JEWISHINSIDER

JULY 18, 2025 ♦ 22 TAMUZ, 5785

JULY 17, 2025

Netanyahu's coalition is teetering – but his government is likely to last the year

United Torah Judaism left the coalition and Shas quit the government, but did not pull its 11 lawmakers out of the parliamentary coalition

By Lahav Harkov

New Israeli elections are unlikely to happen this year, despite the departure on Wednesday of two parties from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's government over disagreements over Haredi military exemption legislation.

After months of disagreements, Ashkenazi Haredi faction United Torah Judaism left Netanyahu's coalition in protest, leaving it with 61 out of the Knesset's 120 seats. On Wednesday, Sephardic Haredi party Shas' five Cabinet ministers quit the government, though party leader Aryeh Deri will remain an observer in the Security Cabinet.

Shas only quit the government — meaning their Cabinet posts — and did not pull its 11 lawmakers out of the parliamentary coalition. Shas, whose voter base is right-wing and even more supportive of Netanyahu than the prime minister's own Likud party, said it will not vote with the opposition. This means that Netanyahu retains a majority in the Knesset, albeit a razor-thin one.

Opposition leader Yair Lapid still argued soon after Shas' announcement that "starting today, Israel has a minority government. A minority government cannot send soldiers into battle ... It has no authority, no right. It is an illegitimate government."

"Israel does not have full-time welfare, health, interior, housing or labor ministers," Lapid added. "The Netanyahu government is a minority government that endangers the care of Israel's citizens."

Both Haredi parties have been boycotting Knesset votes since April in protest over the Haredi conscription debate, in effect leaving the coalition with a minority and obstructing its ability to pass laws.

Israeli law only allows an early election to be called proactively, meaning that a Knesset member would have to propose a bill to disperse the legislature, followed by three separate votes on the issue. Opposition leaders held a vote last month on dispersing the Knesset, and under Israeli law are prevented from calling another such vote for six months unless 61 lawmakers sign a petition to the Knesset speaker.

Netanyahu's government has time on its side, with the Knesset's summer recess beginning on July 27 and the legislature's voting schedule recommencing on October 19.

By law, the next election is set for Oct. 27, 2026, but the last time a Knesset election was held on its originally scheduled date was in 1988.

Shas and UTJ left the government over the ongoing political debate over legislation that would impose penalties on Haredi yeshiva students who do not enlist in the IDF. The parties' Councils of Torah Sages

have argued that religious study must be prioritized over serving in the military.

Israel has a mandatory military draft, but has historically exempted Arab citizens and Haredi yeshiva students from conscription. Governments on the left and right maintained the exemption for Haredim over decades, but Israel's High Court of Justice struck it down in a series of rulings over more than 10 years, with no minor adjustments made by consecutive governments satisfying the justices' standard of equality under the law. Last summer, the court ordered the Defense Ministry to send draft notices to young Haredi men.

Meanwhile, the 21 months of war in Gaza — with hundreds of thousands of Israelis serving in reserves, many of whom have served hundreds of days in active duty, leaving behind families and businesses — have increased the IDF's manpower needs and the urgency to resolve the issue of Haredi conscription. Shas and UTJ's allies on the Israeli right have moved away, in varying degrees, from tolerating the exemption for political expedience even as their own constituents serve in the IDF.

Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee chairman Yuli Edelstein, a Likud lawmaker, has been at the forefront of the dispute with the Haredi parties, refusing to advance legislation that does not satisfy the military's needs, while Shas and UTJ demand that the bill institute little to no consequences for yeshiva students who do not serve in the IDF.

When announcing his resignation from the cabinet on Wednesday, Religious Services Minister Michael Malkieli said that penalizing yeshiva students for not serving is "no less than cruel and criminal persecution."

Among the proposed sanctions are cutting daycare and housing subsidies afforded to the Haredi sector, prohibiting those who ignore conscription notices from receiving driver's licenses or leaving the country, and, in some cases, arrest.

Edelstein reached a compromise over the sanctions with the Haredi parties in June, less than a day before the 12-day war with Iran began. However, the Haredim continued to boycott coalition votes in recent weeks, leading Edelstein to withdraw some of his concessions.

Speaking at a conference on Wednesday, Edelstein said that "this is not the time to bring down a right-wing government."

He called on the Haredim to "bring a concrete proposal. For once, the Haredim should say what they agree to. My door is open; I promise to examine it quickly and hold negotiations."

"For an entire year, they did not bring any concrete proposal for a conscription law," Edelstein added. "In the moment of truth, they ... made all kinds of excuses every time ... It's apparently not a question of the extent of the sanctions or the target [enlistment] numbers, but a total refusal to take part in the holy privilege ... that is called the Israeli Defense Forces."♦

JULY 17, 2025

Amid generational shifts in giving, Jewish groups need new types of engagement, fundraising consultant says

Latest Giving USA report shows donations to religious causes shrinking, requiring Jewish organizations to find new ways of being relevant while building up endowments to retain viability

By Judah Ari Gross

The article first appeared in eJewishPhilanthropy.

The annual Giving USA report that was released last month described a thriving philanthropic field, which saw a rise in inflation-adjusted giving for the first time since the COVID-19 pandemic.

The survey found that 2024 continued many of the existing trends in charitable giving, namely fewer donors providing more of the donations. The increase in giving was also not uniform, with some areas, such as public-society benefit and international affairs, seeing significant growth, while giving to religious causes — still the largest recipient — shrank by 1% when adjusted for inflation.

To understand what the Jewish community can learn from the report, *eJewishPhilanthropy* sat down on Wednesday with Avrum Lapin, the president of the Lapin Group, a fundraising and management consulting firm for nonprofits, who also serves as a board member of the Giving Institute, the organization behind Giving USA and its annual report.

The interview has been lightly edited for clarity.

Judah Ari Gross: One of the underdiscussed but likely profound issues in the Jewish communal world is the generational shift in philanthropic giving. How do we see that in this year's Giving USA report?

Avrum Lapin: There are a couple of things going on. One is that Jewish giving was really counted in giving to religion. And giving to religion, if you look back 20 years,

was at you know, 50%, 55%, 60% [of total charitable giving]. And now it's 23%. And that's against the backdrop of less affiliation — not just in the Jewish community, all over. And so I'm not surprised that the number has gone down, and it's gotten picked up mostly by education and human services.

When we spoke last year, we talked about three generations: the post-Holocaust, the baby boomers and Gen Xers, who are currently in positions of leadership, the 45-to-60-year-olds. And now we need to account for the millennials, who are beginning to appear.

Young Jews are not the same as the previous generation. They're not committed to Jewish institutions in the same way. They're not committed to Israel in the same way. I think we saw it when many in that younger cohort who had gravitated back to the community kind of stayed on the sidelines during and in the aftermath of Oct. 7. And I think that is a big challenge for the Jewish community as it looks forward. In the realm of philanthropy, we have to find ways to find ways to engage those millennials.

In their parents' generation, and it's the same going back, they gave to Israel, gave to the Jewish community first, and only then gave to everyplace else. From Gen X, that went away. Giving to the Jewish community, giving to Israel, giving to Jewish causes was one item on their philanthropic menu. And they are a very generous generation. Obviously, you see the giving continues to grow. So the case needs to be made. We need to find a way to create paths of affiliation, paths of connection of engagement for young families.

Synagogue affiliation may or may not be the thing. The traditional way of Jewish federation young leadership programs may not draw people in the same way as they did.

In September 2024, the Generosity Commission, which was commissioned by The Giving Institute in 2021, dealing with this issue of the next generation. And interestingly enough, the rising generation of millennials, in particular, was motivated by social justice. They want to see impact from their giving. They want to see the results of the giving. And so that the notion of belonging to a community and being an individual donor in a community is different. And I think that the attention that needs to be paid to the emerging generation is different than it was for the generations before.

I think that the aftermath of Oct. 7 has shined a light on some of the fissures in the Jewish community and the need for the community to bring new solutions to the table rather than just the old prescriptions.

JAG: Regarding that generational divide, is the right move for organizations to try to make that pitch to this younger generation or should they also be hedging and trying to lean in more to the older generation to say, "If you don't give us money now, we're not going to survive another 10, 20, 30 years," and to try to set up stronger endowments. Obviously, you can do both, but if the older generation still has that commitment, should the focus be on maintaining viability?

AL: We're seeing on the ground level a little bit more attention to endowments. Local institutions are thinking more about endowments, less about buildings. There are fewer people going into synagogues, fewer people going into different places, and so the need to expand buildings and to build those buildings is diminishing. You want to renovate them, keep them attractive, keep them inviting, but at the same time, it's less about building them than about sustaining the institutions themselves. And so there's a little bit more attention now on endowment than there was perhaps before COVID and before Oct. 7.

But there's no organized activity of "Well, we need to build up institutional endowments." I think organizations are coming at it on their own.

It needs to be, in my mind, a priority to say that "Yes, immediate needs obviously are important. You need to keep the lights on and people paid. But you also need to think about the viability and the strength of the community going forward."

It's not a given that the institutions in the Jewish community will be as strong as they might be now or as strong as they were five years ago, or, I guess, six years ago before COVID. And so that's a challenge for us. And that's something I think that organizations should be looking at, and not just saying, "Well, we want to make our bank account bigger than it is now." You need to give it some thought. What's your vision for the future? What value do you bring to the American Jewish community or to the North American Jewish community that will be valued, that will be seen as something important? That will make a difference going forward. And how do you then package it, communicate it, relate it, raise money around it, and make sure that the future is at least to a certain degree secured.

JAG: Donor-advised funds don't really appear in the Giving USA report, despite their growing prevalence. Are there other trends that are potentially missing from the data that Jewish resource development professionals should be aware of with the breakdown of individual giving versus foundational giving?

AL: There was a fear when donor-advised funds exploded in popularity several years ago that people were kind of banking their philanthropy. Since they don't have the same allocation or distribution requirements as family foundations that you were going to see a decrease in giving. And you actually didn't. Giving from donor-advised funds has been as robust as ever. You don't get any sense that money's being held back.

And I think that once [DAFs] become a regular part of the ongoing reporting... you'll see where the essence of Jewish giving is, and it's more in terms of giving from individuals.

The JFNA Israel Emergency Fund, [launched] after Oct. 7, almost entirely came from individuals — specifically individuals of a certain age. I think if JFNA were to try to do that again, they would run into generational issues, even in just the two years that have passed.

I think that the lines may have blurred a little bit [in terms of the sources of charitable gifts] just because of the way people are giving, but it's still largely motivated by the vision and passion of individual donors.

JAG: One of the trends that has been around for years but is clearly getting stronger in this year's report is that more money is being given by a smaller number of wealthier people. On the other

hand, one of the larger grantmakers in Israel is the International Fellowship of Christians and Jews, whose funding overwhelmingly comes from small donations from large numbers of people. So clearly that model can also work.

AL: And you see it on the political side as well. You had [Sen.] Bernie Sanders [I-VT) in two campaigns, and [President] Donald Trump in the second campaign, not so much the first, drawing these small gifts from massive amounts of people. What did Bernie Sanders say? The average gift is $27 or less?

And yet that's not carrying over into philanthropy. The philanthropy is still concentrated, and it's a self-fulfilling prophecy. If the preponderance of your money is coming from a small amount of people, you spend less time on the bottom-up, more time on making sure that you get those major gifts because it's a competitive arena. It's fewer people, everybody's knocking on their door, so that becomes the same cycle.

JAG: But are you aware of any initiatives within the Jewish community to change that, to send out mass mailers to everybody soliciting donations for $18? Or is that just passe?

AL: A lot of organizations are trying to do things that are fun, saying "You don't have to give to come. Just come and have a good time and have a drink and network and so on." But again, that's kind of taking the old model and projecting it forward.

And there are small organizations, like there's an organization here in Philadelphia called Tribe 12. They're looking to engage Jews in the work of the Jewish community. And there needs to be more initiatives like that and less of the legacy organizations trying to create a new "Birthright" for millennials. And I say that with love and respect.

But it's important to do something different, not just to try to attract young people to do the same. People are looking for connectivity. Somebody who's 30 years old today or 35 years old today grew up in a world that was a lot different than their parents. They need to connect and they need to feel a part of something. And it's not there in the same way as it was for their parents. And just offering them a place to come and have a drink is nice, but it's a one-off. They need to be part of a community. They need to be part of something that functions and is alive. Just like the prior system or the existing system was for their parents, going back one to two generations. It was a place to go. It was a place to be. The synagogue was a community. Federation was a community, and not so much anymore. So we need a community that reflects and meets the needs and expectations of younger people as they're looking for some way to connect.♦

JULY 15, 2025

The psychology of denial: American Psychological Association struggles to confront antisemitism in its ranks

The group's annual conference, being held in August, features a panel that describes the Oct. 7 Hamas terrorism as attacks on 'military targets'

By Gabby Deutch

In late February, Dr. Julie Ancis drafted an open letter with a group called Psychologists Against Antisemitism, condemning antisemitism within the American Psychological Association. More than 3,500 people signed on to demand the organization act against what they described as "the serious and systemic problem of antisemitism/anti-Jewish hate" within the APA. With 172,000 members, it is the largest body dedicated to the study of psychology in the world.

For months, the organization appeared to do nothing. Ancis did not even get an acknowledgement that the letter had been received. But then in May, after she and another Jewish colleague raised their concerns in a meeting with Rep. Ritchie Torres (D-NY), Ancis received an invitation from senior APA officials to discuss antisemitism.

The meeting was ostensibly meant as an olive branch from the organization where she had once been a prominent member: In 2010, a division of the APA named Ancis, a distinguished professor at New Jersey Institute of Technology and one of the pioneers of the psychology field's approach to diversity, equity and inclusion, its Woman of the Year.

Yet when Ancis looked at the list of stakeholders invited to the Zoom meeting, she was astonished to see the names of several APA groups that she considered the biggest perpetrators of antisemitism within the APA. Later, she learned that the list of invited "stakeholders" included Dr. Lara Sheehi, the president of an APA division focused on the study of psychoanalysis, who was called out in the open letter for describing Zionists as "genocidal f**ks." (Sheehi, who left a teaching position at The George Washington University in 2024 after being accused of antisemitic conduct by some of her students, recently appeared on

a podcast to defend the tactics of the man accused of shooting and killing two Israeli Embassy staffers outside the Capital Jewish Museum in Washington in May. She did not respond to a request for comment.)

"The stakeholders should include people who have expertise, not the ones who are promoting antisemitism, where we're tokenized. It's an absolute lose-lose situation, and hostile," Ancis said last week. She decided not to attend. "I'm not going to sit in that farce of a meeting."

That the APA would host a meeting about addressing antisemitism where the "stakeholders" included both Jews who have scrupulously documented harassment and bias within the organization's ranks for months, as well as some of the people they identified as the perpetrators of that harassment, is, according to Jewish psychologists, evidence of how this historic organization has lost its way and ceded its moral voice.

"Could you imagine APA having a listening session for LGBTQ+ individuals, which includes people who are known to be homophobic?" asked Dr. David Rosmarin, director of the Spirituality and Mental Health Program at McLean Hospital in Massachusetts and a Harvard Medical School professor. "They want everyone to be included, and all that kind of stuff. What that means is that there's no room for Jews, because they're including people who are engaged in antisemitic, anti-Zionist rhetoric, publicly, in the discussions."

"They're between a rock and a hard place. They're trying to appease different constituents, and I feel like they're appeasing the ones who are loudest and bigger, and that's not the Jewish professionals," Dr. Julie Ancis told JI.

Several leading Jewish psychologists told *Jewish Insider* in interviews last week that the APA has repeatedly failed to respond to the concerns of its Jewish members, despite a stated commitment to promoting an "accessible, equitable and inclusive psychology that promotes human rights, fairness and dignity for all," according to the organization's diversity mission. They say the APA has avoided taking a stand against double standards and litmus tests applied to Jewish psychologists who are vilified for their support for Israel.

Instead, the organization has been almost paralyzed in the aftermath of the Oct. 7, 2023, Hamas terror attacks and ensuing war, seemingly afraid to take sides between the Jewish psychologists seeking support and an increasingly vocal contingent of anti-Israel voices in the field, some of whom have described Zionism as a pathology to root out.

"They're between a rock and a hard place. They're trying to appease different constituents, and I feel like they're appeasing the ones who are loudest and bigger, and that's not the Jewish professionals," Ancis told JI.

The APA is the key body shaping the education of psychologists in the United States. It accredits masters- and doctorate-level academic programs at hundreds of universities across the country. So while the battle over antisemitism in this organization may seem like an internecine ivory tower fight, the way it is handled is poised to have major implications for the future of psychology — a field that touches the millions of Americans who see a therapist, and whose research shapes the way we understand each other and ourselves.

*****

Concerns about antisemitism in psychology have followed the APA since soon after Oct. 7, when the Association of Jewish Psychologists chided the organization for issuing only a tepid statement about the Hamas attacks. "We … are deeply disappointed and terribly saddened that our professional association could not more forcefully and unequivocally condemn the horrific acts of barbarism against the Jewish people of the State of Israel," they wrote at the time.

The issue has become a flashpoint again this year in the run-up to the APA's flagship annual conference, which will be held next month in Denver.

Among the events at next month's gathering, which is expected to draw several thousand people, is a "critical conversation" called "truth-telling as resistance" focused on understanding the 2024 encampments amid "a global and national effort to distort realities about Palestine and the encampments."

At a symposium about "resisting anti-Palestinian racism," psychologists can earn continuing education credit for attending a talk that will discuss "advocacy and actions to resist anti-Palestinian racism" that are "erroneously framed as antisemitism." Another symposium, focused on mental health during wartime in Gaza and Lebanon, features a talk by a presenter who describes the Oct. 7 terror attacks that killed more than 1,200 people as attacks on "military targets" in Israel.

"Wha concerns me most are the psychologists who are maybe not Jewish or maybe not aware of these concerns in the Jewish community, who attend these talks with what I consider to be antisemitic rhetoric, and accept and internalize the ideas and rhetoric as true," said Dr. Caroline Kaufman, a post-doctoral fellow at McLean Hospital. She will be speaking at a symposium about antisemitism, which also offers continuing education credit. "When they treat Jewish clients, or they have Jewish colleagues, or they conduct research, those ideas continue into those endeavors. That is extremely concerning to me."

Rosmarin, a colleague of Kaufman's at McLean, put a baseball hat over his yarmulke at last year's APA convention in Seattle because it didn't feel like a "safe space," he said. He worries the organization does not understand the scope of the problem. "This is like a cancer that's spread throughout the organization," said Rosmarin, who is also the president of the APA Society for the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality.

*****

The term "gaslighting" — a form of emotional abuse in which one person falsely and repeatedly tells another person that their experience of reality is untrue — has become so popular in recent years that it was named *Merriam-Webster*'s word of the year in 2022. A growing body of psychological research is devoted to studying the concept, which the APA defines as "manipulat[ing] another person into doubting their

perceptions, experiences or understanding of events."

Given psychology's deepening understanding of gaslighting, it was particularly ironic that following the APA's antisemitism meeting, which occurred last Thursday, an email discussion broke out in which several psychologists attempted to invalidate and refute the concerns their Jewish colleagues raised about antisemitism. (The email thread was viewed by JI.)

One psychologist referred to the substance of the Zoom call as "propaganda" and said he would denounce only "*actual* antisemitism." Dr. Karen Suyemoto, who chaired the APA's task force that developed guidelines for addressing race and ethnicity in psychology, agreed.

She called it "imperative" that "actual antisemitism" be addressed, because "the continuing confounding creates barriers to allies and accomplices who do not have [a] nuanced understanding." (Suyemoto, a University of Massachusetts professor, declined to comment to JI. She was the guest editor of a recent special issue of the APA's flagship journal that focused on "practicing decolonial and liberation psychologies," which the Anti-Defamation League, Academic Engagement Network and Psychologists Against Antisemitism criticized in a Tuesday letter as "ethically compromised and biased.")

To Jewish psychologists, the skepticism from professionals who claim to listen to marginalized communities did not add up.

"We take identity very seriously. We realize that it intersects with both risk and protective factors," said Kaufman. "That's a given in our field, and APA seems willing to recognize that for several identities or groups. But it's seemingly unwilling to address such concerns for the Jewish community. I can't understand why."

In 2007, the APA adopted a resolution on antisemitic and anti-Jewish prejudice that detailed modern manifestations of antisemitism alongside a commitment to being a leader in fighting it. (The resolution had the foresight to note that 21st-century antisemitism "may be more difficult for its perpetrators to identify and challenge, as their beliefs about themselves may be that they are not biased against Jews.")

But since Oct. 7, a vocal group of APA members has been encouraging the organization to revisit this resolution because of its assertion that antisemitism can arise in the context of criticism of Israel. An activist group called Psychologists for Justice in Palestine drafted a petition last year calling on the APA to "refute" that part of the resolution — and instead admit that it is actually "discriminatory" to refer to anti-Zionism as a form of antisemitism.

"With the removal of the claim that criticism of Israel can become antisemitic, it would open psychologists to even more experiences of antisemitism and even more antisemitic aggression, by which Jewish and Israeli psychologists can be excluded, denigrated and denied for reasons that are presumably having to do with Israel, but, from my perspective, are really just antisemitism," warned Dr. Caroline Kaufman, a post-doctoral fellow at McLean Hospital.

The petition was endorsed by several APA affiliates, including the Asian American Psychological Association; the American Arab, Middle Eastern and North African Psychological Association (AMENA-Psy); and the Society for the Psychology of Women. AMENA-Psy — one of six official APA ethnic associations — declared just four days after the Oct. 7 attacks that the group stands "in full solidarity with our Palestinian siblings in their decolonial struggle for justice."

The APA ceded to the groups' demands and agreed to reopen the debate about the 2007 resolution. The APA's board of directors even created a task force to update the resolution. But the effort was shelved in March, as internal criticism of the organization's handling of antisemitism began to mount.

"With the removal of the claim that criticism of Israel can become antisemitic, it would open psychologists to even more experiences of antisemitism and even more antisemitic aggression, by which Jewish and Israeli psychologists can be excluded, denigrated and denied for reasons that are presumably having to do with Israel, but, from my perspective, are really just antisemitism," warned Kaufman.

*****

The solutions that Jewish psychologists seek require a long-term commitment from the APA that they aren't confident they will receive, although the organization's leaders stated on last week's call that they do want to do more to combat antisemitism.

The concerned Jewish members want stronger monitoring on APA-affiliated email servers, which have been used by some APA members to promote boycotts against Israel and, occasionally, to defend Hamas. (An APA spokesperson told JI that "enhanced oversight is now in place to ensure respectful discourse and timely response to violations.") They are also seeking more stringent oversight of the panels at the summer conference.

"They still struggle to really make a determination as to whether or not anti-Zionism is antisemitism, and so I surmise that people could say some things that would be very hurtful to large swaths of the professional community, and it would be considered acceptable within the new and refined listserv guidelines," Fordham psychology professor Dr. Dean McKay told JI after last week's antisemitism Zoom. "That's one of those places where I don't think they really know what to do."

The APA frequently invokes bureaucratic red tape in response to these concerns by asserting that the 54 divisions that fall under the APA umbrella — on topics including developmental psychology, clinical psychology and pediatric psychology — operate autonomously, allowing the APA to claim immunity from the most egregious issues.

"APA's 54 divisions operate autonomously with their own governance structures," Kim Mills, the APA's senior director for strategic external communications and public affairs, told JI in a statement. "Each of them program convention sessions that their leaders believe best represent the concerns of their division and will foster academic discourse on a variety of psychology topics."

Mills asserted that the APA "unequivocally condemns antisemitism in all its forms and acknowledges the climate of fear such prejudice creates," and said the organization is "committed to fostering an environment where members of all identities can contribute fully, safely and without discrimination."

Jewish psychologists are waiting to see if that commitment passes the stress test, but they are not confident. Because while they see general proclamations about the ills of antisemitism as helpful, the true measure of whether the APA is serious about taking on the problem is whether the organization is willing to call out the most extreme members in its ranks, some of whom hold high-profile leadership positions. Doing so would require the APA to wade into the fraught conversation about whether the tactics of anti-Zionist activists can cross a line into antisemitism. It is clear the APA wants to avoid doing that.

"They still struggle to really make a determination as to whether or not anti-Zionism is antisemitism, and so I surmise that people could say some things that would be very hurtful to large swaths of the professional community, and it would be considered acceptable within the new and refined listserv guidelines," Fordham psychology professor Dr. Dean McKay told JI after last week's antisemitism Zoom. "That's one of those places where I don't think they really know what to do."

The APA's diversity webpage features a large section dedicated to explaining antisemitism. However, it does not mention Israel, Hamas or the post-Oct. 7 spike in antisemitism. Nor did Mills refer to Israel or Zionism in a lengthy statement she sent JI last week outlining the organization's pledge to fight antisemitism. In fact, she ignored a question about Jewish psychologists who feel they have been targeted for being Zionists.

*****

The Jewish psychologists raising concerns about antisemitism in their field know that doing so entails a risk. They worry about the silencing effect on younger Jewish psychologists who are still finding their footing in the field, which is already in a precarious situation amid federal funding cuts to scientific and medical research.

"I'm protected. I'm already mid-career," said Rosmarin, the Harvard Medical school professor. "I'm animated about this because I care about the next generation."

Ancis, who spearheaded the open letter to the APA, quit the organization three years ago. She is far enough along in her career to not worry about facing backlash for supporting Israel and speaking out against antisemitism. But she worries about younger people in the field.

"A person coming up trying to get tenure in an APA-accredited program and identifying as a Zionist, I think it'd be extremely difficult," Ancis said.

Kaufman only completed her Ph.D. four years ago, and she is at the beginning of what she hopes is a career in academia. She has the right credentials: a postdoctoral position at Harvard, an internship at Yale, a speaking slot at a symposium at next month's APA conference. But she worries that won't be enough to shield her.

"I have very deep and sincere concerns that my involvement in these issues related to antisemitism will negatively impact the opportunities available to me and my career," Kaufman told JI. "I hold that truth or that fear in one hand. The other truth in my other hand is that I have a responsibility as a Jewish psychologist to raise my voice and become involved in this issue. There's truly no other path for me, even if, and I think there will be, serious consequences."♦

JULY 15, 2025

Foundation for Jewish Camp taps interim CEO Jamie Simon to take full reins

Head of selection committee says Simon was chosen due to her significant experience within the camp world — a first for the organization

By Judah Ari Gross

The article first appeared in eJewishPhilanthropy.

The Foundation for Jewish Camp's Board of Directors unanimously voted to hire interim CEO Jamie Simon to serve in the role in a permanent capacity beginning Tuesday, the organization said.

Simon, the former chief program and strategy officer, has served in the interim role since the former CEO, Jeremy Fingerman, stepped down in March. She will be the 27-year-old organization's fourth top executive.

In addition to being the first female CEO, Simon will be the first leader of the organization to come from a camping background, having worked for 17 years at the Tawonga Jewish Community Corporation in California, including six years as its CEO.

According to Jeffrey M. Solomon, chair of FJC's selection committee, Simon's extensive Jewish camping experience was a key factor in the board's decision.

"When you think about the things that Jamie did at Tawonga and how she elevated things at Tawonga and what she's been able to do at FJC even before stepping into this role," Solomon told eJP. "Jamie elevates people, she elevates the organization, and her intimate knowledge of how camps operate is something that we haven't had

historically. And I just think for the next leg of growth, as we think about how we're going to be more intentional about bringing to bear our capability set to elevate the whole industry, it's time for us to have a great camp leader in that position, and Jamie fits that bill."

Solomon added that FJC is in the process of developing its next five-year strategic plan, which includes a particular focus on integrating the concept of Jewish peoplehood into summer camps.

"When we talk about our goals and objectives, it's really about enhancing, enriching and extending Jewish peoplehood," he said. "We're doing that with a little more intentionality to ensure the place of Jewish camping in the pantheon of important Jewish pillars. ... Having somebody [as CEO] who's been able to do that at both the camp level, at the movement level and now at the national level with an organization like ours, that's why Jamie makes so much sense to us."

Solomon said that the selection committee came in with a "very open mind" about the position, considering several candidates before settling on Simon.

"After our extensive search with many qualified candidates, it was clear that Jamie is the best leader to steward the organization's next chapter," FJC board Chair Jim Heeger said in a statement. "She has already demonstrated extraordinary leadership within the organization's ranks, developed strong relationships with partners and has lived and breathed the mission and values of Jewish camp throughout her decades-long professional career."

In its announcement, FJC noted that Simon led the organization through the logistical challenges this summer with the delayed arrival of Israeli staff and cancellation of Israel travel programs because of last month's war between Israel and Iran. This included helping find temporary staff to fill in for the Israeli counselors and raising some $2 million to cover the added costs.

"I am profoundly grateful to the Board for this opportunity to serve as Foundation for Jewish Camp's next CEO. I've seen the power of Jewish camp at every stage of my life: as a camper, as a camp counselor, as a camp director, as a parent, and as a passionate advocate in the broader Jewish camp movement," said Simon in a statement.. "With nearly 200,000 young people expected to attend this summer, enrollment at Jewish camp is higher than ever. My priority is to ensure that every young Jew that wants to experience the transformative impact of camp has the opportunity to do so, and that every camp has the resources they need to succeed." ♦

JULY 14, 2025

Rep. Greg Landsman: Americans are 'tired' of partisanship on Iran and foreign policy

The Ohio Democrat suggested the responses to the strikes from within his party are motivated by the current political environment, fears about a broader war and concerns about the future of diplomatic talks and the safety of people in the region

By Marc Rod

Rep. Greg Landsman (D-OH) has stood apart in recent weeks as one of a small number of congressional Democrats who've been supportive of the Trump administration's strikes on Iranian nuclear facilities.

He argued in an interview with *Jewish Insider* last week and in a recent op-ed that the Israeli and American show of force, alongside the undermining of Iran's proxies across the region, could be the key to weakening the Iranian regime to a point where it will agree to a fundamental change of course going forward, unlocking opportunities for regional peace and prosperity. And, he said, it's critical that the U.S. move forward in a truly unified and bipartisan manner to capitalize on that opportunity.

Landsman told JI he thinks that his Democratic colleagues' responses to the strikes are motivated by the current political environment, fears about a broader war and concerns about the future of diplomatic talks and the safety of people in the region.

"We're just in a different political environment than the one I grew up in," Landsman, 48, said. "The one I grew up in was 'politics stops at the water's edge,' which I loved. ... The thinking behind it ... is that when we take on these really complicated foreign policy issues, that we do it in a bipartisan way, and that's not the environment we live in right now."

He said there's also a "legitimate concern that it would provoke further attacks or it would instigate a broader war." Landsman has argued that the current situation is fundamentally different from the run-up to the Iraq war that many skeptics of the strikes have invoked.

Some colleagues, he added, may have also had concerns about compromising diplomatic efforts or "legitimate concerns for people's safety. But I think for others, and for a lot of folks, it's just political," he said.

Landsman said he still hews to the older approach, believing that it's critical to work toward bipartisan common ground in critical foreign policy questions. He highlighted that the American people overwhelmingly oppose the prospect of an Iranian nuclear weapon.

"I think the American people want

[our Middle East policy] to be bipartisan, all of it," Landsman said. "I think they're tired of the partisanship in general, but in particular, as it relates to how we resolve these international conflicts and how we take advantage of international or global opportunities, I think they are done with all of this being so partisan."

He said he still believes a diplomatic solution with Iran is possible and necessary, but said the regime needed to be weakened and see that the U.S. is willing to use force in order to agree to totally dismantle its nuclear program and allow comprehensive international inspections and to dismantle its terrorist proxies .

Unlike some supporters of the strikes, Landsman said he doesn't think regime change in Iran is the most productive goal, and that the U.S. should instead leverage the regime's vulnerability for a more favorable deal and fundamental change to the regime's posture.

"This regime wants to stay in power. If they decide — which they can, and now they're so weakened that it's an easier decision for them, and that's why the strikes were important — they can decide, 'We're going to focus on the Iranian people'" and abandon terrorism and their ambitions to destroy Israel, Landsman said. "They could unlock the talent of tens of millions of incredibly brilliant people that have been stuck in Iran under this regime."

He said that achieving that will "require real engagement and leadership" from both Congress and the executive branch.

Landsman has proposed establishing a bipartisan and bicameral congressional committee to work toward Middle East peace, and argued that the administration needs an expanded team working on the issue, describing Middle East envoy Steve Witkoff as stretched too thin.

"They need to lay out a vision for ending hostilities with Iran and ending the war in Gaza and giving people a sense of what will happen next in terms of peace and stability and security," Landsman said.

The congressman argued that these issues are too difficult and too important for Congress to be excluded, or to be treated in a partisan manner. He pushed for deep and ongoing executive branch engagement with Congress, not just providing briefings, but in strategizing and building a lasting solution going forward.

Finally putting the Iranian threat to bed would set the Middle East on a fundamentally different course, Landsman argued. "[The Middle East] should be Europe, [if not] for Iran. It hasn't been able to break out that way because Iran has been the primary obstacle."

"Getting to a point where Iran is slowly but surely being removed as a threat opens up all the doors," he said. "It just changes the dynamic for everybody."

He said he believes leaders across the region see a path toward ending the war in Gaza and the long-running conflicts and building "a Middle East that's entirely free from terror and countries are working together" and prospering.

In spite of the deep divisions that have increasingly characterized discussions in the United States on Israel and the Middle East since the Oct. 7, 2023, terror attacks, Landsman said he still believes that "the list of what we agree on is way bigger than the list of what folks may disagree on."

The points of agreement across the American political spectrum include: that Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon; that Iran needs to be subject to stringent inspections; that Iran needs to cease its support for terrorists; that Hezbollah must be disarmed; that the war in Gaza needs to end; that the hostages need to be returned; that Hamas needs to be removed from power; and that international investment in collaboration with Israel and non-Hamas Palestinian leaders is needed to move Gaza forward.

"More international pressure can be brought to bear on Iran and Hamas and Hezbollah and the Houthis to separate them ... and say 'The world has come together. We are going to pick the side of those who want to rebuild the region and rebuild it free of terror and corruption,'" Landsman said. "Ultimately, when you have the kind of security that any country would need and expect, then you get back to the negotiating table."

Landsman has spoken on multiple occasions in recent months about his aspirations for an abiding peace in the Middle East, a vision that he says is driven by a lifetime of connection and passion for Israel and the region.

He said his Jewish upbringing had inculcated in him a sense of connection to the importance of Israel for the Jewish people.

Landsman said that efforts to negotiate between Israel and the Palestinians were also a constant feature of his youth, and that he believes that there is still broad agreement on the goal of a durable peace that can provide security for Israel and self-determination and self-governance for the Palestinians.

A Harvard Divinity School graduate, the Ohio congressman has visited Israel numerous times as a lawmaker, but also traveled there frequently and built connections in his previous work in education advocacy. After implementing new preschool programs in the Cincinnati area, Landsman was asked to help work with Ethiopian Israelis to improve educational outcomes, an effort that grew between 2015 and 2020.

He said his time on the ground in Israel showed him that Jews and Palestinians "have a lot in common" — shared history, a shared home and common experiences of expulsion and rejection. And it highlighted to him the extent to which Arab Israelis are part of and integrated into Israeli society.

"I have built up this legitimate affection and love for these two communities of people that, because of circumstance, have been fighting," Landsman said. "Ending that would transform everything — not just their lives, but the region and the world." ♦

JULY 14, 2025

After Iran strikes, Saudis in no rush to join Abraham Accords, experts say

With no long-term ceasefire in Gaza and a strategy of trying to contain and balance Iran's power in the region, the Saudis are in no rush to normalize relations with Israel, experts told JI

By Lahav Harkov

One of the original drivers of the 2020 Abraham Accords, in which the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain normalized relations with Israel, was Israel's vocal, public stance against Iran's nuclear program and regional aggression. That stance also brought Israel and Saudi Arabia closer, a relationship that developed to the point that in the summer of 2023, it seemed like normalization was just around the corner — which officials, including former Secretary of State Tony Blinken, have since confirmed.

By extension, it might make sense for the Abraham Accords and a Saudi-Israel rapprochement to be back in the headlines after Israel took the ultimate stand against Iran's nuclear program last month, bombing it with assistance from the U.S. President Donald Trump has expressed hope to expand the accords in recent weeks, ahead of and during his meetings with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu last week.

Yet there has been almost no serious talk about Saudi Arabia joining the Abraham Accords in recent weeks.

Riyadh has also been publicly signaling that its relationship with Tehran is still on track since China brokered a deal between the two countries in 2023. Saudi Arabia, like other Gulf States, spoke out last month against the Israeli and American airstrikes on Iran. Last week, Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi met with Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman in Jeddah.

With no long-term ceasefire in Gaza and a strategy of trying to contain and balance Iran's power in the region, the Saudis are in no rush to normalize relations with Israel, experts told *Jewish Insider*.

Bernard Haykel, a professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University, told JI that the Saudis' statements came out of a fear that "if Iran is attacked by Israel and the U.S., the Iranians would retaliate against them ... The public statements are all basically defending Iran's right as a sovereign state to get the Iranians not to see them as an ally or a proxy of America and Israel."

But, "in fact, they are allies of America," he added.

"There's all this public condemnation of the attacks on Iran," Haykel said, "but when the U.S. pulled its forces from the Air Force base in Qatar [due to Iran's retaliation], they moved their planes to a Saudi base. So they condemned the U.S. for attacking Iran, but they also gave the U.S. protection."

In addition, he noted, Saudi Arabia is in CENTCOM, as is Israel, such that if any Iranian drones or missiles were detected over Saudi territory, the information would be relayed to Washington and Jerusalem. "It is a fact that [the Saudis] are part of a security architecture that protects Israel as much as it protects them."

Haykel said there is a sense of relief in Riyadh from how the 12-day Israel-Iran war played out, but Saudi officials are still concerned about Iran's remaining ballistic and cruise missiles: "[Iran is] very close and can swarm Saudi Arabia. Unlike Israel, the Saudis don't have an Iron Dome. They're much more vulnerable."

The meeting between bin Salman and Araghchi is "part of the strategy to protect themselves from an Iranian attack," Haykel added.

Hussein Aboubakr Mansour, a senior fellow at the Jerusalem Center for Security and Foreign Affairs and a researcher at the Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy, told JI that "the Gulf states are immediate neighbors of Iran and will always have to live with them."

"Iran will always be a problem for them no matter who is in power. It is a huge, advanced state, and they are these tiny Gulf states. They can't stop Iran's ambition and wish for hegemony," he said.

Aboubakr Mansour argued that the Saudis have an interest in keeping the current Iranian regime in place, because a more liberal Iranian regime may turn itself into Washington's favored Middle Eastern power, as it was in the 1960s and '70s, threatening the close relationship Riyadh has with the Trump administration.

"They have an interest in Iran remaining the pariah that it is," he said.

Haykel said that the Saudis "are not going to shed tears for Iran, regardless of their public statements."

"They sound like they're anti-Israel, but in actual fact, the Israeli military capability that has been on display vis-a-vis Iran, the attack on the Iranian nuclear facilities and the Israeli capability to defend itself from Iranian attacks are all things the Saudis want," he added. "They want an Iran chastened, that doesn't use non-state actors and doesn't have a nuclear program. They want a contained Iran."

Saudi Arabia's strategy has been "trying to get Iran to behave more responsibly," rather than as a "hugely destabilizing factor in the region through its proxies," Haykel said. That was also the motivation behind the 2023 China-mediated detente between Saudi Arabia and Iran, he explained.

Aboubakr Mansour said that balancing the other major powers in the Middle East — Iran, Israel and Turkey — is a priority for Riyadh.

A decade ago, "standing up to Iran was one of the main attractions of Israel [for the Saudis], that was true then," Aboubakr Mansour said. "Now there's a main factor they need to calculate, that the U.S. is not reliable and maybe it isn't going to be again ... [The Saudis] had four good years with Trump and the Abraham Accords, and then the Biden administration [and the Saudis] couldn't stand each other."

In addition, he said that the Gulf states "have a complete lack of hard power compared to Israel, Iran and Turkey," and bin Salman has big ambitions for his country and its economy.

"All of these elements together lead them to calculate their national interests and strategy in a way that gives them maximum leverage over everyone all the time," he said. "It's about balancing everyone against everyone else ... The Saudis' ambition is huge and they can't allow the Iranians, Turks or Israelis to become a hegemonic force in the region."

As such, Aboubakr Mansour posited that "the Saudis are in a place where they want to see neither the Israelis nor the Iranians win. [The Saudis] want them to put each other in check, which will give [the Saudis] more leverage."

As for what the means for Saudi-Israel normalization, Aboubakr Mansour argued that "the Saudis are comfortable playing the normalization game for as long as they can ... because they can gain more from their current position than actually normalizing."

Normalization talk gives the Saudis positive attention from the media, attracts investment and makes them look better in Washington, but "it's a good show. There's no reality to it," Aboubakr Mansour said.

"They cooperate with the Israelis — they have a new class of statesmen who are [Millenials], they are not interested in the 'resistance' and see the positive in Israel — but interests dictate everything. They will play the game as long as they can extract more leverage from it ... Normalizing with Israel doesn't have the incentives for the Saudis that it did five years ago," he said.

Haykel similarly said that "the Saudis are very good at temporizing, kicking the can down the road until they feel the time is right," he added.

The Saudis "have their own constraints — domestic, regional and the Islamic public – that they have to keep in mind," Haykel said. "They are insisting first and foremost on a ceasefire ... They seem to be talking less about irreversible steps towards Palestinian statehood, but I think it is still a condition for normalization."

Still, he said, "Palestinian statehood is seen in Israel as rewarding terrorism and not something the Israeli public is willing to entertain at the moment, and the Saudis know this well."

Because of that, the Saudis have been "pushing for more cosmetic things ... [such as] working with France to get as many states as possible to recognize a Palestinian state through the U.N."

According to Haykel, the Saudis want to be able to say that a solution for Palestinian self-determination has been found, without making specific demands of what that means, whether the Palestinians would have an army or not, or if they would have full or partial sovereignty.

In that regard, not much has changed since Oct. 7, 2023, in that the Saudi leadership "never had much respect for the Palestinian Authority, with a few exceptions," and as such, Riyadh does not want to be saddled with the bill for Gaza's reconstruction because they do not think the PA is up to the task, Haykel said.

"They want some kind of face-saving solution with the ceasefire being a precondition," he said. "They're waiting for President Trump to put pressure on Netanyahu to reach a ceasefire and then make gestures toward the Palestinians."

At the same time, Haykel warned that there is some talk in Riyadh of pushing for a U.N. Security Council resolution that would enshrine a right for the Palestinians to have sovereignty over the West Bank and to have a capital in east Jerusalem. The idea, he said, came from former PA Prime Minister Salam Fayyad.

"They would like the U.S. to push for this regardless of what Israel says or thinks or does," he added, "but they have not moved to do this yet."

Meanwhile, the only recent public movement toward Israeli-Saudi normalization was the appearance last week of Saudi journalist Abdulaziz Alkhamis in the Knesset for a meeting of the Caucus to Advance a Regional Security Arrangement.

Alkhamis said that the Oct. 7 terrorist attacks and subsequent war, along with the Israeli strikes on Iran, are a sign that the region's "tectonic plates" are moving, and that Israel exposed Iran's strategic limitations. However, he emphasized that "normalization, from a Saudi point of view, is not just a bilateral agreement. It is a regional alignment and must include a credible, irreversible path to Palestinian sovereignty."

Former Israeli Defense Minister Benny Gantz said in the caucus meeting that "there is too much weight given to the Palestinian matter and it is being turned into [an excuse] to stay in place. We must be daring and make advances — we must, but we should also demand this courage from neighboring countries that want to advance normalization." ♦

JULY 14, 2025

Summer camp nostalgia hits the big screen in 'The Floaters'

'You should write about what you know, and if there's anything we know, it's Jewish summer camp,' producer Shai Korman told JI

By Haley Cohen

As summer heats up, Jewish adults looking for an escape from the fraught state of world Jewry may find themselves reflecting on a seemingly simpler time — getting competitive over color war or gaga ball and singing Debbie Friedman songs around a campfire at Jewish sleepaway camp.

That sense of nostalgia for one's Jewish summer camp years is doled out liberally in "The Floaters," a new film that centers on the fictional Camp Daveed and a group of outsider teens called the floaters.

"The Floaters" tells the story of Nomi (Jackie Tohn), who is freshly ousted from her rock band and reluctantly takes a job from her best friend Mara (Sarah Podemski), who is now camp director at their childhood Jewish summer camp. Nomi is charged with producing the camp play with the group of "Breakfast Club"-inspired campers.

The comedy was filmed at Camp Tel Yehudah in Barryville, N.Y. — where the film's three sibling producers grew up, and where their parents met. "You should write about what you know, and if there's anything we know, it's Jewish summer camp," Shai Korman, who produced the film alongside his sisters, Lily and Becky, told *Jewish Insider*. The movie was directed by Rachel Israel and written by Brent Hoff, Andra Gordon and Amelia Brain.

Korman told JI that "The Floaters" — which began production about a month before the Oct. 7, 2023, terrorist attacks in Israel — was not created to counter rising antisemitism. Rather, Korman said, "our goal was expanding and deepening the definition of how Jews are represented on screen."

"We try to push the movie beyond lox and bagels," he said, noting that the sibling trio specifically aimed to "put on screen Jewish women that exemplified the Jewish women that raised us, that were leaders and mentors." Camp Daveed is run by women, from camp director Mara to the camp's rabbi, Rabbi Rachel.

Several iconic films, such as "Wet Hot American Summer" and "Meatballs," were also inspired by Jewish camps. But in "The Floaters," "we talk about the rules of *kashrut*," Korman said. "You see Orthodox and secular kids all together, reflecting the world we grew up in."

Korman said an important aspect of that representation was casting all of the Jewish roles with Jewish actors — which includes Persian, Latino and Asian Jews.

"Making these kind of stories does help combat negative stereotypes about Jews," Korman told JI. "But we came from it more from the joyful affirmative we want to expand."

Like most summer camps itself, the movie is apolitical. Still, it doesn't shy away from briefly talking about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and other debates within the Jewish community. In one scene, campers make maps of Israel out of ice cream. "That's the kind of thing that used to happen at camp when we were there," Korman reflected. A counselor responds that one of the maps holds the solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

In another scene, Rabbi Rachel pushes for discussions about "the hard stuff," including Israel and "all the ways the Torah has excluded or offended you." The idea is rejected by the camp director, who says she would get angry calls from parents if those seminars took place.

"If people go away from this movie thinking it's some kind of political statement, they might want to take a moment of reflection, because what we're doing is showing an authentic experience," Korman said. "The movie is not about Israel, but Israel is part of the fabric of the story and the environment because that's what Jewish summer camp is like."

"The Floaters" premiered in June for a mostly non-Jewish audience at the Bentonville Film Festival in Arkansas. While the film has specific details that "only camp kids would know," Korman said — for example, the chaos that ensues after dairy spoons are switched with meat ones in the camp's kosher kitchen — "for people who aren't Jewish," he continued, "it will make them excited to either learn more or feel like they're in on it. We believe the more specific you get, the more universal you can be."

Currently only available for private screenings, the film's West Coast premiere is slated for Aug. 3 at the closing night of the San Francisco Jewish Film Festival.♦

JULY 11, 2025

Alan Hassenfeld, third-generation Hasbro executive and Jewish philanthropist, dies at 76

The Rhode Island-based Hassenfeld carried the torch of the company and his family's philanthropy, which focused on children's causes and the Jewish community

By Nira Dayanim

The article first appeared in eJewishPhilanthropy.

Alan Hassenfeld, former executive of Hasbro Games and major Jewish philanthropist who was a mainstay of the Rhode Island Jewish community, died on Tuesday at age 76.

Born in 1948 to Sylvia and Merrill Hassenfeld in Providence, R.I., Hassenfeld was part of a generational chain in both Hasbro and his community. The last member of the toy company's founding family to sit on Hasbro's board, Hassenfeld also carried the torch of his family's philanthropic giving to causes supporting children, higher education and the Jewish community.

Hassenfeld's philanthropic contributions cemented him as a community pillar in Rhode Island's Jewish community, where he served as honorary director of the Jewish Alliance of Rhode Island. He was described by those who knew him as creative, passionate and a child at heart — fitting of an executive at the helm of one of the world's leading toy manufacturers.

"He was raised in a toy company. And so that sort of joy and wonder that you have as a child? He never really lost that," Adam Greenman, CEO of the Jewish Alliance of Rhode Island, told eJewishPhilanthropy. "I think that joy and wonder led to the way that he thought about helping others, and almost made it more simple. If people needed help, he wanted to be able to provide it."

Hassenfeld and his brother, Stephen, were the third generation of Hassenfelds involved in Hasbro, the company founded in 1923 by their grandfather Henry and two great uncles, who immigrated from Poland. Hassenfeld graduated from University of Pennsylvania in 1970, joining the family business shortly after. After his brother's death in 1989, Hassenfeld succeeded him as Hasbro's chief executive officer from 1989 to 2003, and chairman until 2005. Until last year he acted as chairman emeritus.

A 1990 profile in *Family Business Magazine* described Hassenfeld as taking a disciplined but creative approach to the business, leveraging his sensitivity and people skills to steer the company in bold directions.

"The tradition which was handed down from my grandfather and his brothers to my father and his brother and to Steve and I was understanding that our most important asset is our people," he said in an interview in Leaders Magazine. "As much as we're known for our toys, toys don't come without great ideation and innovation and that comes from your people."

Just as the toy company was passed down through the Hassenfeld family, so too was the value of giving back to the community. Four years before Alan was born, the Hassenfeld Family Foundation was established in 1944. Throughout his life, Hassenfeld carried on the mission of the foundation, creating nonprofit Hassenfeld Family Initiatives in 2008, focused specifically on causes for children and women. Through the Hasbro Charitable Trust, Hassenfeld gave the founding gift to create Hasbro Children's Hospital in Rhode Island in 1994.

"When Rhode Island was in need of a children's hospital, he almost single-handedly stood up and made sure that one was built. We have Hasbro's Children's Hospital today, because of Alan," said Greenman. "It's just such a loss for Rhode Island. I'm really going to miss my friend, and I think that there's a lot of folks here in Rhode Island that are really going to miss their friend Alan."

According to Greenman, beyond Hassenfeld's commitment to children's causes, he valued giving back to the Jewish community and Israel.

"It really was at the forefront of who he was," Greenman said. "His work with the Jerusalem Foundation and Israel spoke to his real understanding and feeling about Jewish philanthropy worldwide: that we're all part of one community. While his philanthropic pursuits went far beyond the Jewish community, the Jewish community always held a special place for him and was really a key part of who he was."

Hassenfeld also gave heavily to both Brandeis University and Brown University, serving on the board of both schools, and made smaller donations to other universities. In 2014, he donated $2.5 million to Brandeis to create the Hassenfeld Family Innovation Center. In 2015, he donated $12.5 million to found the Hassenfeld Child Health Innovation Institute at Brown University to strengthen the field of children's health.

With a 20-year stint on the board of The Jerusalem Foundation, Hassenfeld followed in the footsteps of his mother, who served as the board's vice chair for several years. According to Joy Levitt, CEO of the Jerusalem Foundation, when Hassenfeld heard that someone on the board was grieving, celebrating or going through a life transition, they could expect a check-in or a personalized letter from him, often including poem and song recommendations.

"He was very playful and funny and, at the same time, deeply committed to the work," Levitt told eJP. "This was a board

that he held together for 20 years through thick and thin, through many wars in Israel and many disruptions and all kinds of challenges. Everybody, next to their loyalty toward Jerusalem, had a loyalty toward Alan."

A donation from Hassenfeld established the Teddy Fountain in Teddy Kollek Park — a favored play space for the city's children in the summer. According to Levitt, the fountain, along with Hassenfeld's giving to youth centers in East Jerusalem, were part of his vision for coexistence in Jerusalem.

"When you go to Teddy Park, you see Arab kids, you see Haredi kids, you see secular kids. You see everybody's just playing in the water. That was Alan's vision for a city in which all people had a chance," Levitt told eJP. "He and his family just believed in that. Believed that we have a responsibility, to make it possible for everybody in Jerusalem to wake up hopeful. He loved Jerusalem, but he also loved children."♦