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Why did we commission this research project?

Like many over the past year, we have watched the outbreak of anti-Israel activities on a number of campuses across North America. We have also heard the ensuing debate about the scope of the actual threat, ranging from the alarmist to the moderate.

As the conflict with Iraq makes these issues even more relevant, one issue is not debatable. Although our organizations are admirably coordinated in their attempts to engage young Jews in pro-Israel advocacy, we are not reaching the majority of Jewish students, despite our best efforts. In fact, recent research indicates there is little difference in the way young Jews and young non-Jews relate to Israel and the Middle East conflict, in spite of daily coverage of these issues in news headlines.

Our concern is that if 1967 was a catalyst for many in the previous generation to reconsider their Jewish identities in a positive light, the events of the past year may ultimately be remembered as having the opposite effect. Furthermore, the efforts of both established Jewish organizations and the myriad of new ones that have emerged to specifically communicate messages on the Israel issue, may inadvertently be contributing to this erosion of interest. We are not connecting effectively with young Jews. Indeed, the messages, messengers, and mechanisms we are using for our advocacy and fundraising campaigns may even be turning them off.

There are many complicated and powerful causal factors for this, including the changing place of Israel in North American Jewish identity, the transition of the perception of Israel from nascent state to regional power, decreasing interest in organizational life, and the rapid development of youth marketing strategies over the past twenty years.

The net effect is that we must now sell the Israel many of us loved during the Six Day War to an audience who grew up after Rabin and during the second intifada. This audience is largely unaware of Israel’s history, and experiences little of the personal connection, obligation, and responsibility of their parents’ and grandparents’ generations. Despite the enormous resources we invest with the best intentions, we are too often “selling a product” that our audience cannot relate to. Too often, we are projecting the memories and emotions we feel at the expense of the real questions they harbor. Many organizational executive directors and communications staff admit they feel they are “shooting in the dark” when it comes to tackling this generation gap.

This report represents a joint effort by a coalition of funders, with the support of a number of organizations who care deeply about Israel and the identities of young Jews in North America. It is our hope that by listening to members of this generation talk about their identities and their relationship with Israel, we can better understand their realities, questions, and mindsets. Our research methodology was simple. We attempted to capture verbatim respondents reactions to 120 pieces of Jewish
organizational collateral, including advertisements, event fliers, advocacy posters, and Web sites. In doing so we sought to examine the following questions:

- What is this audience thinking about? What questions are they asking?
- What impact are our current efforts having? What is working and what is not?
- What language, images, and questions could improve advertising efforts?
- What unintended impacts do the communal messages we place in the public domain (such as ad space on the op-ed page of the New York Times) have on this audience?
- Are there creative mechanisms that would engage a wider audience in more effective ways than print advertising?
- If we adjust our strategies, to what extent can we get beyond the traditional constituents to build messages, mechanisms, and use messengers that reflect their identities?

We hired Frank Luntz to help us in this experiment, after seeing him quickly make a real difference on the communications strategy of the Israeli government. His report follows and functions as a creative brief for all of us who are trying to meet these challenges. It is based on a simple premise: the more information we have and can give our organizations, about what works, what does not work, and what can work, the more effective we can be. We are aware that focus groups have their limitations because the findings cannot always be projected onto the entire population. However, as a first step, we believe Luntz’s findings shed considerable light on this generation’s relationship with Israel, as well as their relationship to the organized Jewish community in general. We ignore the challenges posed here at our peril.

It should be noted that this project is not an original idea. It was inspired by a wonderful report titled Why Bad Ads Happen to Good Causes by Andy Goodman, which communicated verbatim comments and reactions that public interest communications strategies provoked from their desired target audiences. That report was funded by The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, The Packard Foundation, The Pew Charitable Trusts, and The Surdna Foundation and can be viewed at www.agoodmanonline.com.

Our hope is that this creative brief serves to improve all of our work. To this effect, we welcome your responses via e-mail at israelreport@mymailservice.com.

Jeffrey R. Solomon
President, The Andrea and Charles Bronfman Philanthropies
A Word About How This Report is Organized

This report is presented in four sections:

1. **What We Learned** is an analysis of who this audience is and what their questions are. Throughout this section, we cite learning from specific ads.

2. **Beyond Advertising** looks at new strategies that may engage this audience. These strategies may augment or replace conventional advertising campaigns and speaker tours.

3. **Israel Advertising** contains an analysis of 17 different advertisements or campaigns. Out of the 120 pieces of communication shown throughout our research, these are the examples we think are most helpful in illustrating the larger points of our learning.

4. **“Ten Commandments” for the Next Generation of Israel Advertising** organizes our learning around useful principles and guidelines.
Throughout the past year, an outbreak of anti-Israel activities has erupted on a number of campuses across North America. Despite the admirably coordinated attempts by communal organizations to engage young Jews in pro-Israel advocacy, most Jewish students are not being reached — indeed, many efforts may even be counterproductive.

This creative brief explores this challenge. It is the result of focus groups with an 18-29 year-old target audience in which the impact of 120 communal advertising and marketing efforts were tested. These specific efforts were a springboard for a wide-ranging exploration of what might better appeal to this target group in terms of message, messenger, and mechanism.

What we learned
Most traditional communications and marketing strategies are not reaching the vast majority of young Jews. We are writing for ourselves, and talking to ourselves and because of this we may even be alienating the young Jewish audience.

The young Jews we listened to relate strongly to their identity but not in the same way as their parents and grandparents. For this audience, culture has replaced tradition and spirituality has replaced religion. Their association with Israel is frighteningly weak and ill-defined despite its near daily appearance in the news headlines. Older Jews who grew up with the establishment of the state of Israel and the Six Day War witnessed a remarkable record of achievement. The reality of young Jews is informed by Rabin’s assassination and the second intifada. The impact of this is immediately evident in their use of the word “they” rather than “us” when they talk about Israel. The Jewish state is tangible and emotional for most Jewish organizations but is an abstraction for many younger Jews.

If this generation is to be successfully communicated with, strategies must be developed to reflect these changes. Too often, strategies are relied upon that have worked in decades past, incorporating poor aesthetics, the use of long, detailed lists, one-sided sloganeering, overtly religious messages, and an assumption of a love of Israel. It will take new strategies and new tactics to engage this audience. The first step is to reject the assumptions and stereotypes of Jewish youth assembled in the 1960s and 1970s.

1. Younger Jews want to make their own decisions about support for Israel.
   Although most of our respondents support Israel, they reserve the right to question the Israeli position. They do not respond to advertising they view as expressions of “group think.” There are no simple truths for these young Jews. They view themselves as free thinkers, and making their own decisions and choosing their own paths are very important. Ads featuring long lists of Israel’s supporters, or black and white analysis of the situation wash over this audience. There is real power in conversation. They value the chance to listen, learn, and speak in a non-judgmental environment. They hunger for more opportunities to think and question.
2. **Young Jews tend to view themselves as Americans first and Jewish second.**
   Most members of this group do not have the strong emotional connection to Israel of their parents and grandparents. They see themselves as “American Jews” rather than “Jews.” Overt moral and visual comparisons between Israel and the United States are the most effective ways to help young Jews relate. In order to break through to this group, Jewish advertising must be as sophisticated as any advertising. Traditional “touchy-feely” appeals must give way to ads which exhibit more “attitude.”

3. **Secular Jews choose a non-religious path deliberately.**
   This audience may have little interest in rabbis, Hillel, even their own synagogue. They will reject any message or messenger that comes across as overtly religious. At the same time, it is imperative not to mistake young Jews’ rejection of traditional models of Jewish life for a lack of interest in Judaism. They are interested in exploring their Jewish identity, but on their terms.

4. **Young Jews desperately want peace.**
   Young Jews act more like non-Jews rather than observant Jews in that peace is a high priority, much more so than security. They recoil at images and words of conflict and respond positively to any plea for peace.

For more information, turn to the “What We Learned Section” of the report.

**Experimenting with new opportunities to connect:**

In addition to new messages, the research identified new mechanisms to reach this younger Jewish audience in more effective ways:

- Young Jews want more opportunities to think and question – but on their terms. Create opportunities to listen, learn, and speak in a non-judgmental environment that is open, welcoming, and frank.

- Traditional communal mechanisms for addressing these questions such as Hillel may function as a barrier to young Jews who tend to think that it “isn’t cool,” “isn’t fun” and is “too religious.”

It is imperative not to mistake young Jews’ rejection of traditional models of Jewish life for a lack of interest in Judaism. They are interested in exploring their Jewish identity, but on their terms.
Strategies such as advertising and speakers need to be augmented through innovation and experimentation. Cultural mechanisms including music, comedy, and theater, can be used as powerful conveners and they can serve as a bridge to connecting young Jews. Examples include the Free Tibet movement, the Christian rock music industry, and The Vagina Monologues, all of which used culture as a way to disseminate messages and organize constituencies.

For more information, turn to the “Beyond Advertising” section of the report.

When we do create advertising, how can we make it more effective?

• **Less is more.** Make your point quickly or it won’t be made at all.

• **Capture their attention.** This audience is inundated by marketing. Competition is intense. Relying on old messages such as “Israel is a good nation” or “all Jews should support Israel” will not be heard or remembered.

• **Talk peace.**

• **Facts are more important than slogans.** This audience wants a historical road map that brings them to their own conclusion – not a supposition forced upon them.

• **Relate both Jewish and Israel messaging to America.**

• **Overtly religious appeals will fail.**

• **Use visuals more than dense copy or worse, donor lists.** Just because older donors like to read copy does not mean 20-year-old Jews respond in the same way.

• **Ask for their participation.** Give them a chance to do something but don’t demand it.

For more principles and guidelines turn to the “‘Ten Commandments’ for the Next Generation of Jewish Advertising” section of the report.
A Word from the Author

Two decades ago I would have been one of the participants in the focus group sessions that led to this document. I would have gladly sat and talked for three hours about why I wasn’t more Jewish, why I didn’t attend temple more often, why I never set foot in Hillel or speak publicly on behalf of Israel. While I had grown up saying prayers every Friday night and attending temple on every major holiday, by the time I reached college, I could hardly be described as an observant or even a participatory Jew.

And so I relate to some 80% of the young Jewish population who live the life I lived and do exactly what I did. The vast majority of Jewish youths are simply not being served by the institutions that raise money and speak on their behalf.

My story is typical. At the University of Pennsylvania, everyone was Jewish – or so it seemed. But there wasn’t any place for less active Jews to talk, interact or gather. Penn had a well-funded Hillel program, but in my four years on campus, I never set foot in the building. I didn’t even know where it was located. I thought to myself, “This is where the religious Jews go,” and since I’m not religious, I didn’t go.

For the last year, I have roamed across America, listening and learning about Israel from a uniquely American perspective. And what I heard somehow awakened something inside me, an appreciation of my heritage, a connection to my spirituality and a true love for Israel.

Now, for the first time in my life, I am at peace with my Judaism. It took almost four decades, but it was always there. I just needed to see, hear and feel it through the opinions of others. Hopefully, after reading the words and reactions of young Jews to their religion, their spirituality and to Israel, there will be a change in policy and practices and today’s young Jews won’t have to wait so long.

This report is dedicated to all the Jewish organizations and leaders that have it within themselves to make a real difference in the lives of young Jews today. You can continue to speak in words that resonate with your donors but not with your children. Or you can commit yourselves to programs and people on their own terms.

The choice is yours. The future is ours.

Frank Luntz
A large majority of younger Jews seem to know little about Israel, almost nothing about their religion, and show little interest in either. We are facing nothing short of a crisis – and the way many national Jewish organizations are communicating to this segment of the population is ineffective at best and occasionally even alienating.

To some in the organized Jewish community, a concerted effort to reach out to young Jews does not seem particularly meaningful or relevant. To us, and to those who care about the Jewish future, reaching out to enhance Jewish identity and affinity toward Israel is critical.

In this difficult and challenging environment, many major Jewish organizations are asking people to donate significant sums of money for advertising that does not speak to this audience. Now, more than ever, the paid advertising in Jewish and non-Jewish publications needs to work. Now, more than ever, the organized Jewish community has a responsibility to get it right.

Fortunately, many senior Jewish leaders are anxious to take a realistic look at their advertising and marketing efforts. For the past twelve months, many of these leaders have joined us as we have listened to the attitudes and opinions of young American Jews. In our travels throughout the country, we talked to groups of young Jews who are not involved in communal organizing and advocacy programs. These young Jews are also detached from Israel and traditional Judaism. This generation of Jews in their late teens and 20s, instinctively reject overtly religious appeals. Yet these youths are still Jewish—and proud of it—but not in the same way as their parents or grandparents.

For this audience, culture has replaced tradition, spirituality has replaced religion. Ask them why they are Jewish and they will talk warmly about a cultural connection, from Jewish humor and Jewish food to the much maligned but appreciated role of the Jewish mother in their lives. But the sense of “tradition” that Tevya sang about in Fiddler on the Roof just does not exist. They don’t speak about “tradition” because they don’t know about Jewish tradition.

Similarly, young Jews talk about the more emotional elements of their religion and they do remain spiritually connected to Judaism, yet it is rarely articulated in the context of prayer, customs or synagogue attendance. It is not surprising that so few young Jews attend services regularly. For many, the religious aspects of Judaism are either too time consuming or too difficult to learn or practice, and so it has become a very low or even non-existent priority. Organizations like Hillel have made a valiant effort to reverse this trend, but our interviews with college Jews across America suggest that the extent of religiosity among young Jews remains limited and that Hillel is only reaching a small segment of this population.
Another component of young Jewish self-association is Israel – but it is frighteningly weak and ill-defined. Six times we have brought Jewish youth together as a group to talk about their Jewishness and connection to Israel. Six times the topic of Israel did not come up until it was prompted. Six times these Jewish youth used the word “they” rather than “us” to describe the situation, conditions and opinions about the country. There is a distance and detachment between young American Jews and their Israeli cousins that does not exist among young American Arabs and has not existed in the American Jewish community until now.

The way too many of our national Jewish organizations are talking to young Jews is ineffective at best and occasionally even alienating. Unfortunately, we are writing for ourselves and talking to ourselves. At risk is a significant portion of Jewry — its future. Too often, the words don’t resonate. Too often the visuals are unappealing. Too often, the message is not compelling. And so young Jews have switched off and turned away from their own identity.

It’s time for new strategies, new tactics and a new effort to reach out to this essential segment of the Jewish population. It’s time to reject the assumptions and stereotypes of Jewish youth that were assembled in the 1960s and 1970s. It’s time to understand and accept the cultural changes that have taken place on college campuses over the past 20 years. We are talking to Jews who don’t remember the Six Day War or the Yom Kippur War. Anwar Sadat had been assassinated before some of them were even born.

This report is designed to help you appeal to the roughly 80% of the young, secular Jewish population whom we are currently not engaging. We look at using various tools to draw them back to the issue of Israel. The challenge is complex but not impossible. It simply requires a different approach. Use their mindset as a starting point and relate to them on their terms. Give them familiar cultural cues. Understand their new questions rather than force our old answers.

The young Jews in our groups firmly believe they are Jewish, even as they eschew almost anything and everything religious. They respond to the themes of peace and diversity and they have real discomfort with observant Jews who preach or judge them to be less Jewish. Some empathize with the plight of the Palestinians and a few will reflexively argue the Palestinian side when pro-Israel discussions become too one-sided. Tragically, but perhaps not surprisingly, there is little desire to travel to Israel.
What We Learned

There is a direct correlation between the lack of religiosity among college Jews and their lack of knowledge and participation in Jewish and/or Israeli efforts. While there are obvious exceptions, the least religious Jews are most often the least informed when it comes to Israel and the least willing to engage in any kind of supportive role in public. Let me be clear about the first challenge we face.

Until we get this group thinking about things Jewish, even if only in a social sense, we cannot solve any of the other issues affecting this community.

This challenge is further complicated by the fact that these Jews have little interest in our traditional way of organizing. Because many are very integrated into American life, their return path to Judaism must be a social route. A religious approach will not just fail, but could alienate them further. Many of these young Jews are embarrassed by not knowing more about their religion. At the same time, they also feel that religion is at odds with their liberal viewpoint, their intellectualism and the social lives they share with their non-Jewish friends.

In spite of this, our group discussion provoked a desire to question, discuss and learn more. Unlike people we normally see in our corporate or political groups, these participants did not want to leave when the three hours were up. Young Jews valued the chance to listen, learn and speak in a nonjudgmental environment that welcomed open and frank discussion. In some ways this is the most important lesson of all: they want more opportunities to think and question – but on their terms.

The following section details what we learned and what can be done with this knowledge.
Younger Jews want to make their own decisions about support for Israel. Although most of our respondents support Israel, they reserve the right to question the Israeli position. They resist anything they see as “group think.” They also reject the notion that all Palestinians and Muslims support terrorism. There are no simple truths for these young Jews. They view themselves as free thinkers, and making their own decisions and choosing their own paths are very important to them.

How does this attitude influence responses to existing advertising? There is no absolute truth for this group. Therefore, our participants didn’t respond well to anything that they felt pushed them to a conclusion. “We Stand with Israel Now and Forever.” (bottom right) is an example of the kind of message this group rejects. The list of names in this ad did not resonate with our groups. The tagline in the more inflammatory series of ads “There Are Two Sides To Every Story, But Only One Truth” (bottom center) was seen as mere propaganda.

Our participants want to listen to relevant information from both sides. Provocative (but not inflammatory) headlines will make them think, but we must be careful not to preach. Our participants are also interested in talking about these issues in an open intellectual environment. There is real power in conversation. Indeed, the focus groups themselves offered the kind of forum our participants don’t currently find in the mainstream Jewish community.

For many of the participants this was the first time they had talked about their identities in a number of years. They also liked that the conversation was led by someone other than a rabbi and that there was no one there to judge them. In the words of one, “There is more of an exchange of ideas, rather than just one idea being thrown at you.”
Young Jews tend to view themselves as Americans first and Jewish second. Yes, Israel is tangible and emotional for most Jewish organizations, but it is an abstraction for many younger Jews – particularly those in their teens and 20s. Therefore, they reject appeals to Judaism and Israel that may hit home to their parents.

How did this attitude influence the response to specific ads or events? The ads “On 9/12/2001” (far right) and “They Were Only Children” (right) appealed to the common cultural ground between Israelis and Americans. Not surprisingly, the groups also responded well to events that appeal to most young Americans—music and comedy. Young Jews are interested in events that include their non-Jewish friends.

The advertising connotations are significant and essential. Here are three specific recommendations:

- “American Jews” has more resonance that just “Jews” by itself. The reason is obvious. Their connection to their religion and to Israel is weak.

- Overt moral and visual comparisons between Israel and the United States, including pictures of Israelis who look “American” (rather than Middle Eastern) and are engaged in “American” activities are the most effective means to help these Jews to relate to what’s happening in Israel.

- Jewish advertising must be as sophisticated as any advertising that manages to break through to this highly media-savvy group. It is not surprising that the ads that did the best were generally created by people schooled in the entertainment industry, while the least effective ads were hatched right in the offices of traditional Jewish organizations. For this group, the most effective advertising exhibited the kind of attitude and irony they respond to generally. Younger Americans are very sophisticated and reject what they see as overt advertising techniques and, worse yet, traditional Jewish techniques. The touchy-feely messages that appeal to their parents are rejected outright. These young American Jews will not excuse substandard work just because it concerns Israel.
three

Secular Jews choose a non-religious path deliberately, not accidentally. They view Judaism in a social context, through family, friends and events such as weddings and bar/bat mitzvahs. They define their Jewishness culturally instead of religiously, but this not necessarily an entirely negative development. When we challenged them by suggesting that they were not sufficiently Jewish, there was a refreshing intensity to some of their responses.

They reject rabbis, Hillel, even their own synagogue, and they will reject any message or messenger that comes across as overtly religious. They feel that they can safely put off issues about Judaism and Israel because they are not major priorities for them right now. The extent of explicit Jewish activity among many is visiting an online Jewish dating site (well over half had experienced J-Date – a very good advertising opportunity).

**How did this trend influence the response to advertising?** Advertising that used religious references or rabbinical endorsements tended to be rejected by this group. It is worth noting that some particular ads that evoked mixed or negative reactions “Speaking Our Piece” (left) and “We Agree” (far right) were not created with this age group in mind. However, these ads are often in media that this group might read and be influenced by. The “Family” ad (below) evokes Jewish cultural values which resonated with many people in our groups.

Don’t expect events and advertising to directly change this group’s attitudes. Rather, ads and programs should inform and immediately educate. The resulting knowledge will help bring about change.

---

**IN THEIR OWN WORDS**

“Most of my Jewishness comes from my family, my culture.”

“When I think ‘Jewish’ I think of religion, God, Torah and everything. Being ‘a Jew’ I think of personality, humor and the kind of person you can talk to and get that sense that their family is a little bit like yours; their mother is a little neurotic like yours.”

“I think of myself as being a Jewish person. It is my culture but I don’t think of it as my religion.”

“Wanting to be part of an organized Jewish community is something I’ll have time for later in life.”
Young Jews desperately want peace. Every plea for peace in an advertising execution received a positive reaction. More precisely, they recoil at images and words of conflict. In this regard, they act more like non-Jews than observant Jews. Non-Jewish Americans prioritize peace more than any other attribute or characteristic, while for more observant Jews, security and the survival of Israel is the highest priority.

How did this point of view influence reaction to specific ads? There were many different ads shown here. Some were created for our focus groups by organizations in order to test alternate approaches. These ads were created specifically for the focus groups and have never actually run in any media. Of specific note is an ad entitled “I Love Video Games...” (page 43). This ad was extremely well received because it creates the feeling that “this could be you.” It is a fine example of an ad that speaks the language of this audience. Two other ads worth noting are “The Building Blocks of Hate” and “Proof that Israel Wants Peace” (below right). Both were seen as informative and thoughtful.

The single word “gun” in one of the ad executions, “At What Point Would You Pick Up a Gun” (below left) provoked one of the strongest negative reactions, even though it was in service of a non-violent message. And another ad in this campaign, “At What Point Do You Get Pissed?” (below center) was very well received. The sentiment shared by young Jews is, “I don’t ever want to think that I’ll have to pick up a gun... after all, kids have been taught that guns hurt innocent people and they aren’t a way to solve problems.”
The following two points are not rooted in reaction to specific advertising campaigns but reflect the groups’ attitudes about Hillel and birthright israel, two of the most important communal mechanisms we rely on to communicate values and messages to this target group.

**The reaction to Hillel was very divided.** The Jews we talked to didn’t and don’t often attend religious services or participate in organized Jewish activities. At college they avoided Hillel. Why? For these Jews, Hillel, in their words, “isn’t cool” and “isn’t fun.” But there is an answer. Cultural and social events are the key to getting this group involved in Hillel. Give people a chance to meet, including non-Jews, and do not push Judaism or Israel too early. Our general discussion of the types of events that appeal to this group also pertains to Hillel and the kinds of events it sponsors.

There is no desire to visit Israel right now, although there is enthusiasm for birthright israel. This reaction was frightening in its intensity. Only a few participants felt that they might even possibly visit Israel at any point in the next year or two. Safety is certainly the leading obstacle. And this fear is pervasive not just for them but also for their families. birthright israel clicked with this group – but just not at this point in time. Most know someone who went on a birthright trip and enjoyed it. The fact is however, a free trip to Israel is not sufficient for overcoming their fear. Most of the college students said their moms simply wouldn’t let them go.

In addition to safety concerns, some cited no time, not relaxing, too far – but the result is the same. For most readers of this document, a visit to Israel would be filled with spirituality, wonder and inner-peace. For these Jews, today, an Israeli trip would be full of “stress and anxiety.”

**A FEW COMMENTS FROM OUR DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THE ROLE OF HILLEL**

“Get reform people interested—there are only Orthodox Jews who go to Hillel events at Columbia. A large portion of the students at Columbia are Jewish and most are reform—but none is involved in Hillel. It is intimidating to go when only very religious people are there.”

“Make a fun and interesting event which doesn’t necessarily have to do with Jewishness. The Hillel at my school had sushi making. It was fun and low-key, relaxed. It brought people together who happened to be Jewish to enjoy a common activity.”

“I would sponsor events that brought young Jews together on college campuses like ‘Athletes in Action’ brings Christians together.”
Can this obstacle be overcome? Information about accommodations and security must be provided before these Jews will say “Sign me up.” Testimonials from people who have gone on birthright trips would also be helpful. In terms of advertising, “free” may get their attention, but “safe” is the only thing that will get them to go. The advertising postcards without visuals were actually more effective than those with pictures (the most effective of all was a mock boarding pass) – but both executions still lacked some credibility.

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

“Israel has NEVER been safe.”

“Israel is in a constant state of war.”

“I want to go to Israel, but don’t see that happening. I don’t think there is anything right now that could get me to go there. I guess fear controls the mind.”

“Even if we wanted to go to Israel, our moms wouldn’t let us.”
Beyond Advertising — The Role of Events and Activities as an Engagement Mechanism

In looking at new ways to engage our audience’s interest in Israel and its realities, our discussions extended well beyond advertising. We also looked at the role of cultural events as engagement tools.

After listening to lukewarm reactions to many of our traditional strategies—print advertising, speaker tours and advocacy training—we invited our organizational partners to develop ideas that might engage a larger audience. We presented some of these experimental concepts and dummy marketing materials to subsequent focus groups to gauge their reactions.

Many of these ideas recognize that contemporary culture is a powerful lure for this generation. It has been successfully harnessed in other organizing efforts. Witness, for example, the success of the Tibetan Freedom Concerts, the Christian rock music industry, and *The Vagina Monologues*. Each uses culture as a way to disseminate information and organize a constituency.

Young Jews want to share their lives with friends and others outside their religion.

After listening to our focus group participants, we are convinced that contemporary cultural events are potentially great (and currently underutilized) engagement tools. Concerts and comedy, in particular, have the power to gather a diverse group of students together in one place. We found that these events are also better received if they are marketed to both Jews and non-Jews. Young Jews want to share their lives with friends and others outside their religion.

Unlike newspaper or television advertising, these events cannot be overtly political or religious. They can raise awareness among the young Jews that attend, but they lose their effectiveness if they become hybrid events. For instance, we asked members of our focus group if they would be willing to listen to a 20-minute lecture during a dance party. The answer was a resounding no. You cannot stop the music or the comedy for an overt political message.

One final general recommendation on marketing came from this group. Postcard-sized handouts, like those distributed by clubs promoting “street crews,” are a requisite part of promoting events to college students. We not only have to create credible events, but promote them in a contemporary manner.

Here are some concepts we tested and the specific feedback we received.
Comedy Tour
A vast majority of this age group learns about current affairs from comedy-laced sources such as “The Daily Show” with Jon Stewart. A number of organizations suggested programs that use stand-up comedy performances as a way to broach Israel’s challenges. This idea was universally well received. It's smart. It's entertaining. It's educational without being a lecture. It has every ingredient these young Jews want, including the fact that an event with big-name comedians would also appeal to non-Jews.

Monologue-Style Theater
Based on the success of plays like *The Vagina Monologues*, we tested the attraction of a theater piece that presented monologues from young American Jews, Israelis and Palestinians. Their different perspectives would present the complexity of the conflict. This idea was well received.

Increase the Peace National Dance Party
This nationwide tour would showcase some of Israel’s top DJs. Israel is one of the leading exporters of “techno” music, and this tour would be designed to appeal to both a Jewish and a non-Jewish audience. This is one example of an event that is terrific at gathering Jewish students in one place, but would not work as a venue to disseminate information. When asked if they would listen to a speaker at a break in the party, students said they would be less interested in the event if a speech were part of the evening.

Fashion Show
This idea sought to showcase Israel beyond the conflict by organizing a national touring trunk show of Israel’s finest young designers. This had some appeal, but did not generate nearly as much enthusiasm as the concert and comedy concepts.

Comic Book
In recent years, the comic book format has been successfully used to talk to this audience about complex historical situations. In the wake the appeal of *Maus* by Art Spiegelman, which portrays the complexity of the Holocaust and *Palestine* by Joe Sacco, which presents the Palestinian perspective, we tested a comic book which dealt with the creation of the state of Israel.
This concept did not appeal to this group at all. They viewed comic books as something for kids, not college students. The discussion was brief since almost no one expressed any interest in reading comics of any kind.

**Web Sites**
Web sites are a useful strategy to inform those already interested in a subject, but they will not create awareness among audiences who are not already committed. There is an assertion that a well-crafted Web site will help educate young Jews about issues relevant to their lives. We saw no evidence of this whatsoever. Yes, a good Web site is important for those already searching for answers, but its existence is meaningless for those who simply do not care or do not wish to be bothered – a description of most young Jews today.

**Weblogs and Videos**
Internet sites that carry the videotaped opinions and insights of various people—garnered almost no interest. Likewise, opportunities to order videotapes were also rejected. The opinion of most young Jews: “I don’t think I would actually put the effort into ordering or watching the video.” An activity “is much better if it is communal,” and weblogs and videos for individual viewing are not.

**IN THEIR OWN WORDS**

“With Web sites the people who are going there are the people who are already convinced of it. You are not going to be changing people’s opinions; you are going to be reaffirming their opinions. It might be a way to keep people if, for some reason, you were worried about losing support, but you are not gonna make new support with it.”

“You’re the one responsible for going to the Web site and actually having to type in that address. You’d have to already persuade them in some other way [to go to a Web site].”
A Closer Look at Israel Advertising

The following section is a representative sampling of the 120 pieces of advertising and marketing communications we showed to our focus groups.

The first on pages 28-36 presents general positions on the issue of Israel. Many of these ads are not targeted at a younger audience. Indeed, some had very specific target audiences, such as rabbis or the Christian right. We were, however, interested in testing the unintended consequences when these ads are seen by young Jews in mainstream and Jewish media. The focus groups strongly suggest that for young Jews, seeing these ads reinforces their sense that Israel is not their issue and that the organized Jewish community does not represent and reflect their perspective and voice.

The second group of advertisements on pages 37-41 is composed of ads either specifically aimed at a younger Jewish audience or ads placed in campus newspapers or other media targeted to this audience.

The third group of advertisements on pages 42-44 is composed of hypothetical ads, many of which were created by our partners in response to what we learned in early groups. We tested these ads to help us determine what arguments and presentations most appealed to our audience.

We have chosen the following advertisements not to single out these ads or organizations in particular, but because they reflect practical examples of the larger points contained throughout this report.
"WE PEOPLE OF FAITH STAND FIRMLY WITH ISRAEL"
by Anti-Defamation League

Nobody in our groups wanted to read this article. There is just too much text and no visuals. Furthermore, our choice of spokespeople needs to be carefully considered.

Although several liked the title, it was noted that using “faith” in the title and “God’s sovereignty” in the first paragraph is “not good for Jews who aren’t that religious.”

Advertisements that look like articles “look questionable.” “It’s an ad disguised as an article, so to me it says it is not necessarily factual, it’s more propaganda than an ad which you can take at face value and make your own opinion.”

Clutter obscures the message: With “too much text...nothing stands out” according to one person. With little white space left on the page and the monotony of three columns of small text, nothing became eye-catching about the article.

Although it “always seems more objective to get a non-Jewish perspective,” it made many “nervous to equate faith in Israel with the conservative Christian right.”
“SPEAKING OUR PIECE: AMERICANS FOR PEACE NOW...”

by Americans for Peace Now

This advertisement ranked near the bottom of the various appeals. There is too much text, too much religion and too much preaching.

The text is too religious to appeal to younger Jews. All the references to the exodus from Egypt, Yom Kippur, Moses and the Ten Commandments, are too much for Jews without a strong religious connection. The reference to God in the last paragraph added to the poor response to this ad.

This ad is “Too wordy” for most of the group, with a layout that “looks like a textbook.”

“A time for reflection” touched several of the readers, but most didn’t see it.

Response coupons detract from the message. They scream, “Send us money” which is a turnoff for this group. “I don’t like being asked for money.”

Most of the group dislikes being asked for money, so raising money through an advertisement to pay for more advertisements seemed absurd.
“ISRAEL EMERGENCY SOLIDARITY FUND”
by Israel Emergency Solidarity Fund

This ranked among the worst ads, despite containing the pictures of the Israeli victims of terrorism. The small size of the pictures and the text undermined its effectiveness, although some individuals still found it appealing.

No headline was one reason this advertisement failed in our groups. It did not set a context for the pictures leaving too many in the group to wonder “Who are these people?”

“Pictures are better than names” because “you put faces to the numbers. However, there are no “telegraphic aha” pictures, so some of the emotional impact was lost. Images, like headlines or taglines must be large enough to have impact.

Too much religious text. “It would be better if they got rid of all the text at the bottom and got to the point.” “When you talk about the Torah you lose an audience.”
“WE AGREE.”
by UJA-Federation of New York

We tested multiple ads with lists of names. This one, like others, was not well received. The religious tone, the use of Hebrew, and the list of rabbis make this advertisement particularly ineffective. Almost everyone in our groups said they would ignore this ad.

“Of course rabbis agree, try using famous more recognizable names” or “businesses and corporations that support Israel.”

“I don’t know these people.”

“Who the hell are they?”

“It looks like they donated money to get their name on there.”

Contact information, especially the Web address, must be larger.
“THE AMERICAN STREET HAS SPOKEN.”
by olamforisrael.com

Although this advertisement was not among the favorites, there are valuable lessons to be learned from it. Using a Web address and saying “thank you” were seen as positive. In the words of several participants, it is “a good message executed poorly.”

Many found the phrase in the title confusing, unclear and unmoving, although they did like the large type and font. “The weakest part of the ad takes up the most space.”

Most did not like the pictures. One thought it made the ad “look like a wanted poster and a call for terror.” “The pictures, especially bin Laden, make you angry and not want to read it.”

This should be the headline. Most felt that “2 out of 3 is the strongest part.”

The type is too small and there is too much text.

“Thank you America” at the start of each bullet point created a very positive reaction among the group.

Prominently displayed Web address is important for this generation. They get a lot of their information online.
“FAMILY.”
by Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit

This advertisement drew mixed responses, reflecting the challenge of matching content and design. It provoked the most poignant moment of the evening, when an individual correctly noted that the ad “mentions all the things we all identified as being Jewish.” However, others said the ad was “boring,” “not that effective,” and “it didn’t catch my attention” because it lacked visual appeal.

Family “appeals to most” and sets a “sympathetic” tone.

While there is plenty of white space, the text is too small for the importance of the message.

Young Jews “don’t feel connected to” Israel.

Mentioning heritage, religion and values helped for a “connection” with some of the group, helping them “identify with Israel.” Some found the language “sophomoric” and “too Bill Clinton.”

It asks for support and offers straightforward options, allowing the reader to make his or her choice. The list talks about “simple things that we don’t do.”
“ON 9/12/2001...”
by Anti-Defamation League

This was one of the best-ranked political advertisements among those advocating support for Israel. It was the right length, the right tone, and the right message. “It gave an excellent distinction between the Palestinian reaction and the Israeli reaction.”

The text — “Now, finally, the Israeli government has done the same thing to protect its people that our government has done to respond to the 9/11 attacks on innocent Americans” — “hits home with non-religious Jews.”

The rhetorical question, emphasized with italics, helped make the ad “personal” for these readers.

Most found the reference to the Palestinians dancing in the streets to be extremely effective. Many noted it was “very good, even chilling” because “it reinforces Arab attitudes against Americans.” Another agreed, saying, “It really shows Americans what Palestinians are like.” The impact was reinforced because people in our groups had seen footage of Palestinians celebrating on TV news. “Palestinians celebrating in the streets was one of the most vivid images of 9/11.”

Some found this unfair because “not all Palestinians were dancing. I feel really offended by this, so would many Jews I know, most of the moderate Muslims, and most of my non-Jewish friends.”

The boldface type attracts attention to a date the audience relates to, making it “eye catching.”
“THEY WERE ONLY CHILDREN”
by Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago

This advertisement was highly ranked because the girls “looked American” and they were engaged in an activity our respondents could relate to.

The word “Children” works. It makes the reader “sympathetic” and “forces you to think.” It sets an “emotional” tone and “draws your attention.” “Children are everyone’s weakness. Their innocence attracts people.”

Pictures of children are effective because they are “innocent victims that really have nothing to do with the military conflict.” “It is very upsetting to see children harmed in an act of hatred.”

That these kids look American helped increase the emotional impact of the picture. “The kids look happy, real and American” and “it looks like typical American children eating pizza at a pizza place.”

The name, Israel Emergency Campaign, struck a chord in the context of this ad. “It is an emergency. Children are dying.” However, the omission of an Internet address and contact information was unfortunate. It left the group wondering, “How do you contact them?”

No call to action. This is one case of too little text. “It makes you feel, but doesn’t guide you on what you can do.” In addition, “it is a good ad, but it doesn’t say what this organization does.”

The contrast between the two smaller, tragic pictures juxtaposed against the larger, happier picture heightened the ad’s emotional impact. The two sets of pictures made the advertisement “compelling by showing the good and bad.” The impact was significant because “it really challenges you and shows you how a life that is so normal could be horribly disrupted.”

The only problem with the graphics is that the two pictures on the sides are too small.
“WHAT ISRAEL MEANS TO ME”
by American Jewish Committee

This advertisement was received positively, but with reservations. It highlights the need to choose the right messenger. Almost everyone said they would stop and read at least some of the quotes, and that alone makes the ad worthwhile.

“Corny” and dated quotes to some. “Cheesy, too flowery.” “It does not adequately or accurately discuss now!”

Nixon polarizes. “Shouldn’t be in this ad.” “Anti-Semite.”

Some felt the ad was too one-sided and that presidential quotes were irrelevant: “Who cares,” “frankly, I don’t care what they say. It is all a bunch of lies to the public anyway.” After all “it’s also politics and they have to be pro Israel,” so “why should we believe these men.”

Using American Presidents “will catch a lot of people’s attention.” “Shows history of support and understanding.” “I think that Presidents, Republicans and Democrats, having something positive to say about America and Israel is really supportive. I think that is great for many people in this country to see.”
Once again, a list of names was seen as ineffective. The fatal flaw of this ad and others like it, is that it does not command attention or present a compelling point of view. Furthermore, it reinforces the notion of “group think” which these younger Jews find distasteful.

Lists of names don’t mean anything to younger Jews.

“It is not effective because it is another list of names of people that just agree.”

“Random people—why do I care about what they think.”

“I don’t know these people. Who the hell are they?”

“It would be more effective if it was random names out of a phone book.”

The “group think” impression created by list ads is in conflict with this generation’s individuality and intellectualism.

“I still dislike the idea of ‘everyone thinks so, so you should too.”

“Students are better than rabbis or administrators, but I still don’t like mass thinking.”
**“WE’VE JIHAD ENOUGH”**

by StandWithUsCampus.com

Most regarded this as a poor, or even offensive, attempt at humor. However, the last sentence which acknowledges that some Muslims want peace resonated well with this group. Remember, Jewish students want peace and they believe that everyone feels the way they do.

Poor humor. “They’re trying to be funny... not funny.”

“I don’t think humor is really appropriate.”

“In your face, but not funny or clever.”

Message doesn’t connect with students.

“Too harsh! How many people will you offend with this? “ “Not really speaking to college students. It is more a message for Muslims in other countries.”

This ad does not brand all Muslims as terrorists and that is the one element that was well received.

“It sends a message to both Jews and Muslims that Muslims in general are not bad people it is a group in them that is basically brain washed by others to hate Jews.”

“Effective—it shows that many Muslims are not the radical Shi’ites who support terrorism.”
“THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO EVERY STORY, BUT ONLY ONE TRUTH.”

by CampusTruth.org

The phrase “One Truth” turned off young Jews. Most believe “truth” is subjective, even truth about Israel. In their world, the so-called “one truth” is biased, dogmatic, and, at best, only an assertion. However, the concept of presenting “two sides” encouraged discussion and allowed younger Jews to reach their own decision—usually, but not always pro-Israel.

Powerful contrast. “Effective: Israel teaches peace; Palestinians teach hate and destruction.” “Shows a cultural difference and how deeply embedded violence is in Arab culture.”

Needs graphics. “I like it, but there’s not much to catch the eye.”

Include contact information. “Who’s running these ads?”

“I don’t like this ‘only one truth’ tagline.”

“Bad stereotypes”

“Come on! This isn’t all Palestinians.”
“THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF HATE” 
by StandWithUsCampus.com

The strong use of visuals in the heading and the body elicited a “Wow!” reaction. The message — “Peace must be taught: It helps you understand what the whole point of the conflict is and how we can solve it or at least make some change” — struck a chord.

The visuals in the heading were “very eye catching.” “This shows that all the killing is for hatred of Jews.”

The “photos are effective,” because “you’re in shock by what you are seeing and what you are reading. You’re seeing it from a young age that they are taught to hate, or that they are brain-washed.”

Part of the ad’s success is that it doesn’t label Palestinians as evil; they are just people who have been taught to hate.

“I have a lot of Muslim friends: they don’t think like this. So it gives you an idea that it is not that Muslims are evil, that Palestinians are not evil; it’s just that these people are taught to hate.”

Normally pictures this small would discourage readership. Here, however, the pictures of children dressed to kill don’t need to be large. They are unexpected and alarming.

The tag line is highly effective because it “hits at the root of the conflict,” and because it shows that “children learn to hate as a key element of the conflict.” However, the size could be larger.
“PROOF THAT ISRAEL WANTS PEACE…”
by American Jewish Committee Student Group

This was a very popular ad because it provided an informative education. It was easy to read and made its point quickly and effectively, while it emphasized Israel wants peace. It presents history in digest form.

“Use of the word peace is very positive,” because “it shows the Israeli effort for peace.” “There is more honor in wanting peace than attacking Palestinians.”

“I think it is the most important ad because it explains the hardest thing. I don’t know enough about the Jewish cause. If you read this, you have a very brief outline of the situation. I think it is the most powerful, because it doesn’t just rely on emotion. It’s the facts.”

Presenting facts works. “A timeline is informative” because it makes a “strong argument using history” to “show Israel’s long-standing dedication to peace and the opposite for the Arabs.”

It is “important to explain why Israel is not the horrible country Palestinians want you to think it is with this clear, rational demonstration of how Israelis have tried for peace and lost every time.”
“LOOKING FOR A CHALLENGE?”
by Lowe New York

Although irony is appreciated by this audience, there is no room for poor humor. The nearly unanimous opinion about this advertisement concept was that it was “offensive,” “vulgar,” and “insensitive.”

“‘Whoa dude’ looks silly in print.”

The use of “party” was considered an offensive choice of words.

“The image makes light of a serious issue— inappropriate.”

Most disconnected Jews do not know where Hadera is.

“Trivializing murder does not appeal to anyone.”
“I LOVE VIDEO GAMES AND PHOTOGRAPHY.”
by Project Communicate

Our audience responded well to this draft ad execution because the picture and text forged a strong bond between the subject and the reader. It creates the feeling that “this could be you!”

Similar tastes create a bond. This could be any college student in America.

“Students in Israel as well as in the US enjoy the same things.”

“A student like me—I can relate and sympathize.”

“Very emotional. It’s down to earth. It’s relatable. You look at the scene and you see the exact same person who could exist right here in LA and be a part of this group, yet they are facing totally different circumstances that most Americans can’t even comprehend. It gives the whole situation the perspective that these are people too.”

“I think people can relate to the college students with the Western look. How come they can’t have the same life as other people?”

“This is like ‘Oh, wow!’ People like me are going through that!”
“AT WHAT POINT DO YOU GET PISSED?”
by Lowe New York

This test advertisement, designed by a creative advertising agency, was a tremendous success because it was relevant – it spoke to young Jews on their own terms and in their own language. It was the most popular part of a three-ad series. The other two, “At What Point Do You Give a Damn?” and “At What Point Would You Pick Up a Gun,” were much less effective because the message was too extreme and, in the case of picking up a gun, unrealistic.

The positive reaction to this ad was also due to the limited text and plenty of white space. As one participant said to the agreement of the others, “I would actually read every single point.” The message also received praise because it “focuses on civilian loss of life, because that is the core of Palestinian terror.”

The logical, simple progression enhances the impact. It forces the reader to think, “at what point will you start caring, cause it can always reach you.”

This ad puts the reader right into the action/event. “It’s all about the same thing, just in different places, and then it relates to you, because of the last line—you’re on it. It gets closer until the bus is blown up and you’re on it. Then you’re like, WOW!”

Although it has a violent conclusion, the end is considered “perfect: drives it home.” It puts “us on the hot seat. Makes us think, ‘What would you do?’”
In the course of this project, we have discovered that in creating advertising for young Jews, there are no simple truths, but there are certainly lessons to be learned. While it is obvious that individuals react to specific ads in different ways, we were able to uncover a clear and consistent pattern of responses. Major Jewish organizations can only be helped by understanding what these young Jews respond to in advertising. Here are some guidelines drawn from our collective learning.

1. **Less is more.**
   **Make your point quickly or it won’t be made at all.**

   Several organizations insisted on packing as many words and pictures as possible onto the printed page. What they don’t realize is that *the less cluttered the ad, the more likely it will be read.* Younger people read virtually nothing, and they will turn the page if there are too many words. So when designing the ad, take into account the following checklist:

   ✔ Significant white space will help make your ads more readable.
   ✔ Don’t pack the text too densely.
   ✔ Don’t use small fonts.
   ✔ In general, a single powerful photograph will have greater impact than multiple images.

   It is also critical to leave room for a large informative heading and tag line in bold. It may be the only thing they read in the ad.

2. **Tell or show me something I don’t already know.**

   Too many of the ads we tested had a “been there, done that” reaction. This age cohort is the target market for nearly every mass-market consumer product. They are inundated with advertising. Branded products must find a way to stand out and capture attention—Israel-related advertising is no different.

   Just saying Israel is a good nation or that Jews should support Israel is absolutely meaningless to this generation. It simply won’t be read or remembered. A more innovative approach is required: whether it’s a surprising picture, a tag line with a twist, or a message that challenges conventional wisdom to break through the clutter. The advertising equation for young Jews is something like this:
 irony + creativity + relevance = success

And for the real home run, sprinkle in a little attitude.

It is worth noting that these guidelines can apply to television efforts, as well. Although we did not take an in-depth look at television commercials, we did screen a reel of 20 pro-Israel spots. Two commercials stood out from the group. One featured Martin Luther King speaking in favor of Israel. The other showed an attractive young woman preparing to become a suicide bomber. Both had unexpected messages and visuals that resonated with young Jews.

3 Talk peace.

This is a component of all our work on behalf of Israel and the American Jewish community. It is at the core of what Americans in general and Jews in particular most want for the Middle East and for Israel. Even the ads that overtly attack acts of terrorism (and have an anti-Palestinian message) are more likely to be read and receive a better response when a call for peace is included somewhere in the text.

When it comes to peace, be overt. Visuals meant to evoke peace (like a dove) are less effective than a heading or tag line with the word peace in it.

4 History = credibility. Names = nothing.

Give them the historical facts showing Israel’s efforts for peace – that will be much, much more helpful than a list of students, a list of professors, a list of organizations or whomever that supports Israel.

Young Jews don’t know their own history. In addition, they make great efforts to recognize that other viewpoints exist, even struggling to convey and defend anti-Israeli arguments. They will appreciate the information, because it helps them reach their own informed decision. Once this occurs, they will go out and communicate it once they learn it. They want the “facts...just the facts” and not someone’s interpretations or assertions. They want a historical road map that brings them to their own conclusion and not a supposition forced on them. If you keep it straight and simple, it will get read, processed, accepted and repeated – and that’s the goal of any advertising campaign.
Relate your Jewish and/or Israel message to America.

This is very important. These young Jews have a pride in America that was equal to, or ever great than, the pride in being Jewish. As several people said, “I favored all the ads that made a connection to the Israeli cause and the American cause.” Particularly since 9/11, younger Jews are looking to relate the American struggle with the Israeli struggle. Help them. Guide them.

American Jews relate best to people like themselves. We heard again and again how young Jews just feel more comfortable talking to other young Jews; they couldn’t articulate much beyond “they just get it better than my other friends” but that says enough. Some of the most effective ads contained pictures of Israelis that looked American, engaged in American activities, or contained text emphasizing similar likes, tastes and desires as Americans.

Overtly religious appeals will fail.

Selling religion to non-religious individuals will fail. It’s just that simple. There is a potential market for Jewish and/or pro-Israeli events and advertising among young Jews, but an appeal based on overtly religious grounds or an invitation to return to the synagogue will not be well received. In fact, if it is perceived as a “religious effort” you will actually be discouraging participation. For a good example, see the analysis of the “Speaking Our Piece” ad (page 29) and the “We Agree” ad (page 31) of the “Israel Advertising” section of this report.

The visual determines the “connection” between reader and advertisement.

Generally, ads without visuals may generate agreement but they won’t generate emotion or connection. Yes, words convey facts, but pictures are what tug at the emotions. One of the key reasons why so many current Jewish advertising efforts are unsuccessful (especially those with lists of names) is that they lack visuals. Just because the donors like to see their name in print, and just because 50-something Jewish leaders like to read copy does not mean their 20-something children will respond the same way. They won’t. It is important to note that sometimes type can be used as a “visual.” For instance, in the well received “At What Point Do You Get Pissed?” ad (page 44) an interactive list is used as an engagement device.
Be inclusive in your language.

Jews will tend to look for signs that exclude them from the communication, message or activity. Therefore, do not exclude Jews from the larger community by using the word “you.” Use “we” instead. In fact, those messages that allowed readers to see themselves in the advertising were generally the most popular and effective.

Prominently display a Web address on everything.

Unlike their parents and grandparents, the younger generation uses the Web for their research. Point them in the right direction. If you create advertisements and events that get them interested and thinking, they will want more information from the Internet. In the focus groups we saw no evidence of any desire to track down information about Israel, and most of the current advertising did not prompt them to seek answers to their questions or inspire them to learn more. It needs to be easy. As long as the Web address and materials are readily available, at least there is a chance it may be used.

Ask for their participation.

To reach out to young Jews, give them a chance to do something, but don’t demand it. Let them choose how they will make a difference – but give them the opportunity to choose. Ask them. But think twice before asking for money, and when you do, 100% should go to the cause. Young Jews will respond better to causes and actions, than to Jewish organizations.
The general conclusions in this document are derived from six individual sessions with groups of 25 young Jews between the ages of 18 and 29 conducted throughout 2002.

The specific advertising and event analysis is based on two three-hour sessions with young Jews currently living in New York and Los Angeles, though a majority were raised in other parts of the country. The average age of the New York session was 24. The average age of the Los Angeles session was 21. Recruitment identified those who had a positive outlook toward their Jewish identity, but very few of them were currently involved in any Jewish activity or organization.

Based on the research of other respected Jewish organizations, our participants were a mirror image of the majority of young Jews nationally. According to Hillel’s study of college freshmen¹, 87% attended services either only during the High Holidays or not at all. Forty-five of our 49 participants in the New York and Los Angeles sessions had exactly these same characteristics. Only three had been to Israel, again paralleling findings in the Hillel and other organizational research.

Acknowledgments

Work of this kind requires creativity in design as well as care and competence in execution. The project leader, Roger Bennett, Vice President for Strategic Initiatives of The Andrea and Charles Bronfman Philanthropies, brought these attributes to this effort. Driven by his passion about Israel and his desire for quality in everything Jewish, he served as the inspiration for the initiative and its moving force. Our colleagues Jason Soloway and Jules Shell felt the same passion and tirelessly pursued this effort over and above their other considerable responsibilities.

Passion and excellence in performance describes well our consultant Frank Luntz who quickly understood the issues and made them real for all of those concerned with the Israel message. Far from his typical corporate or political client, we were demanding and thrifty. He met the challenge with brilliance and good humor.

From the beginning, we were grateful to Rabbi Andrew Bachman and Rhoda Weisman of Hillel who provided valuable counsel and active support, as well as Sarah Silver of The Alan B. Slifka Foundation, and Lisa Eisen of The Charles and Lynn Schusterman Foundation who, with members of the Israel Campus Coalition, offered sound suggestions and assistance. We also acknowledge the many others who so generously gave of their time and energies, simply seeking better efforts on behalf of a subject about which they care so deeply. Finally, we thank Mary Ann Zeman and the ClearAgenda team for their professionalism in preparing the manuscript and in effectively conveying the subtleties of these findings.

Our partners, The Michael and Judy Steinhardt Foundation and The Alan B. Slifka Foundation, represent the best of American philanthropy: a readiness to take risk on behalf of an important cause. We deeply thank them, as do we thank Andrea and Charles Bronfman who are always ready to do more.

Jeffrey R. Solomon
President, The Andrea and Charles Bronfman Philanthropies

The following is a list of organizations whose materials were tested in the focus groups:

- American Israel Public Affairs Committee
- American Jewish Committee
- Anti-Defamation League
- American Magen David Adom
- Aish HaTorah
- Americans for Peace Now
- Birthright Israel
- Bitterlemons.org
- Brit Tzedek V’Shalom
- Committee for Accurate Reporting in Middle East in America
- CampusTruth.org
- Caravan for Democracy
- Center for Study of Popular Culture
- CET/Project Chail
- Consulate of Israel
- Development Corporation for Israel/State of Israel Bonds
- Edah
- Emunah
- FLAME
- Foundation for the Defense of Democracies
- Film Forum
- Friends and Families, Victims of Oslo
- Friends of Machne Israel/Lubavitch World Headquarters
- Givat Haviva Educational Foundation
- Heeb Magazine
- Hillel
- Israelactivism.com
- Israel Emergency Solidarity Fund
- Israel On Campus Coalition
- Israel Policy Forum
- Israel 21C
- Jewish Agency for Israel
- Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago
- Jewish Literacy Foundation
- Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit
- Jewish Federation of Palm Beach County
- Jewish National Fund
- Jews for Racial and Economic Justice
- Just Vision
- Lowe New York
- MASK
- NABOR
- New Israel Fund
- Olamforisrael.com
- Operation S.I.C.K. – Stop Inciting Children to Kill
- Passion Marketing
- Project Communicate
- Rabbis for Human Rights – North America
- Relativity Theater
- Skirball Center for Adult Jewish Learning
- StandWithUsCampus.com
- Storahtelling
- Students for Peace in the Middle East
- TAL Tours
- The Hub
- The International Childrens’ Welfare Association
- The Jewish Agency for Israel
- The Jewish Museum
- UJA Federation of New York
- United Jewish Communities
- United Jewish Community of MetroWest
- United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism
- Women in Green
- Zionist Organization of America
Frank Luntz is a nationally recognized expert in public opinion research. He has written, supervised, and conducted more than 750 surveys, focus groups and Instant Response sessions for corporate and public affairs clients in ten countries since 1992.

The Instant Response focus group technique Frank has pioneered has been profiled on “60 Minutes.”

He has also been a guest on “Meet the Press,” “This Week with Sam Donaldson and Cokie Roberts,” “Crossfire,” “Capital Gang,” “The Jim Lehrer Newshour,” and many other news programs.

In the 2000 election cycle, Frank conducted almost two-dozen focus groups for MSNBC and CNBC, including live sessions following each night of both party conventions and presidential debates. He was a primary night and election night commentator for “The News with Brian Williams” on MSNBC, and his “100 Days, 1000 Voices” segments won a coveted Emmy Award in 2001.

myisraelsource.com is a virtual community of Jewish educators dedicated to Israel education.
To download additional copies of this report, please visit www.myisraelsource.com. We welcome your feedback. E-mail us at israelreport@mymailservice.com.