addition to a Jewish organization. But it does dilute the time they spend with Jewish organizations, because before they couldn't get on a symphony board, they could only choose the Jewish organizations. So that there would be more units of activity in Jewish organizations, with a given 100 people, than there would be with Jewish and general organizations. I'm saying that people who go on the board of general organizations, are not necessarily making a statement against the Jewish organizations. That's what I'm saying.

ANNETTE: That argument essentially says that the attitude of the Jews in America versus Jewishness is not negative?

MANDEL: No, I don't want to be that positive. I want to explore; I want a database.

ANNETTE: That says what?

MANDEL: That asks what in fact is happening? We think there's disaffiliation. We think that there's maybe even a lack of interest. (Interruption) ... I think we have to ask ourselves --

what is it we want to know about the American Jewish community? And what kind of hard data is there? There's a lot of hard data, we have to look at it. And then we have to be talking to each other with a common language. Because you get 20-30 commissioners around a table, one will say 72% of inter-marriage rate; one will say 42% inter-marriage rate; one will say that young people who have choices are choosing to go on non-Jewish forms of activities (as I have all my life by the way) and that says something, that it is a denial to the Jewish cause. And I'm saying to you -- I won't buy that. I'm saying that I think -- I'm very active in the United Way of America. I'm on the National Board and I was Chairman of the Cleveland group. I've been in that since 1954. It never occurred to me that I was denying my Jewish connection by being in a general connection, because I see myself as a Jew, but I see myself as an American. Do you understand what I'm saying?

ANNETTE: I think I do.

MANDEL: And there are those who translate that into a lack of interest of what have you. And we have to validate that. We have to find out what's happening. I'm guessing that the fact that people who are in their '30s are not affiliating as tightly, as completely as fully in their outside activities with Jewish causes, may in fact simply be saying to us -- there's such a wide array, that some kind of normal distribution, random distribution, is going to take them into non-Jewish causes. Which is not a deliberate slap, insult at the Jewish causes.

ANNETTE: But what is the implication of that for the Jewish side?

MANDEL: The implication of that -- I don't know. First of all we have to validate it. Is what I'm saying fact? What I'm saying is fact, but I don't know that there are any negative implications. It may be that we are growing a generation of Jews who because they will have roots and connections in the general society, will be better Jewish leaders, not worse. Because what we want is an ecumenical society, we want a society in which there are no ghettos, we want strong ethnic groups living in a pluralistic society where each respects each other for what they are. And I think in a country like America or Israel or any country where there are diverse groups -- Arabs and Jews, whatever that an ideal society has a lot of functions and institutions where people intermix, are simply there because they're interested in music or they're interested in art, or they're interested in whatever. Not because they're Jews interested in art, or Arabs interested in art. Because they're people interested in art. Just as for those societies to flourish, there needs to be pride in one's background and roots and culture. So there could be a stronger community, in a highly integrated Israeli (American?) society, and a strong Jewish community in a highly integrated Israeli society. And I think that's the best of both worlds. The same thing is true all over the world as far as Jews are concerned. Jews can be strong Jews and strong Frenchmen.

ANNETTE: Yes. But I think that we are essentially discussing the

notion of what is strong. There's a whole school of sociologists today, who I think are making your point, and are proving it. I believe the data is there and the books are being published now, that say that in fact your point is very well taken.

MANDEL: It's a point, I don't know if it's my point.

ANNETTE: O.K. that point.

MANDEL: Yes, that point.

ANNETTE: And there's one school that argues that point. The other school will say that those ties are so limited, that when the real issues come up, these people may largely not remain Jewish, will not make the choices.

MANDEL: I understand. Right, right. I don't want this to get out of balance. This point is not a major thrust with me. We just happened to get on it. I'd say it's a minor point. And I think there are negative trends, essentially negative trends. My assessment of America, if we glob everything together, is negative. And that's why to me this is war.

I'm trying to be as objective as I can, and say there are pieces of this we ought to look at. It's not a monolith. It's not a single piece. And whereas some Jews are growing up with a thinner connection to Jewish life, than maybe was true -- then I

would like to be true -- there's a host of reasons. Only one of those reasons being time problems -- where they are dividing their time. There are other reasons. And if I were to tell you precisely where I am at today, I see this as a war that we are in the process of losing. That's my bottom line.

So this brings us back to what I think is my position.

ANNETTE: O.K., now if that is the case -- then in that war, what are the elements that we want to battle with? What I would love to hear and to know is what kinds of Jewish outcomes you would be willing to go for.

MANDEL: Yes. Exactly. My definition of that is that we want to raise a person who is a Jewish mensch. What is a Jewish mensch?

I'm going to define that person as a mensch, then it can be my values. My values, truth, justice, love thy neighbor, walk humbly with thy God, do good works, honesty. It's what Pope Pious, let's say, Pope John has as his speech -- he's right. I want that person to understand respect for individuals, you know, the whole host of the framework of Western civilization, all the things that underly Western civilization -- that's what I want this person to do -- to be a mensch. I want this person to be more than a mensch. I want this person to be a Jewish mensch. And how do you define what is a Jewish mensch. The values of a Jewish mensch and the values of a gentile mensch -- if they're both menschen -- are pretty much the same values. The difference

between Jewish menschs is the understanding of the sense of Jewish peoplehood. There's something very different about, I think, about a Jewish mensch than say all the gentile. There is this wonderful sense of peoplehood that links one Jew to another. I've never encountered it any place else -- it may be true -- maybe Scotsmen feel like that to one another -- but, there's this sense of Jewish peoplehood, the notion that one Jew should be responsible for another, which I think has been a -- just an absolutely glorious aspect of Jewish life, as far back as I can remember. Then there is I think the connection with Judaism. I think there has to be a connection with Judaism. I just don't think you're going to have Jewish education unless you have Jewish education for more than part of the values.

So this is a very tricky thing and I haven't got that all thought out, I'll be honest with you. And it is not to say that secular Jews can't be a Jewish mensch. But you know, there are aspects in that.

And I want this person to express his identification with the Jewish people by linking himself to those Jewish people in the form of involvement in the Jewish enterprise. That's not just going to shul, that's taking a piece of the responsibility for the -- not just the human condition which makes him a mensch -- but the Jewish condition, which makes him a Jewish mensch. Now that's what I want to produce. And I want young people growing up to choose that, to see themselves exposed to that -- and say, "hey I like that. They're trying to stuff my head with all that

stuff, I like it, I buy it, I want it." Because it's no longer, as you've heard me say, living through the Holocaust and the nightmare that drives people into the Jewish camp. Because these kids have to learn it the way we learned about the Peloponnesian wars. You know, they can't feel it. And it's not growing up as I did, in a Jewish neighborhood, in a very strong, thick Jewish ambience. I mean I never consciously thought about it, I breathed it in, you know. They don't have either of those 2 exposures, except in certain narrow sides -- they may have it Meah Shearim -- or maybe they got it in Williamsburgh or New York -- but just a small group of people are exposed to that. Neighborhood, ghettoizing, in maybe the most positive sense. So they've got to choose to be Jewish, and I want them to choose to be Jewish because they buy it, because it makes sense to them, because it's very logical. So they've got to be in settings in the family, and at school, and at Jewish experiences, where they're willing to commit to something because of who else is involved, because of who the leaders are, because of who the teachers are.

stuff, I like it, I buy it, I want it." Because it's no longer, as you've heard me say, living through the Holocaust and the nightmare that drives people into the Jewish camp. Because these kids have to learn it the way we learned about the Peloponnesian wars. You know, they can't feel it. And it's not growing up as I did, in a Jewish neighborhood, in a very strong, thick Jewish ambience. I mean I never consciously thought about it, I breathed it in, you know. They don't have either of those 2 exposures, except in certain narrow sides -- they may have it Meah Shearim -- or maybe they got it in Williamsburgh or New York -- but just a small group of people are exposed to that. Neighborhood, ghettoizing, in maybe the most positive sense. So they've got to choose to be Jewish, and I want them to choose to be Jewish because they buy it, because it makes sense to them, because it's very logical. So they've got to be in settings in the family, and at school, and at Jewish experiences, where they're willing to commit to something because of who else is involved, because of who the leaders are, because of who the teachers are.

ANNETTE: We're getting into content and I'd love to pursue this a bit, if that's O.K. with you --

MANDEL: Sure, it's your interview.

ANNETTE: Well, O.K. We're talking essentially about the content of the outcomes. The final product.

MANDEL: Right.

ANNETTE: Not even the content of the kind of recommendations we will come up with, which will be to develop American centers, but what will be done there. And then the question becomes -- the tools for producing this Jewish mensch. Can they be, for example, Jewish learning? Do you think -- what are the elements that will make one into a Jewish mensch, when what you have defined as the environment is not there anymore. And the family is more or less a myth, because it's not there.

What I'm asking you is how far and how willing is the kind of American Jewish person willing to be really Jewish?

MANDEL: I think there are shades Annette.

ANNETTE: I'd like then to know what it is for you.

MANDEL: I think it's a line from brilliant red to pale white, and it goes -- this whole rainbow, this whole spectrum -- and I think people should feel comfortable in maybe a variety of formulations, all of which meet the test of being a Jewish mensch.

ANNETTE: But there is a minimum, below which --

MANDEL: I don't know what the components of the minimum are. I

don't know for example, is understanding more about Purim -- is that -- I think, I sit here with all sorts of things in my head -- that are givens to me, that I haven't checked. I don't know how well they've been tested. You know, should know the holidays, they should know who Queen Esther was, and that's going to make a difference in my life. I believe it. And yet, a lot of that may be mythology. And what I want is a hardnosed search. I want like a search for the cure of cancer. I know what we want in the search for the cure of cancer; we want to eliminate cancer. We want to reduce the incidence of cancer. And we've been hacking away at it. There are now all sorts of cancers that we've learned how to cure. And the difference today over 50 years ago is startling. There's no cure for cancer that is, you know in the simplistic sense "hey, all cancers are the same; we have a single cure." All cancers are not the same; they are all different. The search for the cure for cancer -- has changed our world. I mean people are cured or there is retardation, or remission, or whatever you call it.

I think the search for how to produce the Jewish mensch will never end. And we will make gains, our inventory of small victories will be like building a beach, these little grains of sand will build a beach. We're not going to build a beach by suddenly today building a beach and having it tomorrow. We're not going to cure cancer. We know we're not going to cure cancer that way, we're not going to cure heart attacks that way. A few diseases we have had an instant cure for; I don't -- I think it's going to be very complex. And so I want the search to go on by

researchers, and practitioners, and clinicians. And I want these people who look like the Jerusalem Fellows. And I want them challenging each other, and debunking each other, and arguing with each other -- and saying, you got Purim in yours -- that's terrible. I cut out Purim and look at the kids I'm producing.

Now if we can get people mixing it up like that, of a high enough quality, in places like the Melton Center and schools and institutions and JWBs and Fond Social, then the net of that, added together over I don't know -- a hundred years -- can produce something very different than what we have now. If we have people of the quality that are seeking the cure for cancer, working in I don't know how many centers in the world -- my God, there's something at Hebrew University, there's something here, there's something at this hospital -- there must be 300 centers researching various tiny little fragmented pieces of the search for the cure for cancer. This could be the same thing. And here these crazy people at Bar Ilan -- they've got this notion about this, so they go at it, and they go to a conference, and somebody from the University of Arizona in a little center there that some Jewish family in Arizona endowed, which is searching for the best way to teach Hebrew to gifted children who are left-handed. ...

(END OF SIDE OF TAPE)

ANNETTE: Mr. Mandel, you have just defined in very broad terms what a great outcome would be. The next question then is, what

are the means to bring this about? And what is the Commission going to do for it?

You have mentioned institutions, and you have mentioned people. It's not surprising when one talks to the Orthodox, and I hear this through the interviews, and through talking to my colleagues -- they tell me well, the only thing that will really work is day-schools. Forget about everything else.

MANDEL: It's the single truth idea. You know that there is no single truth. Those of us who are smart, know there is no single truth.

ANNETTE: Is it not surprising that the Orthodox are going to sit at that Commission too, and how do we span the range of possibilities with a Commission that has such a wide variety within it? How is this process going to come along? Will it be because people will be encouraged to be in there, because they believe that in the end there is something in it for them?

MANDEL: My guess is that it's not that simple. I mean the answer to that is yes. And there are a dozen reasons. And everybody has a different mix of 3 or 4 or those reasons. Some people are there because they think maybe there's going to be money. Some people will be there because they want to be part of this, it's just attractive to them to be part of this. They're willing to spend some of their time. Some people will be there for the prestige of being on the Commission -- when they found out who else was on.

they said -- oh, I want to be on that list.

Yet, each of the players is a heavyweight. And I think there will be difficulties and if you ask me how are we going to run this Commission -- I would use three words -- "with great difficulty." That's how we're going to run this Commission. It's going to be one hell of a job. One challenging job. Because you've got 30 chairs around there, everybody is a chair, everybody could chair it. Everybody will think they can chair it better than the chair. That's wonderful. I mean that's great; I love that. We're going to have people summarizing for me -- I'm about ready to summarize, and somebody will stand up and summarize; I know it, I see it. I can hear it happening. People will be looking at their watch, how come you're spending so much time on this subject -- we've got so much more -- they will be traffic coping -- being the traffic cop -- they'll be chairing -- everybody around the table is going to be simultaneously chairing this committee; maybe not everybody. But of the 30, there will be at least 10 who are fidgety because they would chair it a little bit differently.

Well the only way to avoid that is to get a very bland group. You know and we don't have any bland -- there's nobody on this that's bland.

ANNETTE: Right.

MANDEL: So I think it's a real challenge , number one. Number two, there are also very sharp ideological differences, which is what you're bringing up, from an Esther Leah Ritz to -- I don't know who hardest right person is going to be.

ANNETTE: ... Lamm?

MANDEL: Maybe. Although Lamm is very reasonable. So I don't know -- I had a very good breakfast with him. We just had a wonderful talk. But, yes he's got a very different point of view than some other people will have and he wants different outcomes, and he'll be very impatient with certain recommendations that some people feel strongly about, as some people will be very impatient with his quote, "perceived narrowness," end quote. His perceived quote "narrowness," end quote.

ANNETTE: O.K.

MANDEL: Ah, you know, we know what we got there. We got a fabulous group. I mean this is going to be -- this is going to test us, unbelievably. And I know we're going to get hurt; I know we're going to get wounded. There is going to be blood. We're going to have some meetings where I'm going to want to jump out the window. I know it. And going in that way kind of forewarns us that this first meeting is going to be one huge learning experience. And after this first meeting, we're going to first know what we should have done for the first meeting. We're going to work to have interviews and everything, to really pre-plan the

first meeting, and there's one chance in ten that we'll hit it just right. There are I think 9 chances in 10 that we won't. And I don't know who is better than we are. I can't put a better team together. Excluding all of us, I wouldn't know how to put a better team together. And I know a lot of people. So, you know you take any one of the 10 people who think they could be a better chairman - let them pick staff, and there won't be a better staff. I'm just making a flat-out statement. So, I don't think you can do better. You know, we've got the world champion going into the ring with the other contender, and I'm satisfied that we are up to it, but we will get bloodied.

I don't know how we're going to handle all this.

ANNETTE: You made before a statement that probably was very close - we're going to have to somehow manage to get people to agree on elementary facts.

MANDEL: Yes, we need a common language. One of the first papers, one of the first pieces of work we're going to have to do is in creating the common language -- we're going to have to get some facts, like we did on the Israel experience. I mean that made the project possible in my judgment. And I don't want to weight the importance of this hard data, I do know we have to talk about it. Because we want to invest -- you know we could make a statistics project out this -- it would take 4 years -- I don't want to make a statistics project out of it yet. Are there some hard facts

that we have to get our arms around? I don't know. And what are those hard facts? I don't even know that, but I can see a setting in which maybe a group talks about it.

What's the problem? What the hell is everybody talking about? What is the problem? How many versions? There will be 30 versions of the problem if you have 30 people in the room. Let's shrink that to 6 versions if we can. We can't get 1 version; but can we get 30 to 6? We won't get one single set of recommendations either, we may have 2 or 3 major recommendations -- 8 people agree on this one; 11 people agree on this one. I just don't want 30 recommendations; 3 or 4 O.K., but not 30.

I mean conflicting points of views. We reconcile them down to maybe as few differences as we can. We're not going to get unanimity, consensus even on every issue. That's O.K.

ANNETTE: As long as we get the process moving in the right direction.

MANDEL: Yes. All I want are guys with absolutely the narrowest Orthodox traditional, whatever you want to call it, focus researching their little project on cancer; and over here, I want all the Esther Leah Ritzs researching their project on cancer. Because they're both very high quality. And they'll each make their own little contribution to the larger group. Not just a smaller group.

ANNETTE: How much research do you see going into the process of the Commission?

MANDEL: I don't know how to answer.

ANNETTE: O.K. What I mean is, would the scope of research that was done for example in the Israel Experience be acceptable to you? Do you see research really being done? Surveys?

MANDEL: I think I do. I'd want to sit down with, again, the Art Naparstek, the Seymour Foxes, the Henry Zuckers -- maybe one or two others -- and really plan it out. I don't have it designed in my head.

ANNETTE: O.K. I think none of us does at this point.

MANDEL: Yes, and we have to get to that, maybe in July.

ANNETTE: Yes.

MANDEL: Maybe your agenda for July just ask the question -- what are we going to do about this? Maybe we don't do it then; but what are we going to do about this? We don't have to have it all done by the first meeting. What are we going to do? How are we going to manage ourselves? How do we run this Commission? It's not just appointing 30 commissioners, you know, that was our first chore. And I know you're working on the agenda, but it's

more than an agenda, it's a process. We've got to design the process. You're very good at that Annette. And I think we'll put our -- Art's good at that -- we'll put our heads together; we'll do it.

ANNETTE: We certainly have a very, very broad representation on the Commission. It's an extraordinary commission. I think in the breadth of the representation that is on there.

MANDEL: It might be a weakness.

ANNETTE: Why?

MANDEL: I'm only saying, we might be so diverse, we can't get anything -- we get hung up. If we had the Americans, the Russians, the Chinese and the Libyans and the PLO at one meeting, you got so much tension in so many different ways -- that you can't function. We're testing that theory. We've got a very broad range, that grid is some grid. I think it's going to work. It may blow-up on us. There could be a bitter argument the first meeting, ideological, and people could walk out. I don't predict anything. But, the wider the range of points of view, the more exposure there is of all Norman Lamb's closest colleagues at Yeshiva University were in a room, you'd have tension -- but tension of a different kind. That's what I'm saying to you. And the hardest thing to handle is the religious ideology, that's the hardest thing. Three demoninations -- four, Reconstructionists.

ANNETTE: That's right. Yes.

Maybe one of the ways that we redeem that is that with that, would one of the ways be to give each one a piece --

MANDEL: Maybe.

ANNETTE: -- to work on.

MANDEL: Maybe, maybe.

ANNETTE: You think we don't have to answer that in advance.

MANDEL: No. Not -- see my theory of the cure for cancer, permits every shade to take a little crack at it, and make its contribution. Forever. It's like knowledge, it's like the search for knowledge. I mean papers and books are published by the thousands all over the world. And they don't have to link with anybody else. But by contributing to the sum total of the knowledge base of the world, they are linked with everybody else.

ANNETTE: You are really asking for an extremely high level of sophistication and long-range thinking by everyone present there.

MANDEL: That's what we're asking.

ANNETTE: Because they're going to cope with their immediate

concerns which are how do we fund next year's whatever?

MANDEL: What I want is to change the process from whatever it is today to one that's richer, smarter, more heavily endowed by brilliant people, more heavily endowed with funds, more involved with this partnership which I love, this volunteer-lay person-community leader-professional partnership. I want that to thicken and enrich the process in America. I want to turn the process on. I want all those water faucets wide open, lots of them, streaming. That's all I want -- that's the outcome I want. I don't want the answers -- there are no answers, answers change, answers are -- if you take a snapshot, of a point in time, you can have answers. There's a dynamic seeming changing world -- yesterday's answer is yesterday's answer, it's obsolete.

ANNETTE: O.K., let me ... O.K. let me take now an extreme response to that. When I go back to some of my staff or other people in the world, who are not Americans, they will say to me -- ah, this is the American non-content orientation. This is the American process-orientation, and what happens to content in the process?

MANDEL: The process produces content.

ANNETTE: O.K.

MANDEL: What is the process? There is no process with no content.

ANNETTE: Well what you are essentially --

MANDEL: The output of the -- there has to be an output. I want to build lots of factories. My head says -- get hi-tech factories, state-of-the-art factories, run by professional managers who have units that are constantly looking at that factory, to make it more hi-tech, more efficient, more effective -- one and two. To be sure what it's turning out. There's a demand for it and a need for it. And so they need marketing skills, they have to segment their market and decide where they want to be, they may have to try and be the best in that segment of the market. And be very high quality, low-cost producers. So they need to be constantly looking at the machine they ordered 2 years ago that they finally get set up today is already obsolete, and they've got to be immediately working on the replacement. They haven't got it to bug yet. But they've got to be looking ahead now, working on their replacement. Because the end product is not the machine. The end product is not the manufacturing process; the end product is a combination of the marketing skills, the manufacturing skills and the planning skills and the people skills, and all the things that go into managing, with managing and organization, which one could call process. But the process has to be a product-line that gets its test in the market place. People buy it. O.K.

We have to have outputs, the process is no process if it doesn't -- if it isn't measurable by the quality of its content.

it's output. I'm not a manager. I want to be a leader, not a manager.

ANNETTE: O.K., I'm continuing on the their line --

MANDEL: O.K. continue on it.

ANNETTE: O.K.? Even if it's -- O.K. Their line will go as follows: This is not building factories. This is dealing with ideas. And in our world, of ideas, this is what my philosophers will say -- look what happens when you let a JDC loose in France, it says we want to double -- and the Jewish Agency -- this year we want to double the number of kids going to schools in France. Then show the money there -- they have a profit -- whereby the guys who are really interested in Jewish education, that is the fanatics, total right-wing, unenlightened poor education, come in, say we'll do it. Since the JDC wants to double the numbers -- they are there, they get the funds, and what do you have of an outcome? You come back 10 days later, you judge ... 2, and suddenly you see 90% of your -- 70% of your schools in France are schools where no sound person would want to send their children. And there's no alternative choice.

Why? They will say to me -- that is because the JDC never sat down to think, to think, and to say -- what we want is enlightened Jewish education too and therefore we must make sure, because we know what content is about, that fanaticism doesn't

100% of the kids, but only the 5% of the cake at the edge that it deserves. That way we would have had today a network of community schools in France where people could send their children. How do we deal with that?

MANDEL: This is exactly how we deal with that.

ANNETTE: O.K.

MANDEL: You have a factory and you meet with your philosophers; you have a factory. My word factory is not ... a tangible machine. Nativ is a factory -- you can call it what you want. I'll call it a factory.

ANNETTE: Factory - O.K.

MANDEL: And you have machines called people. And you try and assemble the best machinery you can, and motivate it and keep it oiled and all these things. I can use the factory -- I can use the machine kind of as a figure of speech, but you have machines. Your machines have two legs and they walk. You're concerned about the care and the feeding of those machines. The proper functioning of those machines; getting them to be more hi-tech, uptraining them to be more effective. You may send them to take a course instead of putting on a robot, but it's just looking at the producing unit, which can take any form. And wanting to constantly upgrade the quality of the output of that producing unit. So that's one thing -- you're running a factory.

Number two, let's get to that argument. You know what's wrong with the JDC? A producing unit like yours, a factory like yours, hasn't looked at the JDC. And what's wrong - the problem is not that the fanatics are getting the money.

ANNETTE: What?

MANDEL: The problem is that the Joint is not operating the way it should operate. That's the problem. The JDC doesn't understand what you think you understand. And the problem there is not the fanatics at all. We can't deal with the fanatics. I wouldn't touch the fanatics. We have to deal -- we have to look at the chain, chain of events -- and say - where can we -- whether we -- let's say we as MI-G, or MI-NA in the United States -- no, no, MI-NA is going to be temporary. There's got to be, there's got to be something in the United States before we're finished here, like the right JESNA and the right JWB and maybe DJF and maybe seminaries. There has to be an equivalent of MI-G in the United States. Before we're finished, I know we're going to want that. And they sit around and -- MI-G now looks at the Joint and says - - look what they're doing, they're screwing us up here. This is horrendous -- these dumb decisions. And we're looking in the mirror, and we see our faces, and we say we're the problem because we have not come up with the solution, and we have not come up with the solution and implemented it. So one could say -- well, how do you do that? We don't need anybody's hechsher. Who

has to give us permission to decide at MI-G, we want to engage with the JDC in some kind of exercise. And run a quality improvement process for the JDC. Which we dare not ever say that way.

But we might want to do a number, as we say in the States, on JDC. We may want intervene wherever there are points of intervention. And I find nothing inconsistent with a process which identifies the problem, identifies the appropriateness of that problem for a given factory, decides it's appropriate, then figures out alternative ways of intervening and try and intervene. That's not demeaning process; that's using process. And I would say that about JDC and I would say that about Brandeis, and I would say that about JWR, and I would say that about Hebrew University -- hell, we went into Hebrew University with their Melton program -- it's not the same thing it was before; we intervened. That's process. And it's sort of an A to B, B to C, C to D, D to E. We have to know how to do that brilliantly. And it's the same process every place.

(Interruption)

I want to tell you something. The medium is the message. Don't under-rate the process. There is enormous power in process, it's merely a systematic form of thinking, that's all it is.

ANNETTE: Yes, I was going to say something --

MANDEL: Just systematic.

ANNETTE: I mean obviously I have been with this process and been part of this outcome, and I love it. So, what you have done as an answer to my guys in my office, is to say just a moment -- we have the content unit built into the process. And what you call process essentially, and maybe we should speak about that -- what are the elements of the process that make it a good one? Because, as you speak, I say to myself -- goodness, the Commission must make sure to have that MI-G or MI-NA 2, or whatever it is look at it as a crux all the time. Or it must have something built within its process that does that kind of mirror thinking -- that says, just a moment Commission -- you are going to -- in a silly direction.

MANDEL: That's right. Right. Right.

ANNETTE: O.K.

MANDEL: That's the group of 7 maybe, that has to be constantly correcting. Constantly upgrading. We're going to learn alot about MI-NA. I mean I'd like to have the first meeting over with. I'm ... I know what's going to happen. I can't wait to sit around that table, pick ourselves up from the floor, I think we're the best there is. I don't think -- that's arrogant -- but I don't think there's a better group. No one can pull this off better than we can.

ANNETTE: I want to go back to the first part of the conversation,

which dealt with the scope. And in a way, you've answered it, but I'd like to make it more concrete.

When you tell in fact in a very concrete way of the outcomes 5 years from now, 10 years from now -- where you have this enormous search, that is what you call it, and I'm -- it's a very applications of them being from a ... findings --

MANDEL: Correct. The definition of ...

ANNETTE: O.K. you are in fact deciding to take on something of the magnitude of cancer, give it a very wide variety of answers. You are putting your players in the commission with the variety of tools so that indeed you have the beginnings of it.

I would like to know -- you have given the answer of scope, in fact you really want to ..., to impact the whole system. You want to impact the whole of American Jewish society.

MANDEL: No doubt.

ANNETTE: O.K. Isn't that wonderful.

MANDEL: No doubt.

ANNETTE: O.K. And it is probably feasible.

MANDEL: Doable you mean?

ANNETTE: Doable.

MANDEL: I think it's doable. I'm willing to spend some time finding out.

ANNETTE: Yes, O.K. The question that is of interest to us when we speak about outcomes then -- is a more concrete one. What kind of machine do we have to have at the end of the process of the Commission that will make this happen?

MANDEL: You mean the Commission ends, what carries it forward -- what implementation body or --? Yes, that is the question for the Commission. For example -- what should JESNA be? What should JWB be? What should Hebrew Union College be? What units need to be existent that carry on the work of MI-NA? For MI-NA? MI-NA can't be born, create a scenario and die, because this is a dynamic -- we want to create an environment; we want to create a -- there I go with the word process again -- we want to create a chain of events that is self-perpetuating.

ANNETTE: Yes, I think there's nothing wrong with the process.

MANDEL: Process -- O.K.

ANNETTE: The way we've done it has been great.

MANDEL: Yes, yes, that's what we want to do. We want to create a very rich, --, a highly competitive process.

ANNETTE: Can we stay a moment with this notion of environment for the competitive process?

MANDEL: Yes.

ANNETTE: What are its elements? You've named 2 elements, and I'd like to elaborate. You've said, you need top people to be doing the work and they will have to be produced. And then you have all these institutions, JESNA, JWB and others.

To create this competitive process or environment, what are the elements that we have to look at? That was --

MANDEL: Of course, you know, there's a long jump from here to there Annette. First of all to be very clear -- I'm way out there. Because to me, unless I know where I'm going, any road will get you there. If you don't know where you're going, you can take any road. You understand. You have to say here -- hey, where are you going? And you talk about a bold formulation compared to what we've got. Now we have elements of this. But it's not systematically attacked, there's no systematic effort, ongoing, that takes a larger view, a North American view. Let alone a global view.

And we have to -- if you want to start at the very beginning

of the process -- the very beginning of what kind of things we want to accomplish -- it's what do we want to be in place? To sustain and nourish this system. Well, maybe we can look at the medical fraternity. What's in place in medicine? What causes there to be cancer research? What's in place in other forms of endeavour. Can we learn in education? What causes there to be educational ... well as a matter of fact, there is not enough educational ... There's certainly a lot of cancer research.

ANNETTE: Yes, but there you have the human motivation factor.

MANDEL: Alright, well, yes, alright, O.K. And I haven't got it all figured out. I can't be that helpful. So what -- what forms of organization need to be in place to just sustain this idea, this set of ideas, just to keep the system going? And maybe it's a coordinating council called the North American Coordinating Council which has a small staff, and made up of JESNA, JWB, CJF, Hebrew Union College -- I don't know -- maybe a dozen institutions.

ANNETTE: Yes, I think we can stop where you say that we recognize that there probably will be needed some form of mechanism.

MANDEL: right -- mechanisms maybe. Mechanism, mechanisms.

ANNETTE: We will be faced soon with that problem.

MANDEL: Right.

ANNETTE: And right now, let's just call it -- mechanisms -- or

MANDEL: O.K., yes. Right. We know that we can't quit --

ANNETTE: Unless we have that.

MANDEL: Unless something is in place to -- you know, this is a fight for -- this is for eternity.

ANNETTE: Yes. ... big job. How do you view the whole public relations issue? I've often been puzzled, and today is a good day, at what seems to me to be maybe your reluctance to deal with the media, or non-belief in their impact.

MANDEL: I have the same problem, probably criticism, thoroughly leveled at me at Premier.

ANNETTE: You do?

MANDEL: Yes, I tend to be for some reason or other, more comfortable with a low profile not a high profile. And therefore I don't have big P.R. machinery getting my picture on the cover of magazines, which some of my colleague friends do. I do happen to get a lot of P.R. as it happens anyway, but I think we have to look at this as a tool and not worry about my own sensitivities. We have to do what's right. If we need P.R., we get P.R. If we

want articles written, we'll get articles written. If we want interviews, we'll get interviews.

I think we need a very smart P.R. process and I don't know how to define that, but I think we need a pro-active P.R. process. We have to manage the P.R., no doubt.

ANNETTE: O.K., because here it becomes a matter of educating communities.

MANDEL: No doubt. We need a pro-active thoughtful process capable, complete enough and good enough or high enough quality or whatever the words are, to match our needs. We have to define our needs. We have to say -- O.K., here's the P.R. publics -- we'll identify them. What do we want these people to feel about us? O.K., the organized Jewish community, maybe community center field. We want A, B, C, D, and E in their heads. What do we want about the rabbinate? A, B, C and D. That's the way we tackle that.

Once we've got that, then we know how to launch our P.R. Now you're right back in everything you talked to me about, to pretty much the same approach. We remain systematic -- where do we want to be? What's our vision? Let's concretize it, so we're talking a bunch of words. What specifically, what sentences do we want in the heads of this particular public? O.K. Now we're at point zero, how do we get there and let's just measure ourselves every

month, every day, every week -- how far along have we come? And I take that approach to everything.

ANNETTE: O.K., well just out of curiosity -- I would ask you the question of whether you think that your attitude to P.R. has ever harmed anything?

MANDEL: Nothing.

ANNETTE: O.K. Therefore, the question is -- why do we need it? If it hasn't harmed anything, then why do we need it?

MANDEL: Need what?

ANNETTE: P.R.

MANDEL: We need P.R. because I have engaged in P.R., it's just that I personally have -- I put alot of other people out front. That's all I mean --

END OF SIDE OF TAPE

MANDEL: Yes, there were slightly different, depending on the host and beautiful -- and I love to go from research to whatever and whatever, to whatever - I love it, to me it's process. Beautiful process.

ANNETTE: Yes, that's what it was -- process.

MANDEL: We got it, we know how to do it. Do the same thing in the States. Your Jewish Education Committee is the Commission. We'll have sub-committees I'm sure, well they would share -- the problem is, it's very very real problem is -- the life of the Commission. You see, we took 4 years in the Jewish Education Committee, we've got forever really. If we were staying with the Jewish Education Committee in another world -- we just keep going. And as this thing drops off and becomes actual, you know activated -- and installed -- we monitor it and we fine-tune it forever and we're constantly giving it a physical exam, like a doctor with a patient. But we're off on to the next one. And we just keep multiplying. And pretty soon you've got 300 things going. YOU know, 20 years goes by and you've all this stuff happening. You've changed Jewish education.

The Jewish Education Committee could change Jewish education. It just wasn't meant to be the vehicle. So, we got the

methodology.

ANNETTE: Yes, one of the problems that you've alluded to and it's very real, is the fact that so many of the commissioners are heavyweights, or see themselves as being chair people in their own right.

MANDEL: And are.

ANNETTE: And are -- O.K. How are we going to deal with that -- how do you view --

MANDEL: That's when I used the 3 words before.

ANNETTE: Yes. You don't want to elaborate --

MANDEL: Yes, I'll elaborate on it.

ANNETTE: It's such a real problem.

MANDEL: It's a very -- it's a huge problem. Can you imagine getting a committee with 10 guys on it, like Seymour Fox. One of them is the chair. All feel very comfortable about their position and their knowledge. And they're all jacks. Now they -- that system has been made to work in medicine, it's been made to work in academia. We can make it work.

ANNETTE: O.K. can we elaborate --

MANDEL: But there's a lot of fighting and petty jealousies and a lot of -- you know, there's a lot of stuff that takes place. Ask Seymour -- you don't have to ask me. You know it produces tension.

ANNETTE: O.K. why are they going to stay with it?

MANDEL: Oh, I wish I had the answer to that. You'd better come up with answers to that.

ANNETTE No, I'm sure they will.

MANDEL: I'm not sure. We're going to do our best to earn our wings every day, as they say, to constantly keep justifying that they should come to the next meeting. They're going to stay with it because if they do stay with it is because they have respect for each other. They have respect for the management of the Commission; they have respect for the agenda, the way we're approaching it. If they have respect for those 3 things, they already have respect for the notion, or they would have said no. So, we -- that's the one thing we have going for us -- respect for the notion. Now they've got to have respect for each other. I think we've got that. When each guy walks in the room and looks around, first thing they're going to do is count the house. And say -- who am I in here with? We're going to pass that test.

So I think there are two tests we've passed -- respect for the concept, notion; respect for the peer group. Then they've got to have respect for the management, me, the 7, the 5 of us, or whoever it is. Then they have got to have respect for what they're asked to do and how they're asked to do it -- the whole process. The approach -- is it serious or is it frivolous? You know -- I don't want them to say what am I doing here. My God, I flew to New York for this. If we pass that test, which I believe we will, O.K. then we'll hook them. Now to set the hook firmly, requires 2 or 3 meetings and their engagement. They have to be engaged. they have to be on a sub-committee; they have to be in a group of no more than, what, 6, 7 -- so they can have dialogue and they have to like the chair of that sub-committee and they have to like the staff of that sub-committee; and they have to feel comfortable that this is no waste of time, rather, it's in fact the way much of the work of the Commission is going go on.

Then, we have to have a ambiance that permits all of this to happen, without blowing up. Because the ambiance to me is very important in any of these endeavours - very important. It's important in anything; it's important in your shop, it's important in mine; it's important in the Jewish Agency; it's important in the Commission. We have to work on the ambiance. We have to have the right setting, our logistics have to be as comfortable and easy for people as they can be. We can't be clumsy, we can't look like we -- you know, it can't be amateur night, with the food not being there, and the hotel rooms not being there and the meeting room too small, and too hot -- dumb

little things. We have to be just very intense on these dumb little things. Because people don't so much notice the actions of those dumb little things consciously. They do unconsciously. And if they identify ... these dumb little things, something does not click on unconsciously. It kind of is yellow instead of green -- it's yellow, you know --

ANNETTE: I'd like to go one step further. Because you're talking of the life of the Commission, the process of the Commission and the things that we have to be careful for, while it goes on. At the end, what will engage them to invest themselves into it?

Is it true the assumption that I have toyed around with -- that they don't really know truly what they would like to do for the ... let's say -- you have invested yourself in Jewish education and are doing so -- you have invested yourself in the United Way -- in the university -- is it true that some of these foundations don't really have a direction, and therefore that this might be a direction for them?

MANDEL: I think the foundations that we have invited, as nearly as I can tell, all have Jewish, a major Jewish stress.

ANNETTE: Yes.

MANDEL: I would also guess none of them have a major Jewish thrust as they're exclusive direction. And if you're talking

about that group, the say philanthropists, what's going to cause them to want to pick up a module and finance it?

ANNETTE: Yes, yes.

MANDEL: The Bronfmann center at McGill University -- like the Melton Center --

ANNETTE: Yes, yes.

MANDEL: -- well, the involvement in the process and the working of the Commission will lead to understanding, and understanding leads to commitment. You get them committed, they'll take a piece. So we've got to involve them. Charles Bronfmann can't come to this meeting, or worse not come to this meeting, and send Manny Batshaw -- and then you spend time with Manny Batshaw -- and Manny Batshaw reports to Charles. We'll lose. That's possible. You know he's accepted, but I don't know what that means. So somehow we have to get around Manny; maybe we take the Commission to Bronfmann, wherever -- after every meeting, if he doesn't show up. Some way we have to involve him, we have to get him on a sub-committee. We have to figure out how to have him come to a sub-committee, or maybe he's chair of the sub-committee. If he's chair of the sub-committee, we'll get him.

I can't have 6 sub-committees all chaired by the Foundation, but I'm thinking out loud with you -- I haven't really thought this out. I can tell you one thing - I followed this rule of

thumb for years and it works. Involvement leads to understanding; understanding leads to commitment. The key is involvement. There cannot be a link made if there's a passive connection. They have to be working; they have to be involved; not just coming to a Commission meeting -- that's not work. No credit for coming to the Commission meeting. You only earn credit by being on a sub-committee meeting or somehow maybe you and a consultant have a particular piece of research and you're guiding that consultant. We can manufacture jobs.

And by the way, one of the challenges to us is to manufacture jobs. We have to get everybody on that Commission working. And it cannot be what is called "make work." They'll see through us. They'll kill us; they'll hang us, so it's got to be legitimate pieces of work and we have to have our grip -- 30 commissioners - what are they working on? We have to know what their attendance has been at the main meetings; we have to know what their sub-committee assignments are; and what their attendance is. We have to know what they personally are producing, what outputs are we getting from them. We've got to monitor -- you've heard the word monitor -- we've got to monitor each commission person.

I mean -- and then you've got to make sure that I don't complex this thing to the point where we have such a huge apparatus that we drown in it, so maybe we don't do all these things. I'm kind of brainstorming with you.

ANNETTE: Yes. I don't know if you heard Manny yesterday, where he claims -- if it's really true or not -- that one of the motivations for Charles Bronfmann was the informal education piece. And what clicks immediately -- is well, maybe there is a piece there which he would like to go to, and which we can identify early on and then --

MANDEL: That will be the Bronfmann program?

ANNETTE: Yes.

MANDEL: For such and such. Sure.

ANNETTE: That could very well be. So you essentially see the Commissioners as being very active group. You see them -- no --

MANDEL: One of the negatives with asking this kind of person, is they're very busy.

ANNETTE: Yes.

MANDEL: One of the positives of asking this kind of person, is that they're very busy. Because very busy people tend to be the most productive. And if they're not busy; so that scares you away. So by definition, you're limited to busy people -- my thinking -- I only go after busy people; I don't go after anybody who has a lot time.

ANNETTE: Yes.

MANDEL: If they've got a lot of leisure time already, there's something there -- I wonder what it is, you know. That's number 1. So then, if that's the type of person you want, you've got to take his baggage with him, which is he hasn't got any time. And there's a normal, there's a normal drive within him not to go to the meeting. There's a normal drive within him to say no. It's a conditioned reflex -- Ted loves Dot. He's not doing it because he doesn't like us, he's doing it because every time somebody asks him something -- his mind quickly gets to how can I say no. He doesn't even say what is it. It's I suppose a ... Now you have 30 of these people -- my God -- O.K. If we can get 20 of them involved, I'd be thrilled. Some such number you know. Because we'll strike out, we'll fail, maybe with Twersky or maybe we'll fail with Schiff or maybe we'll fail with ... -- I don't know. We'll fail with some. But that's alright. We don't have to get them all. If we can get a critical mass. If we don't involve 20 or so, we're in trouble.

ANNETTE: Yes, we'd better get --

MANDEL: I'd like to get 30 you know.

ANNETTE: We'd better quickly then to the taskforces in the process.

MANDEL: I think the taskforces have to be either set up at the first meeting, or flow right out of the first meeting, and set up before the second meeting. So that at the second meeting, taskforce chairs report. In other words, we need some formulation which gets into taskforces fast. You know when we lay out these 24 months, you'll see, we don't have enough time. No way. That's a very real problem here.

But we said we're going to have our meeting this summer, instead of postponing it to fall. And it's panic and everything else. But unless we set some of those deadlines, hey, we're never going to make it. So we're going to hang on to that 24 months and stuff everything we want to do in those 24 months and stuff that -- and movements, processes, projects, things, pieces of work that we want to do -- that don't fit into the 24 months -- then have to throw them out.

ANNETTE: What?

MANDEL: It's a terrible discipline to --

ANNETTE: Well I think that -- we have had strong lessons -- so it works, that's what works.

I think that essentially you know who the other members of the Commission are, so we don't have to cover that item of the interview. I think essentially I have covered -- we have covered

quite a bit of ground.

It is very interesting that and I think correct, you are -- you've begun essentially by deflecting the interview and the discussion from dealing with the content element, by virtue of postulating that we don't know what -- we don't have the answers. And the best we can do, is to -- I think I'm summarizing -- the best we can do, and what we want to do, is to create the process of search.

MANDEL: High grade search. JWB has to be turned into a high grade power R & D operation. As one piece of what they do. They have to be engaged in the fray. I don't know what their piece is, but we have to maybe help define it. JWB, what's their piece? What's CJF's piece? We probably can list 15-16 institutions. What's their piece in energizing this search process? And what part of the search do they engage in? We have to look at the map of North America and my vision is not this Jewish mensch; my vision is this search process.

The map I see is this search units and search endeavours, and the map of North America -- and frankly the map of the Jewish world -- if we had 15 Melton Centers and 26 Jerusalem programs -- Paris Fellows, Cleveland Fellows -- you know, playing around with Cleveland Fellows now -- these are beautiful ideas, gorgeous ideas. We don't need many -- maybe 6, 6 powerful ideas. Just get them going everywhere. We don't need a whole bunch. They need to

be high grade and replicated. And it maybe is a book this thick -
- every it has a book this thick - best practices book. And then
we need a North American view, and over the North American view,
a world view -- nudging and catalyzing and kicking and gouging
and repairing, firemen fighting fires, you know -- we'll organize
the world. Between MI-B which is the ultimate, and MI-NA which is
one unit of the globe, it's one continent of the 5 continents,
it's 1 continent. And MI-NA may be a flop. If MI-NA is a flop,
we'll start all over again. We have to help the North American
Jewish community do this. And by the way, you will soon get to
the fact that North America is not an isolated, North America
does not operate in a vacuum. MI-NA can't be alone. MI-NA can
only function if MI-NA's linked to me. I mean the researchers in
Montreal are going to have to be just as close to the researchers
in Zaire as they are in Kansas City. I mean, the piece of work
they're really interested in might be in Zaire. What are we going
to cut off linkages? We going to have big walls? YOU know this
whole network is going to be electronically linked.

They'll just go right to their machine and they'll have
voice mail, and they'll have databanks, and they can - you know.
That's what we'll have in 25 years.

Now if we have -- if we can learn in North America what the
heck we're talking about, and have a demonstration, takkah, a
real demonstration project in North America -- we have something
from which some lessons are transferrable. If we can find another
group as crazy as us, in France or England or South Africa or

Israel. Israel -- boy are ready here for a MI-NA. And now all these MI-NAs are going to be linked together.

I have to believe, I want to believe that there's a computer program that links all the cancer researchers together. I want to believe that. If there isn't ... I'll die. But, I want to believe that. And that the work that Rabin does, if he's the guy here, he's a computer man -- or the work that they're doing at Hebrew University and the work that they're doing in Kansas City -- somehow these link, are linked somehow. O.K.

IN any event, we've got a lifetime, we've got a lifetime. We've got work for a series of lifetimes.

ANNETTE: Well it sounds very exciting and very wonderful. And doable by virtue of being a process, I'm using the word --

MANDEL: Because processes can live forever.

ANNETTE: And are not very -- they are not statically defined.

MANDEL: Exactly.

ANNETTE: They are changing all the time.

MANDEL: Look at the practice of medicine -- I mean what better example do you need. Medicine is an evolving part, it's not a

static part. We shouldn't have a commission to just do this. What we want in the medicine are centers of learning and centers of thought and centers of research constantly probing and extending man's frontiers. And multiple ones. Everywhere we want them. And we got them in medicine.

ANNNETTE: You know one of the very interesting things in this conversation -- I think every interview I will have and have had, has in it an element of a very threatening to those segments of American Jews who don't want that specific view applied to them. And yours by virtue of allowing the expression of any type of belief, ideologies, etc. takes totally out the threatening elements.

MANDEL: Not just allows -- I really want to change that word to encourages.

ANNETTE Yes. Encouragement is --

MANDEL: Look I want the hard right if I can impact them, just impact them by having them turn out a Jewish mensch -- that's all. What's a Jewish mensch? Well, O.K., I don't care about the pious, and I don't care about the tzitzis hanging out -- you know all these things -- well to me they're peripheral. I care about what the values that are being inculcated in these young boys and girls, that's all I care about. And you know who is to say -- why isn't that the best way? I mean, I don't have to judge it.

ANNETTE: And you don't mind if he comes out and says -- look, the only way to make a mensch, is if he studies Talmud from six in the morning to 12 at night.

MANDEL: No, I want him to do that, I want him to raise his children to be a Jewish mensch. My dream is that in, not the methodology, but the set of attitudes and values in these heads have a lot of common ... that's my dream. I don't care how he gets there. That's more fun if people get there different ways.

ANNETTE: O.K. well I thank you very much.