ORAL HISTORY OF:

INTERVIEWED BY:

DATE OF INTERVIEW:

LOCATION OF INTERVIEW:

SUBJECT MATTER:

Charlotte Dubin
Thursday, November 10, 2005
Jewish Federation
personal and family history, role
as executive director of Jewish
Federation, world scene of Jewish
philanthropy (second interview)

Robert Aronson

\_\_\_\_

MS. DUBIN: I'm Charlotte Dubin on behalf of the Leonard N. Simons Jewish Community Archives. I'm conducting part two of an oral history interview with Robert Aronson, chief executive officer of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit. It's November 10, 2005, and we're at the Max M. Fisher Federation Building. Mr. Aronson, I'd like to focus on your recollections of some important Federation events and your views on issues that we didn't have time to cover in our first interview.

Let's start with Israel. I know how important it's always been to you and you've told us how the Yom Kippur War made a great impact on your life. Not long after you came to Detroit there was another war, a smaller war, but it posed a threat to Israel, and that was of course the Persian Gulf War. Do you have any recollections of that time?

MR. ARONSON: I do remember it because I believe

that the night that the first rockets hit in Tel Aviv, I remember Michael Borke, who was at the time the executive director of the Federation, coming up to me. We had a campaign opening meeting at Shaarey Zedek that night. He came up to me and said they're firing poison gas at Israel. That stuck in my memory because I remember how terrified we all were when the first scuds hit. Everyone knew Israel was going to be in danger. Even though Iraq had threatened to fire missiles at Israel, we really didn't believe that it would happen. When the smoke cleared, it was not a big deal, but in the period of the war it was very frightening for Israelis, for American Jews, et cetera. I have a very clear recollection of that time and mobilizing staff -- you were with me at the time -- and lay leadership to try to deal with all the issues about the war.

MS. DUBIN: There have been many crises since and some of them have to do with immigration issues. The Soviet Jewry, Ethiopian Jewry, and we're seeing now that there will be more Ethiopians coming to Israel. Anything you could tell us about the way Israel is responding to those issues and how Detroit is getting involved.

MR. ARONSON: First of all, maybe a little background on the Israel/Detroit connection because I think it's important. Apart from my own feelings which are brought to the job of concern for the connection of Israel, this

community has always had a very strong commitment, I might even call it a first commitment to overseas funding and to Israel in general. Our past leadership for many years were all very Israel oriented people. Max Fisher especially. Paul Zuckerman. Other people from this community who shaped the community were very Israel oriented. That's why today we still have much more so than other communities, and I've been around the country and I've seen it, there is still a bedrock foundation of major support for needs in Israel and overseas, for involvement in Israel programs. And the challenge to this community going forward as the relationship of Israel changes from one of simply sending money to involvement in projects, the challenge for us is to figure out how we can engage our younger newer generations of people in Israel projects that excite them and motivate and interest them. We are going through a transition with our relationship with Israel which our founding fathers and mothers really never foresaw. So how we deal with Israel as a community in the future, I think, is one of the two or three critical issues for the Federation to be dealing with.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. DUBIN: Tell us about Partnership 2000.

MR. ARONSON: Partnership 2000 is a project that basically does what we were just talking about, which is trying to create a connection. It is a partnership between the Jewish communities in the state of Michigan, especially

Grand Rapids, Ann Arbor and Detroit, with the central Galilee region of Israel, which is Migdal Ha'emek, Nazaret Ilit, Emec Israel, which is the Jezrell Valley.

The project is about taking some dollars which we call elective dollars, apart from our allocation, and jointly with Israeli volunteers in the region spending those dollars, primarily on people-to-people programs in Israel. But the key to Partnership 2000 is the development of a new core of volunteers in Israel, which is new for them, and connections, personal and otherwise, and charitable connections with people in our community and creating lasting relationships where people feel good about the connection. So for instance over the course of the last five years we've brought almost a 1,000 children from Israel to Camp Tamarack for the summer. Many of them from the region.

In a way it started with the int@fada when we couldn't send our kids to Israel. We've continued it since then. But it's an example of a Partnership 2000 program which focuses on connections now and for the future. It's been tremendously successful.

The partnership is an evolution of an earlier concept called Project Renewal. Project Renewal was twinning our community with two other communities in Israel, first Ramla and then Yavna, and taking some of our dollars and spending them specifically in those areas, so that when the

Detroit community would go to Israel, we would go to Ramla and Yavna, just as now we go to the central Galilee.

What was missing in the Project Renewal was the grass roots involvement of the residents of the area. That's what we focused on in Partnership 2000. One might argue, and some do, that the partnership has been more beneficial for the Israelis than for us in Detroit, but I don't feel that's the case. I feel that people who are involved in it feel a deep and abiding connection for the people of Israel. That's really what we're after in Partnership 2000, and that's what we're after in our relationships in the future.

There really was a time in our history, and it was a significant time and helped build this Federation, when Israel's survival was at stake and people gave money primarily for Israel. The irony is, is that today our major donors still give money primarily for Israel, despite the fact that we are much more involved in our local community and funding many more things, especially Jewish education in this community, that we never really did before. But the primary motivation of our major donors is still what's going on in Israel and how they feel about it. So how we move that relationship forward in a new way without throwing out the old association but building on it in terms of people-to-people projects really is critical for the future of this community.

MS. DUBIN: Is there a personal experience you've

had with Partnership 2000 that comes to mind when you want to talk about its success?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ARONSON: There are so many that it would be hard for me. I think off the top of my head if I think about the camp experience with the young people from Nazaret Ilit, immigrant kids, Russians, Ethiopians, people coming here and experiencing Tamarack for a summer. When I see the kids and they come up to me and say this was the greatest experience of my life and I talk to their parents and they say you know it's really affected us and made us want to be more Jewish in our homes in Israel, the kids come back from Tamarack with something as simple as lighting candles on a Friday night, something that they want to do that they learned at Tamarack. All of a sudden a family in Israel is beginning to observe Jewish customs and traditions, which is not normal in the central Galilee. To see those connections and those personal experiences, when I talk to the kids, is one of the greatest satisfactions I've had as a professional and I think one of the real benefits of the program.

MS. DUBIN: What about the Ethiopian immigration, has Israel responded well, in your opinion?

MR. ARONSON: Well, the Ethiopian immigration has been problematic in Israel from the beginning. When the first Ethiopians came over in Operation Solomon, the integration of the Ethiopians was very difficult. They were put into

caravans, mobile homes, the kids were taken away and put into Orthodox boarding schools. The immigration had a lot of problems. Primarily because of the social and cultural issues, the Ethiopians could not be integrated effectively into society.

The new emphasis, which this community is involved in, through what's called the PACT program, Parents and Children Together, in Natanya, which happens to be the largest Ethiopian population in Israel, is really to focus on education and to try to level the playing field for Ethiopian children, in this particular case between the ages of zero and six years old, in terms of integrating them into the educational system, teaching Hebrew, helping the parents learn basic social skills which many do not have, and to try to get the kids to compete on an equal level in the educational system, in the secular system.

When the kids were pulled out and put into the Orthodox system, they were removed in effect from Israeli society. It's almost like getting to do a redo right now with the Ethiopian population.

There's now a new population coming in which is even more problematic. They're called the Falashmora. They are Christians today, although their ancestors were Jewish. They have to go through a conversion process. They are even more culturally different, one might say primitive perhaps than

even the earlier populations.

I think Israel is beginning to come to grips with the fact that education is the key to the integration of the Ethiopians. It hasn't worked well. Everybody means well, but the population has really not integrated as effectively as it should have. That's what we're working on now.

There's over 100,000 Ethiopians currently living in Israel. The families are large and getting larger. It's an issue that has to be dealt with in Israeli society.

MS. DUBIN: You mentioned that deneral Assembly of North American Jewry will be taking place next week. Will that issue come up?

MR. ARONSON: I think the issue will come up.

There's a national campaign now to bring the Falashmora to

Israel. It's having mixed results. There are many

communities, including Detroit, that have their own programs;

just as we have a Natanya, other communities have elsewhere.

I think the issue will come up. There is still a tremendous

amount of agitation to bring as many Falashmora out of

Ethiopia as possible, but I don't see it as being a disruptive

or overwhelming issue at the GA. I think there are other

issues there.

MS. DUBIN: Tell us what they are.

MR. ARONSON: I believe, and if this is for posterity, which I think it is, we have to take kind of a

longer view, that the very idea of the national organization is the issue at the general assembly. It's now called the United Jewish Communities. It used to be United Jewish Appeal and Council of Jewish Federations and United Israel Appeal. Make a very long story short the three were merged at the request of Federations so that we would have a more accountable and effective national system.

Over the years the national system I believe has been seriously weakened and diminished. As my old friend Max Fisher would have said, the reason for a national system at the end of the day really is to mobilize support for overseas Jewry in Israel. The allocations from communities to Israel has been going down dramatically. The creation of the national system has not stemmed the reduction in overseas dollars. The notion for advocacy for Israel, which was what the UJA was all about, has been diminished. Even the name UJA, which is a household name in virtually every Jewish home throughout America, the name no longer exists as part of the organization.

So I think the challenge for us as a federated system today and certain five, ten and 20 years from how is what kind of national system do we want. Do you still want a kind of a dominant expensive national system that is going to speak on behalf of the Federations and mobilize Federations for collective action, such as the current Ethiopian campaign?

Or are we going to have an organization which is more of a, for lack of a better word, a trade association, which will bring us together but not have a strong central presence.

That's the issue before us right now.

And I believe that we are probably moving away from a expensive strong central American Jewish Federation organization and we're going to be moving more towards individual community action. I believe that's the trend. I believe that's really the core issue facing the UJC today.

MS. DUBIN: In the past, because of the issues that have come before American Jewry, there has been a central spokes organization. Will that be diminished?

MR. ARONSON: I have always felt, perhaps unpopularly, that United Jewish Communities or whatever our national organization is does not have to speak for us on most issues. We don't need resolutions calling for the end of suicide bombing in Iraq or in Israel for that matter. There are other Jewish organizations that are spokesperson organizations. You have the Conference of Presidents, you have ADL. Every Jewish organization speaks out and says it speaks out for American Jewry on all issues.

I don't see that as the role of the United Jewish Communities. I see it as a mobilizing role, bringing the Federations together where there are crises and challenges that transcend individual communities.

Now, to be fair in the course of the last several months UJC has done really a great job of mobilizing Jewish support for hurricane Katrina victims and has raised from all of us well over \$30 million and has become the information center, the distribution center for needs, not just Jewish needs but across all lines for hurricane Katrina victims.

That's an example of how the national system should work. But it should be working that way even when there isn't an emergency. That is not what is happening today.

The trend today in Federations is to individual decisions in communities to do things that that community feels is important. If communities are no longer allocating 40 or 50 percent of their overseas dollars through UJC, to the Jewish agency and the Joint Distribution Committee, that's a thing of the past. Communities are taking their own money and spending it on their own projects and dealing with their own concerns. Communities are acting much more locally, especially as the Israel agenda and the notion of Israel's survival becomes less significant. So communities are making their own decisions and that's a new trend which I believe is going to continue and grow.

MS. DUBIN: That's a great segue into local issues. You've faced a number of challenges over the past number of years. I thought maybe you could just give us a few recollections. Jewish Home for Aged.

MR. ARONSON: That was a disaster. That was one of our challenges, as you call them, over the last number of years, and we continue to have those challenges because, to try to put this in context, our Federation in this community is the place of last resort when something goes wrong in an agency. It becomes the Federation's problem, not the agency's problem. We understand that, we embrace that and we have to be prepared to deal with it as we did in the case of the home.

The case of the Home for the Aged was an example of a change that we were not ready for or able to cope with, and that was as people became older and sicker it became harder for us to run chronic care facilities for the elderly in a proper way. We didn't have the expertise. I'm talking now about the home. We didn't have the focus on the issue of patient care and what was involved in it. We didn't have the staff that could deal with it. To make a very long story short, two of our facilities, Borman Hall and Prentis Manor at the time, received very bad reports for patient care and for a while we were in danger of losing reimbursement from the federal government.

At that point we fired the board, which is the first and only time in my history when I've had to do that, put an expert group in place, brought in an outside firm to run the facilities and ended up privatizing our chronic care home for the aged with a company which now runs the facility out at the

Applebaum Campus.

The Home for the Aged as an agency remained intact and still has a facility, the Jewish Home and Aging Services, of which Fleischman Residence is a part. And we have the Jewish Apartments and Services providing services for many elderly.

The challenge for us now is non-institutional care for the elderly as we have a greater population that needs care because they're aging in place. But at the time of the crisis we were shelling out almost a million dollars a month trying to get the problem under control until such time as we could sell Borman and Prentis Manor and move to a different kind of care.

We now have two facilities, the Danto Facility and also Menorah House in the Oak Park area. Both have excellent care, both are run by a company that knows what it's doing. I think we got out at just the right time and I think other communities will face that issue as well.

I will say that in terms of decision-making, when you face a crisis in an agency and you have to make a decision as a Federation and a Foundation, it's very problematic because crisis sometimes calls for fast action and quick intervention. Our process as a community does not lend itself to that. We have to take soundings and get input from virtually hundreds of different people who have different

stakes in the issue. Special meetings, special committees, board meetings at all different kinds of agencies. It's an exhausting experience when you're running a community to try to deal with a crisis.

That for me was probably the biggest single agency crisis we faced because the people involved we couldn't move, we couldn't ignore. It wasn't like a crisis at the JCC, which we've dealt with also consistently for 20 years. When you're dealing with a crisis involving elderly people confined to bed, who are in trouble, we have an obligation to them. We couldn't walk away from it. It made the crisis quite difficult and hard to deal with.

The ultimate answer, unfortunately, was to do away with the boards that had a not-for-profit attitude towards patient care and get in touch with a more business-like approach to dealing with the issue.

MS. DUBIN: How did you handle Sinai Hospital?

MR. ARONSON: The closing of Sinai was another big one primarily because of the history. People in Detroit, God bless them, our Jewish community, are very aware of and involved in their history. When you change an institution, you have to deal with the history.

Sinai had a great history. Many of our major families were involved with it. It had long ago ceased to be necessary as a Jewish institution, but convincing the

leadership of the hospital that they had to look for an opportunity to sell and in effect to get out of the hospital business in the city of Detroit, which was a complete non-starter, was again a difficult, mostly behind-the-scenes project.

I do want to say that the key individual, and I say this for posterity because it's important, the key individual that made that happen was a gentleman named Bob Sosnick, who is no longer with us. A tough guy, tough businessman, a little intimidating and frightening sometimes, but completely dedicated to the hospital and the Jewish community. He was the one who really engineered the sale of the hospital and the creation of the Jewish Fund which now benefits our community in very significant ways, especially our elderly and people in need of health care, and the Jewish Fund was really the legacy of Sinai Hospital and specifically I must say Bob Sosnick's legacy to this community. If we had attempted to do it even six months or a year later to sell the hospital, we would have been out of luck. It was a moment in time that we grasped, and thanks to him we have the Jewish Fund today.

MS. DUBIN: How about the Jewish Community Center.

MR. ARONSON: It has a long illustrious history, as you know, going back many years. We've moved it more than a few times, with complete facilities going from one place to another, rebuilding buildings. We've been a very building

oriented community. We actually have the strange distinction of having a Jewish Community Center that was open the shortest period of time of any center in America, the one on Curtis and Myers, which was open about 12 years if I'm not mistaken.

Then we bought some wonderful land as a Federation out at Maple and Drake amidst the corn fields and barns, and that turned out to be our Jewish community campus. In retrospect we should have bought more land at the time, but we didn't see it then. A new center was built. Everyone you talk to will agree that the Center was built poorly, too big, not put together well, not user friendly. Over the years Federation has struggled with the Center to deal with the physical facility, the enormous costs involved in running it.

We still have a center down on Ten Mile Road, the Jimmy Prentis Morris Center on the Taubman campus, which we also raised money for when I first came to the community and revived and is still doing very well as a small community center. But the 800 pound gorilla has always been the one at Maple and Drake, the Applebaum Campus. We recently went through a \$35 million renovation of the Center because we were still facility oriented. If we had to do it over again, I don't know that we would have done that.

The center movement in general in America is on the wane because Jews no longer feel the need to socialize or recreate or get together only with other Jews. That was the

basic mission of the Center.

It's always been in deficit, has always had a problem attracting health club members and other members. We've made leadership changes for many years. We've always said we're about to turn the corner, we never quite turn the corner, and we're in that same situation today.

My hope from the beginning at the time I got here is that the Center would be able to develop programs that would attract Jews and non-Jews because it's now not just a Jewish center, and become a place that really was a center for the Jewish community with programs that people wanted to come to, not just health and recreation facilities. We're not there yet. I think it will continue to be an issue and in today's Federation with fewer dollars available, it's becoming more and more difficult to find the dollars to keep the Center running.

The Center is a business, it's going to have to operate like a business if it's going to survive. Federation support will not be as forthcoming as it has been over the years.

MS. DUBIN: Sixteen years ago the community undertook a population study and is doing it again. I'd like to know as a consequence of the strategic plan that followed that study what you anticipate for the current survey and you'd like to see happen.

MR. ARONSON: I don't really want to pre-judge what the results of the study are going to be. I've always said that 98,000 Jews in Detroit is a ridiculous number. I think it's something closer to 75,00 or 80,000. Hopefully our demographic look-back, if you will, will give us some new numbers. But that is probably not the most important finding of the study.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The most important finding of the study is the aging of the population, how many children are being born, what is our potential population for our synagogues and our schools, what kind of planning do we have to do for our older adults, how well is Federation known and understood in the community. But the real issues we have to look at is are we a rapidly aging population with lowering or dropping affiliation rates and smaller numbers of kids, or are we not, are we a more stable community. That's really what I want to find out is what's happening to affiliation numbers with synagogue, with giving to community, with Jewish observance. What's going to happen 10 and 20 years from now, what population of children are we going to see coming into our schools. Those are the numbers and information we really have to have in order to do effective community planning. The issue of how many Jews live in Detroit is really not the critical issue.

MS. DUBIN: A neighborhood project was one outcome of the first study. Is that considered one of the highlights

or success stories of Federation that you managed to stabilize?

MR. ARONSON: I absolutely think that one of the great unsung stories of the Federation of the last 25 or even 30 years has been the stabilization of the Oak Park and Southfield neighborhoods. It's not totally what we would like to see all the way. However, we now have stable populations, people who received low interest loans to buy homes, we have wonderful thriving Jewish campus, we have schools. We just built a new 18-room mikvah, which is a good indication of how the population has stabilized.

Detroit was a community that abandoned its buildings and moved to the next place. They moved in total I think four times since its creation, which is unbelievable. So we made a stand in Oak Park and Southfield and it's worked. They're good and desirable neighborhoods now. I think Federation can be proud of the heighborhood project, the rebuilding of JPM and the other efforts made in that area. I think it's been terrific and it's great to go there.

MS. DUBIN: What vision do you have for this community? What would you like to see this community do?

MR. ARONSON: That's a good question. I think about it a lot. My vision is, if I could simplify it, two things.

Number one, I want the community to be a place where every single Jew can get whatever help or service from the Jewish

community that the family, the individual needs from cradle to grave. From the time they're born and we are able to set aside money for them to go on a trip to Israel, to the time that they die in a Jewish hospice setting and everything in between. I want our community to be able to say that it's providing the very best service for every single Jewish person in the community, for every vulnerable person in the community. That's one whole set of issues and that's one vision.

The second vision I have is that we will do a real job of educating our young people to the joys of being Jewish as the central tenet of their life, and the responsibilities of being Jewish, and that that will be part of every person's psyche and soul in this community. I would like to see that.

And third, and just as important as the other two, I would like to see every single Jew from young to old feel a commitment and responsibility to world Jewry, not just educating our own children and not just building lovely institutions and centers and homes for the aged and schools, Hillels and other things, but feeling committed to helping Jews, knowing them, helping them as part and parcel and foundation to who we are as Jews. That we should feel that commitment to Jews around the world. Those are the three things, if I could give you a vision of the future, Charlotte, that I would like to see the community accomplish.

MS. DUBIN: Sounds costly.

MR. ARONSON: It is. I've learned as a fund-raiser, and I'm primarily a fund-raiser, if you don't set your sights high and if you can't articulate a vision for the future, then the dollars won't follow. That's the way we have to do it.

MS. DUBIN: Is there anything I have not asked you that you'd like to say?

MR. ARONSON: We could talk for hours. I've enjoyed talking and reflecting on my time here. I appreciate you talking with me. My work here has been my life's work, and I want to be sure that when I'm not here that there's a new set of professionals coming up who will also make it their life's work. That's what I would like to see. Thank you.

MS. DUBIN: Thank you, Bob.