LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"Religious Motivations in Recent and Contemporary Jewish
Communal Leadership"

written by _____Richard M. Leviton_____
(name of student)

1) may (with revisions) be considered for
publication: (✓)

cannot be considered for publication: (   )

2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (✓)

may not be loaned by the Library: (   )

Robert L. Katz
(signature of referee)

Robert L. Katz
(referee)

___March 8, 1956___
(date)

RELIGIOUS MOTIVATIONS IN RECENT AND CONTEMPORARY

JEWISH COMMUNAL LEADERSHIP

by

Richard Leviton

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the

Master of Hebrew Letters Degree

and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College- Jewish
Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio   Referee:
February, 1956   Professor Robert L. Katz

DIGEST

The intention of this thesis was to make a study of
the social, economic and religious factors which give rise
to Jewish lay leadership within the context of Jewish Com-
munity Organization, and then to ascertain some of the at-
titudes and motivations of contemporary Jewish lay leadership.

The method employed in our study was two-fold in
nature. Jewish and non-Jewish sociological studies were
first consulted in order to gain perspective and direction
for our study. A number of tentative hypotheses were then
drawn up as well as an interview schedule according to three
categories of enquiry. The categories aimed at gaining in-
formation concerning the biographical background of the lay
leader, his educational and religious frame of reference,
and finally the determinants, motivations and goals of his
leadership.

On the basis of our preliminary preparation, a series
of personal interviews were carried out with a representa-
tive number of local Jewish lay leaders. These interviews
were written-up, summarized and analyzed according to major
trends and exceptions from the viewpoint of the categories
of enquiry and also in terms of the initial preliminary
hypotheses.

To insure the confidentiality of the interviews, they

were placed on file in the files of the Department of Human Relations.

Some of the findings evident in the thesis include the following:

1. A historical relationship between Jewish community organization and leadership of the past with the present.

2. Changes in social, economic and religious conditions have a great effect on the thinking of Jewish lay leadship as well as upon their activity in communal affairs.

3. The majority of the local Jewish lay leaders have lived in this city the greater part of their lives and have thus been able to become firmly established leaders more easily than new-comers.

4. Economic stability is the greatest determinant of local Jewish lay leadership in terms of their prestige, influence and ability to devote necessary time.

5. Formal religious education has had little influence on the conscious level of most of the lay leaders interviewed.

6. A feeling of community responsibility, willingness to work, as well as ascendancy on the economic ladder were important factors in the assumption of leadership positions by local Jewish lay leaders.

7. A pre-dominant feeling that non-Jews respect more Jewish leaders who are active in the Jewish group.

8. A general feeling that the future of the Jew in America is safe but must be guarded against latent anti-semitism.

9. The threat of a recurrent anti-semitism coupled by the not too far removed evidence of its dangers have resulted in a greater unity of the American and local Jewish community.

10. The state of Israel has lessened antagonism between the Zionist and non-Zionist groups and has given the American Jew a greater sense of pride. There is more of a threat now to us because of Arab propaganda.

11. The current religious revival is seen to be important by local lay leaders in terms of getting more people as participating members of the community and in their growing awareness of their Jewishness.

12. Jewish lay leaders are expected to have many qualifications, the main ones being time, money, and effort.

13. An increased effort is needed to recruit new leadership.

PREFACE

The primary intention of this thesis is to examine the various factors and motivations which characterize the contemporary Jewish lay leader. This study should not be considered historical but rather psycho-sociological in nature.

Any study such as this has its limitations and for this reason, the present thesis should not be considered to be definitive. The findings have significance only in so far as they represent the views of both contemporary Jewish and non-Jewish sociologists and psychologists as well as a sampling of Jewish lay leaders of the local community.

Jewish sociology lags behind general studies in the field. There have been a number of excellent research projects however. Norman Miller's Lakeport Study offers us many insights into the workings of Jewish communal organization. Recently there has been published a summary report concerning Jewish Community Organization by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. In addition to this, the Jewish Social Studies Quarterly has published the results of a conference on Jewish Community Organization and leadership. Maurice Karpf published in 1938 the first complete book on Jewish Community Organization in the United States. Aside from the above studies and several local projects, there has been negligible effort expended

in the field of Jewish sociology.

Who the Jewish lay leader is, what he represents,
how he got where he is, what he believes his goals are,
his religious, social and economic attitudes, his rela-
tionship to the community, his special problems--these
questions will be taken up in this thesis. What will be
said here is not to be taken as the last word on the phe-
nomenon of Jewish lay leadership. It is our humble desire
to add in some way to an increasing awareness of this
most important aspect of any study in Jewish sociology.

The first two chapters deal with some historical
and general considerations of Jewish and non-Jewish
leadership and communal organization. The third chapter
is an attempt to present a picture of contemporary Jewish
communal organization and lay leadership. Next we outlined
the methodolgy for our personal interviews with local lay
leaders. Also included in the fourth chapter were the
various hypotheses to be tested, the categories of enquiry,
and the written-up interviews. The thesis is completed with
conclusions and implications from our findings.

I wish to thank at this time the many leaders of the
local Jewish community who so graciously gave me of their
time and information whereby this thesis was able to take
on added meaning and significance. The present undertaking
would have run into many more difficulties had it not been
for the patient assistance of Rabbi Robert L. Katz, whose
valuable observations and guidance helped the author.

gain a clearer understanding into the way he should pro-
ceed. Finally, my devoted thanks to my wife for her aid
in the proof-reading and typing of this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

communal institutions. Already in the 16th century,
regional meetings of the outstanding rabbis and the leaders
of the kahal became common. These were originally called
to settle important litigation between communities or to
adjudicate appellate cases. Gradually they assumed admin-
istrative functions as well and supervised the local kahal.
At the end of the century a new organization had developed
out of these meetings, the Council of the Four Lands, a
supreme council which controlled the Jewish activities of
Great and Little Poland and the provinces of Lemberg and
Volynhia.[1]

> It is clear that in the sixteenth century
> Poland...had become the new centre of a vigor-
> ous Jewish life, well able to develop a rich
> cultural activity. Its 'firmly-knit organiza-
> tion of communal self-government could not but
> foster among the Jews of Poland a spirit of
> discipline and obedience to the law.' But it
> also 'provided the stateless nation with a
> substitute for national and political self-
> expression, keeping public spirit and civic
> virtue alive in it, and upholding and unfold-
> ing its genuine culture.' [2]

This one example gives some idea as to the different
nature and character of the former Jewish community in con-
trast to the community of today. Naturally the difference
finds meaning in the changing political, social, and econo-
mic conditions and factors which shaped the policies of the
lands wherein Jews resided. Emancipation and freedom of
participation have enabled the Jewish community of today
to exist not as a separate autonomous organization neither
affecting nor being affected by the larger community, but
rather as a dynamic part of the larger community.

Thus Jewish Community Organization of today no longer is a state within a state but rather is one which like other particularistic religious communities, serves and services Jews who are politically bound to the one general state. Jews as full and participating citizens of the community at large are no longer asked to be content within a state-made ghetto. At the same time they are given complete freedom to so organize their religious and cultural interests that that which is distinctly Jewish in nature and tendency may be fostered and preserved. Such Jewish communal organization while coordinating Jewish community activity at the same time adds to the enrichment of the American culture and the advancement of basic democratic ideals.

Today, we speak of status, power, and prestige as motivations for the assumption of leadership. Were these factors also the prevalent ones in Kahal leadership? "Negative-balanced" is a term used by modern-day sociologists to describe the assimilationist type of Jewish leader, one whose real desire is to see the Jewish group disappear. As a result, his leadership will be directed toward that goal-- assuming the position of the Anti-semite and watering down the interests of the group he leads. Was such negative-balancing a part of the mental framework of the Kahal leader? Today leadership is assumed oftimes by those in a minority group merely to gain more status and recognition from the majority wherein he would not be able to assume leadership.

Because of the nature of the Kahal, as an autonomous state within a state; because of the strict demarcation

between Jew and non-Jew with little chance for intercom-
munication and belonging, the factors mentioned above did
not play any significant part in the motivations of Kahal
leaders. The Jews, the minority group, accepted itself as
such, and the leaders by and large were not concerned with
trying to make inroads with the majority group. They recog-
nized that attempts such as this would never bring them into
the majority group as full and acceptable equals. They were
separated not only by religious prejudice but also by state
law. Such is not the case today. On the other hand, it was
not necessarily a sincere desire to serve which motivated
the Kahal leaders. It was primarily a desire for power--
to control the masses and thus to satisfy the need for domi-
nance.

As was mentioned earlier, wealth was the primary factor
and reason for gaining leadership in the Kahal period. These
leaders of wealth worked in many instances for the welfare of
the community at large. For instance, schools and courts,
and Jewish activity in general became improved and enhanced
through a closer-knit community organization. The leaders
were concerned with a better system for the nation-less state
as a consequence rather than as a primary objective of their
wealth-power inclinations.

In present-day society we have the phenomenon of the go-
getter-personality leader who seems to be spurred on to lead-
ership to satisfy some compelling drive within him. Wealth
doesn't determine his assumption of leadership, rather it is

his own initiative and perseverance. We see him taking
part in many and varied organizations and usually attempt-
ing to be a big voice in all of them. He doesn't desire
dominance or power so much as he does recognition or sta-
tus, or even possibly self-satisfaction from doing some-
thing worthwhile.

Concerning an earlier period in Jewish history, we
receive some information dealing with the "parnas" which we
can loosely translate as "leader". Who he was, what he did,
his qualifications and the reasons for his getting and ac-
cepting leadership sheds further light on the contrast of
leadership then and now.

In Talmudic times the parnas was both the religious leader
and the administrator of the community:"Who is a scholar
worthy of being appointed as parnas of the congregation?
He who is asked about a law from any source--even if it were
from the tractate of Kallah--and who answers".(Shab.114a)
This statement would tend to show that the parnas was a rab-
binical scholar placed in charge of the congregational
affairs. Signatures of the rabbis to the documents in
the "Judenschreinsbuch" attesting to congregational trans-
actions, the designation of the recognized congregational
representative as "bishop of the Jews", as well as the
oriental custom of combining the leadership in religious with
that of secular matters would tend to bear out the above
nature of the role of the parnas.[3]

In Ta'an 9a Moses, Aaron and Miriam are mentioned as
ideal parnasim; in Yoma 86b, Moses and David are cited in
this connection. In Yer. Peah 21a it is stated that R.
Akiba was appointed the parnas of the congregation. Though
this statement is legendary in nature, it was customary at
his time even to elect a prominent scholar as leader of the
congregation. This was perhaps the rule till the 15th cen-
tury.[4]

As to the rights and duties of the parnas during Talmudic
times, it is not too clear. He was apparently appointed by
the Nasi, and his appointment was in some way ratified by
the people. Larger congregations were administered by a
board of parnasim. It was stated that two brothers might
not hold the office of parnas (Yer. Peah 21a) which pre-
supposes they would have to officiate at the same time.[5]

Some of the privileges of the parnas included being called
up to the Torah after the Cohen and Levi and receiving a sal-
ary. It is stated in the name of Samuel as a law that as
soon as one had been appointed parnas he must not perform any
labor in the presence of three people(publicly)(Kid.70a;
Shul. Aruk Hoshen Mishpat 8,5)[6]

Such statements concerning the nature and role of the
parnas are reflected in the following: "A man appointed par-
nas will soon become rich." (Yoma 22b) The names of the par-
nasim were mentioned in the prayers.(Ket. 8a) "A parnas who
leads his congregation gently (on earth) will be privileged
to lead it in the future world."(Sanh. 92a) God weeps over

the parnas who rules haughtily. (Hag. 5b) That the par-
nas was considered to be of extreme importance in the
community structure re integrity, and character,is clearly
shown by the statement, "A generation is the reflex of its
leader (parnas), the leader, the reflex of his generation."
(Ar. 17a) This statement is an expression of disgust at the
success of unworthy leaders, and it shows an insight into
the factors involved in leadership.

A change occurred in the structure of congregational
leadership in the 16th century. Now the rabbi was confined
to teaching and rendering decisions on religious questions,
while the administration of the congregation was in the
hands of a board of parnasim whose president was called the
parnas. Solomon Luria (d. 1573) mentions the change: Per-
forming labor in public only refers now to rabbinical
scholars.

A revealing statement as to the arrogance of some par-
nasim is the one by Moses Hagiz, who denounces those who
think respect that is due to Talmudic scholars is also due
the local rabbi, as if the appointment of rabbi due to whim
of parnasim (who are elected merely because of wealth)
could add anything to the worth of a scholar.[7] (Hagiz,
"leket ha-Kemah", section on Yoreh De'ah, 103a, " Pahad
Yizhah", s.v. "Talmud Hakam", p. 44a.)

As to the mode of electing the parnas, his rights and
his duties were not regulated by law, but by local custom,
which was only in rare instances written down in Takkanot.

From the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the
19th, the various governments gave constitutions to their
Jewish congregations or the latter adopted such constitu-
tions of their own accord. Through these constitutions in
the language of the country, the Hebrew names for congrega-
tional offices began to disappear and with them the title
of parnas, although it is still used colloquially and in
some congregations officially.[8]

From this brief discussion of the parnas, we are able
to catch a glimpse of what he was, what his functions were
as well as his qualifications, and some of the reasons for
his getting and accepting leadership. We notice the chang-
ing nature of his role as well as the motivating factors
which effected his role. In latter centuries, wealth became
the criteria for leadership; in earlier centuries, Talmudic
times, scholarship and ability were the chief criteria.
During Talmudic times the secular and religious were inter-
twined, one man running both. Later a division of authority
set in.

Today, as we view contemporary Jewish lay leadership, we
see a sharp contrast with respect to the past. Social and
political factors set up new areas of leadership, different
reasons for the assumption of leadership, and different ob-
jectives of leaders. The religious and the secular are more
sharply defined. Jewish participation as full members of the
society in which they live, although still a part of a minority
group, gives rise to new types of leaders. The rise of capi-
talism and the stress of competition give rise to new emphases

in the psychological makeup of leaders. We are not quite so
sure as to the factors which motivate leaders of the Jewish
community, of their functions, their proper qualifications,
their objectives, and their attitudes.

Jewish sociology is a new and quite unexplored field of
study. The problem of lay leadership is only one among many
which have not been investigated and analyzed in the light
of modern social and psychological findings. Interest is
picking up in the subject, but much remains to be accomplished.

Granted social and economic factors played a large role
in previous Jewish centers,, be they Talmudic or Medieval,
just as they do today in determining leadership. Today's
social, political, and economic factors vary so much from
former times, however, that the problem of leadership has new
dimensions. Some of these new dimensions have already been
suggested in the contrast above. Others will be established
in the remainder of this thesis. Suffice it to say that the
Jewish lay leader of today is an accurate index of the sta-
tus of Judaism as a religious force in a climate of economic,
political, and social equality of the Jew with his neighbors.
The factors which motivate him to assume leadership and his
secular and religious feelings all go toward reflecting the
contemporary nature of the relationship of Judaism and the
secular. In a sense, Jewish lay leadership, as well as,
professional leadership reflect the direction in which pres-
ent-day Judaism is headed. We gain therefore from develop-
ing a Jewish sociology an understanding of the Jewish leader

as a factor in group dynamics and as a unique social phe-
nomenon.   We also gain some understanding of the present
condition of Judaism.

We chose for our area of study the voluntary Jewish
lay leader, but it is important to first explore the find-
ings of modern-day sociologists who have attempted to ana-
lyze the phenomenon of leadership in general.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM OF LEADERSHIP

One thing is clear, and that is the uncertainty involved when trying to define a leader at least in terms which would enable the social scientist to proceed with research on the subject.

Shartle and Stogdill offer the definition of a leader as an individual in a given office. "Persons who occupy positions which are commonly presumed to demand leadership ability are proper and likely subjects for the study of leadership."[9] Gibbs notes however that such a definition of the leader embraces so wide a variety of relationships as to be of little scientific value. Redl, basing his approach on the work of Freud, defines the leader as focus for the behavior of group members. The term leader is restricted to that relationship which is characterized by love of the members for the central person, leading to incorporation of the personality of the central person in the ego ideal of the followers, i.e., they wish to become the kind of person he is.[10] This, too, is a highly restrictive definition of the leader, but it does use as its differentiating characteristic the nature of the emotional relationship between the leader and other group members and, in so doing, provides a model worth of much more detailed attention than it has yet received.

Sociometry employs a different method for defining the leader. By way of sociometric choice there is revealed the

feeling or preference relationships among the members of a
human group. Success has been achieved in defining the
leader by this technique, but it has been shown that the
sociometric question asked, or the nature of the socio-
metric criterion, makes a very considerable difference.[11]
Bales, using a somewhat similar technique, had participants
in small group discussions answer four sociometric questions
relating to (a) contributing the best ideas, (b) guiding
the discussion, (c) likes, and (d) dislikes. To these
Bales has added observations and analyses of initiation of
interaction. Finally, participants indicated whom they re-
garded as "the leaders". Bales finds a direct positive re-
lation between basic initiating rank and votes for "best
ideas" and "guidance" except that the second man is unac-
countably low. Furthermore, this relation does not hold
for basic initiating rank and "likes".[12]

The definition of the leader, in terms of sociometric
choice, is further advanced by Bales' finding that the
"best idea" and "guidance" roles are most closely asso-
ciated in the participants' minds with leadership, and that
the "best-liked" role is least closely associated with lead-
ership.[13]

The above findings provide strong support for the
notion that a leader may be reliably defined in terms of
the extent of his influence within a group. Seeman and
Morris in an early report of the Ohio State University
leadership series say:

> One tentatively adoptable definition of
> leadership emphasizes its influence as-
> pect: leadership acts are acts by persons
> which influence other persons in a shared

> direction. This definition implies
> a positional relationship between the
> "leader" and other persons. A leader
> position is defined in terms of rela-
> tive status in an influence hierarchy
> (or relative degrees of influence).[14]

Pigor's definition is still perhaps the most sat-
isfactory. He indicated that leadership is a concept
applied to the personality-environment relation to de-
scribe the situation when a personality is so placed in
the environment that his "will, feeling, and insight
direct and control others in the pursuit of a common cause."[15]

It is necessary to differentiate between leadership
and headship. In the above definition we should qual-
ify the word "influence" so that the term leadership
applies only when this is _voluntarily_ accepted or when
it is in " a shared direction". There is almost general
agreement in the literature of the last few years that
leadership is to be distinguished, by definition, from
domination or headship. There is, Gibbs points out, a
wide social gap in the dominance relation between the
group members and the head, who strives to maintain this
social distance as an aid to his coercion of the group.
There is little or no sense of shared feeling or joint
action in the pursuit of the given goal. Most basically,
these two forms of influence differ with respect to the
source of the authority which is exercised. The leader's
authority is spontaneously accorded him by his fellow mem-
bers, the followers. The authority of the head derives from
some extra-group power which he has over the members of the

group, who cannot meaningfully be called his followers.[16]

Cattell has proposed that we define a leader as "a person who has a demonstrable influence upon group syntality"(the effectiveness of total performance of the group as a group),and that we measure leadership "by the magnitude of the syntality change(from the mean) produced by that person".[17] This type of definition ignores the nature of the relationship between leader and followers, Gibbs notes. With such a definition it would appear that the distinction between headship and leadership would fall away, except insofar as one could define these as subtypes of leadership.

Because of the difficulties involved in the above definitional schemes, Carter and Hemphill have recently proposed the definition of leadership in terms of leadership acts. Hemphill suggests that "to lead is to engage in an act which initiates a structure in the interaction of others as part of the process of solving a mutual problem."[18] Leaders then would be identified by the relative frequency with which they engage in such acts. This formulation recognizes the fact that groups develop leadership hierarchies and that differentiation between successive levels is in terms of frequency of leading. Only rarely, and then in highly structured organizations, can we hope to identify "the leader". Most groups have many leaders. As Carter reiterates, "... in actual behavior, the leaders

or the followers fulfill their stereotyped roles only
in the statistical sense."[19]   Hemphill adds the obser-
vation that "a leadership role is a differentiation of
structure-in interaction in which the point of reference
of the differentiation is frequent leadership acts."[20]
While it should be noted that this defines a leader
in terms of his intragroup behavior, it again produces
a definition which embraces a variety of relations from
dominance to soci-centrality. One could say that it is
a restricted form of Cattell's definition insofar as
"syntality" is "that which enables one to predict future
performance of a group" and, therefore structure-in in-
teraction can be but one facet of syntality.

Leadership is probably best conceived, as Gibbs
points out, as a group quality, as a set of functions which
must be carried out by the group. This concept of
"distributed" leadership is an important one. Leaders
will be identified both in terms of the frequency and in
terms of the mutiplicity or pattern of functions per-
formed. Contemporary research may utilize this concept
by differentiating all types of influential persons in
terms of the pattern of functional roles characteristic
of each.

In the past, attention was given to problems of per-
sonality and the measurement of personality. The descrip-
tion of leader behaviour was pursued similarly. In other

words, there was a search for the traits of personality which were supposed to characterize the leader.

Stogdill made an excellent survey of leadership-trait studies. He states:

> There is no assurance that the investigator who analyzes the biographies of great men is studying the same kind of leadership behavior that is revealed through observation of children's leadership activities in group situations.[21]

Some common "leadership traits" arrived at include: (a) Height. Tallness predominated in a majority of studies. Caldwell and Wellman suggest that the relation varies with the type of leadership activity. When height is significant, it is so as a result of its correlation with other factors which, in some situations, are significant for the assumption of the leadership role. (b) Weight. Leaders lean toward being heavier than non-leaders. (c) Physique, energy, and health. Energy is necessary for leadership; it is required in pursuing any group goal. (d) Appearance. This is a factor in intellectual and religious activities, but it is not too significant. (e) Intelligence. This is a contributing factor in leadership. Leaders are superior to non-leaders most studies reveal. However, problem-solving is one of the conditions for the emergence of leadership; there must be a group problem. Cattell and Stice showed that on all leadership selection methods leaders are higher than non-leaders, but on one criterion only--total number of leadership acts--was there a statistically significant difference between leaders and non-leaders on this factor. It would seem safe to conclude

that this is not the "general leadership trait" which some have so fervently sought.

It would appear safe to conclude that in general leaders are more intelligent than non-leaders, but they must not exceed their followers by too great a margin; this would militate against the emergence of the leadership relationship, for the unified purpose of the individuals concerned would be rendered improbable.

To be a leader in any situation, an individual group member must appear to make positive contributions to group locomotion. Self-confidence and self-assurance would naturally contribute greatly to this. We recognize therefore that the individual personality cannot be left out of the leadership analysis. It is clear that leadership is more than a function of the situation as seen by an independent observer, for individual differences affect the social perceptions of some individuals by others and play an important part in giving structure to the situation for those who are a part of it.

Other traits which might be singled out for a leader would include sociability, initiative, persistence and ambition. In all these traits it has been found that in general leaders ranked higher than non-leaders.

Krech and Crutchfield find that the dominance need of a leader plays an indispensable part in his emergence as a leader. They point out the following:

> Like any member, the leader seeks
> achievement of the group goal and

> seeks also the satisfaction of per-
> sonal or accessory needs. But what
> marks off the leader from the non-
> leader is the urgency of certain
> kinds of needs that are especially
> well served by the leadership role.
> Such needs are those of dominance,
> prestige and power. Other things
> being equal, those persons who have
> insistent needs for dominance, power
> and prestige may be expected to have
> a higher potentiality for leadership.
> And this is particulary true to the
> extent to which these persons have
> developed personalities that are
> characterized by certain ways of sat-
> isfying these needs, viz., in domina-
> ting interpersonal relations with
> others.[22]

Other contradictory studies as well as definitional
difficulties lead us to suspect or doubt whether there
is any clear evidence of the dependence of leadership
strictly upon dominance-need.

Cattell and Stice find no significant differences,
on the scale for surgency-desurgency, between leaders
and non-leaders, when leaders are defined in terms of
observer identification of total participation. However,
when member choices are used as criteria for leadership,
the picture changes. Then there is a positive relation be-
tween surgency and choice. When actual overt election to
leadership becomes the criterion, then both positive and
significant relations exist.

Stogdill writes: "Thus, leadership must be con-
ceived in terms of the interaction of variables which are
in constant flux and change."[23]

Thus, there appears to be no consistent pattern of
traits which characterize all leaders. The traits of

leadership are any or all of those personality traits which, in any particular situation, enable an individual to (1) contribute significantly to group locomotion in the direction of a recognized goal, and (2) be perceived as doing so by fellow group members.

Not only must we know what leadership is; we want to know what "good" leadership is, and how it is differentiated from "poor" leadership. Studies show that evaluation from the different forms of the criterion measure are not high in correlation.

George Homans writing in The Human Group lays down certain criteria for leadership which deserve our attention.[24] They include:

1. The leader will maintain his own leadership.

2. The leader will live up to the norms of his group.

3. The leader will lead.

4. The leader will not give orders that will not be obeyed.

5. In giving orders, the leader will use established channels.

6. The leader will not thrust himself upon his followers on social occasions.

7. The leader will neither blame nor, in general, praise a member of his group before other members.

8. The leader will take into consideration the total situation.

9. In maintaining discipline, the leader will be less concerned with inflicting punishment than with creating the conditions in which the group will discipline itself.

10. The leader will listen.

11. The leader will know himself. (Self-knowledge is the first step in self-control.)

Another criterion is offered by William Foote Whyte:

> The leader is the man who acts when the
> situation requires action. He is more re-
> sourceful than his followers. Past events
> have shown that his ideas were right. In
> this sense "right" simply means satisfactory
> to the members. He is the most independent
> in judgement....[25]

In general, leadership is always relative to the situation. This is why the leader in one situation is not necessarily the leader, even of the same group, in another different situation.

Richard Schmidt points out that "only when the two factors coincide--the acutely felt need for change and a personality adapted to the particular situation--can the process of group formation for the fulfillment of that need be set in motion." Thus need and the right type of personality create the factors necessary for leadership.

> Established leaders as a rule are subject
> in greater or less degree to environmental in-
> fluences; as their potential lines of penetra-
> tion multiply, they are faced with the alter-
> native of ineffective intransigence or com-
> promise with the demands of their new adherents.[26]

In line with what has already been said, Gouldner states: Leadership appears to have emerged as a social problem when individuals possessing a specific frame of reference confront crisis situations with which they feel themselves impotent to deal. This frame of reference emphasizes democracy, individualism, and mastery of the environment.[27]

Let us now consider the satisfactions of leadership. What are the motivations of leadership? Studies have indicated the following:

1. Economic reward. This is not considered the key

incentive. 2. Primitive dominance. A number of studies point out a dominance-submission need. 3. Power over others. Psychoanalytic theorists have frequently claimed to recognize a father substitution in the attitudes of followers to their leader. Some evidence that the leader gains satisfaction for a desire to express parental affection. There are group members who need power and who by virtue of this need are driven to initiate change. It admits that there are "societal forces and limitations which transcend any will-to-power of individuals."[28] It seems there is a limit to the magnitude of the ordinary individual's desire for power over others. 4. Status needs. The important factor in considering status as a motive in itself is that higher status gives entree into attractive associations; it makes possible friendships and group memberships which, in turn, tend to maintain status and thus to satisfy important ego needs.

Leaders are motivated to seek, as well as, to enjoy leadership. This is not necessarily so. Many recognized leaders who gain satisfaction for status needs occupy a role unsought by themselves. Other leaders in science and creative arts gain little in high status. Their positions have been incidental effects of other motives.

Our valuation of eminence, prestige, and status draw people after a man in an area quite beyond that in which he makes his contribution. He becomes a "projected" leader, though he may be able to contribute no more than the average follower in these new situations.

What are the satisfactions of followership? The
following might be listed:

1. Assistance in problem solution.

2. Vicarious satisfaction through identification.

3. Dependency needs. Fromm shows that dependency upon
the leader is more pronounced in autocracy than in demo-
cracy, cause and effect, however, not being determined
definitely in above. In times of stress greater dependence
is shown; persons tend to seek a guide and savior, and it
is under such conditions that autocratic leadership flour-
ishes.[29]

4. Ambivalence of attitudes toward the leader. Fromm
sees positive feeling for the leader due to ambivalent
antipathy toward him. Feelings of hatred are repressed
and replaced by feelings of admiration. "This circumvents
antipathy, because if I believe that the person who domi-
nates me is very wonderful or perfect, then I need not be
ashamed of submission to him, and there is no motivation
toward equality with him, since he is so strong, so wise,
so very superior."[30]

Under patriarchy the follower wants to win the approval
of the power figure; under tyranny he accepts direction
because he fears the consequences of not doing so. His
behavior with respect to the organizer is purely rational.
A service is offered and he accepts it as a means to his
individual goals. He follows the "true" leader because he
wishes to be more like him and through this identity of be-
havior to strengthen his emotional ties with the power figure.

Lawrence K. Frank, writing on the dilemma of leadership, states:

> Individuals, with the rarest exceptions, do not know what to do with their lives--how to act, what to desire and hope for-- and so we need leaders to guide our aspirations, to project goals, and to spur us on toward those purposes. That is the office of culture, to order events and experience, to regulate conduct, and so to organize groups; but culture becomes effective only when translated by one personality into the life of another.

He goes on to say that, "This continuous need for guidance and for stimulation or coercion provides the occasion for the would-be leader who needs to use other people for his own personality fulfillment."[31] Frank thus emphasized the dependence need of the followers as the major cause for the rise of leadership.

This dependence need cannot be denied as was noted in the earlier discussion. Frank points out the abuses of this advantage of the leader over the led:

> The causes to which the leader urges on the led may not have any relevance to the real needs of the mass. Indeed, the more the cause demands sacrifice of their personal interests and needs, the more compelling it may be, because the mass wants to be used.[32]

Concerning the motives of leaders, he states:

> It is not merely intelligence or special ability in a particular line, although those may be present in more than average degree. It is rather the attitude toward authority, the emotional reaction toward those who exercise control in a field. This person he links with the creative leader.

In contrast to the destructive leader, Frank notes that the creative leader "does not seek or need a following with personal loyalty to himself, who will obediently carry out his

program at whatever sacrifice...he asks only to be allowed
to work, to create, to explore for the new and more crea-
tive which...he is rarely permitted to do by his contem-
poraries because his work undermines their own security and
complacense."

Another aspect of leadership is highlighted by Frank:

In professional associations and boards
the members are usually those who are the
more aggressive individuals or more politi-
cally competent and so can win elections and
appointments to office where their adminis-
trative abilities can be exhibited. These
qualifications for offices in profession-
organizations do not often go with creative
ability but frequently blind these individ-
uals to the significance of a less conven-
tional thinker and worker.[33]

The authoritarian head and leader are to be distin-
guished. Their sources of power differentiate them. The
leader is more limited in behavior. He can't be as au-
thoritarian as a head. According to Cattell:

(1) "The autocratic leader creates needs, e.g., by bring-
ing to the group fear, insecurity, and frustration by which
they were not originally stimulated, and (2) he exploits
regressive, primitive, unconscious needs instead of help-
ing the group to outgrow them, e.g., father dependence,
vicarious satisfaction through identification, superego
projection in place of individual conscience."[34] They
become indispensable, and thus the withdrawal of leader
precipitates a crisis and even possible dissolution, and
also reduced opportunity for interpersonal communication
within the group reduces the morale of the group so that
it will be less able to withstand attack and strain.

Democratic leadership is in most respects the direct antithesis of the authoritarian pattern. The democratic leader must give each individual satisfaction as an individual, protecting the group as a whole, and satisfying his own aspirations or benevolent intentions. His power may be the same as that of an authoritarian leader, but he has a different role or pattern of roles in the group structure.

> The democratic leader seeks to evoke the maximum involvement and the participation of every member in the group activities and in the determination of objectives. He seeks to spread responsibility rather than to concentrate it. He seeks to encourage and reinforce interpersonal contacts and relations throughout the group structure so as to strengthen it. He seeks to reduce intragroup tension and conflict. He seeks to avoid hierarchical group structure in which special privilege and status differentials predominate.[35]

The following are some of the values and limitations of democratic leadership:

1. Maximum participation from all group members is encouraged.

2. Group decisions arrived at by group members interactively and as a synthesis of their own efforts elicit more solid support and issue quicker into action.

3. It releases creativity in group members because it can tolerate temporary transfer of power and influence in a way authoritarianism cannot.

4. The cohesiveness or viscidity of a group is found to be generally higher. Different types of group situations, however, react in different ways in the above respect. Some

situations (naval ship crews) have higher morale where there is less permissiveness and where formal relationships are maintained.

Thus we see that the situation often dictates which type of leadership will be most effective though in general in our culture we frown and put negative values on authoritarian leaderships. Authoritarianism and democracy are poles of a continuum, it has been observed, neither of which is wholly good or bad, but represent extremes of a variable "leadership technique" that should be adapted to all the elements of the situation or culture, personality content, structual interrelations, syntality, and task.

Herbert Thelen in his book Dynamics of Groups At Work notes in his Preface that

> It is in the group that personality is modified and socialized; and it is through the workings of groups that society is changed and adapted to its times. Effective leadership depends on understanding these two processes, and it facilitates both. It recognizes that every group has purposes to be achieved, that it has problems of organizing itself and utilizing the resources of its members to achieve these purposes, and that its members have problems of assimilating their experiences in the group within their own private worlds. The goal of effedtive leadership is to encourage behaviors that contribute simultaneously to the solution of these fundamental problems.

Now we are ready to depart from our review of the findings of general sociology and turn to the main subject under consideration: Contemporary Jewish Community Organization and Lay Leadership.

CHAPTER III
CONTEMPORARY JEWISH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
AND LAY LEADERSHIP

Having purviewed the contemporary field of social
science for an overall insight into the phenomenon of lead-
ership and the implications therein, we may now focus our
attention on the subject at hand: the Jewish lay leader
within the context of Jewish Community Organization. What
do we mean when we say Jewish Community Organization, and
what has been done to shed light on its activities and
goals? How may we define the Jewish lay leader, and what
are his role, his goals, and his beliefs? How did he ar-
rive at his position? How does he relate to the whole pic-
ture of Jewish Community Organization? These questions will
serve as the basis for the present chapter.

There has been a recent interest in the concept of
Jewish Community Organization. The Council of Jewish Fed-
erations and Welfare Funds has issued a summary report in
which it reveals research done in Jewish Community Organi-
zation. The report centers its attention upon three com-
munities. The attempt was made to determine the current
goals and directions of central Jewish community organiza-
tions, their strengths and weaknesses, and whether or not
they are meeting the needs of American Jewry. The practi-
cal aspect was to see whether patterns can be discerned
and guideposts established for sound future development.

The recent report marks the beginning of a growing interest in the machinery of Jewish Community Organization and grows out of a desire to create more effective working bodies. Jewish communities of today are larger and more widespread than ever before in America. This is also the case with organizations. When we speak of a Jewish Community Organization, we are thus referring to a link between the growing populace and its increasing needs and drives and the technique of organization to meet these needs and drives. Jewish Community Organization in theory, therefore, strives to meet the needs--particular, not all--of those within its influence.

Mordecai Kaplan would define Jewish Community Organization as "maximum collaboration among different diverse organizations for the purposes that they have in common, without imposing restrictions on purposes that they do not share." This type of philosophy, he feels, would enable Judaism to function as a civilization in the Diaspora by organizing for the "pursuit of their common interests." [36] Kaplan would carry out his philosophy by having local Jewish community councils and a national organization representing communal interests.

Arthur Durham speaks of community organization as "the process of bringing about and maintaining adjustment between social welfare needs and social welfare resources in a geographical area or in a fundtional field."

Abraham Neuman takes a somewhat different attitude:

> Insistence on ideological purity is frequently but a screen for power control. Structurally there is no integrated community, which means that the term commu-

nity has no reality. It is but a name,
an abstraction to designate what we ac-
tually are, a voluntary fellowship held
together by the ties of kinship, religion,
culture and the consciousness of a united
fate and destiny that passeth understanding.[37]

Maurice J. Karpf stated in 1938 that "there is no
information on the role of the Jew and the Jewish com-
munity in American life. No one knows what the tenden-
cies are or should be for the best development of Jewish
life, for its complete expression and harmonious adjust-
ment with the non-Jewish community."[38]

He goes on to say that "a knowledge of norms, atti-
tudes and motivations is essential for understanding, plan-
ning and controlling social life." Harry Lurie writing
in 1952 indicates that in regard to research in Jewish
Community Organization, we have had very little basic
research though there has been much of applied or instru-
mental research.[39]

The remainder of this chapter will indicate along
what lines much of the research has been done in Jewish
Community Organization and lay leadership. One of the
terms often used is the Central Agency when speaking of
organizational structure. Let us consider its functions
now.

The Central Agency in Jewish Community Organization
takes on large community projects outside the realm of the
Synogogue: Fund-raising, defense of Jewish and minority rights,
care of refugees, overseas relief, care of the aged, care
of the needy, adult education, recreation, etc.

Generally when endowed with sufficient authority, it coordinates the work and activities of the various agencies and organizations within its compass. It might be better to say that Jewish Community Organization is the general designation of which the Central Agency is the instrument of action.

In the summary report of the CJFWF mentioned above, it was noted that the Central Agency "is generally considered representative and makes an attempt to involve all segments of the community in leadership positions. A minority in each community felt,however, that wealth, and social position receive undue weight in attaining leadership."[40]

The studies made also reveal the following:

Leadership is in the hands of the wealthy and prominent and is considered to be a natural, perhaps inherited, tendency to select for leadership the most prominent, easily accessible and wealthy individuals. Couple with this feeling, however, the feeling in each community covered, of the need to tap new sources of leadership; to draw on the participation of new groups in the community--youth, women, new residents, etc.--in a conscious effort to recruit more widely and to train deliberately for leadership preparation.[41]

A major problem confronted in doing research in Jewish Community Organization is the one of community participation--or lack of it. In the study of the Albany community it was discovered that the lack of participation was to be attributed

to apathy in community, over-organization

and weakness, lack of clarity about ob-
jectives, or failure of the organization
actively to stimulate participation. Since
relatively few people have shown willing-
ness to assume major responsibilities, a
small group has continued to occupy posi-
tions of leadership and influence. However,
there is little belief that these individ-
uals achieve their influence because of their
financial contributions or social prestige
alone. On the contrary, it was widely felt
that individuals, exerting unusual influence
do so because of their readiness to commit
time and energy to community problems; the
wisdom of their judgement and their experi-
ence in community affairs. [42]

Maurice Karpf published a book on Jewish Community

Organization in 1938 and in it he describes problems of

participation and overlapping as basic faults in organ-

izational structure. Community planning was very bad he

discovered. There had been little inquiry and study

toward better planning. As a result there was no know-

ledge for determining the existing needs and how to

meet them-- or at least help to obviate the mistakes of

the past. He noted that national and international pro-

jects were rarely baded on research and study--they are

rather launched by aggressive and vigorous personalities.

Another problem in community organization is pointed

out by Karpf in his work. He observes that leadership

often is not trained or chosen for the most effectiveness.

There are too few leaders and many demands are made upon

their time and the many responsibilities they assume are

overburdening. It is impossible, he notes, for them to

be intimately informed on all the aspects and ramifications

of enterprises they sponsor. "Leadership is usually based on personal influence, wealth, position, but rarely on intimate and factual knowledge."[43]

Karpf explains that,

> ...any local or national enterprise depends for its success on the type of sponsorship which it is able to obtain. Hence it is the usual practice to seek out the most prominent or wealthiest persons, locally or nationally, and to interest them in the project to be undertaken... The less prominent are usually ready if not eager to associate themselves with the enterprise because of the prestige of the others. The best known in the group are given the positions of leadership, responsibility, and authority in the organization. Here lies one of the greatest dangers to Jewish community development and leadership. The prominent persons have so many duties and responsibilities that it is physically and mentally impossible for them to devote the necessary time to each of the enterprises with which they are connected. With the best of intentions...they cannot be intimately informed on the manifold activities to which they lend the prestige of their name.[44]

He concludes by stating: "If ...provision will...be made...to secure a courageous and well-informed lay leadership, a beginning will have been made toward creating the type of Jewish community organization and activity which a large wealthy, intelligent and enlightened people should have."[45]

In a study conducted by the Jewish Welfare Board, we have some interesting observations reported concerning the lay and professional leaders of the Jewish Centers. I will quote a few of the striking findings, the first being

in connection with the manner of election to the board:

> We have inquired whether the Center Boards
> are elected by the membership or are self-
> constituted and self-perpetuating. Our find-
> ings are based primarily on the reports of
> the executive directors, and these reveal
> that the boards are elected by the member-
> ship in 155 centers (52% of the total of 301)
> and that they are self-constituted and self-
> perpetuating in 74 centers (24%). Fully 72
> centers have failed to reply. From another
> tabulation, we learn that in 138 centers (46%)
> there is no limitation upon the number of con-
> tinuous or uninterrupted terms which officers
> or board members might serve.[46]

The next statement will reveal to a certain extent
the nature of the leader who sits on the center board.

> Are the center boards weighted in the
> direction of wealth and status, or are they
> representative of the active membership of
> the center and of all elements in the Jewish
> community? As many as 104 centers (35%) have
> neglected to reply, and 49 (16%) centers declare
> that the boards represent wealth and status.
> The remainder report that their boards are rep-
> resentative of the active membership, all ele-
> ments in the community, or of both. However,
> youth is represented on the boards of only 85
> centers (28%), with 124 centers reporting that
> youth is not accorded representation. The
> labor elements are represented on only 46 cen-
> ter boards, while 135 boards have no such rep-
> resentation. And local rabbis are members of
> the board in only 97 centers while 104 centers
> do not include rabbis on their boards.[47]

Though all centers didn't report, the above findings

stand as a fairly accurate picture or trend of the makeup

and kind of leaders on Center Boards. We are able to gain

some idea of the Jewish leaders of today operating as part

of a Jewish communal organization.

We hear much in studies of a sociological nature of

the relationship between wealth and status. Being in a

society where wealth is a basic measure of the worth of a

human being, this relationship of wealth to status is a
natural one. Wealth, therefore, giving a person status
in many instances results in that person's being eleva-
ted to a position of leadership. He assumes that lead-
ership, on the other hand, to gain more status. Albert
Gordon, in his <u>Jews In Transition</u>, points up the change
in attitude toward status.

> In Eastern Europe the scholar and learned
> Jew was regarded as an aristocrat among his
> people. Parents so prized Talmudical learning
> that they sought, when at all possible, to
> marry their daughters to yeshivoh bochurim.
> Boys and men who possessed such learning were
> not expected to earn a living for themselves
> or their families. Sometimes they were sup-
> ported by the parents or parents-in-law....
>
> This emphasis was soon changed when these
> Jews came to America. Earning a livelihood
> necessarily became of primary importance and
> Jewish study could be engaged in only after
> working hours or on the Sabbath. Status in
> the community was acquired less frequently on
> the basis of scholarship. One of the early
> settlers describes the situation as follows:
> 'Once upon a time it was the hope of every
> Jewish mother that her son would be a rav
> (Rabbi). Today, when you speak to some of
> these Jewish mothers about why their children
> do not attend Hebrew School, they ask: 'Nu, -
> vos veht ehr sein--a rab?' (Well, what do you
> expect him to become--a rabbi?)"[48]

No wonder then at the change in concept of status that has
taken place in the American Jewish Community. No wonder
at the great part wealth and status play in determining
leadership in the Jewish community and in giving motiva-
tion for the leaders to accept roles of leadership. Whether
this is the major factor in the problem of leadership is the
subject of much discussion amongst Jewish sociologists of
today.

Norman Miller, in his much discussed <u>Lakeport Study</u>,
bases his research upon the factor of striving for pres-
tige.[49] This he formulates as the criterion of leadership
motivation. In the first place, a big name gives pres-
tige to a group, so the group endorses him as a leader.
He finds also the tendency to give leadership prestige,
as a sort of reward, to those who have worked faithfully
within the group. The study deals with a Jewish commu-
nity and its leaders. A distinction is made between those
who have power and influence and those who merely have
prominence. There is a general tendency to look upon
prominence rather than power (those who really influence
are often overlooked). This is ascertained from the atti-
tudes people display toward leaders: a. "He is very
prominent." b. "He is active in this or that." c. "He
has done this or that." Whether he is the real power is
something they actually don't know. The leaders behind the
leaders, so to speak, have other motives in mind--those of
power and influence, not merely prestige.

Another interesting fact revealed in the study is that
in certain areas a leader may be very effective, but he is
not good in other leadership situations. For instance, in
the matter of fund-raising, someone may be excellent because
of his experience in the advertising and business world, but
as a board member of a Jewish Center he would be inadequate.

Kurt Lewin touches upon a very important aspect in the
consideration of Jewish leaders within a community organiza-
tion. In his <u>Resolving Social Conflicts</u>, he writes:

> The forces acting on an individual mem-
> ber of a privileged group are directed toward
> the central layers of that group. The forces
> acting on a member of an underprivileged
> group are directed away from the central area,
> toward the periphery of the group and, if pos-
> sible, toward the still higher status of the
> majority. The member would leave if the bar-
> rier set up by the majority did not prevent
> him.[50]

These members Lewin would term negative-balance members.

They are people turned against themselves. Morris Karpf

points out that many of these people are among the most

active lay and professional workers in the Jewish commu-

nal institutions and agencies despite the belief that

Jewish communal activity makes for separatism, intoler-

ance, anti-semitism and should be discouraged. These

members tend to exercise a negative influence on the

Jewish Community life. Their aim and philosophy, if suc-

cessful, could lead only to Jewish Community disintegra-

tion.[51]

Lewin goes on to state that:

> It is clear that an effective organiza-
> tion of a group becomes more difficult the
> more it contains members having a negative
> balance, and the stronger this negative bal-
> ance is. It is a well-known fact that the
> task of organizing a group which is economi-
> cally or otherwise underprivileged is seriously
> hampered by those members whose real goal is
> to leave the group rather than to promote it.[52]

He clarifies his point and relates it to the minority

group by stating,

> In a minority group, individual members
> who are economically successful, or who have
> distinguished themselves in their professions,
> usually gain a higher degree of acceptance by
> the majority group. This places them culturally

> on the periphery of the underprivileged
> group and makes them more likely to be
> "marginal" persons. They frequently have
> a negative balance.... Nevertheless they
> are frequently called for leadership by the
> underprivileged group because of their status
> and power. They themselves are usually
> eager to accept the leading role in the mi-
> nority, partly as a substitute for gaining
> status in the majority, partly because
> such leadership makes it possible for them
> to have and maintain additional contact
> with the majority.[53]

The above statements point up certain important considerations in the study of Jewish lay leadership within the context of Jewish Community Organization. We have touched upon some of the factors which give rise to the phenomenon of leadership and have indicated what might be the needs and objectives of the leader.

To bring this study up to date, we would do well now to report on a recent conference sponsored by the Jewish Social Studies Quarterly. At this conference a group of noted Jewish sociologists discuss the problem of Jewish lay leadership and Jewish Community Organization. The major issues presented there will conclude this portion of the present thesis and will thereby set the stage for the forthcoming interviews with local lay leaders whereby we may be able to test our findings and gain a better understanding of the contemporary Jewish lay leader.

Seymour Lipset in a brief statement entitled "Jewish Sociologists and Sociologists of the Jews", points to the fact that while there are many Jewish

sociologists, there are few sociologists of the Jews. Even
more revealing is the fact that there are less than a dozen
important sociological studies of the Jews.

> And those which do exist have for the
> most part been written by scholars who are
> not in the main stream of the field. The
> late Louis Wirth of the University of Chi-
> cago was unique among the leading American
> sociologists in writing a book about the
> Jews as his doctoral dissertation, and even
> he did not follow up this study in his sub-
> sequent work. One reason for the avoidance
> of Jewish topics by Jewish scholars lies in
> the fact that for many of them becoming soci-
> ologists and anthropologists has been one way
> of escaping from their Jewishness.

Mr. Lipset sees this former situation changing and a grow-
ing interest arising in the field of Jewish sociology. He
attributes the change to the emergence of "third genera-
tion" Jews in the academic world.   "They being native
born do not feel the need for conformity as their prede-
cessors; rather they feel the need for roots, for an identi-
fication with a group which is smaller than the total society.
And traditionally in America, this has meant belonging to a
church and pride in ancestors."[54]

Norman Miller's remarks concerning "Changing Patterns
of Leadership In the Jewish Community" drew a good deal of
interest and discussion at the above conference. Many of
his ideas have already been given in this thesis, i.e., the
role of the status factor in leadership motivation. It
would be well, however, to make mention of some of the high-
lights of his shortened Conference address. An important
qualification is made by Miller at the outset:

My study represents a focussed investigation of one aspect of the leadership structure of a middle-sized American Jewish community. It is not intended to throw light on all of the changes that have taken place within it. Nothing stated here should be taken to imply a contemptuous attitude toward the individuals discussed or to deny in any way the sincerity with which they pursue their formal goals.

Mr. Miller in his study of the Lakeport community relates the following pertinent information:

The League (Allied Jewish League) which comprises a number of smaller organizations which are concerned with case work, education community center activities, camping and the like, commands the greatest prestige and authority among the Jews in Lakeport. Its existence derives from its role in the general intra and inter-ethnic stratification system of Lakeport. Since the League is the high-prestige Jewish organization, activity in this area on the leadership level is expected of high-status individuals.

Mention is also made by Miller of the rise of a group of nouveaux-riches anxious to gain social acceptance among the established Jewish elite. "And their financial contributions and help in soliciting funds were absolutely necessary." It appears then according to this sociologists' findings that the League through its functioning maintains and regulates the social status system of the Jewish elite.

Miller concludes his report by pointing to the "existing tension between the religious and philanthropic structures in American Judaism. The one challenges the power and prestige of the other. It is a jurisdictional struggle, not a struggle over men's souls. It is a

struggle for total control between two secularized struc-
tures."55

Many comments are directed at Miller's findings.
Abraham G. Duker is not in complete agreement with
Miller that Jewish communal leadership is motivated
overwhelmingly, if not primarily, by the laymen's search
for status and prestige and the professionals' manipula-
tions for influence and control. Though admitting these
to be factors in leadership, Mr. Duker takes Mr. Miller
to task for failing to deal adequately with the problem.
He feels Mr. Miller should have dealt more with

> the most potent factor behind philanthropic
> giving: the devotion of many American Jews to the
> cause of Israel and their awareness of the respon-
> sibility as Jews that continues to be sharpened
> by the emergencies at this crucial state in Jewish
> history. This awareness has also led to a greater
> interest in Jewish living in America. The human-
> itarian and human factors must be taken into account
> but not without ignoring the prestige-validating
> action in fund-raising. The drive for prestige
> and influence is not to be discounted in any so-
> ciety and the search for koved was no mean factor
> even in the much too idealized East European com-
> munity. However the less material and tangible
> factors of belongingness and of desire to help the
> poor and persecuted, of anxiety about survival of the
> Jewish group, should not be ignored. I therefore
> find Mr. Miller's approach to be dogmatic to the
> point of a mechanistic interpretation. He under-
> estimates Jewish cultural tradition and the process
> of Jewish re-identification.

Duker endeavors to show the failure of Miller to
outline and analyze the ideological aspects of leader-
ship involved in social work. He states that while it
is true that Jewish religious revival may involve the rise
in prestige and authority of the rabbi and be an aspect

of the rabbinate's struggle for power, it is also in-
dicative of the struggle for the introduction of Jewish
religious and cultural content in Jewish institutions.
Survivalist Jews in general feel that religious leader-
ship can and should influence communal activities and in-
stitutions.[56]

Following Duker's comment there is further criticism
of Miller's paper offered by Harry L. Lurie: "There is
little information given about the Jewish population that
would appear to be unique for this group." There is also
the criticism that there was omitted any consideration of
the community leadership below the top level.[57]

Isaac Franck concludes the major comments on Miller's
findings by raising a number of excellent points of which
the following were emphasized: He, too, feels that the
use of status-seeking as an explanation for the recent
shifts in leadership in the Jewish community is inadequate.
He lists a number of other motivations which enter into
the behavior of the Jews and into leadership-seeking acti-
vities in the context of the organized Jewish community.

(1) Differences in country of origin

(2) Economic differences

(3) Religious orientation

(4) Emphasis on philanthropy vs. that on religious, cul-
     tural, educational... aspect

(5) Concern with adjustment of Jewish group to American life

. . vs. insulatory approach to Jewish life

(6) Retaining and wish to escape Jewishness vs. latent or

manifest search for status and prestige within Jewish

group

(7) America-centered orientation in Jewish life vs. Israel-

orientation

Franck asks rhetorically,

> Could these new leaders have been recruited,
> and would the reshuffling of leadership have
> taken place in the same way, if the potent ap-
> peal of certain ideas and soul-stirring his-
> toric events had not been present? Is it not as
> persuasive, or perhaps even more persuasive an
> hypothesis that, the rise of the new insurgent
> leadership to positions of high status, was,
> to use Robert K. Merton's terminology, the "mani-
> fest function", and the potent impact of global
> Jewish needs was the "latent function"? In other
> words, in the lives and behavior of these commu-
> nal leaders, their leadership status and all the
> organizational hocus pocus of campaigns, allo-
> cations, trouble-shooting, etc., are really the
> manifest functions. It is the satisfaction of
> their unconscious search for k'dusha through
> these communal activities, that is the latent
> function in thelives of these men and women.

The following questions Franck feels Miller did not ex-

plore sufficiently: Did the rigid domination of the older

elements in the Jewish community facilitate the recruit-

ment of the best leadership for Jewish communal affairs?

Does the domination today by large contributors help or

hinder in the selection of the best leadership, func-

tionally related to the Jewish community's objective of

raising, allocating and using funds for the development

of meaningful Jewish community programs? In the transition

from the old guard to the new leadership has there
perhaps been some change in the rigidity of the social
stratification within the Jewish community? Franck
criticizes Miller for not attempting to shed light on
the relation between class position within a minority
group and the minority group person's class position
in the general community. In other words, does a Jew
rise to a higher position in the class structure of the
general community by virtue of his being or having be-
come an important Jew, or are the two unrelated? Miller
had asserted but did not effectively demonstrate that a
"Jew who holds a status position outside of the Jewish
community must go through a ritual of active community
work in the Jewish community to retain a position of
status among Jews." Franck feels "that a position of
status in the general community automatically secures
for its holder a position of status in the Jewish com-
munity."58

From our consideration of work done in general and
Jewish sociology concerning the phenomenon of leadership,
we may now list certain hypotheses which will in part
be tested as to their validity through the process of
personal interviews with lay leaders of the local com-
munity. The methodology to be used, the interview sched-
ule,and the interview write-ups will be included in the
following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

There are two areas involved in the interview process which will require some explanation if the reader is to better understand this important research technique. These two areas are the preparation for and then the actual carrying out of the personal interview.

Let us review together the necessary preparatory steps:

1. A backlog of knowledge is necessary concerning the dynamics of leadership, community organization and the Jewish group. This is the reason it was necessary to read the important available Jewish and non-Jewish sources relating to the subject at hand.

2. After sufficient preliminary reading, note-taking and absorption of the fundamental thinking done on the subject, a series of hypotheses were drawn up to be used in a later evaluation of the personal interviews with local Jewish lay leaders. These hypotheses were a later addition to the initial impressions put down by the author at the outset of the writing of this thesis.

3. Next it was necessary to draw up certain categories of enquiry by which the interviews could be later classified and analyzed.

4. An interview-schedule was then developed. This consisted of a series of questions according to the categories of

enquiry.   These were the questions actually put to the interviewee.

5. The author then secured lists from the various boards of the agencies and organizations of the local community - these lists contained the names of the board members.

6. A list of possible interviewees was then drawn up with the idea in mind of having a cross-section of leaders from the various organizations represented. Many of the persons chosen represented the top leadership of the community on the lay level.

7. A formal letter was then sent to each potential interviewee informing him of the nature of the thesis, introducing the author,and requesting his cooperation via a personal interview. A telephone call arranging for the interview followed in a few days.

The above represents the major preparatory steps in connection with the interview. Now it will prove of interest to the reader if we should discuss the actual carrying out of the personal interview:

1. The interviews either took place at the residence or business address of the interviewee. The interviewer had little trouble arranging for the personal interview. Most of those contacted after the personal letter showed a ready willingness to give of their time for the research.

2. It was generally a rather cordial greeting that the interviewee gave the interviewer. Some general conversation usually preceded the actual interview. The nature of this conversation either dealt with the weather, the purpose of the research or with some questioning concerning the background of the interviewer. After this brief warm-up session, the two parties concerned either adjourned to a private meeting place or proceeded with the interview in the same area. In all but one instance did the interview take place without a third person present.

3. Immediately preceding the actual interview, tne interviewee was told that this was to be an informal interview, and that he was to answer the questions as he best he could in terms of his greater or lesser awareness of the answer to any of the given questions. He was also told that some note-taking would be done during the course of the interview but not to let that bother him. In a few instances, the interviewee asked why he in particular was singled out for an interview. The answer given was that he was one of a number of representative lay leaders to be interviewed in order to get as good a cross-section of the local community representation as possible.

4. In a casual, informal way the interview was then started with some biographical questions concerning the length of time the interviewee had lived in the local community, etc.

In general the interviews proceeded rather smoothly with the interviewees expressing themselves quite freely in response to the questions. There were interruptions of one kind or another during the interview due to personal or business reasons, but each interview was usually concluded at the end of an hour and a half interval.

5. As the interview proceeded, the interviewee appeared to take on increased interest,and in most instances he endeavored to give a serious, thoughtful answer. There were some comments to the effect that had he more time to think the question through, he would be better able to answer.

6. At no time did the interviewer take the conversation away from the interviewee. The effort was made to allow the interviewee to speak as freely as he wished with as few interjections by the interviewer as possible.

7. At times a clarification of the question posed was necessary, or a bit more time was allotted to the interviewee to ponder the question. He would at times refer back to a previous question while answering another one.

8. While the interview in general was quite sober in nature, there was ample opportunity to relax the mood of the interview with some slight humor concerning a particular point discussed or viewpoint.

9. When the body of the interview came to a close, the interviewer thanked the interviewee very much for the

time and cooperation afforded him. His information would be very helpful, the interviewee was assured.

10. Before leaving, the interviewee usually asked whether or not this thesis was going to be published. The interviewer told him it would be in the College library for him to look through if he so desired. The value of such research was then generally reiterated with the idea that such research has led in certain cases in particular areas to more effective community organization.

11. In only one instance was the interviewer asked to stay after the interview for something to drink. In most cases the interviewer thanked the interviewee and departed.

The above in a general way then includes the two basic areas involved in the technique of the personal interview. Preparation plays a great part in determining how meaningful and significant the personal interviews will be. The actual interview must also be handled in such a way as to create a relaxed, informal atmosphere allowing the interviewee the greatest possible freedom to express himself adequately.

Following are the hypotheses, categories of enquiry, interview-schedule and letters which formed the background and essential tools by which the personal interviews were were carried out, classified and analyzed. The write-ups of the interviews are on file in the Department of Human Relations of the Hebrew Union College. Anyone requesting to see them may do so with proper permission. This has been done so as to insure the strict confidentiality of the people interviewed.

HYPOTHESES

1. Status-seeking plays a major role in the motivation structure of the Jewish lay leader.

2. Status-seeking in some instances is a manifest function of the Jewish lay leader; a desire to serve or to gain k'dusha is the latent function or motivation.

3. Jewish lay leaders display a wide range of religious attitudes.

4. The religious consideration plays a secondary role in Jewish lay leader motivation.

5. Some Jewish lay leaders exhibit evidence of a negative balance in regard to their Jewishness; these are the marginal leaders.

6. Wealth is the greatest single determinant in the qualifying of a person for Jewish lay leadership.

7. Youth is not properly represented in Jewish communal leadership.

8. Some leaders in Jewish Communal Organization have no real identification with the survival of Judaism.

9. Some lay leaders assume leadership having little information regarding Judaism, the history of the Jew, nature of Jewish community organization.

10. There are instances of people who head institutions who have no contact with people who are served by them.

11. Some Jewish lay leaders have no clearly defined goals.

12. Some leaders do not seek leadership initially,
    but are drawn into it by virtue of their wealth,
    social prominence or by some kind of accidental
    involvement.

13. One may be a leader and possibly be indifferent
    or even opposed to the avowed purposes of the in-
    stitutions he heads.

14. Some leaders undergo a change in motivation while
    in office.

15. There is evidence in Jewish lay leadership of the
    "go-getter" personality.

16. Many Jewish lay leaders do not represent the best
    possible leadership for Jewish communal affairs.

17. The domination today of leadership by the "large
    contributor" hinders to a degree the recruitment
    of the best leadership, functionally related to the
    Jewish community's objectives of raising, allocating
    and using funds for the development of meaningful
    Jewish community program.

18. A Jewish lay leader rises to a high position in the
    class structure of the general community by virtue
    of his being or having become an important Jew.

19. Those Jewish lay leaders who have insistent needs
    for dominance, power, and prestige may be expected
    to have higher potentiality for leadership.

20. There is no consistent pattern of traits which
    could characterize all Jewish lay leaders.

21. The socio-economic status background of the Jewish
    lay leader (parents were rich) enabled him to ascend
    the ladder of leadership earlier.

22. There is an accompanying rise in the assumption of
    leadership with the rise on the scale of economic
    status.

CATEGORIES OF ENQUIRY

I. Biographical data

II. Educational and Religious backgrounds

III. Goals and determinants of leadership

I. Biographical data: This includes how long he has lived
   in the local community, his occupation, positions he
   holds in the Jewish and non-Jewish community, amount
   of time he spends in communal work.

II. Educational and Religious backgrounds: This includes
   the extent and nature of secular and religious education,
   religious motivations and attitudes, affiliation with
   congregation, comparison and influence of parental
   religious interests.

III. Goals and determinants of leadership: This includes
   attitudes concerning the status quo of local communal
   organizations, viewpoint on policies and purposes of
   organizations served, attitudes as to the qualifications
   of Jewish lay leaders, thoughts concerning the re-
   cruitment of good leadership, the importance of eco-
   nomic stability in qualifying one for leadership, the
   importance of non-Jewish respect for Jewish leader.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Biographical Data:

1. Occupation? Profession?

2. How long in Cincinnati:

3. What positions has he held in local Jewish institutions?

4. What positions in general community--not Jewish has he held?

5. Does the kind of experience or skill you have in your profession or occupation bear on the kind of work you do in your community, voluntary leadership?

    a. Do you devote time to fund-raising in your institution, or analyze budgets, (as an example)

    b. If a lawyer, does your work on the board involve working on committees dealing with constitutions?

6. What types of work or committee activity interest you most? Which the least? Why?

7. Do you find community work takes up much of your time? Does it mean many evenings away from home? What about your time for recreation and relaxation- do you have to give up some of this? How much?

Educational and Religious Backgrounds:

1. Do you belong to a congregation? If so, which?

2. Are you active in the congregation? Ever held membership on boards?

3. Do you have any impressions of the interest of your parents in congregational life? Are your interests different from theirs? How?

4. Is America becoming more religious? Are Jews becoming more religious? In what way? Is this trend important? Why? "hat effects will it have on Jewish community life?

5. Did you have any religious education? What kind and for how long? What influence, if any, do you think it had on you? What do you remember about it? What kind of religious training do you think is important?

Goals and determinants of leadership:

1. Do you think Cincinnati deserves its reputation for being a well organized and well managed Jewish community? Why? What does it need?

2. What types of institutions do we possibly lack? Why?

3. Do you think your views are fairly typical? (if not, in what ways...)

4. What do you think Jews have in common? What are common community needs?

5. Do you think there is much disagreement as to basic policy in the boards of our institutions? If so, what are the reasons for such differences?

6. What do you think is the future of the Jewish Community Council? Should it be made more active?

7. Do you have a feeling of accomplishment in your community work? If not, what do you think should be done and what kind of lay leadership is necessary for this purpose?

8. Ideally speaking, what should be the qualifications of a Jewish lay leader? Character, religious attitudes, type of person, what kind of motivation?

9. What circumstances led to your election to this position? Did you accept office reluctantly? Would you describe yourself as active, before you took office?

10. Are you in complete agreement with the general purposes of the organization? If not, how do you differ?

11. Do you or your family use any of the services of this organization? (Do not ask this question of the Family Service Bureau) board members.

12. What do you think are the directions the organization is moving in?

13. What do you think is the future of the Jew in America? Do you think there is a growing, less, or static level of Jewish support of communal organizations?

14. Do you wish you could devote more time to non-Jewish organizations?

15. Would you agree that the recent Look magazine

article gave a good description of the Jew?

What about the Life magazine article? Why?

16. Do you think anti-semitism is on the increase?

17. Do you feel Jewish community leaders are do-
ing all they might do to cope with this problem?
Is part of the problem in any way with Jews
themselves? If so, in what ways...?

18. Without being modest, what factors led friends
and others to nominate you for office?

19. To what extent is economic "stability" a factor
in qualifying one for Jewish communal leadership?

20. Do you think non-Jews respect-more-or less- the
Jew who is a leader among the Jewish group?

21. What prevents some people from becoming more
active in the Jewish community? If you have
certain potentially strong leaders in mind, would
you say that they are presently active in the
non-Jewish community?

22. What means should be used to recruit young
lay leaders?

700 Chalfonte Place
Cincinnati 29, Ohio

November 27, 1955

The Agency Name
Street Address
City and State

Dear Sir:

    I am a student at the Hebrew Union College and am
at present engaged in the writing of my senior thesis
which deals with Jewish Community organization and lay
leadership.

    It would be much appreciated if you would forward
to me a copy of the names of the members of the board of
your agency. This would greatly facilitate the gathering
of essential information for my thesis.

    Thank you very much for your cooperation in this
matter.

            Sincerely,

            Richard Leviton

700 Chalfonte Pl.
Cincinnati 29, Ohio

January 5, 1956

Name
Address
City and State

Dear Mr.   :

    I am a senior student at the Hebrew Union College and
am presently writing a thesis on the American Jewish Commu-
nity. Research in this field will not only add to a greater
understanding of Jewish communal organization but will also
afford me, as a future rabbi, a better understanding of
Jewish institutions and community problems.

    I hope to interview a number of lay leaders of the
Jewish Community. They represent the various agencies
and boards of the Cincinnati Jewish Community. It would be
greatly appreciated if you would be willing to contribute
to this research. These interviews will be helpful in deter-
mining community needs.

    In a few days I will call you, and I hope that we will
be able to arrange for a personal interview at your earliest
convenience. Thanking you in advance for your consideration
I remain,

                              Richard Leviton

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS:
MAJOR TRENDS AND EXCEPTIONS

As stated before, part of this thesis is a record of
the personal interviews which were conducted with a repre-
sentative number of local lay leaders. These interviews in
written-up form are on separate file in the files of the De-
partment of Human Relations of the Hebrew Union College.
They may be seen on request, but will remain on file so as
to maintain their strict confidentiality.

There follows now, however, a summary and analysis of
the major trends and exceptions that we have been able to
draw from the interviews. We will do this according to the
major categories of enquiry that we originally drew up.
These categories went under the general designations of:
I. Biographical data II. Educational and Religious
Backgrounds III. Goals and Determinants of Leadership.

Biographical data. The men and women interviewed re-
presented a wide variety of occupations. There were lawyers,
businessmen, housewives, manufacturers and people from the
insurance field. There were also men representing the con-
tracting and architectural lines of work. All of the men
interviewed have been quite successful and could be classified
as belonging in the upper-middle to upper income brackets.
The husbands of the women interviewed fall into the above
financial brackets also.

The majority of those interviewed had been born in the local area and have lived here the greater part of their lives. Only a few had lived in other communities for any appreciable amount of time.

It was extremely interesting to discover that most of the people interviewed held a variety of leadership positions in the Jewish and non-Jewish communities. Many gave me long lists of positions held in the local Jewish institutions. Activity in the Jewish community exceeded in all cases that done in the non-Jewish community. A majority of those leaders interviewed represented the top leadership either past or present of all the major institutions of the Jewish community. These include such institutions and organizations as the Jewish Community Center, Jewish Hospital, Jewish Family Service, Jewish Community Relations Council, United Jewish Social Agencies, Jewish Welfare Fund, Council of Jewish Women, Camp Livingston, etc. In general most of the non-Jewish communal work was in the area of the Community Chest, Red Cross, or professional legal and political groups. There were some Jewish leaders,however, who were more active in civic activity such as the Mayor's Friendly Relations Committee, City Planning and Improvement Committee. Some work was also done in art and historical societies.

The striking feature of what has been said is the multiplicity of leadership positions concentrated on so few individuals. It would appear on the basis of our interviews

that key individuals over a period of years tend to mono-
polize the top leadership positions in the community.
This leadership is not "seized" leadership however. It is
usually based on the person's proven and tested leadership
ability. They were persons who could be counted upon to
give forth with the necessary time, money and effort.

There seemed to be in most instances a definite bear-
ing of the leader's skill or experience from his profession
or occupation on the kind and effectiveness of work done in
the community. This was especially true of the lawyers
whose speaking and legal experiences and skills gave them a
definite advantage in communal activities. One lawyer men-
tioned the fact that he has been very helpful to some of the
local synogogues and churches in terms of real estate and
constitutional problems. An architect, on the other hand,
stated that his work in the community has been in the area
of social planning and social dynamics; his chief concern
was how to get more participation from people and how to make
the local services available to all and used by all. A
banker was of the opinion that his experiences have given
him broader perspective for community work in terms of hu-
man relations. He stated, "The quality of knowing people
is essential to organizational work." Still other leaders
who are primarily fund-raisers take over into this work,
certain skills and experiences from their work in the busi-
ness world.

The majority of those interviewed expressed no parti-
cular preference for one type of committee work over another.
The usual answer was, "I take any job given me." There were
those however who knew their limitations. For instance a
contractor admitted frankly that he could only be of use in
the fund-raising area because his experience qualified him
for this type of work. He did not feel that he could be of
much good on the board of the Jewish Family Service or sim-
ilar agencies because to be effective in such organizations
one must have an acquaintance with its many problems, etc.
He could be effective in fund-raising whereas in something
else he felt he would be a total loss. As he put it, "Fund-
raising is a technique and organization is a personal qual-
ity. I could never tell you what a Sunday School should
teach, but I could tell you how it could make capital im-
provements and raise money."

In general most of those admitted that fund-raising
was the hardest and least appealing type of committee work.
In this sense, those interviewed showed a preference when
possible to work on other than fund-raising committees. So-
licitations still remain however as one of the principal
occupational hazards of local Jewish lay leaders.

The average amount of time devoted to community work
by those interviewed ranged from about one-third to one-half
of their total working time. This has meant for a number of
the leaders many evenings away from home. In most cases

there were no regrets for the time and energy given to Jewish
communal work. Most of them agree,however, that too much
responsibility and leadership burdens rested on the should-
ers of too few people, but that this is a natural situation.
One of the interviewees looked at it this way: "I would quit
if I added up all the hours. But one must be willing to
give up time. It requires lots of day-time and evening work
if you want to know what the various committees are doing."
Another remarked, "It means a number of evenings away from
home. There is always something." Still another took this
position: "Yes, (community work) takes up a lot of time.
But I don't mind. I don't believe like a lot of people
in just empty leisure time and relaxation. I want to be stim-
ulated during my leisure time, and from my vacations. Work
is a challenge and I've always tried to do the best I could
do no matter how small the job." One important community
leader remarked, "My wife says I am away too many evenings."
An active woman leader frankly confessed, "It got to be so
bad,(community work activity) that I had to give up a number
of my activities and devote my time to a few only. Another
thing, you just can't do your best if you get too involved
with many organizations." One of the top male leaders of
the Jewish Community complained that "there isn't enough
time in the week to do everything." He estimated that his
outside community work consumed up to 60% of his time. The
feeling of being overworked was expressed by some. One said,
"I was considered a good fund-raiser, but I was overworked

in it,and now I feel tired. I had little free time for myself because of my involvement with communal work."

The ages of those interviewed ranged from about 35 to 65. The majority have been active in the Jewish and general community anywhere from ten to forty years. Of those who had served the longest the impression was given that they had done their part. As one put it, "I feel I have done my part. I believe in bringing young men in."

Educational and Religious Backgrounds. All of those interviewed belonged to some Temple or Synogogue. The majority belonged to Reform congregations while a few held membership in Conservative congregations. No one interviewed considered himself to be an Orthodox Jew or did anyone have a membership in an Orthodox Shul. This last remark must be qualified as one of the leaders interviewed held a membership in an Orthodox Shul but only out of respect for his parents. He has a family membership in the Reform Temple because as he states, "I belong to a Reform Temple because I believe that it is necessary to have vision; if one is satisfied in something, no progress is made. There has to be a feeling of wanting to improve, to enlarge; otherwise Reform too will find itself like Orthodoxy before too long, too confined and without vision."

In most instances a marked disinterest in congregational activity prevailed. This was true even though a substantial number of the interviewees have held or are presently holding leadership positions on the boards of the Temples.

Activity in the greater Jewish community far outweighed the time spent going to religious services or taking part in congregational affairs.

It was the general feeling of those interviewed that they take a more active part and interest in congregational life than their parents did, even though that doesn't amount to much. As a noted lay leader commented, "My parents were rather passive in congregational life. They were too busy providing for the opportunities and essentials for their children. I feel I have had more time and have had a more organized religious training." This he went on to say gave him a greater interest in community activities. Another leader revealed this about his parents: "My parents were radical reformers. They threw out all the rituals and dogma."

The major trend in all the interviews was the fact that the children had had more time for congregational life than the parents. Their religious attitudes on the other hand do not differ greatly from those of their parents. They do find themselves serving on Temple boards, something their parents never did, except in one or two instances.

The interests and attitudes of the parents of the lay leaders interviewed had a great influence on their own religious thinking. For instance a woman leader observed that her parents were ultra Reform and inactive in congregational

activities, "They had what almost bordered on hatred of Orthodox Jews. They talked against them excessively in the house. They even admonished that their children should not date them." She went on to say that any religious or Jewish influence she had received from the past was negative. A lawyer told me the following about his interests: "My parents were born in Europe, knew little English when they came here. My father was tied up in business and had little leisure time. The German Jews then controlled most of the organizations which held the East Europeans back. That is why my parents were not as active as myself. As for our religious differences, my parents were almost orthodox, but they weren't as high-bound as some are; in fact, they would have been considered fairly liberal for their day. I myself have been liberal, but because of labels, I belong to a conservative group, even though the conservative philosophy is not so well defined."

The general concensus was that there was taking place some sort of religious revival in America, and that more Jews were becoming affiliated with Temples and Synogogues. Most of the interviewees felt, however, that Jews were not becoming more religious even though they attended Synogogue functions. It was felt that a religious revival will result in greater group security and unity. There will be a greater group consciousness, many felt, as well as greater community responsibility. Interestingly enough a few leaders foresaw the time coming when Jewish life will move back to the Synogogue.

One of the interviewees commented, "I think that maybe some of the religion will rub off on them if they keep going. I think they are feeling the need of religion more now. The trend is important because I think it will help develop community responsibility; people will tend to stop and think more." He went on to say that he thought the low Jewish divorce rates would continue because of the religious revival. - "For if you are a member, you tend to develop inhibitions." Another leader whose interests in Judaism parallel those his parents held, that is, the national and ethnic aspects more than the religious remarked concerning the revival in religion: "It is an important trend for the Jews, because they must be regarded as a religious people: the people of the Book. We live in a Protestant country which respects religious Jews and not athiestic ones. Most of the anti-Semites can't find fault with our religion, but they do find fault with Jews as individuals."

A lay leader for a good many years had this to say about the religious revival: "There isn't more religion today, for most Jews today still have a void when it comes to the depth and nucleus of Judaism. When I first started in community work, non-Jews saw us as an irreligious group. Maybe now the kids will get at the core of religion. The attitude of the non-jew toward the Jew will change. We don't need the pat on the back for being a religious group, but it helps in a predominant Christian atmosphere."

Many of the interviewees pointed to the social and economic

factors as the main reasons for the rise in synogogue member-
ship. Still others in a minority saw no particular importance
in the religious tendency of today. As one stated, "I don't
see any relationship between this trend and future Jewish com-
munity life. There is a good participation in community ac-
tivities, but this is not true of the Temple. I had no reli-
gious motivation." This same leader went on to say that he
personally could do without the Temple. "I joined because of
the child. I really don't know what function the synogogue
plays in the community."

The amount of religious education varied among the inter-
viewees. Most of them had what amounts to a Sunday School
education up to the Confirmation level. Most of the leaders
did not feel that their formal religious education influenced
them in any considerable way. Few of them could remember any-
thing significant about it. For this reason there was gen-
erally a corollary attitude to the effect that the children
should get a better education than what the parents got. A
prominent lawyer and community leader explained his feelings
about religion this way: "More (Jews) are joining Temples. I
think this will mean a greater feeling for one another and a
better knowledge of what the religion is. This is reflected
in the growing support of Israel. You don't find the animo-
sity between German and Russian Jews as you once did." He
continued by saying: "I had very little Jewish education; oh,
I learned a little Hebrew, but not much of anything else.

That is why I want my children to learn Hebrew and to get the education I didn't get. I am for as an extensive religious education as possible. The more they can get, the better they will be for it."

There was exhibited in some of the leaders a certain guilt feeling concerning the lack of religious education. One said, "Sunday School had little if any influence on me. I remember nil about it. I sort of have guilt feelings about my lack of it (religious education).

All those interviewed were in agreement that their religious education was merely surface in nature. One prominent leader felt however that the trouble lie in the misplacement of emphasis. "There is too much reliance upon the Temple to do the job. The home is where the child should get his training. The trouble is that there is too much tendency toward the material rather than the spiritual."

The major trend in the interviews indicated that the leaders were in favor of a rather intensive religious education. There were exceptions to this trend by some. One person put it, "I was against the 2 day a week school. Sunday School is enough." Along with this attitude there was prevalent a rather negative attitude to the Synogogue and religious education. There was a feeling by some that religious training can be overdone and that the primary aim of it should be to give the child a sense of belonging."

One person felt that his religious education had made

him more sympathetic to the shades of difference among the Jewish ideologies of today. He also felt that the kids are not getting enough religious training today. Another felt that attendance at Temple doesn't mean being religious. "Religion is what you do, not what you think; action is more important than beliefs."

It was an unconscious Jewish religious motivation if any which played a part in the assumption of leadership roles by Jewish lay leaders. At least very few attribute their desire to serve to some religious influence from the past.

In general, most of those interviewed had but a hazy idea of what kind of religious training they thought to be important. The term "essential" and "intensive" was used quite often, but as to what formed the essential or what comprised the "intensive", few could say. There were a few that did have a grasp of what they deemed to be important. The following highlight some of the suggestions:

1. More Jewish literature should be read.

2. Tell children the differences between Jews and non-Jews.

3. Teach Jewish history and historical Biblical stories.

4. Give children awareness of their ancestry.

5. Parents must be taught along with children.

6. Teach direction and sensitivity to children.

7. Give children broad viewpoint.

8. Understanding of the holidays.

9. Fluent reading of Hebrew.

10. Complete education in Bible.

11. Ethical teachings of Judaism.

12. Last four words of Adon Olom.

The last three or four points were given by a lawyer who had had 4 to 5 years of private Hebrew instruction with a teacher but "not an educator". He explained: "He didn't know English and I didn't know Yiddush."

A basic difference between children and parents was noted as regards Jewish existence. As one leader put it, "I feel I have a more intense relationship due to the conditions of the time. I feel our brethren in the old country made a big mistake. They tried assimilation and they let things slide by. They became weak and as a result were a pushover for the Hitler regime. I also feel that the principles upon which Israel was founded are important for us and that we should do all that we can to help them."

An interesting suggestion was made by a prominent fundraiser in the community. He suggested along business lines that religious education must be made attractive to the kids. In addition to this it must be sold to them like in business. "Kids must feel they are getting something out of it."

This comment points up the idea that religion like most of our way of life has become a commodity, just another aspect of materialism.

Goals and Determinants of Leadership. According to
most of the interviewees, Cincinnati fares quite well in
terms of having a well-organized and well-managed Jewish
Community Organization. This is held to more correct when
one compares Cincinnati to other communities. Cincinnati
taken by itself is seen to be less than perfect in its or-
ganizational structure and management. A recurrent point of
view was something like this: "I believe Cincinnati has a
well-organized Jewish community. There is a certain amount
of overlapping, but that is true of most communities."

The majority felt that the local community did not
lack any major institutions. The typical feeling was that
Cincinnati has more institutions if anything than it needs.
There was also the idea that there was a need to improve the
existing institutions. Mention was made of the proposed
needed Jewish Center building. The Old Folks home needed
better facilities.

Some of those interviewed also felt that the Cincin-
nati Jewish community lacks the top-notch leadership it once
had. One highly respected lay leader remarked: "It lacks
the leaders of stature it once had. They were real rallying
points, and we don't seem to have men like them as leaders any-
more." Another felt that the Rabbis of the community were
not giving the desired spiritual leadership as Wise and Kohler
once did. He felt that in a large sense the future community
depended upon the type of rabbinical leader at hand.

A number of those interviewed although they were in the
minority felt that the local community was quite disorgan-
ized and badly managed. Here are a few of the reactions they
gave to the situation: "The community's greatest need is for
a central organizing agency. Sheltering Oaks was three years
late in coming because of no central agency. There were too
many channels to go through in addition to a lack of coordin-
ation." Another leader declared firmly, "This is not a well-
organized community at all. It is badly organized so far as
the social and economic aspects are concerned. The Syno-
gogues are all right, but the community organizations are
bad. There is no central body to regulate all the existing
organizations and as a result there is a great waste of mon-
ey and much overlapping. We have an obsolete structure and
sometimes I ask myself how we ever function at all. There
is a tremendous amount of duplication and a waste of funds.
For instance the proposed new Center Building should be a
community building which would house many agencies, instead of
each agency paying rent somewhere for its offices."

A different type of need was suggested by an interviewee
who stated: "One thing it needs is to move out of the Avondale
Ghetto atmosphere. There are too many Jews concentrated in
one small suburb." In terms of leadership needs, one layman
was of the opinion that the community lacks executive leader-
ship. " It does lack executive leadership, that is, paid
leaders, professional leaders."

Another exception to the major trend of considering the Cincinnati Jewish community well-organized was the opinion of a local leader that there was "more heterogeneity here than in other towns. There are old family blocks who have become the natural leaders. They are now in the minority but are unwilling to join the other groups in running community affairs." This viewpoint is also shared by another prominent lay leader who feels that the Cincinnati Jewish community lacks most of all "cohesion". A woman lay leader felt that the greatest common community need is the development of leadership. "The same people are called upon time and again. This happens too often. You see the same names of people on the boards. We have to get new leadership. This can be done only by a constant vigil on the part of the existing leaders. They must encourage and give jobs to prospective leaders."

There was a definite trend in the thinking of the interviewees that there existed a good deal of agreement as to the basic policies of boards which they served. They also conceded the fact that it[18] healthy to have disagreements if aired openly. A number of the leaders said that they disagreed with certain purposes of various organizations and that they would speak out against them. The most controversial organizations were found to be the Jewish Community Council and the Jewish Center. There was the feeling by some that the Center should be open on Friday night and Saturday and that the Center should

truly be a community center than merely a Jewish Center. To
some the present Center policies reflected badly upon the
Jewish community. The majority felt however that disagree-
ments are only natural and that they weren't bad enough to
cause a break-up of the organization.

The major trend in thinking was that the local Jewish
Community Council is a useless, ineffective organization.
Even those favoring a central agency are hesitant to call it
the Jewish Community Council because of the bitterness gener-
ated over it in the past years. The general feeling was that
the Council has been nothing more than a "debating society".
It has been ineffective as a coordinating central agency be-
cause of certain ideological problems and conflicts, vested
interests, and struggles for power. As a result it has little
influence and has headed for a speedy grave. Many of those
interviewed gave good reasons why they thought the Community
Council was all but defunct. Here are a list of the cogent
reasons offered:

1. The origins of peoples divide them.

2. There are too many opposing teams.

3. A community can't be governed on a "Kahal" basis.

4. The Jewish Welfare Fund won't be dictated to.

5. No need for a democratic body to disperse funds.

6. People won't delegate any power to it.

7. The community interests are submerged by vested interests.

8. At present there is an unfair, uneven representation.

9. The Jewish community can't be organized on a democratic
   basis. It was tried and failed. Results were bad.
10. The Zionist issue and Jewish education often split the
    Council.
11. It was nothing but a glorified debating society.

All in all there was voiced a feeling of accomplishment
in the work done in the community. As one put it, "There is
a great deal of self-satisfaction involved in community work;
this is especially true when something worthwhile is accom-
lished." Another stated: "I have a certain feeling of im-
portance being associated with distinguished, intelligent
men, people who sometimes serve under me. I feel I am part of
something important as the Jewish group is an excellent in-
strument for carrying out strong democratic feelings such as
de-segregation." Still another said that he got into com-
munity work because of the satisfaction derived. "There is
a selfish motive, in as much as one would feel that he has
missed out and then would feel bad." A woman leader in the
same way replied, "My participation in organizations satis-
fies a personal need of mine as well as giving me a feeling
of service. It sort of serves as a therapy for my personal-
ity." Yet another expressed his satisfaction in this way:
"I am proud of the fact that we have been able to eliminate
the adjective "Jew" from the list of disagreeable things in the
minds of the non-Jews. One gets satisfaction from doing these
things, not money."

Most of the leaders felt a humble sense of accomplishment such as the one who stated: "If I have been able to influence the community in any way to bring about its cohesiveness, then I would feel satisfied."

It was indicated that there was little room for real democracy in the selection of board members. The Jewish Center, it was felt, probably had the best cross-section representation in terms of religious affiliation and income levels. Most of the lay leaders are drafted or appointed to their positions by a nominating committee. They are chosen generally because of some ability or capacity to handle a particular job. This is especially true of fund-raising organizations. Past performance determines to a large extent whether someone will be elected to a particular board as well as the individual's personal wealth.

There were given a wide variety of possible qualifications that an ideal Jewish lay leader should possess. The following list will indicate the chief qualifications as stated by the interviewee:

1. Give more time than is expected.
2. Give more money than is expected.
3. Have an interest in others and in the betterment of facilities for people.
4. Have desire to serve.
5. Study Jewish History and Jewish Community Organization.
6. Be well-informed in general with good education.
7. Have liberal and democratic attitude.
8. Understand how to work with people and how to get things done.

9. Have integrity.

10. Be firm in loyalty to group one leads.

11. Have leisure time from personal affairs.

12. Be an extrovert.

13. Do not be irrascible.

14. Have good health.

15. Be recognized as honest in business.

16. Be fair in approach to all branches of Jews.

17. Be regarded as a "good" Jew.

18. Start young in leadership structure and at bottom.

19. Have awareness of problems and needs of the community.

20. Have genuine Jewish pride.

21. Have a sense of balance.

22. Listen more than speak.

23. Apply ideas to basic facts of life.

24. Have background in business or profession.

25. Have willingness to learn.

26. Be forceful amongst Jews.

27. Take interest in number of activities.

28. Put peoples talents where most useful.

29. Be a good judge of people.

30. Have genuine interest in minority groups.

A number of interviewees felt that deep religious convictions
were not necessary. According to them one's connection with
a congregation would be sufficient.

The greater part of the interviews reveal that those
in positions of leadership got there because they were willing
to give of their time and money. They were generally asked
to participate, and then they worked hard. After a while
their responsibilities increased as they became known and
their influence spread. In most cases the leaders accepted
their positions with enthusiasm and with very little reluc-
tance. Of those interviewed the majority said that they
had been active in the organization for quite a while before
taking a board position or becoming an officer. There was
some criticism,however, of present day leadership on the top
level. Many of these leaders, it was recounted, assumed top
leadership positions without ever having worked in the or-
ganization before. They had made their pile, so to speak,
and now jumped in and led others who had put in a good many
years of hard work already. A quote from one of the inter-
views makes this point bluntly: "I started out soliciting
fifty cent cards and then a dollar card and advanced up the
line the hard way. It is a different story today. People are
in the saddle of leadership because of a ten year change in
conditions. Big money is needed and men are put in as big
leaders who were not of the structure-school, that is, they
didn't start from scratch in organizational work. They made
their money first, then became active. I could tell you of
big leaders today who wouldn't lift a finger earlier. They
started at the top strictly because of their money. Many of
these men are not qualified, but they have the big money and

get the job. Now some of them do pretty good jobs once on
the job, but it took them a long time to become active. A man
should start on the bottom in community organizational work.
This will give the community better leadership in the long run."

Though wealth played a big part in qualifying one for
leadership, the interviews also brought out this point: "It
was my personal willingness to tackle all tasks that enabled
me to become a leader. It wasn't my great wealth. It is true
that most of the leaders are also the big givers, but this
wasn't true in my case. I burned the midnight oil for a long
time and put in a lot of hard work."

Along with this viewpoint was the other fact as mentioned
by the interviewees that anyone interested in doing Jewish
community work will find more than enough to do. That they
would assume top leadership positions however is another story.

The following are some of the things it was felt that
Jews have in common:

1. Race- foods, yiddish words, common heritage.

2. Religion.

3. Charitable heart.

4. Concern for their own people.

5. Physical characteristics.

6. Mass fear-defensiveness. As one put it: "Gentiles wonder
why we are so organized. The fear of anti-Semitism brought
on many of our organizations."

The major trend in so far as use by the leader's fam-
ily of the services of the organizations he serves indicated
that use is made. There were exceptions but these were in
the minority. There were even those who said that they would
even use the Jewish Family Service if need be, although they
would be a bit reluctant.

Most of the interviewees were aware of the general
goals and purposes of the organizations they worked for.
There was a strong tendency to identify these goals with
such words as democratic or American ideals. This was espe-
cially true of the members of the JewishCCommunity Relations
Council. It was felt by a number of leaders that the best
thing Jews could do in the future would be to foster demo-
cratic, American ideals. This too is the true function of the
Jew in America, it was felt. Jews are considered by many
of the local leaders as the "most active, liberal minority
group in America. The Jewish group takes action more quickly
than the Christian group who seem to exhibit lethargy at times."

In general it was felt that the future of the Jew in
America is rather secure. He will not give up his Jewishness,
but rather will "become more united in the future and this
will nip anti-semitism." There will be a greater awareness
of one's Jewishness, it was felt and this will lead to greater
responsibilities to the community. Along with this above trend
it was generally agreed that there will be a growing level of
Jewish support of community organizations. The only thing

which may slow up or bog down deep support is the constant
demand being made on the Jewish group by many diverse organi-
zations. No one likes to be hounded for money and support too
often and by too many different groups.

Not one of those interviewed felt he was putting more
time into non-Jewish activities than Jewish activities. Only
one who felt he had done his share of Jewish communal work
was now turning to a more active non-Jewish activity level.
he still continued to support the Jewish group however. Some
did indicate that they wish they could spend more time in
non-Jewish groups, but are not able to, There was mention
by a few leaders that certain Jews spend so much time with
non-Jewish organizations that they don't work for the Jewish
community. These were considered to be "glory-seeker".

The Look magazine article concerning the position of
the Jews in America today was generally liked by the inter-
viewees. It gave a fairly accurate account, they agreed.
The Life article, on the other hand, was bad, most thought.
It emphasized the bizarre in Jewry and certainly did not give
a majority characterization.

There was a general sensitivity to the potential danger
of anti-semitism in the United States. According to most of
the interviewees, Anti-semitism was not any greater now than
before, in fact, in recent years it has been more or less under
cover. Many leaders mention certain instances of it cropping
up in this community and the other sections of the country.
Most felt that Israel gives the Jews here a greater feeling of
self-respect. One said, "It is a great achievement. It stands

for something other than the things Jews are generally asso-
ciated with, like business and industry."

Many said that they felt bad when a Jew was convicted of
especially being a communist, theif, etc. Others felt ashamed
or embarrassed when a Jew was overly loud in public. Certain
Jews it was generally felt had something to do with the prob-
lem of anti-semitism because of their shady activities and
mannerisms.

Though anti-semitism wanes or is less apparent, most
of the lay leaders felt that a great need now establishes
itself to guard against its potential rising up. One of the
interviewees explained: "You know how divided the Jews were in
Germany; many of them even helped Hitler,and you know what hap-
pened. We can't let it happen here."

The new State of Israel has both helped fight anti-
semitism in America and create new seeds for it. It has united
Jews and torn down many of the old walls amongst them such
as the one between the German and East European groups. At
the same time Arabic propaganda has been more vicious. There
was also revealed in the interviews a counter feeling. Some
felt that too much money was devoted to fighting Anti-semitism.
The local defense agencies were considered to be doing an
adequate job in combatting anti-semitism, however.

Concerning anti-semitism then, in general it was felt
that a common fear of it either due to a knowledge of what
has happened or what could happen united Jews to fight it.

Certain personal factors were involved in qualifying persons for leadership positions. These are the most important ones:

1. Tremendous efficiency.

2. Charm.

3. Tact.

4. Intelligence.

5. In the case of women: children who are old enough so as not to require as much attention.

6. Interest in organization's purpose and what it does.

7. Economic stability giving person time required.

This last point is reflected in the interviews as an extremely important one. One interviewee remark: "It plays a big part in leadership. I have my own business so organized that I can give the necessary time." A woman leader commented: "One's financial status plays a greater part in determining the leadership on men's boards more than on women's. Wealth and influence are very important."

An interesting aspect of the interviews was the fact that the interviewees in toto agreed that non-Jews respect more the Jew who is a leader among the Jewish group and who has a pride in organized religion. A few quotes will suffice to give an idea of the general attitude toward this: "Non-Jews respect Jews more who are engaged in Jewish life. I receive many cards from Christian friends showing their respect."

"A non-Jew respects a Jewish leader more than an inactive
Jew. Christian and Jewish leaders often cross paths and a
non-Jew recognizes and values Jewish leaders. This often
influences our general well-being. I was put on the allo-
cations committee of the Community Chest-a little Jew-because
of my activities." "I am not sure what non-Jews feel about
Jewish leaders. I am not that much in touch with them. In
fact my wife says that she wishes we had more non-Jewish
friends. I do hope that non-Jews would respect us, but they
might say, 'It's just like them." "I was asked into a local
business group not because I was Jewish, but probably be-
cause they thought they could get something from me."
"Non-Jews respect him more. He gains more admiration for
his knowledge of causes. Ignorance of one's religion or
community brings no admiration. Some of my friends who are
ignorant of those matters are looked down upon by us and by
them."

Many factors were offerred as reasons why people
do not become more active in the Jewish community. Some
of the major ones follow:

1. Selfishness on part of would-be leader--he doesn't want
    to relinquish time.

2. Inability to the extent of incompetence in handling a
    job.

3. Lack of education and awareness of needs. Many leaders
    today who did'nt do a thing before have become aware of

community needs and feel a duty.

It was also indicated that leaders have to be hard skinned and able to resist abuse. This prevents some potentially good leaders from becoming active. Others stay away because they realize the more involved they become the more money and time they will have to contribute. A woman leader felt that the boards she belonged to were overly controlled by some of the older elements of the community who weren't willing to relinquish their authority.

There was the feeling expressed that more successful people in business must be brought into the leadership positions in the community. "If we get leaders of fine minds and character we will do all right." There is a leadership training program which most of the interviewees feel is doing a good job. There are those,however, who do not agree and say that the present leadership is not giving young leaders the proper attention. They should encourage them more and show them personal attention. This is especially true in fund-raising, one of the interviewees pointed out. There is "no new crop of good leadership coming up. There should be something like an understudy group formed where the new leaders could see first-hand how things are done."

It was stressed by some that people of means are usually chosen for leadership in fund-raising because of their ability to pledge a large amount. He sets the pace and is able

to talk to other wealthy elements who respect him as their
equal.

In conclusion, I will quote from one of the interviews
a thought of interest for those of us interested in the
destiny of the rabbinate: " A lot depends on the Rabbi coming
through. Scholarship is fine but we also need inspired
leadership. The Rabbi ought to be the outstanding leader
of the community and bring the diversities together."

APPENDIX A

AN EVALUATION OF HYPOTHESES IN LIGHT

OF ACTUAL INTERVIEWS

Status-seeking while playing a role in the motivation

structure of the Jewish lay leader is superceded by a strong

desire to serve or to gain k'dusha. A responsibility to the

community was felt by most of the leaders. In a sense a cer-

tain ritual of activity was deemed necessary by the leaders

in order to relieve themselves of felt duties.

A wide variety of religious attitudes were expressed.

Some of the interviewees exhibited strong religious convic-

tions with definite ideas as to the role of the Synogogue

and the Rabbi, while others showed a marked disinterest and

ignorance of the institutions of Judaism. Negative-feelings

characterized a number of the interviews. In this respect

the hypothesis that some Jewish lay leaders show evidence of

a negative-balance in regard to their Jewishness was born

out.

Wealth turned out to be the greatest single determinant

in the qualifying of a person for Jewish lay leadership al-

though the willingness to work of many seemed to tone down

the harsh implications of the above fact. In other words,

a certain willingness was necessary as well as wealth. People

of lesser means have become established leaders because of

this.

It was found that an effort was being made to have youth properly represented in Jewish communal leadership although much work still remained.

Also made clear was the hypothesis that some leaders in Jewish Communal Organization have no real information regarding Judaism or the history of the Jew. Most of the leaders, however, are interested in the survival of Judaism and Jews.

The hypothesis that some Jewish lay leaders have no clearly defined goals turned out to be not altogether correct. Most of those interviewed had some idea as to the goals of the organizations they served.

It was borne out that some leaders do not seek leadership initially, but are drawn into it by virtue of their wealth, social prominence or by some kind of accidental involvement. This is true of those leaders who shunned communal work in the past but have become active after making their pile, so to speak.

In most cases the hypothesis that one may be a leader and possibly be indifferent or even opposed to the avowed purposes of the institutions he heads was not completely true. Many of the interviewees opposed certain of the purposes of their organizations, but they were not indifferent to them.

The interviews do not bear out the contention that many Jewish lay leaders do not represent the best possible leadership for Jewish communal affairs, although there are implications to this effect in them.

The interviews would tend to bear out the hypothesis that a Jewish lay leader rises to a high position in the class structure of the general community by virtue of his being or having become an important Jew. At least most of the leaders felt that non-Jews respect more the Jewish leader.

One thing we established was that we see no consistent pattern of traits which could characterize all Jewish lay leaders. It was true that the socio-economic status background of the leader enabled him to ascend the ladder of leadership earlier. It was also quite evident that the hypothesis rang true in so far as there seemed to be an accompanying rise in the assumption of leadership with the rise on the scale of economic status.

There was little evidence to show that a change in motivation takes place in office, or that Jewish lay leaders in this community are motivated primarily by a religious concern.

It is interesting to note that most of the interviewees found their formal Jewish education lacking and surface in nature. It had little influence upon them nor do they remember a great deal about it.

APPENDIX B

IMPLICATIONS FOR RABBI, SYNOGOGUE

AND AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

There is reflected in the interviews with local
Jewish lay leaders certain attitudes toward the Rabbi, the
Synogogue and the American Jewish Community. Many of these
attitudes have been stated already. In drawing this thesis
to a close let us venture an overall impression as to the
meaning of all these attitudes.

The Rabbi is not considered by the majority of Jewish
lay leaders as someone who is overly involved in community
affairs outside the Synogogue. There is the feeling or un-
dercurrent that the Rabbi should take a more active part and
offer spiritual leadership in the greater Jewish community
organization. One gets the impression also that the Rabbi
is wanted on a more personal level and not only at the time
of funerals.

The Synogogue it appears will continue to take on more
of the social activities of the community and will compete
with other organizations for the loyalty and participation
of a good segment of the Jewish population. There will be
an ever-increasing Synogogue membership with Jews becoming
more aware of their Jewishness and their religion.

The American Jewish Community is seen to be a more
closer knit community than ever before. World conditions
and the fear of anti-semitism will be strong factors in

determining the unity of the American Jewish group and
the effectiveness of Jewish Community Organization on all
levels.

Notes To Chapter I

1. See Sachar, <u>History Of The Jews</u>. p. 251.
2. Ibid. In part quoted from Dubnow, V. I., p. 113.
3. See article in <u>Jewish Encyclopedia</u> entitled "Parnas".
   p. 541.
4. Ibid. above.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.

Notes To Chapter II

9. See Shartle and R. M. Stogdill, <u>Studies in Naval Lead-</u>
   <u>ership</u>. Columbus, 1952.
10. Redl, "Group Emotion and Leadership" (Psychiatry V).
    1942, pp. 573-596.
11. See Moreno's <u>Who Shall Survive?</u> Washington, D. C. Nerv-
    ous and Mental Distributing Publishing Company, 1934.
12. Bales, " The Equilibrium Problem in Small Groups " (<u>Work-</u>
    <u>ing Papers in the Theory of Action</u>). Glencoe, Illinois,
    The Free Press, 1953, pp. 111-161.
13. Ibid. above.
14. Seeman and Morris, <u>A Status Factor Approach To Leader-</u>
    <u>ship</u>. Columbus, 1950.
15. See Pigors', <u>Leadership or Domination</u>. Boston, Houghton-
    Mifflin, 1935.
16. C. A. Gibb, "The Principles and Traits of Leadership"
    (J. Abn. Soc. Psychol.). 1947, <u>42</u>, pp. 267-284.
17. In an article by R. B. Cattell, "New Concepts for meas-
    uring leadership in terms of group syntality" (Human
    Relations IV). 1951, pp. 161-184.
18. See J. K. Hemphil, <u>Theory of Leadership</u>. O. S. U.
    Personal Research Board, 1952.
19. Carter, " Military Leadership," (Military Review XXXII).
    1952, pp. 14-18.
20. Hemphil, above.
21. Stogdill, " Leadership Membership and Organization "
    (Psychological Bulletin XLVII). 1950, pp. 1-14.
22. See Krech and Crutchfield, <u>Theory and Problems of So-</u>
    <u>cial Psychology</u>. New York, McGraw Hill, 1948.
23. Stogdill, " Personal Factors associated with leadership"
    (J. Psychology XXV). 1948, pp. 35-71.
24. See George C. Homans, <u>The Human Group</u>. New York, Har-
    court Brace and Company, 1950.
25. William Foot Whyte, " Informal Leadership and Group
    Structure " (In <u>Studies of Leadership</u>, ed. by Gouldner).
    New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950, p. 108.

26. See article in <u>Jewish Encyclopedia</u>, " Leadership",
    by Richard Schmidt, p. 285.
27. Alvin W. Gouldner, ed. <u>Studies In Leadership</u>. New
    York, Harper and Brothers, 1950, p. 11.
28. See Lee, " Power Seekers " (In Gouldner's <u>Studies In</u>
    <u>Leadership</u>). New York, 1950, pp. 667-678.
29. Erich Fromm, <u>Escape From Freedom</u>. New York, Rinehart,
    1941.
30. Ibid.
31. Frank, <u>Society As The Patient</u>. See in chapter entitled
    " Dilemna of Leadership " on page 308.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Cattell and Stice, <u>The Psychodynamics of Small Groups</u>.
    Urbana, Univ. Of Illinois, 1953.
35. Gibb, " Leadership " (In <u>Handbook of Social Psychology</u>
    ed. by Lindzey II). Cambridge, Addison-Wesley, 1954,
    pp. 877-920.

Notes To Chapter III

36. Mordecai Kaplan, <u>Future of the American Jew</u>. New
    York, MacMillan, 1948, p.
37. Abraham A. Newman, " The Evolving American Jewish
    Community " (The Jewish Social Service Quarterly XXXI).
    1954, p. 3.
38. Karpf, <u>Jewish Community Organization in the U. S.</u>
    New York, 1938, pp. 154-155.
39. See article in J.S.S. Q. " Approaches To Research in
    Jewish Community Organization ", Sept. 1952 by Harry
    L. Lurie.
40. In the <u>Pilot Studies in Jewish Community Organization</u>
    which is a summary put out by the Jewish Council
    of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1955, p. 14.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. Karpf, p. 154.
44. Ibid., p. 166.
45. Ibid., p. 168.
46. See Oscar Janowsky, <u>The JWB Survey</u>. New York, The
    Dial Press, 1948.
47. Ibid. above.
48. Albert Gordon's <u>Jews In Transition</u>. p. 22.
49. Miller, " The Jewish Leadership of Lakeport " (In
    Gouldner's <u>Studies In Leadership</u>). pp. 195-227.
50. Lewin, <u>Resolving Social Conflicts</u>. New York, Harper
    and Brothers, 1948.
51. Karpf, p. 49.
52. Lewin, above.

53. Ibid.
54. Lipset, " Jewish Sociologists and Sociologists of the Jews " (In JSS, July, XVII). 1955, pp. 177-179.
55. Miller, " Changing Patterns of Leadership in the Jewish Community " (JSS, as above). pp. 179-183.
56. Duker, above under title of " Historical and Sociological Factors in Jewish Communal Leadership ", pp. 183-193.
57. Lurie, same as above, " Motivations and Social Change ", pp. 193-195.
58. Franck, same as above, " Oversimplification of Motivation ", pp. 195-200.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asch, S. E. Social Psychology. New York, Prentice Hall, 1952.

Bales, R. F. "The Equilibrium Problem in Small Groups" (Working Papers in the Theory of Action). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953, pp. 111-161.

Carter, J. H. "Military Leadership" (Military Review XXXII). 1952, pp. 14-18.

Carter, L. "Leadership and Small Group Behavior" (Sherif and Wilson, Group Relations at the Crossroads). New York, Harper, 1953.

Cattell, R. B. "New Concepts For Measuring Leadership in Terms of Group Syntality" (Human Relations IV). 1951, pp. 161-184.

Cattell, R. B. and Stice, G. F. The Psychodynamics of Small Groups. Urbana, University of Illinois, 1953.

Duker, A. G. "Historical and Sociological Factors in Jewish Communal Leadership" (Jewish Social Studies XVII). 1955, pp. 183-193.

Durham, Arthur. "What Is The Job of The Community Organization Worker?" (Proceedings of National Conference of Social Work). 1948.

Franck, Isaac. "Oversimplification of Motivations" (JSS XVII). July, 1955, pp. 195-200.

Frank, L. K. "Dilemma of Leadership" (Society As The Patient). p. 308.

Freud, S. Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego. London, International Psychoanalytic Library, 1922.

Fromm, E. Escape From Freedom. New York, Rinehart, 1941.

Gibb, C. A. "Leadership" (Handbook of Social Psychology II). Cambridge, Addison-Wesley, 1954, pp. 877-920.

Gibb, C. A. "The Principles and Traits of Leadership" (Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology XLII). 1947, pp. 267-284.

Gordon, Albert. <u>Jews In Transition</u>. New York, Rinehart, 1948, p. 22.

Gouldner, A. W. Editor, <u>Studies In Leadership</u>. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Hemphill, J. K. "Theory of Leadership" (Unpublished Staff Report). Ohio State University, 1952.

Homans, George C. <u>The Human Group</u>. New York, Harcourt Brace and Company, 1950.

Janowsky, Oscar. <u>The Jewish Welfare Board Survey</u>. New York, The Dial Press, 1948.

Kaplan, Mordecai. <u>The Future of the American Jew</u>. New York, Macmillan Company, 1948.

Karpf, Maurice J. <u>Jewish Community Organization In The U.S.</u> New York, Block Publishing Company, 1938.

Krech and Crutchfield. <u>Theory and Problems of Social Psychology</u>. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1948.

Lee, A. "Power-Seekers" (In Gouldner's Studies In Leadership). New York, Harper, 1950, pp. 667-678.

Lewin, K. "Field Theory and Experiment in Social Psychology: Concepts and Methods" (American Journal Sociology XLIV). 1939, pp. 868-896.

Lewin, K. "Group Decision and Social Change" (Newcomb and Hartley, Readings in Social Psychology). New York, Holt, 1947, pp. 330-344.

Lewin, K. <u>Resolving Social Conflicts</u>. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Lipset, Seymour M. "Motivations and Social Change" (JSS XVII). July, 1955, pp. 177-179.

Lurie, H. L. "Approaches To Research In Jewish Community Organization" (JSSQ). September, 1952.

Lurie, H. L. "Jewish Sociologists and Sociologists of the Jews" (JSS, XVII). July, L(55.

Miller, Norman. "The Jewish Leadership of Lakeport" (Gouldner, Studies In Leadership). New York, 1950, pp. 195-227.

Miller, Norman. "Changing Patterns of Leadership in the Jewish Community" (JSS XVII). July, 1955, pp. 179-183.

Moreno, J. L. Who Shall Survive? Washington D. C., Nervous and Mental Distributing Publishing Company, 1934.

Neuman, Abraham A. "The Evolving American Jewish Community" (JSS XXXI). 1954, p. 3.

"Parnas" (Jewish Encyclopaedia). p. 541.

Pigors, P. Leadership or Domination. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1935.

Proskauer, Joseph M. A Segment of My Times. New York, Farrar, Straus and Company, 1950.

Redl, F. "Group Emotion and Leadership" (Psychiatry V). 1942, pp. 573-596.

Reisman, David. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven, Yale University, Press, 1952.

Reisman, D. Faces In The Crowd. As Above.

Sachar, Abraham. A History of the Jews.

Schmidt, Richard. "Leadership" (Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences). p. 285.

Seeman and Morris. A Status Factor Approach To Leadership. Columbus, Ohio State Univ. Research Foundation, 1950.

Shartle, C. L. and Stogdill, R. M. Studies in Naval Leadership. Columbus, OSU Research Foundation, 1952.

Sklare, Marshall. Conservative Judaism. 1955.

Solomon, Hannah. Fabric of My Life. New York, Block, 1946.

Stogdill, R. M. "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership" (Journal of Psychology XXV). 1948, pp. 35-71.

Stogdill, R. M. "Leadership Membership and Organization" (Psychological Bulletin XLVII). 1950, pp. 1-14.

Summary Report, Pilot Studies in Jewish Community Organization. Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1955.

Thelen, Herbert. Dynamics of Groups at Work. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1954.

Whyte, W. F. "Informal Leadership and Group Structure" (Gouldner, Studies In Leadership). New York, Harper, 1950, p. 108.

Zborowski, Mark and Herzog, Elizabeth. Life Is With People. New York, Internationsl University Press, 1952.

Zeitlin, Joseph. Disciples of the Wise.