

To the Board of Directors of Beth Israel Center:

A Meditation - On the Meeting of April 12

In the discussion on retaining the Rabbi the opinion most frequently expressed was that we can't afford the expense. It is true, the expense of the Rabbi is \$7,000, and, as presented, the budgeted need for fund raising is on the order of \$4,500.

But the Rabbi is only one large expenditure in a roughly \$36,000 budget. There is another salary of the same amount; there are mortgage payments, interest and taxes of roughly \$10,000. Why then is the onus of deficit tagged on the Rabbi?

We also discussed the possible sale of the house, and ^I noticed a correlation between those that considered the house an asset to be retained, and those that considered the Rabbi a burden to be shed. It is evident, however, that sale of the house would wipe out our mortgage and tax burden of \$10,000 annually, which in turn would more than finance the \$7,000 salary of the Rabbi. *Refinancing our debts, would have a similar, no lesser effect.*

I can accept that there is opposition to the Rabbi. The reasons are not always openly stated, but in religious matters, this congregation, like all others, is a collection of minorities. The objective in any policy of religious nature is to serve, satisfy or compromise with as many of the minorities as possible.

So let us have done with the financial smokescreen. We can afford the burden of the Rabbi in a number of ways. Whether we want to is the question to be approached first. After that, we discuss the means, if necessary, but let's not play games, lest we destroy what we are all trying to preserve, our congregation.

Edward Weingart