

# *Nitzotzot Min HaNer*

# **Management for the Leader**

*Volume #17, June – July 2004*

## *TABLE OF CONTENTS*

OVERVIEW	2
I. MANAGING YOURSELF & OTHERS	2
II. MANAGE TO, NOT FROM	3
III. LEVEL ONE MANAGEMENT: TIME MANAGEMENT	5
IV. TIME MANAGEMENT AS A FUNCTION OF LEADERSHIP RATHER THAN MANAGEMENT	10
V. LEVEL TWO MANAGEMENT: DELEGATION	11
VI. LEVEL THREE MANAGEMENT: THE DYNAMICS OF INTER-DEPENDENT LEADERSHIP	20



## Overview

This edition is not a management manual. It provides a more sophisticated understanding of how to get more things done. In the pages that follow, we describe three levels of management. Level one is classical time management, including a refreshing reappraisal of the use of technology. Level two management is delegation or, better, empowerment. Delegation is not simply finding people to do things for you – that is employment. Delegation is the surrendering of whole sections of the organization to ‘team-player’ employees who are expected to become better than you would be in that area. It turns you from a boss into a facilitator or server. Whereas time management simply reshuffles the furniture, proper delegation creates new vistas and horizons. Whereas time management is a management issue, we have suggested that delegation is more a leadership than a management issue. But there is an even higher, third level, of management – partnerships. It is our belief that too few heads of organizations in the outreach world have sought out a real partner to join them in their endeavors.

These three levels of management only help if you know what you are managing towards, and not just out of a desire to get out of your current mess. We have therefore provided what we believe to be a user-friendly chart to assist your own evaluations on this score.

For those of you who have yet to express your leadership by becoming heads of organizations, only the first three sections of this edition will be relevant to you. The third section, time management, was already written specifically for an organizational head. Some of the things written there would be inappropriate and obnoxious if used by someone in a different position.

## I. Managing Yourself & Others

The life of an outreach professional is, by its very nature, busy. His day is open-ended. There is always more that he could be doing. Since outreach is rooted in relationships, he could always be investing more in the people he knows – another chat, another *chavrusa*. The programming side always beckons for more, the fundraising is never enough – in fact every area of his life seems that it could just as well take over all of his waking hours and more. Many outreach workers are on duty seven days a week – they rush into Shabbos, and Shabbos itself is an intense day, with guests and *minyanim*, *shiurim* and just *schmoozing*. Sunday has its own opportunities and provides its own business.

This situation leads to issues of burnout (which we dealt with in two previous editions of Nitzotzot), to questions concerning management of one’s personal growth in the context of a demanding, professional environment, and to questions of how to spend time with the family.

Moreover, the hectic pace can become a vicious cycle, preventing one from doing the things that would allow one to operate more efficiently and at a higher level. Stephen Covey relates the story of a woodchopper who spent the whole day chopping down a tree. In the middle of the day, someone suggested that things would go much faster if he took a break to sharpen his saw; to which the woodchopper replied that he did not have the time to do so.

Time management beckons as the panacea that will solve all of this. But the need to get through ‘your shopping list’ in a more efficient, ‘time managed’ way has to be seen in a broader context. If the goal is the ability to do more in less time, then time management must also involve partnering and delegation, staff motivation and goal setting. Time management is really not the right heading – it needs to appear as a sub-category of what we will call “Managing yourself and others.”



## II. Manage To, Not From

You cannot begin to time manage until you are clear about your goals. As an outreach professional, it is easy to be busy. The phone is always ringing, e-mails come pouring in, the repairman is coming today and you have a fundraising appointment. Someone calls about *minyán* times and a frantic mother wants to speak to you about her kid who is going off the *derech*. You can be on the go from morning till night, but this does not necessarily mean that you are being productive. There is no point in becoming efficient about all of this business unless it is actually achieving your goals. You cannot time manage away from the situation you are in unless you know what it is you want to achieve. You have to time manage towards your goals and not away from your current business. Once you have decided what you want to do, you can work out how you fit it all in. That stated, we need to point out that an ideal schedule just does not exist, not because you are not perfect, but because the world around you is not. Welcome to *Olam HaZeh*, a messy place full of greys. So what you are trying to achieve is a practical, good year<sup>1</sup>. Such a year should be divided between the following chunks of dedicated time:

- a. Direct goal-related action
- b. Secondary goal-related action
- c. Other
- d. Means to ends action
- e. *Yisurim shel ahava*

A *direct goal-related action* is one which represents the hard core *kiruv* you are trying to do. This may be a *shiur*, a program, talking to someone about *Yiddishkeit*, and so on.

A *secondary goal-related action* is one which reflects the background of what you have to do in order to do *kiruv*. This includes formulating a vision, setting goals, strategizing and evaluating, staff management and coordination.

*Other actions* are those which do not help your own *kiruv* efforts but are worthwhile nevertheless. Such actions include helping other organizations with *kiruv* or *chesed* or raising money, helping individuals who might be regular *frum* members of the city, or any other worthwhile action that may have nothing to do with your own organizational goals.

*Means to ends actions* have no value per se, but have to be done in order for your organization to continue running. These include fundraising and publicity, legal and *halachik* issues, obtaining and running a building, etc.

*Yisurim shel ahava* are those things which really do not seem to be helping you in any way, but take significant amounts of your time and energy nevertheless. These include politics and failed initiatives.

On the following page is a chart which reflects the amount of time you ought to be spending on each one of these categories, depending on whether you are running a small, medium or large organization:

---

<sup>1</sup> I have talked about a year rather than a smaller unit of time because many of things we bring below are either seasonal or infrequent, but quite time-consuming when they do occur.



A – ENDS

**1. Direct goal-related**

	<b>Big Org.</b>	<b>Med. Org.</b>	<b>Small Org.</b>
Counseling	3%	3%	2%
Kiruv – giving shiurim, program, seminar participation	4%	8%	15%
Programming – brain-storming, planning	7%	5%	5%
Programming – implementation	2%	14%	8%
Programming – discussions and evaluations	5%	1.5%	1%
<b>Sub Total 1</b>	<b>21.00%</b>	<b>31.50%</b>	<b>31.00%</b>

**2. Secondary goal-related**

Vision – goal setting, evaluations, etc.	5%	1%	0.5%
Staff issues – org. related	8%	2%	3%
Staff issues – personal	4.5%	2%	3%
New staff – searching, hiring and training	2%	0.5%	1%
General organizational coordination, networking	2%	0.5%	1%
Information flow, finger on the pulse	3%	1%	1%
<b>Sub Total 2</b>	<b>24.50%</b>	<b>7.00%</b>	<b>9.50%</b>

**Total (Sub Total 1 + Sub Total 2)**

**45.50%      38.50%      40.50%**

**3. Other**

Helping other organizations	8%	4%	3%
Helping other individuals	5%	5%	2%
Personal development	2%	2%	2%
Staying abreast	1%	1%	1%
Unusual family events	1%	1%	1%
<b>Sub Total 3</b>	<b>17.00%</b>	<b>13.00%</b>	<b>9.00%</b>

**Grand Total**

**(Sub Total 1+Sub Total 2+Sub Total 3)**

**62.50%      51.50%      49.50%**

B – MEANS + OTHER

**4. Means to ends**

Fundraising and public relations	18%	22%	20%
Financial, admin., legal, building	5%	9%	7%
<i>Halachik</i>	1%	1%	1%
Crisis management	2%	5%	7.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26.00%</b>	<b>37.00%</b>	<b>35.50%</b>

**5. Yisurim shel ahava**

Politics	2%	1%	1%
Burn-out days	2%	2%	3%
Inappropriate, misdirected	4%	4%	4.5%
Failed initiatives	2%	3%	4%
Lack of time-management (wasted time)	1%	1%	2%
Health	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.50%</b>	<b>11.50%</b>	<b>15.00%</b>

**Total (Sub Total 4+ Sub Total 5)**

**37.50%      48.50%      50.5%**

**Grand Total**

**100.00%      100.00%      100.00%**



The specific figures are not that important. Nor is it important now to understand why figures mysteriously go up or down between small, medium and large organizations. What is important is that you have got to get your first three categories (Direct and Secondary goal-related and Other) to over 50% of your time. For these are the categories that reflect the end. The moment you are spending more time on the means rather than the end, you are in trouble. Never turn your life into one dedicated to means. Regroup and change whatever you have to change – but remain an ends person.

To do this, you cannot only be a manager; you have to also be a leader. The time management approach for these two aspects of your life is going to be different. In fact it may sometimes clash. For example, if you get too focused on maintaining order you may make a great manager but a less than excellent leader<sup>2</sup>. You need to learn how to balance the two. As a manager, you need to create and maintain order, but as a leader you need to focus on new approaches and ideas. As a manager you need to implement the goals of the organization, but as a leader you need to create those goals, shape moods, evoke images and establish objectives. As a manager you are trying to protect yourself from others intruding too much and you are constantly fighting clutter, but as a leader you are looking to interact with people, in search of better ways or new ideas. As a manager you want your role with others to be defined, but as a leader you often need to engage in turbulent and intense interactions with others.

### **III. Level One Management: Time Management**

We are now ready to deal with level one time management, what we call practical time management. The average outreach professional is full of interruptions, too many meetings and not enough time to feel that he is fully in control. A fitting analogy is Henry Mintzberg's<sup>3</sup> description of the way business managers move through a bewildering array of issues on any given day. In fact fully half of their activities are completed in less than nine minutes, hardly enough time to really focus on things and understand them thoroughly.

#### **◆ Keep appointments short**

One of the biggest time-wasters is open-ended appointments. Generally, you should tell people how long the appointment is when they walk through the door. Say, "We have 45 minutes, let's see what we can get through." If someone is late, and you have appointments back-to-back, you are perfectly entitled to still finish on time, though you must announce this in advance, or at least give the meeting less time than you would otherwise have done. Try and bunch your scheduled appointments back-to-back, so that when the next person arrives you can easily end off the first appointment. This will also leave you with bigger chunks of bunched time during which you can focus on other things.

If you do not have another appointment scheduled, ask your secretary to call someone (preferably overseas) at that time. When the call comes through, pick up the phone and say, "Hang on one moment, I just have to say goodbye to someone."

---

<sup>2</sup> Abraham Zaleznik, *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 1992 as summarized in the Dec. '01 edition.

<sup>3</sup> The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact in *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 1975 as quoted in Tom Peters, see note below.



Many times I bump into people and they say that they want to meet with me. Often, I do not make an appointment on the spot, fearing that they aren't really that motivated to meet with me. I ask them to call me at my office to make the appointment, and many do not.

◆ **Leave detailed messages**

Let's say that someone is looking to make an appointment with you. You return their call and they are out. Say the following: "Hi. This is Rabbi Meirowitz. Concerning your request for a meeting, I can meet at one of the following four times." Always leave a range of options. State your preference, though. "Please call back with one of the times. If you do not get hold of me, just leave your choice of time with my secretary."

Most people find themselves unprepared to leave a detailed message. If you really want to save time, make some points of what you want to say. To adapt a phrase, "A minute in time saves nine."

Sometimes you know that talking to the person will take a lot of unnecessary time when leaving a message would be just as effective. Call the person's secretary, if they have one, and say, "I don't need to disturb him. Just tell him ...". If you are calling when there are time differences, you can call during non-office hours and leave a message on the person's answering service.

◆ **Diarize more than appointments**

Block off time in your diary for all the things you have to do. That way you make sure that your appointments don't take up your whole day.

If your wife needs your time, don't wait until you have a free moment. That may never happen. Make an official appointment, preferably in the morning before going to work. Although you may both feel awkward about it at first, you may find that this is the best way to give each other the time that you need together.

I also diarize time to write proposals and budgets, and have a time during the day when I return most of my phone calls. Any telephone conversation that is going to take longer than five minutes, I make as an official, diary-entered, appointment.

◆ **Calls, cars and messages**

Tell people to call you back at times when you know you are driving.<sup>4</sup> If you are taking a long drive you can schedule a longer telephone meeting. (Some like to use such time to unwind.) Train your secretaries not only to take messages, but to find out what times the person will be available at that number over the next two days. Your secretaries should also have a reasonable idea of who is difficult to get hold of, creating a telephone tag situation, and who has 'interruption rights.' Hand your cell to your secretary when you get to the office in the morning and have her answer that as well. Your secretary should always ask what a call is about, though she should not push for an answer. She should learn to refer callers to the right address. No need for you to spend twenty minutes on the phone explaining that you don't do weddings or dealing with an issue which had nothing to do with you. On the other hand, you do need to return *all* your messages, preferably that day. If you see that you can't, get your secretary to call and say that you haven't forgotten them. However, if you know in advance that you are going to have a busy day, your secretary should explain to

---

<sup>4</sup> Unless it is dangerous to do so.



people how intense your schedule is today and ask them to call back in two or three days (be specific). That way, the onus of calling back is on them, not you.

I am not a great fan of talking business under the חופה. I feel it is a זלזול of a holy event. But I do arrange to meet people just before and just after, as well as during the *seudah*. I prepare for these occasions, not leaving them to chance. Similarly, if I have to take a long car/bus trip, I schedule telephone meetings in advance.

In Israel, I usually travel by bus, as this affords me the opportunity to do my writing. I do not like making calls on the bus. But I have found that my walk to the bus stop after work is an excellent time to return calls. During the later afternoon, I consciously do not return some calls, knowing that I will have the time to do so on my way home. I travel overseas quite a bit, and I try to arrive at the airport at least three hours before boarding, as I find this a good time to finish my business, especially if I need a really long conversation, as well as to write.

◆ **Don't go to things you feel you shouldn't go to**

Don't get *shlepped* to go and see a building when you are not thinking of moving; don't go and see a project or display because someone else said you have to see it; don't allow meetings to take place unless they have a clear purpose.

I was once 'placed' on a supervisory board for a particular project which had yet to appoint a project manager. I refused to attend meetings until this step had been taken, even though the project involved donors, which made it highly uncomfortable. After two meetings I was informed that three prospective project managers had been found, and was asked to assist with a final decision.

Even where I feel that a meeting is going to be worthwhile, I assess how necessary my attendance is. I will generally not go to meetings where I feel that I am really not needed. Sometimes you may be required just to show your face. In such cases, go as late as possible. The earlier you go, the more pressure you will be under to stay.

◆ **Work where you can be productive**

I would like to take things even further. As a leader you can afford the luxury of not working in an office environment where you do not feel productive. If you have to prepare a budget and you need an hour of uninterrupted time, go sit on the nearest park bench with your laptop.

I remember a co-director joining an organization and, within a few days, confiding that he found the offices too busy and stifling an environment. The organization arranged an office for him in a different location, where he was fabulously productive.

◆ **When to work and when to play**

When you do things because you feel you need to show other people that you are working, you are not going to be fully productive. And even if you are, you are going to pay a price in burnout or resentment that is not worth the gain.

Finished what you have to do, or feeling blah? Get out of the office and go home. Don't feel that you have to set an example to your staff. They know you are dedicated. And if you still can't get over your feelings of guilt, consult with your nearest therapist. Richard Moran said, "The person who spends all of his or her time at work is not hard working; he or she is boring."



Many people have a certain office threshold after which they have ‘had it.’ This may be 1 pm or 9 pm. For some the solution is a couple of hours at home, others need to work from home for the rest of the day.

Find a day – Tuesday or Wednesday – when you start work later than usual. Use that time to pay your bills, polish your shoes, and write to your parents.

◆ **The One Minute Manager**

Read *The One Minute Manager*. It is a short, easy-to-read book and it will save you loads of time. Similarly, Mintzberg and Tom Peters<sup>5</sup> have shown that a leader can influence a large number of activities through brief contacts.

One of the most successful outreach people today is Rabbi Shmuel Mofson of Ohr Somayach, South Africa. Rabbi Mofson has contact with several hundred people every week, possibly close to a thousand. How does he find the time for so many contacts? I have watched him go up to someone, look him in the eye warmly, and with total concentration, and ask him with a depth of sincerity how he is doing. Within three minutes he is on to the next person, the first one feeling satisfied that Rabbi Mofson truly cares about him.

◆ **Using technology**

Technology will make your life easier. But it will not necessarily save you time. Used in the wrong way, it can make you a less rather than a more effective person. And it is awfully addictive. Recently, a businessman told me that he had to ban internal e-mail messages from one employee to another (often sitting in adjoining booths) both because of the depersonalization and the loss of time involved.

Take palm pilots. Most people in *kiruv* use palm pilots as electronic telephone books and as appointment books. I have no palm. I use a paper (yes, paper) diary, and I use a Casio electronic phone book (though they won’t make them much longer). Speed? I have watched people write appointments in their palms as I was writing in my diary. The best palm time? One and a half times my diary-writing time. I have watched people beam to each other and waited for them to finish long after I wrote in the number. (And how many times in your life are you going to beam anyhow?) Convenience? About once a month I hear of someone who lost his palm, dropped it in water or down the stairs and had forgotten to back it up.

But more than that, my diary allows me to see my whole week at a glance, prioritize things, set goals and feel I am on top of things. It allows me to easily relate to longer periods of time, months at a glance, plan overseas trips and make sure I get everything else in as well. I would never give up my paper diary for a silly palm. (Maybe one day they won’t make diaries any more – gulp!)

And then there is the cursed cell phone, so controlling that, more than once, I have seen *Bnei Torah* answer a cell in the middle of *davening*! So let me tell you what I do. I have a cell phone but I do not give out the number. I only turn it on to make outgoing calls. I will sometimes arrange to have someone call me on my cell phone at a particular time, and then switch it on at that time for that purpose. That’s it. And I couldn’t be happier. I really am not interested in making myself more available than I am, because I am using my current availability in ways that are far more productive than I would with a cell phone.

---

<sup>5</sup> Tom Peters, reprinted in *Harvard Business Review*, Dec. ’01



But I still suffer from a more ancient malady. The desk phone. I was once in an El Al office and there was a long line. Part of the problem was that the El Al agents were taking phone calls all the time. So I walked out of the office to the call box five yards away and called them. I received instant service. Now I have the same *yetzer hara* as other people to helplessly respond to that ring no matter whom I have sitting in front of me. I know that the chances of the phone call being as important as the conversation I am currently having are very small. I know that I am affecting the quality of this conversation. I know that this conversation is an arranged appointment and the call is not. I know that this person spent a good deal of time *schlepping* over to meet me and the caller did not. So what is the mystery of this grip of modern technology over our lives?

In order to save my life from this horrible fate, I tell my callers to try between 12 pm and 2 pm. That is also the time that I return calls. I turn down most (but not all) callers at other times, but *I tell people when I will be available for their calls*. What I also find amazing is how so many people do not leave a message. They find that, when I am not available, there are other people who can help them. I have oversimplified, but the idea is clear.

*There is a great rule of thumb in technology investment* that will keep you on the straight and narrow: To what *kushya* is this piece of technology a *teretz*? I know people who really do need a palm. For example, the Ner LeElef Placement Officer, Rabbi Yaakov Miller, was constantly writing notes about different students, particular job opportunities, tens of things and people who needed to be followed up. His old system: pieces of notepaper. For Rabbi Miller, the palm is truly a blessing. Others use palms to better organize their lives. They write memos, are beeped by reminders, record expenses and keep their schedules all under one roof. If the *kushya* was lack of organization, then the palm, for some, is a good *teretz*.

So what is not a good *kushya*? Well, out-of-date technology for one. (Unless you cannot get spare parts or new programs are not interfacing with your hardware.) It really does not matter how out-of-date your computer, how slow your modem, or how backward your photocopying machine or telephone system – if it is working for you, then you will probably waste time rather than save it by upgrading. By the time you locate a new system that's right for you, negotiate a price, have it installed, learn how to use it properly, have all the little problems ironed out and spend the time raising the money for the stupid thing, you will have wasted many tens and tens of hours. (But if you do buy a new system make sure that it is a good, up-to-date one.)

I know people – ‘boys with toys’ I call them – who are always buying new programs for their computers. Every day they are tinkering, wasting hours, to be able to do something a half a second faster. Their eyes and their hands are not up to this increased pace, so they don't even save the four seconds a day they were trying to. If you want to save time, *shmooze* less on the phone, or take a good look at your priorities. I am pro-technology. I am just anti-toy. Instruments that are cell phones and palms all in one were recently launched on the market. Now there is an instrument for me. I believe that, for the first time, a palm could truly save me time, provided that I only use it as a phone book and to make calls and I don't get trapped using all its features like downloading e-mail, using its word processing features, etc. And the Casio is all but extinct.

Go for the technology enablers, but don't fall into the technology trap.



#### IV. Time Management as a Function of Leadership rather than Management

Time management will teach you how to organize your day so that you get it all in. But shuffling the deck more efficiently will only buy you so much time. Essentially this is a managerial, not a leadership tool. Understanding how you are going to arrange all that you have to is indeed a *chesed* to yourself. It will relieve you of stress and hassle. But it will not make you a better leader. What we need is a level two time management. What will help you far more is to learn how to become a proactive instead of a reactive leader.

Proactive Leadership	Find Partners	Delegate	Vision, Goals, Strategies and Evaluations
Time Management	Become Selectively Accessible	Technology	Prioritize

One of the biggest *mosad* builders in *Klal Yisroel* today is Rabbi Dovid Refson, *shlita*. One would expect him, running so many things, to be constantly overwhelmed, and certainly nearly impossible to speak to. Yet he always seems to be able to give his full attention in every meeting, to address whatever needs to be addressed in a calm and focused manner. Level one time management could never achieve this.

Jack Welch described his life as possibly the most successful CEO of his time:

*If someone tells me, "I'm working 90 hours a week," I say, "You're doing something terribly wrong. I go skiing on the weekend. I go out with my buddies on Friday and party. You've got to do the same or you've got a bad deal. Put down a list of the 20 things you're doing that make you work 90 hours and 19 of them have got to be nonsense – or else somebody else has got to do them for you."*<sup>6</sup>

Now a *kiruv mosad* is not a business. And it is hardly likely that 19 out of 20 things which a *kiruv* professional does are nonsense. But the latter part of the sentence – *or else somebody else has got to do them for you* – merits a further look. The singular most important step one can take to becoming more proactive has to do with sharing the load. If your first reaction is, 'This is all very nice but I can't afford another person,' then read on.

The most important help you need is a partner. Only secondly do you need to learn the art of delegation. However, because partnering is a higher level skill than managing, we will deal with the latter first.

<sup>6</sup> Jack Welch Speaks, pg. 33



## V. Level Two Management: Delegation

*Leadership almost always involves cooperation and collaboration, activities that occur only in a conducive context.*

William Pagonis<sup>7</sup>

Big things are done by teams of people. One-man shows will always get stuck at a certain point. Some one-man shows manage to employ numerous people. They may have the superficial look and feel of a real organization, but they will only go so far. Unless you really believe this, you will probably not be pushed to find a partner. For it is much more comfortable to be sitting at the top of the pyramid by yourself, condemned to be a small player forever. Stephen Covey is quite right when he calls the need for independence a form of immaturity.<sup>8</sup>

What we are dealing with here is delegation, on a massive scale. “Getting the right people in the right jobs is a lot more important than developing a strategy,” said Jack Welch,<sup>9</sup> and the same holds true for *kiruv*. The first question asked by Mr. Zev Wolfson, one of the greatest philanthropists of our generation, upon hearing a good idea, is: “Who is going to head the project.” He doesn’t ask where the rest of the money is going to come from, or the dozens of other questions that could be asked. A good man will make all those other things happen.

Yet delegation remains a real challenge for most outreach professionals. People have told me: “If you want to get something done, you have to do it yourself;” or, “I can’t delegate, the things I am doing are just too important.” Or, “We are at such a critical stage right now, I simply have to handle this myself.” And of course, “I just can’t afford to take on (the right kind of) help.”

Delegation is not something that comes naturally to most leaders. In fact a *Rosh Yeshiva* of a leading *Baal Teshuvah yeshiva* told me that it was the hardest thing he had ever had to learn. After all, anything which he delegated to others he knew he could do better himself. But it can be learned.

Many people regard Jack Welch as the greatest CEO of the 20th Century. One of the reasons that General Electric was such a great success under Jack Welch was that he learned to do what even great CEOs had found too challenging, “to bring the democratic process, the voice of the ordinary worker, into the corporate arena.”<sup>10</sup>

Welch went a step further. He realized that by delegating he was not making a necessary compromise in order to do more, as conventional wisdom would have it. He saw that his workers, being specialists in their field, would be able to act in areas where he was really quite ignorant.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Leadership in the Combat Zone*, Harvard Business Review, Dec. 2001

<sup>8</sup> *The Seven Habits*, pg. 51: If I am physically interdependent, I am self-reliant and capable, but I also realize that you and I working together can accomplish far more than, even at my best, I could accomplish alone. If am emotionally interdependent, I derive a great sense of worth within myself, but I also recognize the need for love, for giving, and for receiving love from others. If I am intellectually interdependent, I realize that I need the best thinking of other people to join with my own.

<sup>9</sup> *Jack Straight from the Gut*, Jack Welch with John A. Byrne

<sup>10</sup> *Jack Welch Speaks*, by Janet Lowe, pg. xviii



“People say, ‘Jack, how can you be at NBC; you don’t know anything about dramas or comedies....’” Welch explained. “Well, I can’t build a jet engine, either. I can’t build a turbine. Our job at GE is to build resources – human and financial. The idea of getting great talent, giving them all the support in the world, and letting them run, is the whole management philosophy of GE, whether it is in turbines, engines, or a network.”<sup>11</sup>

I found a similar thing as a director of an outreach organization. The head of our Campus division knows more about the dynamics of students than I do and the follow-up staff are more expert in that area than I could hope to be. Perhaps they did not enter the organization better than me in those areas. But, as intelligent people specializing in what they do, they quickly became the experts in their area.

Delegation has to be learned, otherwise you are always going to be overwhelmed, and you will become a pathetic half-baked expert at everything. Learn to be a massive delegator, and you will do bigger and better things!

After you have delegated you have just started. Now begins the tough job of leading, managing and inspiring people. Now begin issues of motivating staff and showing recognition and gratitude; of inspiring loyalty, not only in your organization, but for the Jewish people; of professional competence and growth; of upward mobility and the Peter Principle. Most important, one has to build up trust and earn respect; to create a working community that is caring and nurturing. The truth is that delegation will not work unless all these things are factored in. A future Nitzotzot will, iy”H, deal with all of these issues.

What we cannot stress enough is the need, at this stage, to communicate your belief in the person’s abilities. Self-fulfilling prophecies are just as prevalent in organizations as they are in elementary school classrooms. If a manager is convinced that the people in his group are first-rate, they’ll reliably outperform a group whose manager believes the reverse – even if the innate talent of the two groups is similar. But what is truly amazing is that, even where managers understand this, they are still more effective in communicating low expectations, rather than high expectations, to their subordinates.<sup>12</sup>

Studies reveal that employees are often unaware that their managers consider them good, or the best. Clearly, the belief you have in and communicate to your employees, not the way you organize them, is the key to high expectations and high productivity.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, you have to start early. As employees mature and gain

---

<sup>11</sup> *Jack Welch Speaks*, by Janet Lowe, pg. 10. This does not mean that Welch always ‘managed loose,’ as he would call it. In his own words: Knowing when to meddle and when to let go was a pure gut decision. I managed tight when I sensed I could make a difference. I managed loose when I knew I had little if anything to offer.

Consistency was not a requirement here. Sometimes being an undisciplined, unmade bed got the job done faster. You pick and you choose your opportunities to make a difference. I loved to go on the field when I thought I could play, and I loved cheering from the sidelines when I didn’t think I belonged in the game.

*Jack Straight from the Gut*, Jack Welch with John A. Byrne

<sup>12</sup> J Sterling Livingston, *Pygmalion in Management*, Harvard Business Review, January 2003

<sup>13</sup> Livingston, *ibid*: Another insurance agency manager copied the organizational changes made at the Rockaway district office, grouping the salespeople he rated highly with the best manager, the average salespeople with an average manager, and so on. Improvement, however, did not result from the move. The Rockaway district manager therefore investigated the situation. He discovered that the assistant manager in charge of the high-performance unit was unaware that his manager considered him to be the best. In fact, he and the other agents



experience, their self-image gradually hardens, and they begin to see themselves as their career records imply. Their own aspirations and the expectations of their superiors become increasingly controlled by the “reality” of their past performance. It becomes more and more difficult for them and for their managers to generate mutually high expectations unless they have outstanding records.<sup>14</sup>

In their study at AT&T, Berlew and Hall concluded that the correlation between how much a company expects of an employee in the first year and how much that employee contributes during the next five years was “too compelling to be ignored.” The key is the concept of the first year as a *critical period for learning*, a time when the employee is uniquely ready to develop or change in the direction of the organization’s expectations.<sup>15</sup>

◆ **Get out of the way, stop managing, and start serving & leading**<sup>16</sup>

Many people have the idea that, even after they have delegated, they have to micro-manage – to look over the details of everything that has been done. They are frightened that their delegation will appear as abdication.<sup>17</sup> This is silly, for it defeats the object of delegation. As a delegator, you have to nurture people and their ideas, not control them. You have to become more of a cheerleader than a controller. If you feel that you are not going to be satisfied with your employee’s work, that you are a perfectionist, then understand that, in the long run, you are always going to remain essentially a one-man show. You may have lots of people working for you – but none of them will really do anything independently that is creative or significant.<sup>18</sup> They will know that they are but laborers, extended arms of the only mind that counts in the organization. As one GM Motors employee once put it, “For 50 years GM has been employing my body, when they could have also gotten my mind for free.”

It may actually be that many things do not get done as well. But, in the long run, the organization will achieve much more.

Part of delegating is watching a staff member doing something wrong and not saying anything. Save your involvement for the big time. The issue is not whether something could have been done better. It can always be done better. Rather, focus on whether the program is growing, whether it has a good reputation, and most important of all, focus on believing in the person doing the job. All people, with their formidable

---

doubted that the agency manager really believed there was any difference in their abilities. This agency manager was a stolid, phlegmatic, unemotional woman who treated her agents in a rather pedestrian way. Since high expectations had not been communicated to them, they did not understand the reason for the new organization and could not see any point in it.

<sup>14</sup> Livingston, *ibid*: Incidentally, the same pattern occurs in school. Rosenthal’s experiments with educational self-fulfilling prophecies consistently demonstrate that teachers’ expectations are more effective in influencing intellectual growth in younger children than in older children. In the lower grade levels, particularly in the first and second grades, the effects of teachers’ expectations are dramatic. In the upper grade levels, teachers’ prophecies seem to have little effect on children’s intellectual growth, although they do affect their motivation and attitude toward school.

<sup>15</sup> Livingstone, *ibid*.

<sup>16</sup> Expanded from an article written by the author for the *Yesodos Magazine*

<sup>17</sup> Adapted from Carol Walker, *Harvard Business Review*

<sup>18</sup> Ralph Stayer wrote an interesting article on this point called *How I Learned to Let My Workers Lead*, printed in the November-December 1990 edition of the *Harvard Business Review*. Stayer writes how he had to learn to stop controlling, and start coaching. Stayer finally learned the difference between letting people independently make the decision he would have made and really allowing people to make their own decisions.



intelligence, depth of feeling and desire to grow, are capable of doing great things. (In fact the desire to grow is the number one reason that most people choose a particular job to begin with.<sup>19</sup>) But they need to believe in themselves; they need a certain confidence to lead.<sup>20</sup> The easiest way to get them to fulfill that potential is to believe in them – and let them know it. To quote Welch again: “There is probably nothing worse in business than to work for a boss who doesn’t want you to win.”<sup>21</sup> And this means granting as much autonomy imaginable.

For this reason never monitor the hours of any senior staff member – and let them know that at the outset. The surest way to get people to want to keep on growing is for them to trust and respect themselves. The surest way for you to nurture that is to show that you trust and respect them. And one of the best ways to do that is to make people feel that they are accountable to themselves. Few people want to underachieve. Most people need some framework, like the minimum number of hours per week they are required to do. But I have never had a senior staff member who only worked those hours. This is because most people really want to do what is needed. Only in the case of secretarial staff, who are serving an office with definite hours, is it necessary to have a clock in and clock out system. True, *shiurim* have to be given on time. Meetings have to be kept. But staff get to choose their own hours. If I have a staff member whom I need to be accessible at a certain time, I tell him and leave the solution up to him.

And if a particular staff member takes advantage, then fire him. He is not for you. But don’t waste your days monitoring him.

---

<sup>19</sup> In a 2000 survey by Bottom Line Business, employees ranked salary and benefits 11 out of 18 on a list of factors for staying in their current jobs. The top ten reasons were:

- Career growth and learning.
- Exciting and challenging work.
- Meaningful work and the opportunity to make a difference.
- Great co-workers.
- Being a part of a team.
- A good boss.
- Being recognized for a job well done.
- Having fun on the job.
- Autonomy and a sense of control over their own work, and
- Flexibility in work hours and dress code.

Salary did not even make it to the top ten. But money issues do figure prominently in the reasons why people leave a job. The top eight:

- Loss of faith in management.
- Feeling unappreciated, bored or unchallenged.
- Frustrated with excessive politics.
- More money.
- Feeling used or exploited.
- Concern about the future of the firm.
- The departure of a close friend.
- A more flexible benefits package.

<sup>20</sup> Jack Welch put it this way: “It is a series of reinforcing confidence builders which we all go through. When you’re elected captain of the team ... it just happens – you’re used to a series of experiences, and people look to you and respond favorably to you.” (*Jack Welch Speaks* by Janet Lowe, pg. 14)

<sup>21</sup> *Jack Straight from the Gut*, Jack Welch with John A. Byrne



◆ **Who works for whom?**

As a boss, your headspace should be, “You don’t work for me. I work for you!” Part of your work is to work for your employee – to make it happen for him when he gets stuck, to broaden his horizons, to act as cheerleader and to get rid of obstacles. If I am good at what I am supposed to do, then my employee will come to me – it will be worth his while. If he doesn’t, I usually regard it as my fault, not his. It is I who have to show him that I can be of help, not the other way around. When an employee comes to me with a problem, or for a general discussion of how to move things forward, I try to solve things on the spot. I try to make the phone calls, do the networking, and write the proposal, together with the person right there. His presence forces me to deal with the issue. And it gives him a feeling of my availability and responsiveness. I know that once he walks out of the door I am probably not going to have another minute to take care of it.

On the other hand, I do not solve problems for people who can take care of it themselves. In such cases I try to provide whatever it is I think the person needs in order to do it by themselves. And usually my first question after a problem has been presented is, “What do you think?”

A lot of what I do is simply trying to tell staff what other members of staff are doing, getting the right staff together, acting as a kind of salesman of one person’s ideas to another. I was pleased to see Welch say the same thing:

*“Getting every employee’s mind into the game is a huge part of what the CEO’s job is all about. Taking everyone’s best ideas and transferring them to others is the secret. There’s nothing more important. I tried to be a sponge, absorbing and questioning every good idea. The first step is being open to the best of what everyone, everywhere, has to offer. The second is transferring that learning across the organization.”<sup>22</sup>*

A lot of what I do is just telling other people the information they need to know: what is happening in the organization, what other people are doing, articles, studies, conventions, people to know and ideas to use.

The other thing I do is coordinate networking. I ensure that all parties to an issue are informed and in touch with one another. I call this directing traffic.

In order to direct traffic, make evaluations, and ensure that the information flows back up to you, you do not need to know everything. But you do need to train your staff to know when they have to inform you of something. In order to complete your perspective, you need to have reviews, some of them written, on a regular basis. Dr. Michael Kaufman of VISA (Visiting Israel Students Organization) has a review of each Shabbaton first thing on Sunday morning when all the details are still fresh in everyone’s mind. I try to review at least one program or the performance of one staff member per week.

---

<sup>22</sup> Jack Straight from the Gut, Jack Welch with John A. Byrne



When you see things this way you will understand what Henry Mintzberg means by calling a senior executive a conductor of a symphony orchestra rather than someone who carefully micro-manages staff.<sup>23</sup> The role of the executive is, through a constant stream of unobtrusive actions, to infuse others (often quietly) to perform with inspiration and talent. Mintzberg calls this a covert leader. And he agrees that such leaders are engaged on the shop floor rather than detached in their offices.

What emerges from this is a very liberating insight – that by serving in this way you actually lead. What you are trying to reduce is not serving, but managing. Steven Covey made famous the distinction between a leader and a manager. A manager is an efficiency expert – superb posters, balanced budgets, everyone with a job definition. A leader inspires, has a vision and is able to communicate that vision to others. This is an essential element of delegation, the subject of this section. If, as a leader, you cannot communicate a shared understanding of the organization's goals then, indeed, your delegation will be problematic. As a leader your job is not only to energize and invigorate, but also to give people a sense of mission, elicit passion and commitment *that is specifically directed*. As a server, you give people the extra tools and help they need to feel empowered by their mandate.

Every *kiruv* leader is part manager. Personal and organizational management is essential to running an organization. But woe to you if you make management your primary expression and leadership secondary.

So the recipe is about three spoons of delegation, two spoons of leadership, two spoons of serving and no more than one spoon of management. If this is a new recipe for you, try it. It tastes delicious!

Of course there will be times when something doesn't get done at all. Worse still, sometimes the person may mess up and cause damage. But overall, that's a small price to pay; for by delegating you not only free yourself up, you also free the creative juices of the person to whom you are delegating. My experience has been that most of the people to whom I delegate ultimately do a better job than I could have. There may have been a learning curve to start with; but ultimately they became the experts in their field. I, on the other hand, remained just a 'kol bo' nik.

#### ◆ **Nurturing managers**

Delegating goes beyond giving staff the job to do. It has to involve giving some of your staff the mandate to become leaders themselves. Usually, this requires that you appoint staff to a formal managerial role. Of course there are dangers in this. You may Peter Principle beyond their level of competence. A more common problem is the fact that many in this position fail to grasp how their roles have changed – that their jobs are no longer about personal achievement but instead about enabling others to achieve, that sometimes driving the bus means taking a back seat, and that building a team is often more important than just doing it yourself and getting the program done.<sup>24</sup> Even the best employees can have trouble adjusting to these new realities. That trouble may be exacerbated by normal insecurities that make rookie managers hesitant to ask for help, even when they find themselves in thoroughly unfamiliar territory. As these new managers internalize their stress, their focus becomes internal

---

<sup>23</sup> Covert Leadership: Notes on Managing Professionals in Harvard Business Review, November-December 1998

<sup>24</sup> Saving Your Rookie Managers from Themselves, by Carol A. Walker, *Harvard Business Review*, April 2002



as well. They become insecure and self-focused and cannot properly support their teams. Inevitably, trust breaks down, staff members are alienated, and productivity suffers.

Carol Walker points out that effective delegation may be one of the most difficult tasks for rookie managers.<sup>25</sup>

When you first put someone into such a position, you have got to invest in him. Don't expect him to 'just get it.' Explain and nurture the person over the next couple of years into higher levels of managerial competence. Make sure that he feels comfortable telling you about how things are going, especially all the things that he messed up on. Don't keep him waiting for days to discuss issues – make him a priority. At the same time, try and avoid giving 'packaged and boxed' answers. Get him to put his own solutions on the table, and then discuss them. In this way, you continue to model for him how to empower and delegate. Most important, continue to express your confidence in him. Tell him again and again and again.

◆ **Feel secure**

It's just amazing how many communal rabbis and *kiruv* leaders are looking over their own shoulders. To delegate massively you have to feel secure. If you think that your employee is going to undermine you – let him, or get rid of him. But don't trap the both of you in your little bubble of inadequacy.<sup>26</sup> Most people in whom you invest your trust will live up to it. If you are a real leader, you will feel secure. Trusting is a low-risk investment with high yields. It's any investor's dream.

---

<sup>25</sup> Carol Walker in the Harvard Business Review: Wanting to show that they are worthy of the appointment, they feel under a lot of pressure to produce results. The natural response of rookies when faced with such challenges is to "just do it," thinking that's what got them promoted in the first place. But their reluctance to delegate assignments also has its roots in some very real fears. First is the fear of losing stature: If I assign high-profile projects to my staff members, they'll get the credit. What kind of visibility will I be left with? Will it be clear to my boss and my staff what value I'm adding? Second is the fear of abdicating control: If I allow Yankie to do this, how can I be sure that he will do it correctly? In the face of this fear, the rookie manager may delegate tasks but supervise Yankie so closely that he will never feel accountable. Finally, the rookie may be hesitant to delegate work because he's afraid of overburdening his staff. He may be uncomfortable assigning work to former peers for fear that they'll resent him. But the real resentment usually comes when staff members feel that lack of opportunity is blocking their advancement. Seemingly capable rookie managers often try to cover up a failing project or relationship – just until they can get it back under control. A newly promoted manager doesn't want you to see weaknesses, lest you think you made a mistake in promoting him.

<sup>26</sup> J. Sterling Livingston, Pygmalion in Management, Harvard Business Review, January 2003: The high expectations of superior managers are based primarily on what they think about themselves – about their own ability to select, train, and motivate their subordinates. What managers believe about themselves subtly influences what they believe about their subordinates, what they expect of them, and how they treat them. If they have confidence in their ability to develop and stimulate subordinates to high levels of performance, they will expect much of them and will treat them with confidence that their expectations will be met. These managers project confidence in their own ability to give their high expectations credibility. As a consequence, their subordinates accept these expectations as realistic and try hard to achieve them.



In fact, if you feel secure, then your most likely problem is going to be the very opposite, that your employees still turn to you too much. Never answer a question or solve a problem you think they could manage themselves. Say, “You can handle that,” or “That’s going to have to be your choice.” *Chizuk*, nurturing and encouragement yes; babysitting – never.

◆ **Team players**

*How silent the woods would be if only the best birds sang.*

Anonymous

It is a mark of good leadership to be a team-player yourself, to look for partners and to empower employees. It is a mark of good management to ensure that your staff will be team players as well. But team playing does not come as a ready-made package. Even those who will be team players have to learn how to do this. For it goes against the grain of our natural state.

Rabbi Reuven Leuchter points out that it is the nature of a person to see only his way. Your *daas* is not democratic. The individual *seichel* doesn’t entertain another opinion. In order to be true and pure, in order for your *seichel* to function and be yours in its truest sense, it has to be single-minded, with a complete attitude that *I* am right and *you* are wrong!

The area in which this quality is most appropriate, indeed vital, continues Rav Leuchter, is learning; learning means seeing your *pshat* in the *gemora* and sticking to it because you are right and your *chavrusa* is wrong. It does not, it cannot, accept a different view to its own, or else it is not your pure *seichel*.

Then eventually, as you are *meffalpel* with your *chavrusa*, you allow yourself to take a step back from the rigidity of being committed to the rightness of your local vision, and recognize the other’s opinion.

In the running of a team though, these functions reverse; the main part is to be able to give in, despite what your *seichel* tells you. Your job as a team player is to bend, agree, and compromise, to work together with and to be *mevater*.

And this is where *middos* really come into their own. The *middos* to be content with giving if necessary, to not remain with open or hidden resentments, but to know that this is the team and is all part of one common purpose.

Team playing is a learned behavior. It is learned in families, it is learned in team sports (where those are permissible) and it can be learned in multiple other ways. As Stephen Covey puts it, we have grown on the maturity continuum from dependence to independence to interdependence.<sup>27</sup>

In good Jewish *chinuch*, a *bochur* and later *avreich* should be educated to understand that a community is a function, in part, of team play. All too often, however, I see people who see the *kehilla* as something to be used as a service. I need to *daven* in a *minyán* and therefore I have to go down to the *shul*. It probably helps me with my *kavana* and, who knows, maybe they give a good *shiur* too. But contributing to a broader sense of community is a minority attitude.

Some of the biggest frustrations of people in the field are felt by those who feel they are working with someone (it only takes one) who is not a team player. Usually the feeling is that the person is not willing to roll up his sleeves and participate in the less romantic parts of *kiruv* – he wants to stick to the pure *kiruv* as

---

<sup>27</sup> *The Seven Habits*, pg. 49. There he writes that dependence is the paradigm of you; independence is the paradigm of I; while interdependence is the paradigm of we.



opposed to everything, before and after, which makes it happen. Sometimes, the loner is quite hard working and talented. In these cases, his reason for cutting others out is because he is trying to carve out his own little *melucha*. My experience is that this is usually insecurity rather than a *gaava* problem. It is just as unpleasant, nevertheless.

Of course, when hiring, you should be looking only for team players. This includes identifying people with whom you feel you can work effectively. Experience has shown that you will invest more in such a person to begin with. Even where the person is failing, giving up on them means giving up on yourself – on your judgment and ability to select, train, and motivate people. Less effective managers select subordinates more quickly and give up on them more easily, believing that the inadequacy is that of the subordinate, not of themselves.<sup>28</sup>

Half the battle is won by the behavior you model and the atmosphere you generate. If you are a team player, your staff will usually pick up on this and be the same. In such an environment, the message that allows everyone to feel good about themselves and about those around them is, “I need you. You are important to me.” Don’t expect your employees to be better than you. If you act independently, without consulting and sharing with them and bringing them into the loop, they will behave in the same way.

But not everyone is naturally going to become a team player, even in the right environment. There are many *kiruv* stars who aren’t team players and whose influence, therefore, remains limited.

A team player is characterized by the mindset of being prepared to roll up his sleeves and join in the ground work if that’s what’s required. He won’t see setting up tables or clearing up as *mesiras nefesh*. For him, that is simply what needs to be done. And that kind of positive attitude is infectious.

People who are not team players ultimately burn out. They are high maintenance – if they are not upsetting others, they are getting upset themselves. They often have unrealistic expectations, which inevitably lead to them having *taanos* against you. Every time a staff member leaves, they will be convinced that they are going to fill the slot. Similarly, they will be upset by any perceived threat to their jurisdiction. The classic non-team player is the one who always considers his project the only important one amongst the many that the organization may be doing and demands more than his fair share of resources when they are limited. The bottom line: these people are insecure. When they are not given the right type of attention, their insecurities often kick in. As a result, they require a lot of stroking.

Team players, on the other hand, can handle it when things do not go their own way. Rather take a mediocre team player than a star who is not. You will do better in the long run.

◆ **Principles of mentoring – upgrading the skills base**

Staff need to be nurtured into continuously upgrading all aspects of their professional development. When you send your loyal secretary on a computer course, you are not only making your organization more competent, you are also reinvigorating her with a sense that she is really growing and developing. When you tell one of your speakers that you are giving him a one-month sabbatical to prepare a whole new set of *shiurim*, you are giving him *chiyus* which will prevent burn-out. You are gaining years in quality and energy from that one month. In this regard, each

---

<sup>28</sup> J Sterling Livingston, Pygmalion in Management, Harvard Business Review, January 2003



person gets what they need. Jack Welch again: “They say that differential treatment erodes the very idea of teamwork. Not in my world. You build strong teams by treating individuals differently.”<sup>29</sup>

The fact that so many of us running *kiruv* organizations would find it difficult to take these words seriously is a mark of how short-sighted we are in these areas.

Multinational companies spend tens of millions of dollars each year on staff training and upgrading. Many have their own training centers and business universities. Some, like Amdocs, have specialized courses for managers, others cover the spectrum of staff and skills. They do this because it works – the company does not lose millions; it gains billions.

An outreach *kollel* or *kiruv* organization cannot think that big. But you can hold meetings, as we do, often inviting a specialized outsider to help upgrade our thinking. We pay for staff to go and see other operations, and we continuously direct them to speak to people who seem to have a new angle on how to do something.

All of this requires a certain headspace. It is the headspace of being a mentor rather than a boss, of being a nurturer rather than an administrative overseer.

We could summarize this whole section of delegation with the words of Rabbi Moshe Pamensky, of Aish HaTorah. He had it right when he said, “I try to constantly retire. To give over my entire job to someone else.” What he understood was that the more he tried to retire, the more he would have to do; for the organization would grow and grow.

## VI. Level Three Management: The Dynamics of Inter-dependent Leadership

Level three management is the active search for a partner with whom to share your beautiful *mosad*. Many excellent delegators never thought to look for a partner. They have gone as far as they can go with real sharing. But the secret to the success of many of the greatest *kiruv* organizations is their partnerships. Ohr Somayach has taken on between two and four *Roshei Yeshiva* and a *hanhala* to boot. Ner LeElef has four directors, the Heritage House, three. Aish HaTorah may have only one *Rosh Yeshiva*, but it has a real power sharing structure.

Whereas partners are essential for doing bigger things now, they are even more important for the longer-term viability of the organization. They provide institutional depth. Every healthy organization should be built in such a way that it can continue to run quite well without any particular person involved. Any time I hear someone say, “It is unthinkable to imagine the Roundtree Machon existing without Rabbi Shlapperbersky,” I know that that institution is headed for trouble, sooner or later. An organization has institutional depth when you go away for three weeks and people hardly notice. It is a little disconcerting to return and to find that people managed quite well without you, but that is an issue between you and your therapist.

We may debate whether couples who are likes make for better marriages than those who are opposites, but the best partnerships appear to be of the latter kind, when each partner brings different strengths to the table. Your partner does not have to be like you in order for you to have a deep, mutual respect. It matters not whether you think you are doing more for the organization than your *shutaf* – respect in partnerships is not dependent on there being a relationship of absolute equality.

---

<sup>29</sup> Jack Straight from the Gut, Jack Welch with John A. Byrne



What is required is that you have someone who shares responsibility with you, financial, political, project-related and other; someone whose judgment you trust, even if you would have done things differently. You need a headspace whereby you are perfectly comfortable if *most* issues do not go your way. Rav Shach, זצ"ל, was once asked by a *chassan* for three pieces of advice to guide him into marriage. Rav Shach's answer was: לותר, לותר, לותר. A partnership is like a marriage. If this is the advice for your own *בשר אחד*, it is certainly good for your partner of a different sort.

One of the most remarkable partnerships is that of two great fathers of the *Baal Teshuvah* movement, *HaRav* Mendel Weinbach and *HaRav* Nota Schiller, *Roshei Yeshiva* of Ohr Somayach. These great leaders are opposite in their style, and often differ in their vision of the *mosad*. But their partnership is enduring and fabulously productive. However, their partnership with another father of the movement, *HaRav* Noach Weinberg, in the early days of Ohr Somayach, did not endure. The difference was not different visions of the organization – that exists between Rabbis Weinbach and Schiller today. The difference was, and remains, a fundamentally different *hashkafa* on the nature and purpose of *kiruv*. And that is not something that either of the parties can be asked to compromise on.<sup>30</sup>

Most partnerships tragically break up over lesser things. Partnerships usually break up over power. This rarely has to do with *kavod*, over who gets to say the *brocha* under the *chupa*. *Kavod* is something which can always be resolved because it can be endlessly reproduced, in many different forms. I joke with my staff that half their monthly salary is paid in *kavod*. Most organizational heads have their *kavod* needs under reasonable control. In any case, you can always meet your partner's *kavod* needs and, even if he does not show the need for it, you should always look to give him *kavod*.

When one looks at the actual issues over which partnerships broke up, they rarely make sense. But they are symbols of power, of *מי בראש*. *Kavod* is for beginners. Power is the mature person's *יצר הרע*. In *mosdos*, power becomes difficult to deal with because it gets mixed up with the *lishmoh* factor. The issue becomes serious when people feel more loyalty to their *mosad* than they do to their partner. This should never be the case. A true partner will stand by his *shutaf*, even if they have to leave the *mosad* together. If partners do not have mutual loyalty, then they have compromised their basic institutional integrity. This will show up in all aspects of the *mosad's* operation. A partnership is like any other relationship or friendship. It requires active maintenance or else it fades. Like every relationship, it will have its moments of tension. Like every worthwhile relationship, the starting point has to be that it is not an option to split up; that you have got to make this work.

Partners require lots of communication, loads of it. In fact, with a real partner, you should feel anxious if you cannot get hold of him for a day. You should feel the urgency of sharing with him, not only to take advice or to update, but just for the sheer joy of sharing.

---

<sup>30</sup> This is one of those cases where I truly believe the break up has been beneficial to the Jewish nation. It is hard to imagine that as much would have been achieved by the parties had they all stayed together.