

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR	Robert A. Jacobs
TITLE	"Differential Functions of the Jewish Community Center and Congregations in the Cincinnati Jewish Community"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. ☐ D.H.L. ☐ Rabbinic ☒
Master's ☐ Prize Essay ☐

1. May circulate ☒) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [] for _____ years.) for Ph.D. thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

- [illegible]

Mar. 21st 1977
Date

Robert A. Jacobs
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed

Date 7/7/77

Moving Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

DIFFERENTIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER
AND CONGREGATIONS IN THE CINCINNATI JEWISH COMMUNITY

ROBERT A. JACOBS

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

Cincinnati, 1977

Referee: Prof. Robert L. Katz

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank a number of persons who have given me assistance and encouragement throughout the research and writing of this thesis. Twenty-four interviewees, whose names I cannot reveal gave generously of their time and thinking. They listened to my endless questions and I appreciate their patience.

Several members of the faculty supplied me with important guidance and criticism. Among them are Dr. Jacob Marcus, Dr. Norman Mirsky, and Dr. Robert Katz.

I would also like to thank my wife, Laura, who put up with my incessant pounding on the typewriter, who gave me guidance with my writing, and made herself available for my many questions, even as she worked through many term papers of her own. To her I give my most affectionate love, and inscribe this thesis to her--

To Laur-laur . . . !

Finally, I take full responsibility for the content of this thesis and for any errors or misstatements which may exist within it. If I have offended anyone, I trust they will realize that it has not been intentional. If there are any deficiencies in my work, I hope that my reader will be charitable and forgiving.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIGEST	i
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. PREVIOUS RESEARCH	5
II. METHODOLOGY	22
Interview Procedure	22
Questionnaire	22
Interview Process	24
Client-Service Matrix Analysis	27
III. A SUMMARY OF PERTINENT HISTORICAL EVENTS	28
Formation of the Jewish Community Center in Cincinnati	28
1960--The New Center Building and the Sabbath Opening Controversy	32
Relationships Among the Synagogues in 1960	37
Relationships Between the Synagogues and the Center in 1960	40
IV. STUDY FINDINGS	45
Results of the Client-Service Matrix Analysis	45
Extent of Institutional Cooperation and Interaction	53
Direct Institutional Relationships Between Synagogues and the Center	53
The JCRC as a Catalyst for Synagogue-Jewish Community Center Relations	59
The Federation as a Catalyst for Synagogue- Jewish Community Center Relations	61
The Cincinnati Board of Rabbis as a Catalyst for Synagogue-Jewish Community Center Relations	62
V. CONCLUSION	64
Future Implications for Cincinnati	69
Relationship of Study to Previous Literature	72
Future Implications for American Jewry	74

NOTES	76
BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
APPENDIX A Correspondence	84
APPENDIX B Questionnaires	89
APPENDIX C Client-Service Matrix Analysis	98
APPENDIX D Sabbath Programming Regulations for the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center, 1960	109

DIGEST

This thesis attempts to describe the working relationship between the synagogues and the Jewish Community Center of Cincinnati.

Previous literature on the subject of Jewish community center-synagogue relations was examined from 1948 (the date of publication for the Jewish Welfare Board Survey) onward. This literature was utilized to establish a background perspective from which to understand current Center-synagogue relations in Cincinnati.

The methodology used for this study consists of two components: one, personal interviews with congregational rabbis of Cincinnati, current and past Center directors, Federation executives, Jewish Community Relations Council officials, and board members of Center and synagogue boards; and two, a compilation and analysis of client-service matrices which graph by institution groups served against services provided.

This study determined that the Center was originally established to centralize existing recreational "centers," which were adjunct organizations to several synagogues, with the settlement houses located in the basin area of Cincinnati. This centralization conserved financial resources and brought German Jews and Eastern European Jews into increased contact with one another. Thus, a clear community need brought the Center into existence.

This study has also determined that in recent years the services offered by the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center overlap with those offered by synagogues. These activities include youth programming, Jew-

ish cultural events, picnics, holiday dinners, small group activities, and older adult activities. The only function unique to synagogues are religious services. The only functions unique to the Center are those that require large numbers of participants or extensive facilities. Thus, both synagogues and the Center share the common purpose of providing social, cultural, and recreational activities for the Jewish community.

Despite a common purpose, little coordination or interrelation of activities is apparent. Groups of Jews such as college age young adults and singles receive insufficient service. Similar programs are developed by the Center and a synagogue, yet little interaction occurs between those planning the events. The Center director and synagogue rabbis engage in frequent telephone conversations, however, interviews with Center officials, Federation executives, and congregational rabbis reveal resentment that may disallow more effective relations.

INTRODUCTION

The principal aim of this project is to describe the working relationship between synagogues and the Jewish Community Center of Cincinnati. Since the synagogues and the Jewish Community Center are membership institutions that comprise seventy per cent to eighty per cent of Cincinnati's Jews, I hope to portray a clear picture of how the institutions may link the community together by building a sense of common cause and a sense of common purpose. The following research questions are examined in this report:

1. To what extent is there overlap of institutional function and consequent joint sponsorship of programs?
2. Does any vehicle exist for the informal interchange of ideas between rabbis and agency directors?
3. How is a sense of common cause and common purpose operationally promoted in the community?

I will approach these questions by examining the background research into synagogue/Jewish community center interaction in other communities; personal interviews with the congregational rabbis in Cincinnati, Jewish Community Center, Federation, and Jewish Community Relations Council officials, both present and past, and selected synagogue and Center board members; and a client-service matrix analysis of people served and services provided by the Jewish Community Center and synagogues.

Both the Jewish Community Center and the synagogue stand as Jewish

institutions in a Jewish community with declining Jewish religious and ethnic identification and declining numbers. Less and less, Jews see themselves as Jews in ways that they can be readily identified as Jews. At one time, anyone could recognize a Jew from his payes, tzitzit, and yarmulka if he were a man, sheidl, if she were a woman.

If these determinates were not available, there was always a Jewish religious institution: the shul, shtibl, synagogue, or temple. There were the Jewish butcher shops and fish markets, the Jewish bakeries offering the delicacies of a transplanted East-European community, and a definite street culture; of which today there are remnants only in the Fairfax area of Los Angeles and the Williamsburg section of New York City.

Replete with open-air markets, religious bookstores, hawkers, and street vendors speaking Yiddish and Hebrew, as well as English, these Jewish neighborhoods provided an atmosphere of Jewish living that was a part of a Jew's everyday life. To grow up in such a neighborhood was to know Shabbas, the Jewish holidays, and how to conduct oneself as a Jew--because being Jewish was with you, every minute of every hour of every day.

As Jews grew up in America, they shed many of these vestiges of a former life, ones that seemed incompatible with the tenor and flavor of America. They grew up in Jewish communities and grew out of them. There developed an increasing tendency for Jews to locate themselves outside of Jewish neighborhoods--in areas where there were few Jewish institutions to serve them and where more and more of their neighbors were non-Jews.¹

In earlier times, after some segment of the Jewish population was

forced to move to another location by reason of changing composition of the neighborhood, the rest of the community soon followed to that new area, developing a new Jewish neighborhood. In Cincinnati, the movement to Roselawn and Amberley seems to be the last such community move because more and more Jews are locating themselves in diverse areas of the city: Hyde Park, East Walnut Hills, Wyoming, Mt. Adams, and perhaps even Westwood.²

In the recent past, where there developed a sufficient concentration of Jews, a synagogue usually followed with a religious school, because Jews relied upon the synagogue and the religious school (today perhaps more so) for the religious instruction of Jewish children (although research done by Himmelfarb--1975 shows that the type of Jewish education received by over 80% of those American Jews who have received any Jewish education has been a waste of time!).³

With the facility that modern roadways provide, families that relocate outside the Jewish neighborhood maintain contact with their old institutions and neighborhood, rather than create a new Jewish neighborhood and community. Individual families tie into the old Jewish institutions and their accompanying services. However, there can be little day-to-day contact among the membership of any of these institutions because the membership is located in every section of the city. A family can travel the distance to the temple for services or Hebrew school, but also for Boy Scouts and a study group or to play baseball is often impossible. The synagogue is just too far away. Instead, Jewish families find comparable activities in their immediate locale; away from Jews, with non-Jews. Jewish families are seldom able to participate in group activities with other Jews day-in and day-out as did their grand-

parents in large urban Jewish settings.

The Jewish community falls victim to widespread dispersion when Jewish families no longer locate themselves in Jewish neighborhoods. Synagogues, community centers and other Jewish institutions service fewer Jewish youth. Jewish bakeries, kosher butcher shops and other retail businesses in the "Jewish neighborhood" trade with fewer Jewish consumers. The Jewish community loses its integrity as a community.

Suburbia, on the other hand, has an integrity, a homogeneity all its own "which has tended to segregate households not only by race but by age."⁴ In this situation, the individual together with his immediate family becomes the source of judgment for his actions and development. Kinship develops not around the extended family, as in previous generations, but around peer groups. As the homogeneity of a Jewish community gives way to the homogeneity of suburban life, traditions are often left behind. Has anything been done to deter this process?

The success of Jewish communal institutions can be measured by their ability to serve Jews despite the phenomenon of geographic dispersion and increasing loss of identification. Because of the decreased homogeneity of the community inter-agency cooperation becomes essential, not only to locate service populations, but also to integrate and coordinate services.

CHAPTER I

Previous Research

Three areas comprise the background research necessary to study the subject of synagogue-Jewish community center relations: trade literature consisting of the various Jewish communal journals, rabbinical journals, and conference papers; sociologic literature on the Jewish community in America; and sociologic literature on the theory of coordination in community planning.

The trade literature and Jewish sociologic literature tend to fall into two distinct periods: that from 1948 until the early sixties and from the sixty-seven War until the present. The trade literature and Jewish sociologic literature of the first period are well indexed through 1959 by the Commission on Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues of the National Jewish Welfare Board in their publications [i.e., Selected Articles: Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues, Vols. I and II (New York, 1956, 1959)].

In 1948 Oscar Janowsky published the Jewish Welfare Board Survey containing the only extensive study done on synagogue-Jewish community center relationships. His landmark study provides a good anchor point from which to begin a description of background literature.

Janowsky found that relations between the synagogue and the Jewish center were in many instances neither close nor cordial.⁵ The lack of cooperation he found was conditioned by a number of factors: institutional loyalties, personal feelings, attitudes toward formal religion,

and differing conceptions of Jewish life. He noted that since they are institutions whose functions oftentimes overlap, neither has a clear bailiwick and the situation is one which lends itself to conflict. Although it is commonly agreed that "religious" programming and ritual is the function of the synagogue, there are as many differing conceptions of the terms as there are Jews and hence, much rivalry and overlapping of services.

Furthermore, Janowsky noted that synagogue leaders oftentimes saw the Center as an agency that would compete with the synagogue for membership. To make matters worse, this particular agency would be funded with communal money. To the leaders of many synagogues, such efforts appeared deliberately competitive and harmful.

He goes on to say that, since rabbis seldom had training in social work and social workers seldom had training to conduct the Jewish activities of the Center, both groups of professionals were critical of one another. Rabbis were oftentimes critical of social workers when social workers attempted to conduct Jewish activities at the Center and when the Center sponsored no Jewish activities. Social workers were critical of rabbis when rabbis asserted themselves in Jewish communal life without the requisite training. This professional separation led to the assumption that Center leaders were secularists and hostile to formal religion, and rabbis were religionists and hostile to secular activity as a function of a Jewish institution.

Janowsky comments in conclusion that despite the differences that exist, there are no insurmountable obstacles to understanding between social workers and rabbis. He feels that the professional and institutional boundaries that divide synagogues and centers are arbitrary ones

because "no jurisdictional boundaries can be drawn between the informal work of the one and the extension activities of the other."⁶

In the nineteen fifties, when centers and synagogues began erecting new buildings simultaneous with the movement of Jews from city to suburb, in some places the new buildings and new locations gave rise to new institutional relationships and a heightened awareness of what Janowski discusses--the separation of synagogue personnel from center personnel because of institutional loyalties and professional differences.

A concern for the development of positive relations is documented by the availability of literature on the subject.⁷ It seemed to many that partnership was the only answer:

It was accepted that all members of the Jewish community were entitled to service from Jewish institutions supported through central Jewish communal funds . . . everyone of its organizational bodies was entitled to the services of its communal institutions and agencies. Simply because the individual was a member of a Jewish fraternal body, a Jewish membership organization or a synagogue or a temple was no reason for discriminating against them when it came to the provision of services made possible through the financial support of some central Jewish communal body.⁸

Here Rabbi Alvin I. Fine, Rabbi of Temple Emanu El in San Francisco outlines his aforecited rationale for joint center-synagogue programming. In subsequent paragraphs he goes on to detail the methodology.

In 1957, Sanford Solender, the Director of the Jewish Community Center Division for the National Jewish Welfare Board, stated that there are "rich opportunities for cooperation between the two"⁹ (synagogue and center). He goes on to say that "the Center is interested not only in providing valuable Jewish group associations under its own roof, but in making its skills in enriching Jewish group life available to other Jewish organizations and groups as well."¹⁰ With respect to synagogues he

suggests:

1. Provision of direct leadership or supervision by the Community Center to the synagogue in respect to the group activities conducted by the latter . . .
2. Jointly sponsored programs in which the Community Center supplements its main program by operating the equivalent of a branch in congregational facilities . . .
3. Conduct of its own extension program by the Community Center utilizing synagogue facilities . . .
4. Advisory help by the Community Center to synagogues.
5. Coordinating and central services rendered by Centers which benefit synagogues. . . . These include club leader recruitment and training, community-wide youth councils and inter-organizational youth activities, community-wide . . . councils and program events.¹¹

Solender's premise is that the Jewish community center has a commitment to strengthening every facet of Jewish group life.¹² He states that the intention of the Jewish Center movement is to work with synagogues rather than compete with them.

This spirit of cooperation between synagogue and center, which Janowsky said was vital to the building of Jewish community and which the previous two authors saw as central to their work as rabbi and social worker, was met with skepticism and fear by others. In the Winter-Spring, 1962, issue of Conservative Judaism, the editors held a symposium on the relationship between the Synagogue and the Center. Five rabbis and one Center director contributed articles to the symposium. For the four previous years, the editors of Conservative Judaism corresponded with the executive directors of the National Jewish Welfare Board in an effort to officially involve the participation of the Welfare Board in the issue of Conservative Judaism which dealt with the Center and Synagogue. The editors of Conservative Judaism were unsuccessful. The

Welfare Board maintained that no genuinely serious problems existed between the Center and Synagogue, and that any problems that emerged from time to time could be dealt with on a local level.¹³

The Symposium spans fifty pages which include a case history of one center's difficult relationship with the community in which it was situated, an annotated bibliography of previous literature on the subject of relationship between synagogue and center, two articles on difficulties within Jewish center work, and three articles on difficulties between synagogue and center as institutions. All of these articles share a common ground: criticism of the conduct of Jewish Center work and numerous suggestions to improve that work.

Rabbi Bernard Ducoff, in his article, "Synagogue, Center, and Bureau: Confrontation and Direction," excerpts sections of a report on "Leisure Time Activities Under Synagogue Auspices" distributed by the National Jewish Welfare Board as a guide for the Federation Study committees together with an "analysis" prepared by the writer and adopted by the Board of Rabbis of Northern California. His purpose was to present in sharp focus the key issues confronting the synagogue and Center movements in the United States and to indicate how the Bureau of Jewish Education can serve as a model for future Jewish Center development.¹⁴ However, his analysis oftentimes exhibits sarcasm and accusation which could only serve to hamper relations with the Center body. For example, when Rabbi Ducoff discusses the Welfare Board's call for cooperation, he writes, "A careful reading of these four suggestions for 'cooperation' uncovers the unwillingness of many Center professionals to permit any encroachment upon their sovereignty."¹⁵ When Rabbi Ducoff discusses the Welfare Board's claim that community centers serve the whole com-

munity, he writes, "Perhaps the most telling answer to all of this faulty reasoning is the paradoxical fact that it is the Jewish Community Center which limits its activities to members."¹⁶ This kind of criticism exemplifies the fear and skepticism discussed earlier.

Rabbi Harold Schulweis, in his article, "Jewish Leisure and the Synagogue," discusses the difficulties of creating Jewish programming in the synagogue that will successfully compete with the secular programming found in a Jewish community center. He goes on to say that since the Center is a membership institution like the Synagogue, "there is no reason for the Center to be treated other than the way the Synagogue or B'nai B'rith or Hadassah is treated, as far as Federation's local allocations are concerned."¹⁷ Finally, he calls for synagogues to band together to form inter-congregational commissions to strengthen the hand of the synagogue community. However, Rabbi Schulweis several times expresses his dissatisfaction with the attitude of "unstructured leisureism" he says the Jewish Center promotes. He implies that it is detrimental to the community when compared with a more religious synagogal approach. Rabbi Schulweis writes, "It is precisely the dominant American secular civilization, daily encircling the Jewish child and adult, which finds itself most pronounced in Jewish Center programming. Expression of the Jewish civilization is programatically peripheral."¹⁸ He goes on to say, that the Jewish Center approach is, "Give them what they want. Without energetic efforts towards Jewish goals, without a sense of Jewish aspiration, the Center continues its Americanization program with the third generation American born."¹⁹ Without a discussion of the motivation and circumstances under which Centers develop their programs, Rabbi Schulweis's analysis is incomplete and tends to inhibit discus-

sion of the issues.

Rabbi Mordecai S. Halpern, in his article, "Detroit--And the Elephant--And the Center Problem," lists sixteen chronological events involving the establishment of Sabbath programming at the Detroit Jewish Center. He comments on the difficult interaction which he and the other rabbis of Detroit experienced with the Center leadership during that time and draws some conclusions based upon the local situation--relating them to the Jewish community generally.²⁰ Among his concluding remarks are the following:

1. The Jewish Center fulfilled its original purpose decades ago as a settlement house, aiding in the process of Americanization. It has not evolved a satisfactory reason for existence since that time.
3. It is high time that rabbis and synagogues learn to work together in the face of community problems such as the center.
4. It is also high time that the Synagogue assert itself as the primary institution of the American Jewish Community--present and future--and not accept the fact that it has been granted separate but equal 'facilities.'²¹

These concluding remarks clearly result from the difficult interaction which the author and his colleagues experienced with the Center leadership in Detroit. Rabbi Halpern suggests that his experience in Detroit applies to Synagogue-Center interaction generally. However, this again tends to inhibit discussion of the issues.

In successive articles of the Symposium, the authors raise issues similar to those which I have summarized and deal with them in similar fashion. That is, each criticizes some aspect of Jewish Center work and offers suggestions to improve the work. It may be true that from the rabbinical point of view numerous problems beset the Center, however, a statement in the fashion of this Symposium does little good, as

is evidenced by the fact that Conservative Judaism received few comments approving the viewpoint of the symposium.²² The symposium provoked numerous articles on the subject of synagogue-Jewish center relations which can be found in the subsequent issues of Jewish Spectator, Congress Bi-weekly, Conservative Judaism, Journal of Jewish Communal Studies, The Reconstructionist, and several local newspapers throughout 1962. However, most of these tend to be of a biased nature, written in reaction to the symposium. After this rash of articles written in response to the Conservative Judaism symposium, the subject of synagogue-Jewish center relations lies dormant in the literature until well after the '67 war. However, it never again commands the concern evidenced in the fifties and early sixties.

I was greatly surprised that a topic on which so much was written could so suddenly lose its currency. In numerous interviews I raised the enigma with respondents hoping that someone involved with a synagogue or center could offer an explanation. One synagogue board member suggested that there was little relevance to my selected topic since the synagogues and the center had little in common and consequently little reason to interact! One federation official suggested that with the increased prominence of federations, the issue of synagogue-federation relations had superseded the synagogue-center question. An area rabbi echoed that response when he told me that the controversy surrounding synagogue-federation relations is reminiscent and in some ways a re-statement of the synagogue-center relations controversy some years ago. These last two responses seem to have direct bearing on the issue.

In most areas of the country, the federation did not develop its power and influence until the '67 War in consequence of the demands put

on the American Jewish community for assistance. The federations became the local collection and transmittal agencies. They were able to gear up and expand their operations to meet the burden of economic support for Israel that the American Jewish community was asked to shoulder. Following the '67 War, a long period of tension ensued throughout the Jewish community. Israel was threatened with retaliation; border raids against Israel were staged relentlessly and as a result, the American Jewish community was forced to maintain a constant state of alert, helping Israel bear the enormous burden of a protracted conflict.

These historical events dominated the attention of the American Jewish community and channeled not only resources, but also concern away from previously urgent internal affairs. Synagogue-Center relations was one of these affairs.

In the late sixties and early seventies, when the community's concern returned to affairs at home, the internal situation had changed enormously. No longer did the Synagogue and Center compete as monolithic institutions in our larger communities. The Jewish community center had become a constituent organization of the greatly expanded federation. Hence, the Center and Federation now shared responsibility for function and program at the Center. Federation people used the phrase "the central address of the Jewish Community" to describe the federation's position. If that were true, what position did the synagogue now have? The federation collected an ever-increasing purse from the Jewish community, for disbursement of which the federation was also responsible. Therefore, the federation required ever-increasing hours from leaders in the Jewish community to fulfill the federation's assumed tasks of fund-raising and community organization. More and more, the federation rather than the

Jewish community center became a potential threat to the synagogues.

In the late sixties, when rabbis returned their attention to the American Jewish community, the federation rather than the Jewish community center posed the greater threat. Hence, synagogue-federation relations became more prominent than synagogue-center relations as a topic for concern in Jewish communal literature.

The only sociologic or trade literature written since the '67 War concerning synagogue-Jewish center relations deals with the subject tangentially with the exception of several articles in a book by Gilbert S. Rosenthal.²³ Included in this literature are a variety of articles written by rabbis, social workers, and professors. Among them are: "Brokha Brokers and Power Brokers" by Gerald E. Bubis,²⁴ "Restructuring the Synagogue" by Harold M. Schulweis,²⁵ and "Synagogue Survival Strategies in the Rootless Society" by George Johnson.²⁶

Gerald Bubis, in his article "Brokha Brokers and Power Brokers," discusses the stereotyped images of the rabbi and the federation director--heads of institutions with overlapping concerns and capacities (much like the Jewish Community Center and the Synagogue). For the rabbi, he says that power is permanent and individual. For the federation director, power is transitory and related to the organization for which he works. Bubis briefly raises two areas of cooperation between synagogues and federations as examples of unfilled needs within a community on which synagogues and a federation might cooperate: one, providing service to the Jewish aged left behind in changing neighborhoods; and two, federation funding of these synagogues. However, these areas also represent examples in which a center and synagogue might cooperate for the betterment of Jewish life. Clearly, this critic sees the oppor-

tunity for cooperation between communal and religious institutions.

Harold Schulweis, in his article, "Restructuring the Synagogue," writes that the rabbi today is at times no more than a religious functionary and seldom acts as a community representative. A congregation tends to be an audience of Jews comprised of separate individuals who come together for reasons of their own. However, in Schulweis's opinion, the congregation can become a catalyst that brings together separate, lonely people. It can facilitate the interaction among congregants rather than hire the rabbi as caterer to provide topical lectures, guest lecturers, or introduce the congregation to new books. Schulweis says that hiring the rabbi as a caterer makes congregants passive and reduces the rabbi to a figure-head needed only to give an occasional blessing.

He also asserts that the Jewish community center staff can help a synagogue build a sense of community and create relationships. The community center staff includes social workers trained in group work. In several position papers, the National Jewish Welfare Board has emphasized that community centers are willing to lend aid to synagogues requesting help to develop their programs. Consequently, it appears that Jewish community centers could play a vital role in helping congregations to develop interaction and interrelationship among their membership.

George Johnson, in his article, "Synagogue Survival Strategies in the Rootless Society," analyzes the phenomenon that in the modern American society, kinship has developed not around the extended family, but around peer groups. In such a mobile, suburbanized society, Jews migrate away from their parents and away from their old traditions. In this separate migration of individual generations, what occurs is not universal integration as much as universal disintegration. The synagogue develops

accordingly:

The proliferation of suburban child-centered synagogues, accessible mainly for symbolic rather than communal purposes is as much a reflection of the ideology of Jewish adjustment to American living patterns as it is an expression of Jewish continuity.²⁷

Although Johnson speaks only of the synagogue, the psychological, sociologic, and social phenomena of which he speaks concern all Jewish institutions equally and institutional relations as well.

In Gilbert S. Rosenthal's anthology, New Directions in the Jewish Family and Community,²⁸ case examples are listed of synagogue-Jewish community center (YMHA) joint programming in the New York area that exist to the present day. Examples of these cases follow in the ensuing paragraphs.

Joe Harris, in his article, "Toward a Cooperative Jewish Community" (located in the aforecited volume), finds that synagogue-Jewish center interaction is evidently based on the need to reach the greatest number of unaffiliated Jews in the New York area and the feeling that this can be best accomplished through cooperation of existing institutions. Harris summarizes remarks made by Graenum Berger, Consultant on Community Centers for the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in New York, when he says that "economic realities" are a reason for cooperation. He lists several specific areas of cooperation: adult Jewish education, Jewish education for children 3-7 years of age, and the modification of Y camps to serve the Jewish educational needs of many more synagogue-affiliated children. The crucial premise for synagogue-Jewish center interaction seems to be the recognition that both the synagogue and the Jewish center are vital institutions in the Jewish community with many responsi-

bilities, but neither possesses all the answers nor the ability to meet all of the requirements of the Jewish community.

A. David Arzt writes in his article, "The Synagogue and the YM-YWHA," located in the volume, New Directions in the Jewish Family and Community, that there are a plethora of different kinds of groups, each with their respective set of needs which have to be filled. These groups demand expertise in group work as well as Jewish "sensitivity." Consequently, he concludes that synagogues must enter into partnerships with Jewish Centers and pool their resources in order to meet existing needs. He goes on to say that:

There has to be a willingness on the part of the professionals and lay leaders to sit down often and honestly explore their feelings, understand their own attitudes and work then through. At the same time, they must begin to plan certain types of programs together using each other's personnel as resource people always with the view that the greater Jewish community is more important than the peculiarities of any one institution.²⁹

A. David Arzt, like other authors in Gilbert Rosenthal's anthology, sees a definite need in relationship and cooperation between synagogues and Jewish community centers.

Certainly interrelated with the sociologic and trade literature on synagogue-Jewish Center relations is one article on synagogue-federation relations which also deals with the topic of coordination in Jewish community planning. This document is a Master's thesis written by Howard Weisband at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in 1975.³⁰

Weisband deals with synagogue-federation relations in the Los Angeles area. In his report, he illustrates the kinds of formal relationships that exist in Los Angeles--the types of committees and their operation. He also documents the relationships that exist in 1975. The author finds an artificial distinction and separateness created by participants in the

"religious" and the "secular" in Jewish life. Weisband contends that:

. . . Federations see themselves as the 'organized Jewish community,' while synagogues often refer to 'the centrality of the synagogue.' Usage of such phrases only serve to create blockages and cause impasses among participants in their attempt to bring about solid, stable relationships between federations and synagogues.³¹

He urges the creation of "coordinating systems" (an agency) to provide the structure that would allow for synagogues and federation constituent agencies to deal with issues that demand ad hoc attention. In such a setting, participants would first concentrate on achieving consensus, and then identify those areas in which coordination might take place.

However, the multitude of varying opinions on what coordinating strategy to apply to which situation demonstrates the difficulty in determining an optimal strategy.

My bibliography lists several works on the topic of coordination in community planning. This material is of a theoretical nature and deals with strategies for optimal interaction.

Two or three methodologies exist for interorganizational coordination: coordination through interagency or interorganizational committees, coordination through joint or unified service operations, and non-coordination. Each of these describes ways in which organizations may interact with one another at different times.

Coordination through interagency or interorganizational committees represents the least potent device, although it is quite common. In this strategy, representatives of agencies or organizations sharing common interests or goals form a committee to improve communication, interrelate planning, develop devices for cooperation on the operational level, and so on. The sociologist Alfred J. Kahn writes in his textbook, Theory

and Practice of Social Planning:

Unless the convening authority has real power and uses it (with reference to funding usually) or one or more of the members is especially well located for forceful leadership, each significant member of the group maintains a veto. Only a superordinate task of considerable moment, usually in response to a community emergency, permits such a body to overcome fundamental vested interests. Otherwise, it accomplishes many things, but leaves enough unsolved so that calls for more coordination persist.³²

Here Alfred Kahn explains that interagency committees will seldom accomplish "tasks of such moment" that it will be clear to others outside the agencies involved how effectively the coordinating body functions. For synagogues and centers that may potentially use such a model, this suggests that a coordinating body should include board members with some clout so that the importance of the coordinating body will become clear.

Coordination through joint or unified service operations represents a technique whereby coordination is achieved by inventing a unified service-delivery system under which several services are reached through one access point. This technique assumes that many services are available through a variety of different agencies or organizations. If a contact is made to any one agency or organization, the person making the contact can be immediately referred to the agency providing the service desired. The heart of the technique shows a well integrated set of services that account for the goals of all the agencies of the coalition. Kahn says that:

Agreement on several levels, from line practitioners to executive and board, achieves coordination. Even a simple advice and referral system makes a contribution along these lines as it asks the questions so as to channel community inquiries.³³

Non-coordination terms a strategy whereby agencies do not coordinate. The technique avoids monopoly. Protection of the status quo as a consequence of coordination will be avoided. Agencies will concentrate on

the development of new services rather than become preoccupied with coordination. Another function of non-coordination is to promote an agency's independence. This may be important when a conflict of values arises and both values in conflict are desired.³⁴ However, this clearly portrays a radical approach.

Counterposed to this would be complete program coordination.

Kahn points out that:

Complete program coordination, if it existed, probably would stifle initiative and block innovation. This seldom is a true danger, however. The degree of coordination that can be achieved among relatively sovereign agencies or bureaus even within one department, each of which may have the support of professional or lay constituencies, usually leaves considerable free zones and areas for innovation and competition.³⁵

Hence, coordination is not an activity that will totally consume an agency's resources, but rather establishes a larger guiding structure within which an agency may serve the community. Interorganizational coordination can permit and even encourage conflict without destruction of the overall societal relations.³⁶ Agencies that engage in a coordinating process never surrender their ability to make policy decisions.

After researching and reviewing these three integrated categories of literature (i.e., Jewish trade literature, sociologic literature on the Jewish community in America, and sociologic literature on the theory of coordination in community planning) one can discern that a minimal amount of previous literature on the subject of synagogue-Jewish community center relations exists. However, with the multitude of work done in other diverse areas, it becomes possible to derive some significant implications.

In 1948, Janowsky found that relationships between synagogues and Jewish community centers in the United States were neither close nor

cordial. They were institutions whose functions oftentimes overlapped and each institution saw the other as competing with it for membership. By the 1960's other authors found that relationships between synagogue and the Jewish community center were sometimes close and usually cordial. By this time, centers had established communal roles for themselves. These roles lay in the area of leisure-time recreational and sometimes cultural activities.

Despite the clear statements of purpose developed by leaders of the Jewish Community Center Movement, synagogues sometimes still found themselves in competition with centers in the areas of youth activities and cultural programming. The leaders of synagogues directed criticism at the center and the leaders of the centers directed criticism at synagogues, to little avail.

There developed a passive acceptance of inherent conflict in roles. However, few attempts were ever made to establish more formal relations between the two institutions. The center's role was to function as a communal institution, while the synagogue's role became more privatist, serving a particular sub-group of the Jewish community in the "religious area."

Perhaps what is necessary today are objective studies performed on the very viable analyses and hypotheses presented by the authors cited throughout this chapter. Naturally, and unfortunately, the subjective nature of these analyses and hypotheses would lead to very difficult, if not impossible, study designs. The future for this brand of literature looks bleak. Hopefully this will not lend itself to similar implications for synagogue-Jewish community center relations.

CHAPTER II

Methodology

The methodology used for this study consists of two parallel procedures for collecting relevant data: 1) personal interviews with Jewish Community Center, Jewish Community Relations Council, and Federation officials, congregational rabbis, and several board members from area synagogues and the Jewish Community Center; and 2) the compiling of a Client-Service Matrix Analysis which graphs services provided against age groups served for the different institutions studied. These two methods in conjunction will provide an accurate portrayal of institution services.

Interview Procedure

Questionnaire

Three questionnaires are utilized in this study (see Appendix B): one for Jewish Community Center and Federation officials, another for congregational rabbis, and the last for board members of the different institutions.

The Center-Federation questionnaire consists of forty-five questions formulated from "A Summary of the 1956 Survey of Jewish Community Center and Synagogue Relationships,"³⁷ and consultation with Dr. Robert Katz, Professor of Human Relations at Hebrew Union College. The questionnaire attempts to ask questions which will determine: the existence of conflict between the Center and synagogues and the extent of any such conflict; the types of joint programming that may exist, together with a

description of the implementation; the kinds of informal interaction that may occur between institutions; the overlap of programs; the makings for good institutional rapport; and what changes can be expected in the broad area of synagogue/Center relations.

The Synagogue questionnaire comprises thirty-eight questions taken from the Center-Federation questionnaire. At times the questions are modified to reflect the different perspective of respondents. For example, in the Center-Federation questionnaire the question is asked, "Within the past ten years has the Center conducted activities in synagogues? Of at least two denominations? Of three?" (cited in Center-Federation questionnaire located in Appendix B). In the Synagogue questionnaire the companion question reads, "Within the past ten years has the Center conducted activities in your Synagogue/Temple?" (cited in Synagogue questionnaire located in Appendix B). Several questions are deleted because they deal only with the functioning of the Center. For example, question number three reads, "Does the Center have a liaison with the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis?" However, the two questionnaires are roughly equivalent, asking similar questions from different perspectives.

The Board questionnaire differs greatly from the other two questionnaires. The other questionnaires seek responses over a broad area in order to determine every relevant issue of concern. In contrast, the Board questionnaire has only six questions; five are open-ended, the sixth merely asks the respondent of which boards he has been a member. The open-ended questions seek the attitudes and opinions of respondents. Two of these questions are taken from the other two questionnaires; I formulated the other three. Thus the Board questionnaire seeks more

subjective data than the other two questionnaires.

The five open-ended questions tended to stimulate a conversation or explanation that often gave a clear picture of the board member's perspective of Center-synagogue relations in Cincinnati--both as it exists presently and as it might exist in the future. Since these respondents are very involved with Center and synagogue affairs, their opinions have a direct bearing on the extent of present relations and the possibility of future relations between the Center and synagogues.

In addition to interviews of Center and Federation officials, congregational rabbis and board members of these institutions, an official of the Jewish Community Relations Council and several lay people prominent in negotiations surrounding the 1960 Jewish Community Center Sabbath opening controversy (see the ensuing chapter) were interviewed. These interviews were conducted to obtain specific information which was otherwise unavailable. Hence, no questionnaire was used.

Thus, for the Center and Federation officials, congregational rabbis, and board members interviewed, questionnaires were utilized to cover broad areas of relevant material. In other cases where specific information was sought, no questionnaire was used. Instead, specific questions were formulated to investigate particular issues.

Interview Process

Twenty-five interviews were conducted, comprising Federation, Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC), and Center personnel; board members of various social service agencies; and congregational rabbis in the community. These interviews lasted from ten minutes (with one rabbi) to two and a half hours (with one board member). Most lasted from one to one

and one half hours.

Initially the names of twelve congregational rabbis in the community were selected, whom I hoped to interview together with various Federation, JCRC, and Center personnel. A letter of introduction was sent to each of these potential respondents (see Appendix A), describing the nature of my thesis project and stating my desire to meet with them in regard to that topic.

I was able to arrange appointments with all but one of these officials. In each interview I took written notes which were subsequently converted into a typewritten transcript (a copy of which is located in the American Jewish Archives, but unavailable for public inspection). Following each interview, a follow-up note of thanks was sent expressing appreciation for the interview (see Appendix A).

In each interview with rabbis and Center officials, I requested the names of one or two board members who might be contacted with similar questions. I stated that board members with a working knowledge of more than one institution would be preferable. Thus, no board members were contacted without the knowledge of an institution official.

Names of board members were not solicited from the Federation officials or the rabbis of smaller Orthodox congregations. I felt that the Federation Board was outside my immediate focus and that the smaller Orthodox congregations would not have many activities similar to those of the Center. Thus, board members contacted were generally those of the larger congregations.

After receiving the names of ten board members, letters of introduction were sent which included the name of the rabbi or Center official suggesting the individual. I was able to establish appointments with

only six of this group. The others were either unobtainable or were unable to find time in their busy schedules.

The interview method is time consuming and reaches a limited number of respondents, however, the advantages of in depth discussion outweighed its limitations for my project. This method together with the Client-Service Matrix Analysis, which provided a necessary additional perspective, comprises the methodology.

Client-Service Matrix Analysis

The Client-Service Matrix Analysis is an application of a management science methodology called "Program Planning and Budgeting" or "PPB."³⁸ The Client-Service Matrix Analysis can show at a glance what services are provided by what service agencies to what age groups. Such a procedure allows one to examine similarities and differences among all the synagogues and the Jewish Community Center by defining elements that would allow comparison across the institutions (see matrices located in Appendix C). Since objective measures are easily handled as compared to subjective measures, the Client-Service Matrix Analysis provides a good check to the subjective interview technique.

The client-service matrices supply the reader with an overview of the "mission" of different institutions. The service population is broken down by age groups, and services are separated into several general categories; thus service overlap among institutions is readily discernible. The matrices are not meant to function as comprehensive graphs that chart every activity of each institution studied, but rather as more general representations of the areas of service provided by the different institutions.

The information in the client-service matrices was first taken from bulletins and program brochures from the various institutions. After extracting data from these sources, I discussed the completed institutional matrix with either the rabbi, director, or others in the organization. This procedure provided a check on my initial research.

The client-service matrices for each institution appear in Appendix C. These matrices together with the results of personal interviews with various institution personnel and board members build a portrait of Center-synagogue interaction.

CHAPTER III

A Summary of Pertinent Historical Events

Formation of the Jewish Center in Cincinnati

The Jewish Center of Cincinnati, later to be known as the Jewish Community Center, was the result of a merger among the YM-YWHA, the Jewish Community House, Wise Center, and Rockdale Center.*

The YM-YWHA was an organization that met in the basement of the old Rockdale Temple at the corner of Rockdale and Harvey Avenues. It had very little space there in which to conduct activities, so many activities were conducted in the old Bureau of Jewish Education building and various temples and synagogues in the area.

The Jewish Community House was a settlement house on Clinton Street in the basin area of Cincinnati. By the late 1930's all but a very few Jews had moved away from this area of town and there was no further need for the facility. It was at this time, when the Jewish Community House no longer had any clear function and the YM-YWHA desperately needed a facility for its expanding activity program, that the community began to consider a plan to consolidate the four existing Jewish social and recreational organizations.

The other organizations, the Rockdale Center and the Wise Center were organizations affiliated with the Reform temples that bear their names and existed to provide social and recreational activities for

*All information in this and succeeding sections of the chapter has been derived from personal interviews, copies of which are filed in the American Jewish Archives, but unavailable for public inspection.

temple members.

The Jewish Center was created to unify the social, cultural, and recreational programs of the Jewish community. Reform Jews as a group opposed this unification more so than the Orthodox, primarily because creating the Jewish Center meant closing down the Rockdale and Wise Centers and forcing two dissimilar groups in the Jewish community to fraternize.

In the 1930's Cincinnati was home for German Reform Jews who had long been United States citizens and for Eastern European Jews who had arrived in Cincinnati as immigrants only twenty to forty years previously. The Eastern European Jews, for the most part, were also Orthodox. These two groups, although both Jewish, found they had little in common. So great was the disparity between these two groups that only recently have Cincinnati Jews ceased to consider an intermarriage a marriage of two Jews, one of German Reform parentage, the other of Eastern European parentage.

The merger of the four organizations providing social, cultural, and recreational programs for the Cincinnati Jewish Community was initiated by the community's leadership because they saw the necessity of interaction between the diverse groups that made Cincinnati Jewry. The dark cloud of World War II and the ominous location of European Jewry was perhaps a catalyst, but whatever the reason, it is clear that the Jewish community's leadership--both Reform and Orthodox--desired cooperation and interaction.

The first home for the newly formed Jewish Center was not a single building, but two. One was the old Eli Wittstein Post at the northeast corner of Dana and Reading. The other was the old Manischewitz house on

Forest Avenue. The Reading Road building was used as an adult building and the Manischewitz house as a youth building, although, after a short time the youth used both buildings. A mikveh was located at the Manischewitz house. The first executive director of the Jewish Center was Louise Felson Pritz. She headed the Jewish Center for several years until 1940, when she married.

At that time, the Center Board decided to hire a professional social worker as director. They chose Cy Sleznick, who was then working in Cleveland. The Center continued with its two buildings for three more years, until 1943, when the Center purchased the old University School on Blair and Hartford. The school was situated on 7.7 acres of land in the heart of the Jewish community, which seemed an ideal location for the Center. Its constituency was immediately at hand and the area surrounding the building afforded the Center room for outdoor recreation and possible expansion. That expansion dream came true when the Cincinnati Jewish Center became the first Center in the country to build a swimming pool. When the acquisition and occupation of the new building was complete, the two other buildings were sold.

The Jewish Center stayed at Blair and Hartford for twenty years. In the course of those years its name was expanded to "Jewish Community Center." It developed an identity and purpose all its own which was separate and distinct from that of other agencies and institutions. The Center provided social, cultural and recreational programming for Cincinnati Jewry and came to serve as a meeting ground for the diverse special interest groups within the community.

Never once, throughout those twenty years was there a major conflict between any synagogue or temple and the Center. The Center never entered

into religious programming and synagogues never sought to sponsor leisure-time activities like the Center's. There were rabbis and laymen who suggested that their synagogues could and should function as a Jewish Center, but no successful attempt to implement that goal was ever made. It was understood within the community that the synagogue's purpose was religious and the Center's purpose was social, cultural and recreational.

and more began moving into the Bond Hill, Roselawn, and Ashbury areas. By the late fifties the trend became sufficiently clear to the leadership of the Jewish community for them to consider moving the Center and other communal institutions. A plot of land was purchased for the Center on Summit Road and the building fund campaign was begun.

During that campaign, the Center Board called a meeting to discuss the possibility of the Center opening on Shabbat. All of the rabbis, with the exceptions of Rabbi Albert Hahn and Rabbi Elmer Silver (Rabbi Silver who did not comment), agreed that the Center should not be opened. They said that without the Shabbat the Center would have no air of rest and that they were opposed to any such opening.

Later, the opposite opinion was expressed by a small group of influential Reform Jews. They said that the Center was an institution of the total community and those in the community who desired to use the Center's facilities on the Shabbat should be allowed to do so. The issue was heatedly discussed among members of the Center Board until Rabbi Hahn was hastily dismissed and a motion picture concerning the subject was projected and a poll taken. The poll showed that the majority of the community was in favor of the Center's opening on Shabbat. It was suggested that the Board table the issue and deal with it after the Center was built, which they did.

The issue was kept up publicly until the day the Center was dedi-

1960--The New Center Building and the Sabbath Opening Controversy

For more than twenty years, Avondale was the center of Jewish life in Cincinnati. There Cincinnati Jewry erected their temples and synagogues, established their Hebrew schools and social welfare organizations, and founded their Jewish Community Center. However, in the mid-fifties, with the increased movement of blacks into the Avondale area, Jews more and more began moving into the Bond Hill, Roselawn, and Amberley areas. By the late fifties the trend became sufficiently clear to the leadership of the Jewish community for them to consider moving the Center and other communal institutions. A plot of land was purchased for the Center on Summit Road and the building fund campaign was begun.

During that campaign, the Center Board called a meeting to discuss the possibility of the Center opening on Shabbas. All of the rabbis, with the exceptions of Rabbi Albert Goldman and Rabbi Eliezer Silver (Rabbi Silver who did not comment), agreed that the Center should not be opened. They said that without the Shabbas the Center would have no day of rest and that they were opposed to any such opening.

However, the opposite opinion was expressed by a small group of influential Reform Jews. They said that the Center was an institution of the total community and those in the community who desired to use the Center's facilities on the Shabbas should be allowed to do so. The issue was heatedly discussed among members of the Center Board until Rabbi Goldfeder pointed out that publicly raising this particular issue at that time would split the community and hurt the fund raising campaign currently in process. It was suggested that the Board table the issue and deal with it after the Center was built, which they did.

The issue never came up publicly until the day the Center was dedi-

cated. The rabbis and other community leaders attended a large banquet at the new Center building. Rabbi Eliezer Silver affixed the mezusah to the doorpost (Rabbi Silver represented one of the leading Orthodox rabbis in the country--a leader of the Agudas Rabanim, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis; he was a rabbi of pre-eminent authority with whose opinions few Orthodox and Conservative rabbis--certainly none in Cincinnati--would dare to take issue). One of the leaders in the fund-raising drive for the new Center--some say it was Karten Mailender--went over and asked Rabbi Silver teasingly whether he might allow the Center to open its doors on the Shabbas. To everyone's surprise he said yes! However, he added certain stipulations which would allow the Center to remain within the Jewish strictures regarding work on the Shabbas.

Following Rabbi Silver's statement there was a general uproar in the community and among the rabbis especially. Never before had a leader of the Orthodox rabbinate in America condoned the opening of a Jewish community center on the Shabbas, much less given it a personal hechshar. The Center Board sent a delegation of three men to talk with Rabbi Silver and confirm what they had heard. The delegation included Karten Mailender--active Center Board member and future president, Aaron Wiesen--chairman of the Saturday Programming Committee of the Center and a lawyer, and Harold Raab--the President of the Jewish Community Center. When these men spoke with Silver, Silver confirmed what he privately had told a few at the Center dedication that the Center may be open on Saturdays with Silver's approval if the Center Board would agree to certain restrictions on activity (all of which may be found in Appendix D). These included: no parking in the Center parking lot, no use of the vending machines, no smoking, no carrying of bathing suits to or from

the Center, no use of public telephones, etc. So great was the disbelief at Silver's approval that the committee asked for and received from Silver a signed letter containing all of the particulars of the agreement.

Meanwhile, the congregational rabbis of Cincinnati met, with the exception of Silver. All were against the Center opening on the Sabbath. They discussed ways of fighting the Saturday opening--perhaps publishing a statement against the Saturday opening in the American Israelite. But, in the words of one local rabbi:

. . . by the same token you have to be realistic; you have to realize that fifty rabbis could write a statement--but you're fighting Rabbi Silver. After all, he's the authority--the posayk. When he says you're going to be open, you're going to be open . . . there was no point in us fighting him, because we wouldn't have had a leg to stand on. We would say no and he would say yes--and they (the Center Board) would abide by his decision, especially when that's what they want.³⁹

However unhappy the majority of Cincinnati's congregational rabbis were with Rabbi Silver's decision (i.e., to give his permission for the Center to have Saturday activities), the rabbis felt powerless to challenge Silver's stand.

Orthodox Jews of other cities were angry with Silver's decision. By opening the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center for Sabbath programming, they said he opened the door for others to begin Sabbath programs in other Jewish community centers without the restrictions which Rabbi Silver imposed. Although Silver made it clear that he was only giving permission for the Center in Cincinnati to open, this was taken by others to be a kind of blanket permit (e.g., the Jewish Community Center in Detroit).

In deciding to give permission to the Jewish Community Center for Sabbath programming, Rabbi Silver cited several reasons. Among these

was the nature of Sabbath afternoon programing available to the Jewish community. It is reputed that Silver said, "Rather than go to Coney Island (King's Island's predecessor) on Shabbas, desecrate the Shabbas, eat non-kosher food and so forth, let them come to the Center, and under Jewish law, let them observe the Shabbas."

Silver did not presume to give advice to Jewish community centers in other cities. In an interview published shortly after the Center opening in Cincinnati, he said:

I know the leaders of the Jewish Community Center in Cincinnati and I have confidence in their sincerity. I know they operate a kosher kitchen with adequate supervision. Besides, I live in Cincinnati and can 'keep an eye' on what is happening here.

The Jewish Community Center leaders in other cities can consult with the rabbis in their communities and arrive at their own decisions.⁴⁰

Silver saw Sabbath programming at the Jewish Community Center as a vehicle to maintaining Sabbath purity in the Jewish community of Cincinnati.

The respect that Jews of Cincinnati had for Rabbi Eliezer Silver was great. At the time of this writing, sixteen years after the Center dedication, and almost nine years since Rabbi Silver's death, the Jewish Community Center of Cincinnati continues to follow the rules and regulations for Sabbath programming set down by Rabbi Silver. Over the years there have been changes, but the body of regulations continues to be kept. So strong are the feelings of commitment and gratitude to Rabbi Silver that one former president of the Center said that as long as he (the president) lived, he would see to it that the Center would continue to keep the regulations mandated by Rabbi Silver.

Certainly Rabbi Silver's influence bore significantly on the Jewish community in 1960. This impact was felt not only by the community per se, but by the community's institutions as well. His influence on re-

relationships among the synagogues in 1960 will find implicit and explicit mention in the subsequent chapter.

Relationships Among the Synagogues in 1960

The primary vehicle for interaction and relationship among the synagogues in Cincinnati in 1960 was the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis. The Board of Rabbis served as an informal forum for the congregational rabbis of Cincinnati to discuss current issues and learn together. Secondly it served as a spokesman for the rabbinic community in Cincinnati. There were monthly or semi-monthly meetings where discussion was held on synagogue relations with the Welfare Fund, Center, etc. Rabbi Bernard Kalchman of the North Avondale Synagogue and later Rabbi David Indich of the Golf Manor Synagogue taught a class. These activities provided informal contact among the rabbis.

The Board of Rabbis was seldom able to speak for the congregational rabbis of Cincinnati. The Board was composed of Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative rabbis who frequently held differing opinions. Much of the difference of opinion led to good discussion meetings, however, the situation often prevented the Board as a whole from issuing statements on matters concerning the Jewish community.

Perhaps the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis could not have the prestige that a similar body in another large city might have. As was illustrated in the previous sub-chapter, Rabbi Eliezer Silver's voice was larger than that of all the other rabbis in the city, although Rabbi Silver was not a member of the Board of Rabbis. As previously discussed, prior to Rabbi Silver's announcement that the Center might open its doors on the Shabbas, all of the other congregational rabbis in the city were against the Center opening. After Rabbi Silver's statement, every rabbi, with the two exceptions of Rabbi Indich and Rabbi Goldman, threw tacit support behind Silver's effort.

On another occasion, the Board of Rabbis wanted to put a Jewish chaplain in Jewish Hospital. All of the rabbis on the Board of Rabbis were in favor of it. The opposition of Rabbi Silver was perhaps the central factor that led to the proposal's defeat. Despite their collective opposition, the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis was unable to successfully defend a position contrary to that of Rabbi Silver.

The Board of Rabbis seldom functioned as a clearinghouse for synagogues and temples to coordinate their activities and programs. However, there were occasions when synagogues jointly sponsored events. One example was a youth council among the area synagogues which Rabbi Goldfeder developed. After it was functioning the Center took over sponsorship. Other examples include the various community-sponsored events: Israel Independence Day, Jewish Book Month, etc. Temples and synagogues together with other Jewish organizations would lend their name in sponsorship of the event although little joint planning actually occurred. These examples among others indicate the cordial institutional relations that synagogues maintained with one another.

Despite the warm institutional relations that were maintained, synagogues seldom did their planning together. Two or more congregations seldom joined together to sponsor one event. Each congregation had its own particular constituency and there was seldom the need or desire for cooperative programming.

In summary, relationships among the synagogues of Cincinnati in 1960 were cordial although there was little interaction among the congregations. Congregational rabbis had a forum in which to air difficulties, discuss current issues, and study together. However, that forum, the Board of Rabbis, was not used as a clearinghouse. Orienta-

tions among congregations were sufficiently diverse as to make impractical such coordination. Since the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis did not function as a coordinating body, it neither determined nor influenced relationships between synagogues and the Jewish Community Center. Those relationships were determined by Center policy and efforts of individual congregations.

The Jewish Center was created to unify the social, cultural, and recreational programs of the Jewish community. From the 1920's until the early years of this century, Cincinnati's Jewish population was predominantly Eastern European Orthodox Jews. Cincinnati's Jewish Center, then, had assigned a high degree of social significance to the Jewish community and had attained a high level of success. By 1950, the Jewish Center thought that the Jewish community should develop more unity and be heard, very specific Eastern European Jews. By 1950, the Jewish Center had changed its emphasis. With the coming of the war, there was a need to develop better unity in the community. There was a need to develop mutual respect between the two very different segments of the Jewish community (Eastern and Western). A unified Jewish Center was needed that would serve the needs of both groups.

In 1950, the Jewish Community Center still fulfilled both needs. That had changed in the previous twenty years. Orthodox Jews of Eastern European background had stayed in Cincinnati and adapted their children to Americans. Many of them had attained wealth comparable to the majority of German before families. American Jews had been educated among the children of German before and Eastern European parents alike. Good relations had developed between the two groups. Yet, there was still need for a Jewish-center institution that would provide service to

Relationships Between Synagogues and the Center in 1960

Relationships between the synagogues and the Jewish Community Center in Cincinnati in 1960 were based on a set of well defined roles. The Jewish Community Center's role was clear and describable as was the collective role of synagogues in the community. In the following paragraphs, a description of these various roles will ensue.

The Jewish Center was created to unify the social, cultural, and recreational programs of the Jewish community. From the 1880's well into the early years of this century, Cincinnati received twenty thousand Eastern European Orthodox Jews. Cincinnati's German Reform Jews, who had attained a high degree of social mobility within the larger community and had attained a high level of respect, were initially alarmed at the thought that the non-Jewish community might associate them with the bearded, very foreign Eastern European Jews. By 1940, the shock of these newcomers had subsided. With the coming of the war, there was a need to develop better unity in the community: there was a need to develop mutual respect between the two very different segments of the Jewish community (Reform and Orthodox). A unified Jewish Center could fill that need.

In 1960, the Jewish Community Center still fulfilled that need. Much had changed in the previous twenty years. Orthodox Jews of Eastern European background had adopted American ways and educated their children as Americans. Many of them had attained wealth comparable to the security of German Reform families. Conservative Judaism had won adherents among the children of German Reform and Eastern European Orthodox alike. Good relations had developed between the two groups. Yet, there was still need for a leisure-time institution that would provide service to

the entire Jewish community. Since the Center was not owned, directed, or guided by any one group, it could maintain a non-religiously-oriented program and a philosophy that welcomed all groups of the Jewish community. Some have aptly described the Center as the meeting place of the Jewish community because it provides common ground for various elements of the community to gather.

The collective role of synagogues in Cincinnati was to serve the religious and Jewish educational needs of the Jewish community. The various synagogues and temples tended to serve particular constituencies distinguished in various ways: denominational preference, socio-economic level, societal status, professional status, and family affiliation.

The Center and synagogues had certain parallel functions in 1960. Both provided certain activities which were similar in nature; these activities include youth groups, adult classes holiday programs, and camp programs. Both institutions served as meeting places for social action projects. Thus, in certain areas, programs were remarkably similar.

However, unlike the synagogue, the Jewish Community Center functioned as a "community" agency. That is, it received funds from the central community charities--both Jewish and non-Jewish alike. To do this, the Center had to remain officially non-sectarian. Further, the Center was expected to provide athletic, social, and recreational activities for the entire Jewish community and additionally serve as the neutral ground for diverse sub-groups within the Jewish community to meet.

The synagogues, on the other hand, were the religious institutions of the Jewish community. In addition to those functions and activities which it shared with the Center, the synagogues provided worship services,

Jewish education for both children and adults, and maintained pulpits as platforms from which rabbis, as religious authorities, might address their congregations and community on matters of concern to them. These activities, delineated in this paragraph, have traditionally served as the primary functions of synagogues.

Good relationships between synagogues and the Jewish Community Center generally depended on two factors: good communication between institution leaders (i.e., the Center director and rabbi); and an acceptance of one institution's primary jurisdiction in a given area by other differing institutions. For example, the synagogue traditionally had primary jurisdiction in the areas of religious services and Jewish education for both children and adults. The Center, on the other hand, took primary jurisdiction for athletic activities (and facilities) and non-religiously oriented group and craft programs. It became accepted Center practice that whenever the Center developed activities in a traditionally synagogal area, one or more rabbis would be consulted.

Despite the Center efforts, some rabbis remained discontent--perhaps with the Center as a sufficiently Jewish institution, perhaps because it was too Jewish. Certain rabbis felt that by offering new Sabbath cultural programs the Center was infringing upon what was a "synagogue" area of service, yet other rabbis criticized the Center for not including sufficient Jewish content in its programs. Thus by 1960, the Center had not clarified its role to the community (or the community had not specified the role it wanted the Center to play) and fully established its areas of influence. Hence, areas of conflict remained.

When a synagogue developed activities in what had become the Center's area of jurisdiction, Center staff was seldom consulted. A few

years later, in the mid-sixties, there are examples of this. When one temple sought to organize an area-wide council of Jewish youth groups, it never saw the need to clear its plans with Center staff. Another temple began to offer calisthenics for its members without clearing its plans with the Jewish Community Center staff. Two reasons come to mind. When compared with the synagogues in the community, the Center was a very new institution. Hence, it had little time to clearly define its areas of jurisdiction and have them accepted by the older institutions. Second, certain rabbis have considered the synagogue a monolithic institution in the community needing no aid from any other agency. Thus, little coordination was apparent between the Center and synagogues.

When the Center Board began to consider the question of Sabbath programming, they were careful to follow the understood rules of protocol. A committee from the Center Board contacted each of the rabbis and discussed the question with them. As previously mentioned, (with the exception of Rabbis Goldman and Silver) each of the rabbis rejected the Center proposal for Sabbath programming until it became apparent that Rabbi Silver's hechshar was sufficiently strong that no group could successfully stand against it. At that point, the Center's proposal was universally endorsed by the community's rabbis.

Cincinnati's congregational rabbis were unhappy with the Center's decision to open on the Shabbat. However, they were still committed to a delineation of purpose, function, and authority. Hence, relations between synagogues and the Jewish Community Center were preserved much the same as they existed before the controversy.

Thus, the major historical events pertinent to Center-synagogue relations in Cincinnati today are: the formation of the Jewish Community

Center and consequent division of social and recreational activities from religious activities; and the construction of the Summit Road Jewish Community Center followed by the assumption of Sabbath activities approved by Eliezer Silver. These events and their implications (some of which do not appear until the concluding chapter) led to the evolution of today's Center-synagogue relations.

CHAPTER IV

Study Findings

Results of the Client-Service Matrix Analysis

The Client-Service Matrix Analysis (located in Appendix C) graphs in broad terms the areas of responsibility assumed by the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center and individual temples and synagogues in the Cincinnati metropolitan area. As previously discussed in the chapter on Methodology, the analysis describes areas of service overlap (which tends to be a source for conflict). The analysis records age groups receiving service, and specifies the types of services included in an institution's service delivery system as compared with those offered by similar institutions. These classifications build a picture of an institution in terms of services provided to the community, and contribute to a portrait of the roles played by the Jewish Community Center and synagogues within the community.

The activities graphed by the client-service matrices have religious, quasi-religious, cultural, and recreational components. For the purposes of this study, religious activities are those activities which involve worship, formal Jewish education, or study of traditional Jewish texts. Quasi-religious activities are those activities which are primarily social or recreational, but which involve some prayers (i.e., blessings over the Chanukah candles at a Chanukah party, blessings over the wine at a Shabbas dinner, and melave malkot). Cultural activities are those activities centered around a Jewish theme or with

a strong Jewish component, but ones which do not include blessings or worship. Examples include a lecture on Kashruth, an adult education class on a Jewish theme, and a Jewish art exhibit. Recreational activities are those which involve athletics, games, crafts, singing, dancing, group get-togethers, informal discussions--any activities which do not involve an explicit Jewish theme. Throughout this chapter and the next, these classifications will be used when the words, "religious," "quasi-religious," "cultural," and "recreational" are used to describe an activity or set of activities.

The temples and synagogues studied included three Orthodox, two Conservative, and four Reform congregations. All of these synagogues and temples conduct regular religious services and holiday celebrations, offer youth services at least for the High Holidays, conduct Bar Mitzvah ceremonies, baby namings for newly born children, and study groups for adults of the congregation. Additionally, the rabbis of each synagogue or temple officiate at the regularly scheduled services, holiday celebrations, weddings and funerals of congregants, and each does at least limited counseling. Most of the congregations studied have a sisterhood, men's club, religious school, and youth group. Additionally, most offer Bat Mitzvah ceremonies for girls, consecration and confirmation ceremonies, and sponsor a lecture series.

The activities listed in the previous paragraph suggest the role of the synagogue as a religious and cultural center for the community, offering activities which are either of a religious nature or enhance a commitment to Judaism and Jewish community. However, synagogal activities are not limited to the activities listed above. Among the congregations studied, the following activities are also a part of activity

programs: breakfast minyans, couples clubs, child-grandparent retreats, reminiscence groups, family dinners, women's groups, tennis parties, picnics, and even lipid testing. Some of these have a direct connection to religious and cultural functions of a synagogue or temple. However, others do not; they are more recreationally oriented and tangentially serve a temple's religious purposes. Thus, especially in recent years, synagogues and temples have added recreational programming to their more primary religious and cultural functions, thereby extending the role of the synagogue as religious center to that of recreational center as well.

The role of a synagogue as recreational center is more clearly evident among the Reform and Conservative synagogues than it is among the Orthodox synagogues. The three Orthodox synagogues studied included among their activities only a handful of programs that are not religious, quasi-religious, or cultural: annual picnics and two couples clubs. The two Conservative synagogues studied included among their activities a more diversified schedule of recreational programs, which includes not only picnics and a couples' club, but also a "Supermarket Sweepstakes drawing," art auction, and bridge club. The four Reform temples studied included an equally diversified schedule of recreational programs, including: picnics, couples' clubs, art auctions, bridge tournaments, child-grandparent retreats, a course in photo-journalism, art classes, and a trip to the ballpark, among others. Thus, the Reform and Conservative synagogues have developed more diversified recreational programs than those of Orthodox congregations. This tends to establish these congregations as recreational centers as well as religious and cultural centers.

Orthodox congregations, while not functioning as recreational cen-

ters like Reform and Conservative congregations, generally have especially strong and diverse religious, quasi-religious, and cultural programs. They offer regular daily services, lectures and discussions on Jewish themes, and often study groups on various aspects of Jewish law. This stronger orientation toward religious activities among Orthodox congregations obtains from the relationship of Orthodoxy to Jewish religious law and Torah: "Moses received the Torah (the Law) from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the Elders, and the Elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets delivered it to the Men of the Great Synagogue."¹¹ They interpreted and passed it on to generations of rabbis until today. Thus, a very strong bond ties Orthodox Jews to the mitzvot (commandments) contained in the Torah and the authority of the religion mandated by generations of believing Jews. So important is the religion and tradition to Orthodox congregations that most activities offered by Orthodox synagogues are tied in some way to religious functions.

The Jewish Community Center of Cincinnati provides no religious functions; it rather serves as a recreational and cultural center for the Jewish community. The Center's broad, multi-faceted program includes specialized activities for: older adults, single adults, teens, pre-adolescents, pre-schoolers, as well as for family units. The activity programs vary, depending on the age group, but in every case are extensive, offering a variety of opportunities for involvement.

Among the activities sponsored by the Center, however, quasi-religious programming does emerge, but only as a necessary component of other activities. For example, Camp Livingston (an affiliate of the Center) includes Sabbath programs as a part of the regular camp program; similarly, at Chanukah Family Dinners sponsored by the Center, a candle

lighting ceremony is performed. Although Hebrew ulpan-type classes, Israeli folk-dancing, and a night with Theodore Bikel are included among the Center's "Jewish programming," no religious education study groups or classes are taught, nor are religious services conducted. Religious programming remains the exclusive precinct of temples and synagogues while both the Center and synagogues serve the community with social and recreational programs.

This situation is a product of the metamorphosis that the Center's role underwent in the community since its creation. As discussed more fully in the previous chapter, the Center was originally created to unify existing social and recreational programs developed by different temples, synagogues, and "community houses." This unification served two purposes: one, Jews of East European and German heritages began to mix while participating in the same activities; and two, synagogues and temples were allowed to revert to their more primary religious functions since competitive social and recreational programs were eliminated. In 1960, the Center opened its doors, under Rabbi Silver's hechshar, to offer "only those activities which were in keeping with the Shabbas." These activities were mostly recreational. However, by the strict nature of the Sabbath regulations (see Appendix D), anyone attending the Center on the Shabbas was inherently involved with a religious experience. Furthermore, as a part of the Center's Sabbath program, study groups (led by Rabbi Goldman) were offered to the community. Thus, although the Center was created to unify the social and cultural activities in the community and to allow synagogues to revert to their more primary roles as religious centers, in 1960, by the inherent nature of the Sabbath programming (i.e., conforming very strictly to Jewish Law),

the Center began to provide elements of religious programming. No longer was there a clear distinction between the Center and synagogues. A greater ambiguity of roles became apparent.

Today, delineations between the functions of synagogues and the Center are even more blurred. As indicated by the Client-Service Matrix Analysis, in addition to Sabbath programming (i.e., conforming very strictly to Jewish Law), the Center now sponsors Jewish holiday celebrations and dinners. Correspondingly, synagogues now offer an ever growing number of distinct recreational activities. Furthermore, both Anshe Emeth and the Jewish Community Center serve as cultural centers for the community.* Thus, the area for coordination or conflict of programs has become greater than ever before.

Although the Center and synagogues offer extensive overlapping activity programs, segments of the Jewish community exist, towards whom either the Center or synagogues direct little programming. The client-service matrix analysis examines twelve segments of the community (age groups). Of these segments, the college-age young adults and older adults are reached by minimal programming.

College-age young adults affiliated with the University of Cincinnati are provided with religious services and a broad social and recreational programs through the local Hillel Foundation. However, college-age young adults who are native Cincinnatians returning to Cincinnati for vacations, have few activities directed to their age group to choose from. Several synagogues offer reunions or a special "college service,"

*Throughout this chapter and the next, an effort is made to protect the identities of congregations studied by using pseudonyms when referring to them.

but no other activities are available. *the population still do not receive*

Older adults have an excellent recreational program offered and directed to them from the Jewish Community Center, which includes piano lessons, bingo, cards, sewing, a drama group, dance classes, special trips, and other activities on a nearly 'round-the-clock' schedule. But that program includes no religious elements. Among the synagogues studied, only Suburban and Zion Temples schedule activities directed to older adults, and these are only a few. However, the membership of the three Orthodox synagogues studied include a large number of older adults, and the activities sponsored by these synagogues consequently serve older adults. Although five of the nine synagogues studied schedule activities that include older adults, studies⁴² show that there are many older adults often plagued with boredom and a feeling of uselessness, who require assistance and are not receiving it from existing programs.

These two examples, i.e., college-age young adults and older adults, explicate the gaps found in the community's overall programming. These groups also potentially represent other less well defined groups not included in the Client-Service Matrix Analysis due to the limitations or scope of my study, but who also require service.

Thus, the Client-Service Matrix Analysis outlines a more objective perspective of the services rendered or not rendered to Cincinnati's Jewish community. This analysis displays the partial delineation of roles evident between the Center and local synagogues, the significant service overlap which exists in the area of recreational programming, the difference in roles between Orthodox and other synagogues, and suggests that despite the considerable programming available from synagogues

and the Center, that some segments of the population still do not receive adequate service from these institutions. The Client-Service Matrix Analysis does more than merely describe service phenomena. It also bears some significant implications: that the area of coordination or conflict of programs between the Center and synagogues has become greater than ever before, and others which will be discussed in the ensuing concluding chapter.

Extent of Institutional Cooperation and Interaction

Institutional cooperation and interaction between the Jewish Community Center of Cincinnati and synagogues in the community are determined not only by the institutional relationships between the Center and individual synagogues, but also by the relationship of congregational rabbis to the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis and the consequent collective relationship of congregational rabbis to the Center, and the potential roles which Federation and the Jewish Community Relations Council may have as catalysts. The following three sections deal successively with these topics.

Direct Institutional Relationships Between Synagogues and the Center

Direct institutional cooperation and interaction between the Center and synagogues are conditioned by a number of factors: one, a willingness of Center officials and rabbis to accept the existing division of responsibility--the Center offers recreational and Jewish cultural programs, and houses major community events, while the synagogues offer religious programs, Jewish cultural programs, and recreational programs; two, good personal and professional relationships between congregational rabbis and the Center director; three, willingness on the part of rabbis to refer congregants to existing Center activities; and four, the ongoing involvement of some temple board members in the Center Board. Although not necessarily inclusive of all factors that may affect synagogue-Jewish Community Center relations, these factors were suggested as the relevant factors by area rabbis and Center, Federation, and Jewish Community Relations Council executives in the course of personal interviews and cor-

roborated by the Client-Service Matrix Analysis.*

At Anshe Emeth Congregation, an unusual situation is evident: unlike other congregations in the community, which function as religious and cultural centers for their membership, Anshe Emeth also functions as a major Jewish cultural showplace of Cincinnati. Anshe Emeth is a large Conservative congregation with capacious new facilities which are centrally located to the Jewish community. Every year Anshe Emeth promotes their "Night of Stars" among other events. For the "Night of Stars," Anshe Emeth contracts a well-known Jewish entertainer who commands several thousand dollars for one performance. Facilities at Anshe Emeth seat over two thousand and attendance at these events is always sufficient for the Night to be a money-maker.

Until this year, the Jewish Community Center of Cincinnati had never spent more than a thousand dollars on an entertainer for one evening. Facilities at the Jewish Community Center are not as large as those of Anshe Emeth, and the Center Board, in the past, has not been willing to risk such a large investment on an entertainer for one evening. Anshe Emeth Synagogue, rather than the Center, has functioned as the Jewish cultural showplace of Cincinnati, sponsoring cantorial concerts, a showing of "Maskit Shop" products, the "Night of Stars," and other large productions. However, this year, for the first time, the Center sponsored an entertainer of the first rank, Theodore Bikel. By bringing to Cincinnati such significant entertainment, the Center is perhaps beginning to develop itself as a major Jewish showplace, too.

*The e personal interviews are on file in the American Jewish Archives, but are unavailable for public inspection.

In past years, the Center has served as a center of social and recreational activities for the Jewish community. It has provided basketball, baseball, tennis, swimming, lectures, older adult groups, teen groups, and craft groups among an extensive program of social and recreational activities. By offering the community major cultural events, it completes its multifaceted program of recreational and cultural service. However, this multifaceted program of service does not necessarily suggest that positive personal and professional relationships obtain between the Center officials and rabbis.

One Center official commented that the Center actively pursues good relations with congregational rabbis. In a personal interview, he specified two such ways. The Center requests one or more interested rabbis to sit on the Center Board. Unfortunately, the rabbis do not always accept; in fact, this year, no rabbis sit on the Center Board. The Center director frequently telephones congregational rabbis in the community to solicit their opinions on whether a particular activity should be offered by the Center. Examples of such activities are those which involve Sabbath programming or any which may have quasi-religious content. Despite Center efforts, the official said that some congregational rabbis were distrustful of the Center because of its extensive programming and size. He commented that if the Center takes the lead in organizing programs, that it appears to synagogues as if the Center is trying to devour them. Clearly, Center executives seek communication with the congregational rabbis in the community; how effective that communication is will become apparent in the ensuing discussion.

Congregational rabbis affirmed that the Center director consults with them about various programs, but mentioned a variety of opinions

concerning the position their synagogues occupied vis-a-vis the Center. The majority of rabbis agreed that the Center provides a much needed service to the community that congregations cannot provide. A gymnasium, a health club, year-round swimming, and extensive tennis facilities were cited again and again as examples of services that synagogues cannot duplicate. However, there was a substantial minority of rabbis who were unhappy about various aspects of the Center program as it related to synagogues. Some felt that the Center program is not particularly Jewish, while others felt that by entering into Jewish programming and allowing the Conservative congregation B'nai Israel, to use its facilities, the Center is sponsoring programs that only synagogues should sponsor. One or two rabbis felt that the Center was in competition with synagogues for membership (see below). They said that with the percentage of Jews unaffiliated with synagogues increasing every year, a Center with some religious programming could provide those Jews with a haven and thereby become directly competitive with synagogues. Thus, as intimated by many of the Cincinnati rabbis and Center officials, the existing communication and interaction between the Center and congregational rabbis in the community does not entirely bear positive effects on their relationships.

Most rabbis do not refer congregants to Center activities; some because they do not see it as their role (i.e., referral), others because their synagogue schedules similar activities, and still others because they do not have sufficient rapport with Center staff. One rabbi stated that he refused to make Center announcements from his pulpit because no linkage with the Center exists that provides the kind of good feelings that would make a rabbi want to announce their programs. Two other rabbis said that the Center offered few activities which would appeal to

their congregants. Another rabbi commented that although he refers congregants to Center programs as the Center requests, he has misgivings because, "it seems like the Center and the Federation are trying to take away synagogue lay workers and their funds to funnel them to the Federation and Center activities."⁴³ Those rabbis who refer congregants to Center activities stated that they do so out of a commitment to the "total community," and a philosophy that no one institution can serve all the Jewish needs of its constituency. Consequently, although some rabbis do refer congregants to Center activities, either because of the nature of activities provided or insufficient communication and interaction between congregational rabbis and the Center staff, many rabbis do not refer congregants to Center activities.

Laymen who sit on both the Center Board and a synagogue board seldom play a significant role in enhancing cooperation and interaction between the Center and synagogues. Nearly all of the Center Board members are synagogue members, and many of them are synagogue board members. However, from discussion with rabbis, the Center director, and Board members, it became apparent that dual board members are not expected to function as catalysts. However, in the one case where the Center developed a joint program with a synagogue, the idea came from a synagogue president who was also a board member of the Center.

The president of Beth Jacob Synagogue was a member of the Center Board when he suggested to the Center director this idea of having Center staff supervise a regularly scheduled youth lounge at Beth Jacob Synagogue. The Synagogue president and Center director put together a proposal to the Synagogue. The Synagogue Board accepted the proposal and it was determined that responsibility for setting policy would be

delegated to a joint committee which functioned as follows: the Synagogue Board and a committee of the Center Board met separately to develop their ideas on policy, then came together to work out a common agreement. Thus, although joint programming between the Center and synagogues is rare, the role one synagogue president played in developing Center programming at his synagogue is illustrative of the important link laymen who are members of both the Center Board and a synagogue board can provide.

Ties between the Center and synagogues are also dependent on financial and political considerations. Sufficient funds must be available for joint programs and an institution sponsoring programs conducted at another location must have its own facility sufficiently utilized. Otherwise the institution can be charged with inefficient allocation of resources. Although the Center has many activities that utilize the Center building on a nearly 'round-the-clock basis, vacant areas still exist. One Center official commented that without fully utilizing the existing Center facility, that the Center could not engage Center staff in further programming that takes place at other locations (i.e., synagogues) because the expenditure could not be justified. Thus, joint programming and interaction is also dependent on the availability of resources and adequate utilization of existing facilities.

Direct institutional cooperation and interaction between the Center and synagogues in Cincinnati is minimal. The Center director, Center staff, and rabbis accept the existing division of responsibilities as a barrier impeding interaction. The joint program developed between Beth Jacob Synagogue and the Center is the first example of interaction which may signal a move towards greater cooperation. Center officials active-

ly pursue good relations with congregational rabbis, however, the resulting communication is also minimal with little evidence available that suggests congregational rabbis perceive the Center as a central resource, whose activities they will promote and refer congregants to. Similarly, little evidence is available that suggests the Center staff as a whole may request assistance. Several laymen are both members of the Center Board and a synagogue board, however, they keep their roles separate and seldom function as a link between institutions. Consequently, the Center and synagogues in the Cincinnati community tend to have little relation to one another.

The Jewish Community Relations Council as a
Catalyst for Synagogue--Jewish
Community Center Relations

The Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC) is an independent coordinating and public relations agency of the Jewish community. The organization receives its operating funds primarily from the Jewish Federation and secondarily from private donations. Its purposes are: one, to coordinate the activities of the Jewish community with those of public service agencies and churches of greater Cincinnati; two, to organize certain mass activities for the Jewish community, i.e., the Yom HaShoah commemoration (in remembrance of the holocaust) and, in previous years, the Yom HaAtzmaut commemorations (celebrating Israel's Independence Day); and three, to coordinate the response of Jewish institutions to various issues confronting the Jewish community. The JCRC potentially functions as a catalyst for synagogue-Jewish Community Center relations when organizing mass activities for the Jewish community and in the process of coordinating the response of Jewish institutions to issues

that confront the Jewish community.

As aforementioned, certain mass community activities are organized by the JCRC, i.e., the Yom HaShoah commemoration and the Yom HaAtzmaut celebration. However, these and other similar events are planned by only a few JCRC board members and professional staff who seldom fully represent agencies involved in implementation. For example, in past years when the JCRC was responsible for planning the Yom HaAtzmaut celebration, the Center and synagogues were sponsoring institutions, but the professional staff together with a handful of JCRC board members actually planned the event. The JCRC director commented that including representatives of the many sponsoring institutions would make the planning process unduly cumbersome. Hence, in its capacity as a planning agency for large community events sponsored by several institutions, the JCRC cannot function as a catalyst for Center-synagogue interaction.

A similar situation prevails with regard to the JCRC's function as a coordinating agency for the response of Jewish institutions to various issues that confront the Jewish community. To maintain contact with the many different Jewish institutions, the JCRC board includes representatives from the boards and professional staff of all Jewish agencies, organizations, and synagogues in Cincinnati. These board members work together on various task forces and subcommittees to deal with the various issues that confront the Jewish community. The JCRC is the only organization in the city with all of the congregational rabbis on its board, the Center director, and present and past Center presidents. Despite this representation, the JCRC does not catalyze interaction between the Center and synagogues, because the JCRC was never designed to have the function of a community relations organization for institutions

within the Jewish community.

The Cincinnati Jewish Federation as a Catalyst
for Synagogue--Jewish Community Center
Relations

The Jewish Federation of Cincinnati is the central planning, coordinating, and fund-raising body for agencies of the Jewish community. The Federation provides long-range planning for the community, coordinates the responsibilities and functions of the constituent agencies, and raises funds for agency operation, the United Jewish Appeal, and Jewish Welfare Funds. In personal interviews with the officers of the Federation it became clear that the Federation has no particular concern about the Center relationship with synagogues in the community.

Problems between the Center and synagogues in Cincinnati are drastically reduced. One of the executives reported that twenty years ago, the rabbis would publicly issue charges that the Center was not sufficiently Jewish, and other rabbis would charge that the Center was taking participants away from their religious programs. However, the Center was in the process of developing a clear function for itself. Today, these charges are no longer heard. The Center's function has become well defined. The community better understands what types of activities fall within the Center's responsibility and what activities fall within the synagogues' responsibility. Furthermore, with the advent of the Federation and centralized planning, the Federation bears a large part of the criticism formerly directed to the Center because of the pivotal role the Federation plays in community organization. As a result, Jewish Center-Synagogue relations is a dormant issue in the community and for Federation today.

The issue of Jewish Center-Synagogue relations is also seldom a topic for concern in Federation because the Federation responds to the most immediate crises, of which Jewish Center-Synagogue relations is not one. Six or seven years ago, the community was desperately concerned with the youth issue, but today the burning issues are Jewish education and aging, so the Federation as representative of the community responds with new studies and projects. If and when concern is refocused on Jewish Center-Synagogue relations, the Federation will be ready to respond.

The Cincinnati Board of Rabbis as a Catalyst
for Synagogue Relations
with the Jewish Community Center

The Cincinnati Board of Rabbis in past years has been an informal meeting place for Cincinnati's congregational rabbis. In monthly meetings, the rabbis discussed (and on occasion articulated to the press) their collective position on important issues. At these meetings, Rabbi Kolchman and later Rabbi Inidch led a regular class. The member rabbis also discussed the relationship between their synagogues and various other institutions in the community (including the Jewish Community Center). However, the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis has not met in three years and today it has little or no voice in community affairs.

The president of the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis cited several reasons for the Board's inactivity. He said that the rabbis in Cincinnati cannot speak with a united voice. Oftentimes, the Orthodox and Reform rabbis split apart on issues. Consequently, from a desire to keep peace between the rabbis, it became easier to discontinue meetings. Furthermore, not all of the congregational rabbis in the community belong to the Board and the Board president said that he was fearful of creating

cliques. As a result, the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis seldom meets and plays no role in Jewish Community Center-Synagogue affairs.

From the study findings it becomes clear that the delineation of function between synagogues and the Jewish Community Center is becoming increasingly blurred. In the past, the Center has provided social and recreational programs, and synagogues have provided religious and cultural activities. However, the Center now provides some Jewish cultural activities and limited religious programming. Synagogues provide social and recreational activities which are sometimes unrelated to their religious program of activities.

At the present, relationships between the Center and synagogues are cordial. The Center director tries to maintain communication with every congregational rabbi and the Center staffs a youth lounge at one of the synagogues. However, an undercurrent of suspicion and distrust of the Center is evident among several congregational rabbis.

The effect of this suspicion and distrust on the community is apparent in limited correlation of activities between the Center and synagogues. The Center requests congregations to advertise Center programs; certain rabbis refuse. Synagogues develop recreational activities, but would not consider Center staff aid. As a result, both the Jewish Community Center and synagogue programming suffer.

Despite less than optimal programming among these institutions, no efforts to catalyze more cooperative and interactive relations are forthcoming from the Jewish Community Relations Council, Federation, or the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis. The JCRC has limited or no responsibility in the area of inter-institutional relations. The Federation has more

than sufficient work without the responsibility of catalyzing better Center-synagogue relations. The Board of Rabbis is an inactive organization. Thus little immediate effort or concern is forthcoming from the community concerning the state of Center-synagogue relations in Cincinnati.

CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Very little written history is available on Jewish Community Center-synagogue relations--whether in Cincinnati or elsewhere (see Bibliography for available literature). The two institutions have had areas of program overlap, yet they have also performed different functions within the community. Thus, fertile ground becomes available for either conflict or cooperation.

The Jewish Center was created as a recreational center. It provided activities for both East European and German Jews, and centralized the activity programs of Wise and Rockdale Temples among others (see Chapter III). However, since its creation, the Center has undergone a full metamorphosis. Today, it not only provides recreational activities, but cultural and quasi-religious activities as well. Thus, over the years, its purpose and function have changed.

Today the Center no longer serves to integrate the East European and German Jews of Cincinnati or to provide activity programs for the synagogues. East European and German Jews regularly interact and synagogues have again developed their own extensive activity programs. The Center, instead, functions as a recreational and cultural center for the Jewish community. However, a blurring of roles between the Center and synagogues has accompanied the development of the Jewish Community Center as a cultural center. Clearly, religious content is often a necessary component of cultural programs. The Center has developed certain

cultural programs with definite religious content (e.g., holiday dinners, Chanukah parties, and Sabbath programming both at the Center facility and at Camp Livingston). As a result, the Center's function and programs of activity have changed with the passing of years, and the functional distinction between Center and synagogue has become increasingly less certain.

As institutions, the Center and synagogues are progressively taking on programs outside their stated areas of concern. Since 1960, the Center has developed a Sabbath program and in recent years has expanded the quantity of cultural programs it offers. Furthermore, numerous activities have quasi-religious elements. Synagogues offer a large variety of recreational activities (see Chapter IV, "Client-Service Matrix Analysis"). Yet, because they lack the facilities, they are not recreational centers in quite the same sense that the Jewish Community Center is a recreational center.

Community attitudes to these changes in function vary depending on which institution (i.e., synagogue or Jewish Community Center) changes. Despite the blurring of distinctions between the functions of synagogues and the Center, the community as a whole and rabbis in particular continue to view with disfavor any further Center efforts to provide programs with religious elements. For example, although the Center conducts an extensive older adult program, no religious components are included (e.g., services, religious study groups) because it is understood in the community that only synagogues provide extensive religious programs. Yet, synagogues do not provide the necessary transportation to and from their activities for many older adults to frequent such activities on a regular basis. Thus, many older adults may be deprived of this kind of activity.

Community planning and coordination are necessary to prevent such a situation and others like it from occurring. However, that planning is not forthcoming from the Federation or any other agency in the community.

The need for extensive planning and coordination of programs largely goes unheeded in the community. The Federation maintains a "community calendar" which lists all of the major events scheduled in the Jewish community. Whenever an organization schedules a major event, it is hoped that the organization will list it on the community calendar. However, in practice, events are oftentimes not listed and conflicts in program result. Consequently, the coordination of times for major events offered by different institutions poses certain difficulties.

The coordination and interrelation of similar programs offered by different institutions pose even greater difficulties. Among some synagogues in Cincinnati, coordination of programs exists (e.g., joint lecture series, joint religious schools, and occasional joint services). However, between synagogues and the Center, only one instance exists wherein activities were interrelated (the youth lounge of congregation Beth Jacob which was staffed by Center personnel). Research yielded no instances of coordination: temples and synagogues tying certain of their activities into those of the Center and the Center seeking to coordinate certain activities among synagogues. Furthermore, little concern for such coordination was evident among the community leaders interviewed: Center and Federation officials, rabbis, and laymen. Little value is placed on coordinating similar programs sponsored by different institutions. Instead, competition among institutions with similar programs is the norm. Such competition is not vicious, but simply a common

aspect of relations for the Center and various synagogues in the community.

One of the rabbis interviewed clearly described this phenomenon.¹⁴⁴ He began by saying that in America today, synagogues must enter into the area of secular programming or they might as well close up shop. The Synagogue has taken over Center work as the congregation has become less religiously oriented. Consequently, the Rabbi has become less of a teacher. Today, he must function as a social worker, the business manager of the congregation, and especially a social director. The programs of his congregation must be competitive with those of other congregations and those of the Center. Without competitive programming, institutions would be unable to establish their identities or maintain their constituencies.

He went on to say that good relations among the various institutions in the Cincinnati Jewish community exist to the extent that institutional identities have been established and are recognized by other institutions and individuals within the community. He noted that Reform and Orthodox rabbis can and do have fruitful relations with one another only when each is secure with his own Jewish identity. He concluded by suggesting that only when Center and Synagogue identities are well-established and rabbis and directors feel secure with the positions that their institutions occupy in the community, do relations between synagogues and the Jewish Community Center become supportive and productive.

Are relationships between the Center and synagogues supportive and productive? The analysis provided by this rabbi is buttressed by available evidence. Among the congregational rabbis interviewed, two Orthodox rabbis and one Conservative rabbi indicated that they would welcome Center aid in developing various kinds of social activities.¹⁴⁵ A Center

official stated that the Center would definitely be willing to provide consultation or supervision to help a particular synagogue with a program.¹⁶ Unfortunately, neither the requests nor the response have been heard.

Few attempts to coordinate similar programs have been made. A youth activity council organized by the rabbi of a large synagogue and now under Center auspices, is the only example of coordination revealed in my study. No coordination of older adult programs, adult education, or single adult activities exists.

Synagogue and Center personnel have little contact with one another. Although a group exists for Jewish communal agency professionals to informally meet, no comparable group exists that would catalyze interaction between synagogue and Center professionals. Thus, little opportunity exists for these professionals to encounter one another.

From these brief examples and others noted in the previous chapter, it is clear that little communication and interaction exists between synagogue and Center professionals. The roles occupied by the Center and synagogues (especially Reform and Conservative) have become amorphous and blurred. These institutions are confronted with "identity crises." They have historically established identities, but their roles in the community are no longer stable. Each of the larger congregations has become more than a house of worship by incorporating diverse recreation programs into its schedule of activities. Each of these congregations has joined the role of "community center" to whatever its historical role. Thus, as was suggested by the aforementioned rabbi, by developing elements of a common identity and common function, the Jewish Community Center and synagogues of Cincinnati necessarily have difficulty developing positive, interactive relations.

Future Implications for Cincinnati

The future of synagogue-Jewish community Center relations in Cincinnati is influenced by several national and local trends: one, a shrinking Jewish population in Cincinnati; two, a general movement among Jews away from a recognizable Jewish identity; three, an expected shift of the Jewish population center in Cincinnati from Roselawn; and four, a greater difficulty among synagogues in obtaining sufficient funds to provide adequate Jewish education for their membership. These changes will change the environment in which synagogues and the Jewish Community Center presently interact.

The Jewish population of Cincinnati can be expected to shrink as a result of a general population shift away from the Cincinnati metropolitan area and the effect of zero population growth on the Jewish community. Synagogues would require replacement membership to maintain their solvency. Unable to find a sufficient number of new families, some synagogues would necessarily combine into larger institutions.

The general movement among Jews away from a coherent, recognizable Jewish identity is documented by Fred Massarik in "Jewish Identity: Facts for Planning," a monograph of the National Jewish Population Study,⁴⁷ and by Leonard Fein in Reform is a Verb.⁴⁸ Massarik reported that the level of Jewishness in Jewish homes, as determined by religious practice, has measurably decreased within the past generation and that large numbers of respondents report little or no attendance at religious services.⁴⁹ Fein reported that there is "a general uncertainty regarding the 'requirements' or even the desiderata, of Judaism, an uncertainty that is quite evident among adults and still more striking--substantially more striking--among youth."⁵⁰ Thus, synagogues must provide more extensive recreational and

cultural programming in addition to "special events," that will attract new congregants and maintain the interest of old. Large synagogues with extensive recreational and cultural activity programs would necessarily provide more significant competition to Center programs than presently existss, and might suggest to community planners that synagogue-centers with group work as well as rabbinical staff would be preferable.

Just as the Jewish population center of Cincinnati moved from the West Side of downtown Cincinnati to Avondale, and from Avondale to Bond Hill and Roselawn, the population center is expected to shift again.⁵¹ Such a shift would require the construction of a new Jewish Community Center and several synagogues (in addition to many other communal institutions and private businesses). If such a move is even possible, much discussion would inevitably result among community leaders on the interrelation of institutions and facilities to obtain the greatest return on funds invested for relocation. Such discussion could favor the construction of a single, large synagogue-center capable of providing religious facilities for two or more congregations simultaneously (perhaps a Reform, an Orthodox, and a Conservative congregation) so as to conserve precious community funds, rather than the construction of several separate facilities.

With the decreased enrollment in synagogue schools that will result from zero population growth in the Jewish community, schools will either combine or continue operation on a smaller scale. In either situation, Jewish communal funds and planning will be required to develop adequate educational programs. This year (1976-77), congregation Anshe Emeth became the first synagogue in Cincinnati to request funds for its Hebrew school from the Federation. Similar requests have been made in other

large cities, and as the problem of decreased revenues resulting from fewer Jewish children attending congregational Hebrew schools intensifies, synagogues in Cincinnati will be drawn into closer working relationships with the Federation. Inevitably, synagogues will thereby be drawn into closer working relationships with the Jewish Community Center and other communal agencies.

Thus, in the near future, new challenges will confront the Jewish community of Cincinnati: population movement, decreased population, and decreased religious involvement. These crises, with their attendant demands, will require the forging of new institutional relationships and better interrelation of services among the synagogues and the Jewish Community Center of Cincinnati. The quality of Jewish life in Cincinnati hangs in the balance.

Community Center programming was of a recreational and cultural nature (see p. 31). However, recreational and cultural programs necessarily included activities similar to those of synagogue programs. Youth activities were a particularly frequent area of conflict. A passive acceptance of the partial duplication of roles (i.e., that the Center and synagogues provided very identical activities) developed among Center and synagogue leaders. Yet, few attempts were ever made to establish active relations between the two institutions.

In recent years numerous analyses of synagogue-federation relations have emerged (see Bibliography, especially Weisland, Interorganizational Analysis of Federation-Synagogue Relations) and several brief reports on successful Center-synagogue relations (see Bibliography, especially Rosenthal, New Directions in the Jewish Family and Community). However, no serious study of Jewish community center-synagogue relations has been attempted since the 1956 Survey of Jewish Community Center and Synagogues

Relationship of Study to Previous Literature

This study, as with previous studies and literature on the subject, suggests that effort needs to be invested to expand the substance of future Center-synagogue relations. In 1948, Oscar Janowsky found that relations between synagogues and Jewish community center in the United States were neither close nor cordial (see pp. 20-21). Functions of a Center oftentimes overlapped in content and purpose with those of synagogues. Rabbis often felt that a Center competed with synagogues for membership. Thus, suspicion and distrust existed among leaders of the two institutions with regard to the purpose of the other.

By the 1960's Center leadership had more clearly defined the role of the Center. The Center had become the central recreational and Jewish cultural center of a community. Center programming was of a recreational and cultural nature (see p. 21). However, recreational and cultural programs necessarily included activities similar to those of synagogue programs. Youth activities were a particularly frequent area of conflict. A passive acceptance of the partial duplication of roles (i.e., that the Center and synagogues provided many identical activities) developed among Center and synagogue leaders. Yet, few attempts were ever made to establish active relations between the two institutions.

In recent years numerous analyses of synagogue-federation relations have emerged (see Bibliography, especially Weisband, Interorganizational Analysis of Federation-Synagogue Relations) and several brief reports on successful Center-synagogue relations (see Bibliography, especially Rosenthal, New Directions in the Jewish Family and Community). However, no serious study of Jewish community center-synagogue relations has been attempted since the "1956 Survey of Jewish Community Center and Synagogue

Relations."⁵² This present study of relationships between the synagogues of Cincinnati and the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center is an attempt to provide further data on the subject and thereby fill a significant gap in the literature. The present study has determined that a large degree of functional overlap continues to exist between the services provided by the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center and the synagogues studied, and that, furthermore, little cooperation or interrelation of programs exists. Inherent in these findings, skepticism is evident concerning the possibility of cooperation between the Center and synagogues..

Thus, little change has occurred in the relationship between the Center and synagogues since the Janowsky study where, to reiterate, he noted that since the Center and synagogues are institutions whose functions oftentimes overlap and neither has a clear bailiwick, the situation is one which lends itself to conflict (see p. 6).

However, neither the Federation personnel, board members of communal agencies and synagogues alike, nor even some rabbis continue to see the synagogues apart from "communal" institutions. Presumably because synagogues are seen as separate non-"communal" institutions, interrelation of activity programs and services seldom takes place between the synagogues and the Center, Jewish Family Service, or other communal institutions. Good Jewish community organization and coordination can only develop when synagogues are included as a part of the communal structure of a community.

The closeness which synagogues have with other Jewish communal institutions (i.e., of serving Jews to the community with Jewish activities) has been hampered by a Jewish communal striving to duplicate the nation-wide ideal of a separation of church and state—an ideal which is important for American Jews, but one which can have little meaning for a small

The Future Implications for American Jewry

With little change evident in the nature of Center-synagogue relations in the past twenty-nine years, and with the increased prominence of communal institutions, increased attention must be focused on the interrelation of synagogal and communal programming to ensure the future security of the Jewish Community in America.

An arbitrary distinction between religious institutions (i.e., synagogues) and secular institutions (e.g., Centers and federations) has too long existed. In earlier times and other lands, the communal agencies of a Jewish community were suffused with religious concern and identity. Similarly, the religious institutions of a community served communal interests as well, by functioning as centers of community gatherings. The present division of responsibilities between communal and religious agencies is historically arbitrary.

However, center and federation personnel, board members of communal agencies and synagogues alike, and even some rabbis continue to set the synagogue apart from "communal" institutions. Precisely because synagogues are seen as separate non-"communal" institutions, interrelation of activity programs and services seldom takes place between the synagogues and the Center, Jewish Family Service, or other communal institutions. Good Jewish community organization and coordination can only develop when synagogues are included as a part of the communal structure of a community.

The commonality which synagogues have with other Jewish communal institutions (i.e., of serving Jews in the community with Jewish services) has been superseded by a Jewish communal striving to duplicate the national ideal of a separation of church and state--an ideal which is important for sovereign states, but one which can have little meaning for a small

minority group within a sovereign state. Our Jewish community in America is only one of many minority groups struggling to maintain their identities in the face of dominant Christian and secular cultures. Without interrelation of all facets of our Jewish community, Jews cannot hope to maintain a distinct identity in America.

²David P. Verrady, "Recent Changes in the Settlement Patterns of the Jewish Population of Cincinnati" (unpublished technical report submitted to the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati, August, 1973), p. 1.

³Harold Himmelfarb, "Jewish Education: Educating the Culturally Deprived Jewish Child," *Analysis*, No. 31 (September, 1975), p. 3.

⁴George E. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

⁵Isaac Janowsky, *The Jewish Welfare Board Survey* (New York: The Jewish Welfare Board, 1948), pp. 33-34.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁷See my bibliography.

⁸Salvin I. Fine, "Partnership is the Only Answer," in *Selected Articles: Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues*, ed. by the Commission on Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1956), p. 13.

⁹Sanford Salzman, "The Place of the Jewish Community Center in Jewish Life: A Formulation of the Position of the Center," *Journal of Jewish Community Service*, Vol. 30 (Fall, 1957), p. 35.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 38-49.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 148.

¹³Samuel Dresner, ed., "Communications," *Conservative Judaism*, Vol. XVII, Nos. 3-4 (Spring-Summer, 1963), pp. 121-2.

¹⁴Harold D. Dworkin, "Synagogue, Center, and Bureau: Confirmation and Direction," *Conservative Judaism*, Vol. XVII, Nos. 2-3 (Winter-Spring, 1962), p. 2.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 5.

FOOTNOTES

¹George E. Johnson, "Synagogue Survival Strategies in the Rootless Society: A Case Study," Analysis, No. 45 (April, 1974), p. 1.

²David P. Varrady, "Recent Changes in the Settlement Patterns of the Jewish Population of Cincinnati" (unpublished technical report submitted to the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati, August, 1973), p. 1.

³Harold Himmelfarb, "Jewish Education: Educating the Culturally Deprived Jewish Child," Analysis, No. 51 (September, 1975), p. 3.

⁴George E. Johnson, op. cit., p. 1.

⁵Oscar Janowsky, The Jewish Welfare Board Survey (New York: The Jewish Welfare Board, 1948), pp. 33-35.

⁶Ibid., p. 35.

⁷See my bibliography.

⁸Alvin I. Fine, "Partnership is the Only Answer," in Selected Articles: Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues, ed. by the Commission on Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1956), p. 13.

⁹Sanford Solender, "The Place of the Jewish Community Center in Jewish Life: A Formulation of the Position of the Center," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. 35 (Fall, 1957), p. 39.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 48.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 48-49.

¹²Ibid., p. 148.

¹³Samuel Dresner, ed., "Communications," Conservative Judaism, Vol. XVII, Nos. 3-4 (Spring-Summer, 1963), pp. 121-2.

¹⁴Bernard Ducoff, "Synagogue, Center, and Bureau: Confrontation and Direction," Conservative Judaism, Vol. XVI, Nos. 2-3 (Winter-Spring, 1962), p. 2.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁷Harold Schulweis, "Jewish Leisure and the Synagogue," Conservative Judaism, Vol. XVI, Nos. 2-3 (Winter-Spring), p. 16.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 14

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Mordecai Halpern, "Detroit--And the Elephant--And the Center Problem," Conservative Judaism, Vol. XVI, Nos. 2-3 (Winter-Spring, 1962), pp. 24-25.

²¹Ibid., p. 24.

²²Jacob Neusner, "Synagogue and Center--The Symposium In Retrospect," Conservative Judaism, Vol. XVII, Nos. 1-2 (Fall, 1962-Winter, 1963), pp. 2-19.

²³Gilbert S. Rosenthal, New Directions In the Jewish Family and Community (New York: Commission on Synagogue Relations of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, 1974).

²⁴Gerald B. Bubis, "Brokha Brokers and Power Brokers," Jewish Spectator, n. v. (Spring, 1975), pp. 58-61.

²⁵Harold M. Schulweis, "Restructuring the Synagogue," Conservative Judaism, Vol. XXVII, No. 4 (Summer, 1973), pp. 13-23.

²⁶George E. Johnson, "Synagogue Survival Strategies in the Rootless Society: A Case Study," op. cit.

²⁷Ibid., p. 17.

²⁸Gilbert S. Rosenthal, op. cit.

²⁹A. David Arzt, "The Synagogue and the YM-YWHA," in New Directions in the Jewish Family and Community, ed. Gilbert S. Rosenthal (New York: Commission on Synagogue Relations of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, 1974).

³⁰Howard Weisband, "An Inter-Organizational Analysis of Federation - Synagogue Relation" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Los Angeles: Hebrew Union College, 1975).

³¹Ibid., pp. 193-4.

³²Alfred J. Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning (New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1969), p. 221.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Eugene Litwak and Lydia F. Hylton, "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Co-ordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Ithaca: Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University, Mar., 1962), p. 396.

³⁵Alfred J. Kahn, op. cit., pp. 222-223.

³⁶Eugene Litwak and Lydia F. Hylton, op. cit., p. 397.

³⁷Anonymous, "Summary of the 1956 Survey of Jewish Community Center and Synagogue Relationships," Selected Articles: Jewish Community Center Relationships With Synagogues, ed. by the Commission on Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1956), pp. 59-66.

³⁸C. West Churchman, The Systems Approach (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1968) pp. 81-103.

³⁹Interview K of this study.

⁴⁰The Jewish Welfare Board, ed., "An Interview on Sabbath Programming," Jewish Welfare Board Circle, March, 1961, sec. 1, p.2, col. 2.

⁴¹R. Travers Herford, Pirke Aboth--The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers (New York: Schocken Books, 1962), p. 19.

⁴²Anonymous, "A Rationale for Synagogue Programming With the Jewish Aged," Analysis, No. 50 (March, 1975).

Fred Massarik, The Jewish Aging: Facts for Planning of The National Jewish Population Study, ed. by Fred Massarik (New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1974).

Mrs. Alan V. Tishman, "New Challenges in Serving the Isolated and Impaired Elderly," Aging: Alternatives to Institutionalization in The Forty-second General Assembly Papers (New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1973).

⁴³Interview M of this study.

⁴⁴Interview O of this study.

⁴⁵Interviews M, P, and L of this study.

⁴⁶Interview A of this study.

⁴⁷Fred Massarik, Jewish Identity: Facts for Planning, a report of The National Jewish Population Study, ed. by Fred Massarik (New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1974).

⁴⁸Leonard Fein, et al., Reform Is a Verb (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1972).

⁴⁹Fred Massarik, op. cit., p. 3.

⁵⁰Leonard Fein et al., op. cit., p. 136

⁵¹Telephone conversation with a Federation official.

⁵²A summary of this work is located in: Selected Articles: Jewish Community Center Relations with Synagogues (New York: National Jewish Welfare Board Commission on Jewish Community Center Relations with Synagogues, 1956).

Descriptive and Analytical Literature

Selected Articles: Jewish Community Center Relations with Synagogues, I & II. New York: National Jewish Welfare Board Commission on Jewish Community Center Relations with Synagogues, 1955-1956.

Barger, Samuel. Jewish Identity Crisis. New York: The Jewish Education Committee of New York, 1966.

Bolin, Gerald S. "The Growing Awareness of the American Jewish Community." Interpreters, 22 (November, 1975), pp. 2-15.

Chelkoff, H. Harold. "Social Work and the Changing Functions of Jewish Synagogues." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 32 (June, 1963), pp. 155-167.

Churchman, C. West. The Systems Approach. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1968.

Fein, Leonard J. et al. Reform Is a Verb. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1972.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theoretical Literature

- Blau, Peter M. and Scott, W. Richard. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Kahn, Alfred J. Theory and Practice of Social Planning. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1969.
- Litwak, Eugene and Hylton, Lydia F. "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Co-ordinating Agencies." Administrative Science Quarterly, VI (March, 1962), pp. 395-420.
- Warren, Roland L. "Comprehensive Planning and Coordination: Some Functional Aspects." Social Problems, 20 (Winter, 1973), pp. 355-364.

Descriptive and Analytical Literature

- Selected Articles: Jewish Community Center Relations with Synagogues, 1 & 2. New York: National Jewish Welfare Board Commission on Jewish Community Center Relationships with Synagogues, 1956, 1959.
- Berger, Graenum. Jewish Community Center. New York: The Jewish Education Committee of New York, 1966.
- Bubis, Gerald B. "The Emerging Agendum of the American Jewish Community." Reconstructionist, 39 (November, 1973), pp. 7-15.
- Chetkov, B. Harold. "Social Work and the Changing Functions of Formal Religion." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 39 (June, 1963), pp. 358-367.
- Churchman, C. West. The Systems Approach. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1968.
- Fein, Leonard J. et al. Reform Is a Verb. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1972.

- Fine, Alvin I. "Partnership is the Only Answer." Jewish Social Service Quarterly, 31 (Summer, 1955), pp. 449-453.
- Glucksman, Harry L. "The Synagogue Center." The Jewish Center (Sept., 1933), pp. 10-15.
- Hecht, Mel. "The Preservation of an Institution." Unpublished Master's thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1971.
- Himmelfarb, Harold. "Jewish Education: Educating the Culturally Deprived Jewish Child." Analysis, 51 (September, 1975).
- Hughes, Everett. Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.
- Janowsky, Oscar. The Jewish Welfare Board Survey. New York: The Jewish Welfare Board, 1948.
- Johnson, George. "Synagogue Survival Strategies in the Rootless Society." Analysis, 45 (April, 1974).
- Kaplan, Mordecai M. Judaism As a Civilization. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1933.
- Kaufman, Jay. "Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 38 (June, 1962), pp. 369-375.
- Kraft, Louis. A Century of the Jewish Community Center: (1854-1954). New York: National Jewish Welfare Board, 1953.
- Kraft, Louis. The Development of the Jewish Community Center: Purposes, Principles, and Practices. New York: National Association of Jewish Center Workers, 1967.
- Mantel, Samuel, et al. "Measurement of Output in a Jewish Communal System." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 46 (September, 1969), pp. 84-92.
- Massarik, Fred. Jewish Identity: Facts for Planning. Report of The National Jewish Population Study edited by Fred Massarik. New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Jewish Welfare Funds, 1974.
- Morris, Robert and Freund, Michael. Trends and Issues in Jewish Social Welfare in the United States, 1899-1958. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1966.

- Narot, Joseph R. "Should Our Federation Subsidize Our Synagogues?" Sermon delivered at Temple Isreal, Miami, Florida, 6 October, 1972. (Mimeographed)
- Reisman, Arnold, et al. "Systems Analysis and Description of a Jewish Communal System." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 49 (September, 1969), pp. 78-84.
- Roseman, Kenneth. "Power in a Midwest Jewish Community." Unpublished Master's thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1966.
- Rosenthal, Gilbert. New Directions in the Jewish Family and Community. New York: Commission on Synagogue Relations of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, 1974.
- Shapiro, Manheim. "Respective Roles of Synagogal and Other Agencies." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 40 (Spring, 1964), pp. 247-251.
- Silver, Harold, "Toward Cooperation Between Rabbi and Social Worker." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 35 (Winter, 1958), pp. 225-228.
- Silverman, Hillel E. "New Directions for the Synagogue and the Rabbinate." United Synagogue Review (Fall, 1972), pp. 8-9.
- Solender, Sanford. "The Place of the Jewish Community Center in Jewish Life: A Formulation of the Position of the Center." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 34 (Fall, 1957), pp. 39-48.
- Varrady, David P. "Recent Changes in the Settlement Patterns of the Jewish Population of Cincinnati." Unpublished technical report submitted to the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati. Cincinnati, 1973.
- Weisband, Howard. "An Interorganizational Analysis of Federation-Synagogue Relations." Unpublished Master's thesis, Hebrew Union College California School, 1975.
- Wurzberger, Walter. "The Meaning and Significance of Jewish Survival." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 40 (Spring, 1964), pp. 307-315.

APPENDICES

RACERASE BOND
SOUTHWORTH CO. U.S.A.
25% COTTON FIBER

Dear

I am a rabbinical student at Hebrew Union College. To fulfill one of the requirements for ordination, I am writing my thesis on functions of the Center and Synagogue in the Cincinnati Jewish Community under the guidance of Dr. Robert Katz.

Correspondence

As I am actively involved in the Cincinnati Jewish Community, your knowledge of the Center and its relationship with the synagogue community would be extremely useful in helping me develop my thesis.

I will be calling you in the next few days and with this in mind, I would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Robert Katz

Dear

I am a senior rabbinical student at Hebrew Union College. To fulfill one of the requirements for ordination, I am writing my thesis on functions of the Center and synagogues in the Cincinnati Jewish Community under the guidance of Dr. Robert Katz.

As and as someone who is actively involved in the Cincinnati Jewish Community, your knowledge of the Center and its functioning relationship with synagogues in the community would be extremely useful in helping me to develop an accurate perspective.

I will be calling you in the next few days and with this in mind, I would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Jacobs

Dear

I am a senior rabbinical student at Hebrew Union College. To fulfill one of the requirements for ordination, I am writing my thesis on functions of the Center and synagogues in the Cincinnati Jewish Community under the guidance of Dr. Robert Katz.

As , your knowledge of the Center and its functioning relationship with synagogues in the community would be extremely useful in helping me to develop an accurate perspective.

I will be calling you in the next few days and with this in mind, I would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Jacobs

Dear

I am a senior rabbinical student at Hebrew Union College. To fulfill one of the requirements for ordination, I am writing my thesis on functions of the Center and synagogues on the Cincinnati Jewish Community under the guidance of Dr. Robert Katz.

He suggested your name as someone who is active in the Jewish Community. Your knowledge of synagogue problems and projects as they relate to the Jewish Community Center would be extremely useful in helping me to develop an accurate perspective.

I will be calling you in the next few days and with this in mind, I would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Jacobs

Dear ,

Just a brief note to tell you how much I appreciate your making time available to meet with me. I thoroughly enjoyed our session together and am grateful for both the help and insights you provided.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bob Jacobs

Synagogue Questionnaire

1. Are there members of your Synagogue/Temple Board who are also Center Board members?
2. What percentage of your Synagogue/Temple Board are Center members?
3. Does the Synagogue have concerns about synagogue and Jewish Community Center relations which have found expression in committee meetings, discussions, studies of the problems involved, and/or joint planning or cooperative projects?
4. Within the past ten years has the Center conducted activities in your Synagogue/Temple?
5. (If yes on 4) How/are these activities regularly scheduled with a definite enrollment of participants, such as clubs, physical education programs, other classes or special interest groups?
6. (If yes on 4) Has Questionnaires any other adult groups, lectures, concerts, social group sessions, or special events at the Synagogue/Temple?
7. (If yes on 4) Does the center require that participants be Center members?
8. (If yes on 4) Does/Do the Synagogue/Temple require that participants be Synagogue/Temple members?
9. (If yes on 4) Has the responsibility for setting policy with regard to Center conducted activities in the Synagogue/Temple delegated to:
 - a. joint committee?
 - b. the Center Board?
 - c. the Synagogue Board?
10. (If yes on 4) Who assumes responsibility for the supervision of the activities conducted in the Synagogue/Temple?
 - a. the Center?
 - b. the Synagogue?
 - c. joint responsibility?
11. (If yes on 4) Who was responsible for staff supervision and training?
12. Does the Synagogue charge rental fees for the use of their facilities by the Center?

Synagogue Questionnaire

1. Are there members of your Synagogue/Temple Board who are also Center Board members?
2. What percentage of your Synagogue/Temple Board are Center members?
3. Does the Federation have concerns about synagogue and Jewish Community Center relations which have found expression in committee meetings, discussions, studies of the problems involved, and/or joint planning or cooperative projects?
4. Within the past ten years has the Center conducted activities in your Synagogue/Temple?
5. (If yes on 4) Were/Are those activities regularly scheduled with a definite enrollment of participants, such as clubs, physical education programs, other classes or special interest groups?
6. (If yes on 4) Has the Center had any older adult groups, lectures, concerts, scout troop meetings, or special events at the Synagogue/Temple?
7. (If yes on 4) Does the center require that participants be Center members?
8. (If yes on 4) Does/Did the Synagogue/Temple require that participants be Synagogue/Temple members?
9. (If yes on 4) Was the responsibility for setting policy with regard to Center conducted activities in the Synagogue/Temple delegated to:
 - a.) joint committee?
 - b.) the Center Board?
 - c.) the Synagogue Board?
10. (If yes on 4) Who assumed responsibility for the supervision of the activities conducted in the Synagogue/Temple?
 - a.) the Center?
 - b.) the Synagogue?
 - c.) joint responsibility?
11. (If yes on 4) Who was responsible for staff supervision and training?
12. Does the synagogue charge rental fees for the use of their facilities by the Center?

13. (If yes on 4) Does the Synagogue/Temple compensate the Center for the activities or are costs jointly shared?
14. (If yes on 4) Was the initiative for developing the activities taken by the Center, Synagogue/Temple, JCRC, Federation, or another organization or individual?
15. Did the Synagogue/Temple ever turn down an offer made by the Center to provide service?
16. If so, why? limited space, fear of interference, and not prepared for the type of program, or what?
17. To your knowledge, has the Center ever turned down a request made by this Synagogue/Temple for service?
18. If so, why --insufficient budget?
19. Has the Center, within the past ten years provided your Synagogue/Temple with program consultation or other services in addition to conducting group activities?
20. What would you say are criteria for determining which activities are typically "Synagogue"?
21. What functions of a Synagogue/Temple are parallel to those of a Center; what functions are unique; and which can be termed conjoint--of joint responsibility?
22. Does the Synagogue/Temple ever use Center facilities? If so, which ones and for what?
23. Does the Center require a rental fee for such use?
24. Does the Synagogue/Temple actively assist the Center in the conduct of its activities (e.g., religious and Jewish cultural education)?
25. Does the Synagogue/Temple conduct activities jointly with the Center (e.g., Jewish holiday celebrations, rallies Jewish Book Month, etc)?
26. What do you see as difference in leadership styles between Center workers and rabbis?
27. Has your Synagogue/Temple been housed in the Center?
28. Do you see trends in the community toward the development of synagogue-centers?
29. (If so) Is there a need for such a program (e.g., greater dispersion of the community, location of the Center)?

30. Where the Center and Synagogues/Temples have had no problems or conflict, to what do you attribute the favorable situation?

31. Where the Center and Synagogues/Temples have had problems or conflict, to what do you attribute these difficulties?

- a.) general resentment of the Synagogue/Temple by Center workers, Board, Director?
- b.) a misunderstanding of the Synagogue/Temple's function?
- c.) a feeling that the Synagogue/Temple was impinging on the work and function of the Center?
- d.) the scheduling of Center activities on Friday nights or Shabbat afternoons?
- e.) teen-age activities similar to those of the Center's?

32. Where conflicts have been resolved with the Center, how have they been resolved?

- a.) joint-conferences?
- b.) discussions (private)?
- c.) rescheduling?
- d.) intercession of the Synagogue/Temple Board?
- e.) other?

33. Was the conflict really resolved or are there lasting resentments--did the method used drive the problems and conflicts beneath the surface that they may erupt again?

34. What kind of changes do you foresee in the broad area of Center-synagogue/temple relations?

35. What might be the relation of Federation to funding for these changes?

36. What role does the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis play in Center-synagogue/temple relations?

37. Where does your Synagogue/Temple draw its membership from?

38. Can you think of any questions I may not have covered or questions which you would like to ask?

Center-Federation Questionnaire

1. Does the Center have either formal or informal representation by synagogues on the Center Board? Do rabbis or certain laypeople constitute such representation?
2. Are there any Center-synagogue committees on mutual relations? (If not) Might there be a need for such?
3. Does the Center have a liaison with the Cincinnati Board of Rabbis?
4. Are the Center Board members also synagogue members? (If so) what percentage?
5. What percentage of the Center's full-time professional staff are synagogue members?
6. Does the Federation have concerns about synagogue and Center relations which have found expression in committee meetings, discussions, studies of the problems involved, and/or joint planning or cooperative projects?
7. Within the past ten years has the Center conducted activities in synagogues? Which ones?
8. (If yes on 7) What types of facilities are the most frequently used in a synagogue?
9. (If yes on 7) Within the past ten years, what regularly scheduled activities with a definite enrollment of participants, such as clubs, physical education programs, other classes or special interest groups has the Center conducted or sponsored in a synagogue?
10. How about lectures, concerts, meetings of older adults, scout troop meetings, or special events?
11. Do the synagogues in those activities you have mentioned require that participants in Center conducted activities be members of the synagogue?
12. (If yes on 7) Does the Center require that participants be Center members?
13. (If yes on 7) Was the responsibility for setting policy with regard to Center conducted activities in synagogues delegated to:
 - a.) joint committees?
 - b.) the Center Board?
 - c.) the Synagogue Board?

14. (If yes on 7) Did the Center ever assume responsibility for the supervision of activities conducted in the synagogues? joint responsibility? synagogue took responsibility?
15. (If yes on 7) Who was responsible for staff supervision and training?
16. Do synagogues charge rental fees for the use of their facilities by the Center?
17. (If yes on 7) Do the synagogues compensate the Center for the activities or are costs jointly shared?
18. (If yes on 7) Who started the initiative to develop activities between the Center and the particular synagogue(s).
19. After offering to conduct an activity in a synagogue, was the Center ever turned down?
20. If so, why? limited space, fear of interference, and not prepared for the particular type of program, or what?
21. Has the Center ever turned down a request for service made by a synagogue?
22. If so, why? --insufficient budget?
23. Does the Center or has the Center within the past ten years provided a synagogue with program consultation or any other services? group activities?
24. What are the criteria for determining which activities or programs are typically "Center" and which are typically "Synagogue"?
25. What functions of a Center are parallel to those of a Synagogue and what functions are unique, and which can be considered conjoint--of joint responsibility?
26. Do any of the synagogues use your facilities? If so, which ones and for what purposes?
27. Does the Center require a rental fee for such use?
28. Does the Center have active assistance in the conduct of its activities from synagogues (e.g., in the field of religious and Jewish cultural education)?
29. Does the Center conduct activities jointly with synagogues (e.g., Jewish holiday celebrations, rallies, Jewish Book Month)?
30. What do you see as the differences in leadership styles between rabbis and Center workers?

31. Have religious services been conducted at the Center within the past ten years? under whose auspices?

32. (If yes to 31) Did difficulties with any synagogues result?

33. Has religious school been conducted by the Center in the past ten years? If so, did difficulties with any congregations result?

34. Have any synagogues been housed in the Center facility within the past ten years? If so, did difficulties with any congregations result?

35. Do you see trends in the community toward the development of synagogue-centers?

36. (If so) Is there a need for such a program(e.g., greater dispersion of community, location of the Center)?

37. Where the Center and Synagogues have had no problems or conflict, to what do you attribute this favorable situation?

38. Where the Center has had problems or conflicts with a synagogue in the past ten years, to what do you attribute the difficulties?

- a.) general resentment of the Center by rabbi(s)?
- b.) a misunderstanding of the Center's function?
- c.) a feeling that the Center was impinging on the work and function of the Synagogue?
- d.) the scheduling of Center activities on Friday nights or Shabbat afternoons?
- e.) teen-age activities similar to those of the Synagogue?

39. Where conflicts have been resolved with synagogues, how have they been resolved?

- a.) joint conferences?
- b.) discussions (private)?
- c.) rescheduling?
- d.) intercession of Center Board members?
- e.) other?

40. Was the conflict really resolved or are there lasting resentments--did the method used drive the problems or conflict beneath the surface that they might surface again?

41. What kinds of changes do you see coming in the broad area of Center-synagogue relations?

42. What is the relation of Federation to funding for these changes?

43. Where does the Center draw its membership from?
44. Can you think of any questions I may not have covered or questions which you would like to ask?

1. Do you sit or have you sat on a synagogue or Center board?

2. Have you sat on any other agency boards or the Federation Board?

3. Does a synagogue board function any differently from an agency or Center board? Federation Board? (if applicable)

4. Does the Rabbi function differently or play a different role in a synagogue board setting than the director does in a Center or agency board setting?

5. What do you see as differences in leadership styles between rabbis and social workers?

6. What do you see as the differences in function between the Center and synagogues?

7. In other communities--Manhasset, New York for one--synagogues and the Jewish Community Center have developed with cooperative and joint programming.

a.) Would such programming be useful in Cincinnati?

b.) If so, why hasn't it been taken place?

c.) If it isn't useful, why isn't it useful?

Board Questionnaire

1. Do you sit or have you sat on a synagogue or Center board?
2. Have you sat on any other agency boards or the Federation Board?
3. Does a synagogue board function any differently from an agency or Center board? Federation Board? (if applicable)
4. Does the Rabbi function differently or play a different role in a synagogue board meeting than the director does in a Center or agency board meeting?
5. What do you see as differences in leadership styles between rabbis and social workers?
6. What do you see as the differences in function between the Center and synagogues?
7. In other communities--Wantagh, New York for one--synagogues and the Jewish Community Center have developed much cooperative and joint programming.
 - a.) Would such programming be useful in Cincinnati?
 - b.) If so, why hasn't it taken place?
 - c.) If it isn't useful, why isn't it useful?

12. General							✓		✓		✓	
11. Family								✓		✓		✓
10. Older Adult			✓				✓		✓		✓	
9. Married							✓					
8. Adult							✓		✓		✓	
7. Single Adult							✓			✓	✓	
6. Young Married												
5. College Age												
4. High School							✓			✓	✓	
3. Jr. High School							✓		✓		✓	
2. Pre-adolescent							✓		✓			
1. Pre-School							✓		✓			

INSTITUTION

JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

SERVICE

1. Counseling

2. Religious Services

3. Religious Education - classes

4. Religious study

5. Education groups

6. Informal Education

7. Recreation - at-site

8. Recreation - off-site events

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

Major Role

Minor Role

INSTITUTION:

JEWISH COMMUNITY
CENTER

CLIENT GROUP

SERVICE		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-ado-lescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1.	Major Role												
Counseling	Minor Role										✓		
2.	Major Role												
Religious Services	Minor Role												
3.	Major Role												
Religious Education-classes	Minor Role												
4.	Major Role												
Religious study Education-groups	Minor Role												
5.	Major Role	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Informal Education	Minor Role											✓	
6.	Major Role	✓	✓	✓					✓		✓		✓
Recreation --on-going	Minor Role				✓			✓				✓	
7.	Major Role			✓	✓			✓	✓		✓		✓
Recreation --Spec. events	Minor Role											✓	

INSTITUTION:

ROCKDALE TEMPLE

CLIENT GROUP

SERVICE		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-ado-lescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1. Counseling	Major Role												✓
	Minor Role												✓
2. Religious Services	Major Role								✓			✓	✓
	Minor Role		✓	✓		✓							
3. Religious Education-classes	Major Role	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓	
	Minor Role												
4. Religious study Education-groups	Major Role			✓					✓				
	Minor Role												
5. Informal Education	Major Role			✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			
	Minor Role		✓								✓	✓	
6. Recreation --on-going	Major Role			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓			
	Minor Role												
7. Recreation --Spec. events	Major Role				✓				✓			✓	✓
	Minor Role												

INSTITUTION:

WISE TEMPLE

CLIENT GROUP

SERVICE		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-ado-lescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1. Counseling	Major Role												✓
	Minor Role												
2. Religious Services	Major Role				✓				✓				✓
	Minor Role	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	
3. Religious Education-classes	Major Role	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓				✓
	Minor Role											✓	
4. Religious study Education-groups	Major Role								✓				
	Minor Role						✓						
5. Informal Education	Major Role			✓	✓							✓	✓
	Minor Role						✓	✓					
6. Recreation --on-going	Major Role							✓			✓		
	Minor Role						✓					✓	
7. Recreation --Spec. events	Major Role			✓	✓				✓			✓	
	Minor Role					✓							

INSTITUTION:

TEMPLE SHOLOM

CLIENT GROUP

SERVICE		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-ado-lescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1.	Major Role												
Counseling	Minor Role												✓
2.	Major Role											✓	✓
Religious Services	Minor Role	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		
3.	Major Role	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓				
Religious Education-classes	Minor Role												
4.	Major Role						✓			✓			✓
Religious study Education-groups	Minor Role												
5.	Major Role	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓			✓	
Informal Education	Minor Role												
6.	Major Role						✓		✓				
Recreation --on-going	Minor Role			✓	✓								
7.	Major Role			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
Recreation --Spec. events	Minor Role											✓	

INSTITUTION:

VALLEY TEMPLE

SERVICE		CLIENT GROUP											
		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-ado-lescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1. Counseling	Major Role					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
	Minor Role												
2. Religious Services	Major Role			✓					✓			✓	✓
	Minor Role	✓	✓				✓						
3. Religious Education-classes	Major Role			✓	✓								
	Minor Role								✓				✓
4. Religious study Education-groups	Major Role								✓				
	Minor Role												
5. Informal Education	Major Role								✓			✓	✓
	Minor Role		✓	✓									
6. Recreation --on-going	Major Role												
	Minor Role												
7. Recreation --Spec. events	Major Role		✓	✓					✓			✓	
	Minor Role												

INSTITUTION:

ADATH ISRAEL
SYNAGOGUE

SERVICE

		CLIENT GROUP											
		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-adolescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1.	Major Role												
Counseling	Minor Role												✓
2.	Major Role												✓
Religious Services	Minor Role	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓					✓	
3.	Major Role		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓				
Religious Education-classes	Minor Role												
4.	Major Role								✓				
Religious study Education-groups	Minor Role												
5.	Major Role			✓	✓								✓
Informal Education	Minor Role								✓				
6.	Major Role			✓	✓		✓		✓				
Recreation --on-going	Minor Role												
7.	Major Role		✓	✓	✓							✓	
Recreation --Spec. events	Minor Role					✓			✓				

INSTITUTION:

NORTHERN HILLS

SYNAGOGUE

SERVICE

		CLIENT GROUP											
		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-adolescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1.	Major Role												✓
Counseling	Minor Role												
2.	Major Role								✓			✓	✓
Religious Services	Minor Role	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓						
3.	Major Role	✓		✓	✓				✓				
Religious Education-classes	Minor Role												
4.	Major Role			✓	✓				✓				✓
Religious study Education-groups	Minor Role												
5.	Major Role			✓	✓				✓				
Informal Education	Minor Role											✓	
6.	Major Role			✓	✓								
Recreation --on-going	Minor Role								✓	✓			
7.	Major Role									✓			✓
Recreation --Spec. events	Minor Role			✓	✓							✓	

INSTITUTION :

GOLF MANOR

SYNAGOGUE

SERVICE

		CLIENT GROUP											
		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-ado-lescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1.	Major Role												✓
Counseling	Minor Role												✓
2.	Major Role								✓				✓
Religious Services	Minor Role	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓					✓	
3.	Major Role								✓				
Religious Education-classes	Minor Role												
4.	Major Role												
Religious study	Minor Role			✓	✓								
Education-groups	Role												
5.	Major Role			✓	✓		✓		✓				
Informal Education	Minor Role												
6.	Major Role			✓	✓							✓	
Recreation --on-going	Minor Role												✓
7.	Major Role			✓	✓					✓			✓
Recreation --Spec. events	Minor Role												✓

INSTITUTION :

CLIENT GROUP

OHAV SHALOM

SYNAGOGUE

SERVICE

		1. Pre-School	2. Pre-adolescent	3. Jr. High School	4. High School	5. College Age	6. Young Married	7. Single Adult	8. Adult	9. Married	10. Older Adult	11. Family	12. General
1. Counseling	Major Role												✓
	Minor Role												✓
2. Religious Services	Major Role								✓				✓
	Minor Role	✓		✓	✓		✓						
3. Religious Education-classes	Major Role												
	Minor Role												
4. Religious study Education-groups	Major Role								✓				✓
	Minor Role			✓	✓								
5. Informal Education	Major Role								✓	✓		✓	
	Minor Role					✓	✓						
6. Recreation --on-going	Major Role			✓	✓				✓				
	Minor Role						✓			✓			
7. Recreation --Spec. events	Major Role											✓	
	Minor Role			✓	✓								

CONGREGATION OF
NEW HOPE

SHIRAZ

[illegible]

Regulations Governing the Sabbath Program*

The following rules and regulations have been adopted by the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center to govern its newly created Saturday afternoon program after recommendations were made by the Sabbath Programming Committee:

1. No program shall be scheduled Friday evening or Saturday prior to 1:30 p.m.
2. No parties or scheduled entertainments.
3. No smoking, card playing, or gambling.
4. No sale of any kind, whether for cash or credits, including vending machines.
5. No chess, including radio and television.
6. Lights may be turned on and off but by non-Jewish personnel only.
7. Loudspeakers may be operated but by non-Jewish personnel only.
8. Steam rods may be used by non-Jewish personnel only.
9. If shown, no program shall be scheduled to precede the Sabbath.

APPENDIX D

Sabbath Programming Regulations For the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center, 1960

10. No writing or cutting, no arts and crafts, power tools or work tools or electric power sharpening machines.
11. Public telephones will be closed.
12. Traveling is permitted but business suits may not be carried to or from the Center or worn on the Sabbath. The Center will supply paper-covered bags in which wet suits can be deposited to be picked up after the Sabbath.
13. The Health Club shall be bound by all the rules applicable to all other areas of the Center.
14. No staff member who conscientiously objects to working on a matter of religious principle shall be required to do so.

Recognizing that the question of Saturday operation cannot be resolved either way without creating displeasure with substantial groups of people, the Center board agreed that such Saturday operation should be on a very limited basis with primary emphasis on the positive cultural values of the Sabbath. We suggest that rabbis, educators and other qualified individuals be consulted and be made part of appropriate program committees.

*The Jewish Welfare Board, et al., "Regulations Governing the Sabbath Program," Jewish Welfare Board Circle, March, 1961, vol. 1, p. 2, cols. 1-3. [This appendix is a verbatim transcript of the cited article.]

Regulations Governing the Sabbath Program*

The following rules and regulations have been adopted by the Cincinnati Jewish Community Center to govern its newly created Saturday afternoon program after recommendations were made by the Saturday Programming Committee:

1. No program shall be scheduled Friday evening or Saturday prior to 1:30 p.m.
2. No parking of automobiles or bicycles.
3. No smoking, card playing, or cooking.
4. No sale of any kind, whether by cash or tickets, including vending machines.
5. No music, including radio and television.
6. Lights may be turned on and off but by non-Jewish personnel only.
7. Loudspeakers may be operated but by non-Jewish personnel only.
8. Steam room may be operated but by non-Jewish personnel only.
9. If showers are used, hot water tanks must be preheated and temperatures kept at no higher than 75 degrees.
10. No writing or cutting, no arts and crafts, power tools or work tools or electric power exercise machines.
11. Public telephones will be blocked.
12. Swimming is permitted but bathing suits may not be carried to or from the Center or wrung on the Sabbath. The Center will supply polyethylene bags in which wet suits can be deposited to be picked up after the Sabbath.
13. The Health Club shall be bound by all the rules applicable to all other areas of the Center.
14. No staff member who conscientiously objects to working as a matter of religious principle shall be required to do so.

Recognizing that the question of Saturday operation cannot be resolved either way without creating displeasure with substantial groups of people, the Center Board agrees that such Saturday operation should be on a very limited basis with primary emphasis on the positive cultural values of the Sabbath. We suggest that rabbis, educators and other qualified individuals be consulted and be made part of appropriate program committees.

*The Jewish Welfare Board, ed., "Regulations Governing the Sabbath Program," Jewish Welfare Board Circle, March, 1961, sec. 1, p. 2, cols. 3-5. [This appendix is a verbatim transcript of the cited article.]

The following are broad guidelines for Saturday afternoon programming:

- A. Community events in consonance with the Sabbath, such as conferences, study groups, discussions of important questions of the moment.
- B. Social and recreational activities.
 - 1. General club and other group activities
 - 2. Informal athletic programs devoid of formal instruction or competition.
 - 3. Informal swimming program devoid of informal instruction or competition.
 - 4. All recreation informal in character with no competitive or organized activities.
- C. Cultural programs related to the Sabbath:
 - 1. Develop in a positive way the beauty and significance of the Sabbath and its differentiation from the other days of the week through activities such as:
 - (a) discussion and interpretation of Jewish life, history, ethics, etc.
 - (b) games, songs, dances, and dramatics built around Jewish themes.
 - (c) study of Hebrew history and literature and other educational themes informally.
 - (d) themes developed around certain holidays such as Pesach and Purim.
 - (e) exhibit of Jewish symbols, pictures, and other indicia of Jewish life.

The Center Board takes this action on Saturday programming with a deep sense of responsibility and pledges itself to carry out fairly and sincerely all the conditions set forth in the motion approving Sabbath opening.