



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

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

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Cincinnati
March 16, 1966

Report on the Rabbinical Thesis
Submitted by
Kenneth D. Roseman
Entitled
"Power in a Mid-West Jewish Community"

What Mr. Roseman has actually accomplished in his thesis is a work which may be described unhesitatingly as one of pioneering character. He has subjected our Cincinnati Jewish community to a painstaking analysis in order to determine the forces which motivate and control all its important communal activities and institutions -- the Jewish Welfare Fund, for instance.

It is obvious that a great deal of time has been spent on this task, but even more impressive is the fact that Mr. Roseman worked scientifically, and methodologically, in the best traditions of historical and sociological research. He has come to some very interesting conclusions and has produced a truly original work of great merit.

I am very pleased to recommend wholeheartedly the acceptance of this thesis.

Jacob R. Marcus
Referee

POWER IN A
MID-WEST JEWISH COMMUNITY

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters and Ordination
by

Kenneth D. Roseman

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
February, 1966

Referees

Dr. Jacob R. Marcus

Dr. Robert Katz

DIGEST

1. This thesis attempts to describe the power structure of the contemporary Cincinnati Jewish community.

2. "Jewish community" is defined as a combination of two shared values (Jewish survival and communal services) and the institutions which attempt to secure them. Two central organizations (Associated Jewish Agencies and Jewish Welfare Fund) coordinate most of the communal activities. "Power" is defined as "the acts of men going about the business of moving other men to act...." "Power structure" is those individuals who have a role in determining community policies.

3. The methodology used was Hunter's reputational-survey method, although case-study techniques were also incorporated.

4. The power structure is largely composed of Reform Jewish men who are wealthy, long-time residents of Cincinnati, and marginally Jewish. There are some exceptions. No one man controls the Jewish community, but power is increasingly centralized in the two central agencies and the Coordinating Committee of the AJA-JWF.

5. Entrance into the power structure is contingent upon success in one's job and in community work, generosity

with one's time and money, and personal factors. The latter are often most important.

6. The power structure places great emphasis on stability and harmonious operation in the Jewish community.

7. Opposition to the power structure is never totally effective. Organized, group efforts may, however, bring about compromises.

8. Professional agency executives and Orthodox Jewish laymen are gaining in power. The rabbis appear to be losing power.

9. The major problems facing the Jewish community are: fund-raising, the merger of the AJA and the JWF, and the community-supported Jewish education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my most heartfelt gratitude to a number of persons who have been sources of considerable assistance and encouragement to me during the research and writing of this thesis. There are, of course, the twenty-three interviewees, whose names cannot be revealed, but without whose cooperation and generous help this paper could never have been completed. Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus and Dr. Robert Katz have been advisers, guiders, critics, and, more than anything else, good and candid friends throughout the months during which I worked on the thesis. They have my most warm and sincere thanks. Finally, to my wife, Helen, who put up with my prolonged absences during the interviewing process and with my incessant pounding on the typewriter during the later stages of composition, my most affectionate appreciation. This, the first concrete production of my rabbinate, is dedicated to her.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Methodology.....	13
III.	A Brief History of the Cincinnati Jewish Community.....	20
IV.	The Men of the Power Structure.....	27
	The Laymen	
	The Professional Agency Executives	
	The Rabbis	
	The Laymen of the Orthodox Community	
V.	Current Problems in the Cincinnati Jewish Community.....	72
	Fund-raising	
	The Proposed Merger of the AJA and JWF	
	The Problem of Community-Supported Jewish Education	
VI.	Conclusion.....	101

APPENDICES

I.	Tentative Hypotheses and Implications.....	103
II.	Questionnaire.....	108
III.	Initial Letter to Interviewees.....	112
IV.	Transcriptions of Interviews.....	113
V.	Letter of Appreciation.....	114
VI.	Campaign Report-Analysis of Gifts.....	115
VII.	Distribution of Funds by the Jewish Welfare Fund.....	116

VIII. Summary of Allocations.....120

Footnotes.....126

Bibliography.....129

INTRODUCTION

The purpose for which this thesis is being written is to determine if there exists in the Cincinnati Jewish community what is known as a power structure. Presuming that a power structure can be located, we shall want to know the answers to some of the following questions: Who is included in it and excluded from it, and on the basis of what criteria? What are the personal characteristics of the members? How does it operate in the community? What are its goals, achievements, and problems? We shall also want to analyze a few of the major issues of the Jewish community so that we may determine how the power structure affects specific community problems.

In the course of this survey, we shall attempt to present a few suggestions as to the future of the Jewish community of Cincinnati. These proposals may, perhaps, lead to a more efficient use of the human and financial resources of the Jewish community, as well as aid in solving some of the knotty problems which are currently before the community's leadership.

No study can pretend to be comprehensive, when it is dealing with a community of twenty-seven thousand individuals. This study is no exception to that rule. We shall choose to limit it in many crucial respects,

although we recognize that, by so doing, we may somewhat bias the results of our investigation. We shall make no attempt to analyze Jewish relations with and influence on the general Cincinnati community. To move into such a study would require staff and resources far more extensive than those at our disposal, and the results would not, we believe, measurably alter the conclusions which we shall draw in this paper. Therefore, this paper will be limited to a study of the Jewish community in its most parochial sense. A second limitation which we have imposed on ourselves is that we made no attempt to interview every leader or power figure in the Jewish community. Rather, we felt that our results would be valid and useful if we interviewed only a representative cross-section of the community's leaders. Finally, there has been no attempt in this paper to investigate the power structures of past generations in Cincinnati, except insofar as historical information is necessary for a proper understanding of the contemporary situation. We shall attempt to present a survey of only the modern Cincinnati Jewish community.

There are some terms which will be used frequently in the course of the paper and which call for definition at an early stage. These terms are "Jewish community," "power," and "power structure."

One is hesitant to define "Jewish community" in terms of any agreed-upon or shared values, as even the most

casual observer will note that the Cincinnati Jews are widely split on many issues. There are profound ideological, social, economic, and ethnic splits within the Jewish population of Cincinnati which mitigate against defining the term in this manner. Whatever kinship, religious, cultural, or other ties unite the community, they are certainly highly attenuated. There are, however, two generally-shared convictions which form the basis for the concept of the "Jewish community" in any ideological sense. There exists, as it were, a consensus on these two points. In the first place, all Jews share the conviction that Jews must survive as a distinct group. Some will place greater emphasis on the religious aspects of Jewish survival; others will stress cultural forms; still others will hold that the philanthropic aspects of Judaism are most important. Regardless of their differences, however, they will all agree that Jews must survive. A second area of agreement is that, given the necessity of Jewish survival, Jews must be provided with certain social, health, recreational, and religious services by sectarian organizations. There are, to be sure, those who would differ with this last point in limited areas, but there is a general agreement that communal services are needed.

Beyond this minimalistic definition of "Jewish community," there is another manner in which we may define the term "Jewish community." We refer to the institutional

structure which forms the pragmatic and functional basis for a concept of the Jewish community. It constitutes the only formally structured Jewish community in Cincinnati. By this we mean that the Associated Jewish Agencies and the Jewish Welfare Fund operate as if there existed a Jewish community. The leadership, too, presumes that such a pragmatic, functioning community exists; it will be within this structure and based on the consensus of values previously mentioned that any policy and financial decisions will be determined.

We may illustrate this latter point by a case history. Sheltering Oaks Hospital for rehabilitative care was operated under the auspices of the ^{Federation of Jewish Agencies} JWF-AJA at a considerable yearly deficit. To alleviate the situation, it was proposed in 1965 that Sheltering Oaks be transferred to the Jewish Hospital, which is immediately adjacent to it and more able to manage it within the budget. ^{Some Two or three} community leaders, however, demanded that the Jewish Hospital pay for Sheltering Oaks, since it belonged to the Jewish community at large and was being transferred to a private institution. The purchase price was to be set at about \$750,000. They further claimed that, by adding this sum to the general JWF treasury, many unrelated community problems could be solved or eased. On the other hand, there were leaders in the community who held that, if the Jewish Hospital would pay this sum to the JWF-AJA, it would, in turn, be forced to solicit a

similar amount of money from Cincinnati Jewry to replenish its treasury. But, since there is assumed to be a static sum of money available for contributions to communal enterprises, raising \$750,000 for the Jewish Hospital would reduce by a like amount contributions to other campaigns, and, in particular, to the JWF drive. Based on this reasoning, the second group of leaders prevailed, and Sheltering Oaks Hospital became a part of the Jewish Hospital without payment. The JWF is still, in principle, committed to reimburse the Jewish Hospital for any deficit which might be incurred by this facility.

What is important to notice is that both sides to this controversy assumed that there exists a de facto Jewish community in Cincinnati. In the first instance, the men who insisted that the Jewish Hospital pay for Sheltering Oaks Hospital thought of the community in terms of a corporate body of individuals who can own property and operate institutions. Private organizations, such as the Jewish Hospital, were not included in the community structure. In the second instance, the leadership considered the community from a total point of view, insisting that all elements of Jewish life in Cincinnati are integrally connected. Regardless of their point of view, however, the leadership was unified in their presumption that a community of institutions and individuals exists.

We shall follow, in this thesis, the assumption made by the leadership. Therefore, when we speak of the

"Jewish community," we shall mean the total Jewish population of Cincinnati and the organizational and institutional structure, as well as the consensus of shared values upon which the entire organization must ultimately rest.

We are convinced that, within this Jewish community, there is no definition of the overall purpose of the Jewish community other than the two shared values of survival and service which we have already mentioned. A typical expression of the position held by the leaders of the power structure is this statement: "One doesn't think up purposes for the Jewish community. Rather, purposes are determined by needs."¹

There are those, however, who express a different view. They define the goals of the Jewish community in terms of certain specific values, such as a knowledge of Jewish tradition, participation in religious activities, or working for social welfare causes. A moderate statement which combines both of these points of view is found in the report of the Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?"

On the basis of these group deliberations a Committee consensus was reached on the rationale for Jewish communal services. It must be understood that while the four principles which comprise the rationale are each applicable to every Jewish agency and institution, the orientation of the agency or institution determines the means by which and the degree to which these principles are followed.

- I. Jewish Community services should meet the felt needs of the Jewish Community.

- II. Jewish Community services should serve to reinforce and preserve the Jewish Community.
- III. Jewish Community agencies should have a responsibility for service to the total Community.
- IV. Jewish agencies should reflect the ideals of social justice which is a major part of the Jewish heritage.²

The second term which must be defined is "power." The concept of "power" carries with it many diverse connotations. There often appears in works dealing with this subject an aura of the surreptitious and mysterious, which seems to attract individuals to the study in the lurid hope of uncovering a clandestine conspiracy. In this study, we shall endeavor to avoid the pitfalls of such tendencies. We shall consider the concept of power morally neutral in all respects, that is to say, power per se will be considered neither bad nor good. It is only with reference to specific applications of power that moral judgment may be justified, although we shall endeavor in this thesis to avoid even this form of criticism.

One may, of course, advance many definitions of the concept of "power." We have chosen to accept Hunter's statement as most functional and inclusive. He states: "Power is a word that will be used to describe the acts of men going about the business of moving other men to act in relation to themselves or in relation to organic or inorganic things."³

It will be noted that there are three necessary elements in this definition. First, we must realize that power requires participation and involvement in community actions. Thus, individuals who possess the potential for power may choose never to realize this power by avoiding manifest behavior in power situations. A second consideration is that power is never exercised in a vacuum, but always in relation to a specific issue or object. Finally, we shall note that power inheres in men, although it may be manifested through institutions or other channels. Consequently, if we are to discover the elements of power in a community, we must understand how men act in specific situations.

Not only must we ascertain the location of power in the community, but we must also describe it according to the type of power which is manifested.

Three major forms of power may be distinguished in terms of the type of influence brought to bear upon the subordinated individual. The power-holder exercises force when he influences behavior by a physical manipulation of the subordinated individual (assault, confinement, etc.); domination when he influences behavior by making explicit to others what he wants them to do (command, request, etc.); and manipulation when he influences the behavior of others without making explicit the behavior which he thereby wants them to perform.⁴

In a voluntaristic community, such as the Cincinnati

Jewish community is, power is generally exercised by domination or manipulation, and usually by a combination of the two. Threats of coercion or force, although they may in some attenuated manner underlie both dominance and manipulation, are rarely overtly attempted as means for influence over behavior. To anticipate a later discussion, we shall note that where force has been proposed, it has almost always been frustrated.

The unavailability of coercion as a method for accomplishing communal goals has, as we shall see, important consequences for both the composition and operation of the power structure of the Jewish community.

We would also note that, although the total community is never called upon to approve or reject the policies of the power structure, there are ways in which it acts as a check against the development of unlimited power. In a voluntaristic community, there is no taxing power; all funds must come from the citizens by way of donation. Consequently, there is always the threat, at times quite explicit, that contributions will be withdrawn if a certain policy is not followed. This fact is, in our opinion, ^{often} ~~solely~~ responsible for the large measure of compromise in the Jewish community. Only under extreme circumstances is

It must, however, be borne in mind that there are frequent compromises in which honest agreement in a moderate position is reached without pressures or threats.

the risk of antagonizing large contributors or large segments of the population assumed. Therefore, in this regard, we may say that vox populi, vox dei - at least, as we shall later see, the voice of some of the people!

It will be helpful at this point if we distinguish between "power" and some other concepts with which it is frequently confused.

Most men are encouraged to assume that, in general, the most powerful and the wealthiest are also the most knowledgeable or, as they might say, the smartest.... The powerful and the wealthy must be the men of most knowledge; otherwise how could they be where they are? But to say that those who succeed to power must be "smart," is to say that power is knowledge. To say that those who succeed to wealth must be smart, is to say that wealth is knowledge.

These assumptions do reveal something that is true: that ordinary men, even today, are prone to explain and to justify power and wealth in terms of knowledge or ability. Such assumptions also reveal something of what has happened to the kind of experience that knowledge has come to be. Knowledge is no longer widely felt as an ideal; it is seen as an instrument.⁵

If power is not knowledge and if it is not wealth, neither is it a number of other things. We agree with Bierstedt that,

Social power has variously been identified with prestige, with influence, with eminence, with competence or ability, with knowledge (Bacon), with dominance, with rights, with force, and with authority....Prestige would seem to be a consequence of power rather than a determinant of it or a necessary component of it....

Similar observations may be made about the relations

of knowledge, skill, competence, ability, and eminence to power. They are all components of, sources of, or synonyms of prestige, but they may be quite unaccompanied by power. When power does accompany them the association is incidental rather than necessary.⁶

Finally, we shall want to discuss the term "power structure." It is obvious to even the most casual observer that, within any community, there is a hierarchy of authority and power. At the very lowest level, there are those individuals who are charged with the execution of policy, but who are never consulted about its formulation. These persons cannot legitimately be included in the power structure of a community. Above this level, there are various other strata in which individuals exercise more or less influence on the development of community policy. These individuals constitute the power structure. Hunter has written, "...it is obvious that a social order, or a system, must be maintained....Broadly speaking, the maintenance of this order falls to the lot of almost every man in the community, but the establishment of changes in the old order falls to the lot of relatively few."⁷ This small group of men in a community from which emanate the basic policy orientations and decisions about how the community is to operate stands at the top of the power structure. These men are usually, although not necessarily, placed

at the top of the community's organizational structure.

If we may, then, be precise, we shall mean by the term "power structure" all the individuals and institutions in a community which play a role in the determination of community policy. As we stated before, the power structure is stratified, so that individuals will be found to have more or less power, depending on a number of factors.

As a general rule, the power structure has achieved success if "...it utilized commonly available resources at a much greater rate and with considerably more skill than its opponents."⁸ We shall have later occasion to notice the particular factors and resources which have been strategically used by the power structure of the Cincinnati Jewish community. We shall also notice that there is some opposition to the power structure.

II

METHODOLOGY

In any survey of this sort, it is crucial to be explicit about the methodology used, as it may in some ways produce a bias in the results.

We began our research with a period of preliminary reading, with a concentration of interest on studies of the power structures of other cities. The list of books, periodicals, and reports consulted is to be found in the Bibliography at the end of the thesis.

As the reading progressed, we developed a number of tentative hypotheses and implications deriving from them. To a large extent, these were based on two sources: the readings and preliminary discussions about the Cincinnati Jewish community with a number of interested and informed individuals. These hypotheses were divided into three major areas: (1) Personal Characteristics of Power Structure Personnel; Recruitment, Advancement, and Replacement of Power Structure Personnel; (2) The Unity or Disunity of the Power Structure; and (3) Personal Attitudes of Power Structure Personnel. Questions were formulated to test these hypotheses. It was, of course, recognized that there would be three potential results. The hypothesis could, in

the first place, be confirmed. Or, it could be rejected. The third alternative was that entirely new areas of inquiry could be uncovered which had not been foreseen at the stage of formulating the hypotheses. All three possibilities did, in fact, occur.

The list of tentative hypotheses and implications is found in Appendix I. The questionnaire designed to test them constitutes Appendix II.

At the same time as we were formulating the hypotheses and the questionnaire, we attempted to determine who should be interviewed. Two possible methods of determining leadership presented themselves for consideration.

The first was the "Case-Study Method." In this approach, one isolates the major issues and conflicts within the community. Leadership is determined by discovering the role played by different individuals in the resolution of these problems. This technique has the advantage that it does not operate with a basic presumption that a unified power structure exists. There are, however, several disadvantages. The first and major drawback to such an approach is that the analysis of each issue in a community demands an extensive research staff. Professor Aaron Wildavsky, in his study of Oberlin, Ohio, utilized many students in the Department of Government to gather the basic

information. Neither the staff nor the time was available in the writing of this paper. There is a second problem. It is questionable whether one could isolate a sufficient number of recent issues in the Jewish community to provide adequate data for a case-study approach. Finally, it is problematic in a voluntaristic community, such as we are studying, whether one could discover beyond doubt the actual means by which specific issues were resolved. This is always much easier to do in a political community, where the resolution of a communal issue is by the ballot and where open methods of propagandizing are used. Nevertheless, we are sufficiently impressed by this method that, where case histories can be discovered, it will be used to supplement the method we eventually chose.

This alternative method is Hunter's "Reputational Method." In this technique, a number of supposedly-knowledgeable respondents are asked to indicate the leaders of the community. Their responses are cross-checked, analyzed, and a group of alleged leaders is derived. The patent disadvantages of the system are several. In the first place, one begins with the presumption that there is a power structure and that it can be isolated. Second, we know that reputations may be misleading. Third, not every respondent

uses the same criteria for selecting leaders. Thus, there are numerous opportunities for the injection of bias into the selection of leaders to be interviewed.

Nevertheless, we selected this method for our study. It appeared that it would provide a reasonable and practical way of selecting interviewees without an extensive staff and under certain unavoidable time limitations. Recognizing that there was opportunity for bias in the selection, we made attempts to compensate for it. We selected twelve respondents for the reputational survey, representing virtually all elements of the Jewish community. This, we felt, would give ample opportunity for the mention of every powerful individual in the Jewish community. It still remained for the interviewer to rank the names as to their probable position within the power hierarchy. This was done largely on the basis of the number of times a person's name was mentioned and the comments made about him at these preliminary interviews. Thus, we arrived at a list of eighteen individuals. These represented, generally, the top and second level of the power structure. Some segments of the Jewish community were not adequately represented in this cross-section, as it emphasized laymen to the exclusion of rabbis and professional agency executives. To include these groups, which have an

obvious relationship to the power structure, we added six names to the list.

The result was that we settled on a group of twenty-four individuals as a cross-section of the Jewish community leadership and power structure. They represented the following sub-groups:

- (1) Those considered in top power positions at the present time - 11 (one refused to meet with the interviewer).
- (2) Younger men aspiring to top power positions - 5.
- (3) Men who have been rejected from top power positions - 3.
- (4) Professional Jewish agency executives and rabbis - 5.

As a qualifying remark, we must here signify our agreement with Hunter's statement that,

Identifying leaders involved the construction of static classifications. No person or group is ever completely static. Their social positions change, but they tend to change slowly in most cases. Thus, the facts brought out here in relation to the power status of various persons is a static picture. It does not, and is not intended to give, a view of these persons in dynamic relation to each other.⁹

The initial contact with potential interviewees was made by a letter, the form of which is reproduced in

Appendix III. A telephone call was then used to make a definite appointment. We wish to note with pleasure that, in all the contacts which we made with various men in the community, there was only one instance in which an individual refused to cooperate. Regarding this individual, who would have been the twenty-fourth interviewee, more will be said later. Suffice it to say, the rest of the interviewees were extremely cooperative and helpful.

We interviewed each of these men individually, the length of the interviews varying between an hour and four hours. The questionnaire formulated on the basis of the tentative hypotheses was used as the specific guide for the questioning in ten interviews. In all the other interviews, the procedure was more unstructured, although many of the questionnaire's questions were discussed. In every case, the interviewer attempted to be flexible, so that any new and profitable directions or material could be pursued.

The transcriptions of the interviews have been bound separately as Appendix IV. Because of the guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity given to the interviewees, one copy of the transcriptions has been placed in the American Jewish Archives, on the campus of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio, for

"RESTRICTED USE ONLY." Permission for its use may be secured from the Director of the American Jewish Archives or from the author of this thesis. Quotations in the body of the thesis will be footnoted to refer to this Appendix, by page, if they are taken from the text of the interviews. The reader is respectfully requested to understand that the exact source of much of the material in the thesis cannot be divulged.

For the purposes of this thesis, which is a rather general treatment of the subject, we have not deemed it necessary to use a code or series of symbols to identify the interviewees. It is felt that the information and insights can be conveyed without any reference to individuals.

Following each interview, a letter of appreciation was sent. The form of this letter is duplicated in Appendix V.

III

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CINCINNATI JEWISH COMMUNITY

The first known Jews arrived in Cincinnati in 1817. As were most of those who followed them for the rest of the century, these first immigrants were German, Ashkenazic Jews. Starting out as peddlers, craftsmen, and small shop owners, their economic fortunes improved rapidly, so that, by the 1840's, a number of families had entered certain manufacturing fields, especially clothing.

With the improved economic conditions came the accumulation of surplus capital funds. Within a very few years, prosperous Jewish merchants extended their interests to the area of banking. It was in Cincinnati during the 1840's that the Kuhn family began what was eventually to become Kuhn, Loeb, and Company, the greatest financial and banking empire ever established by American Jews.

As the economic fortunes of Cincinnati Jews flourished, so did their social status. As early as 1836, when the first synagogue was consecrated, "...the crowd of our Christian friends was so great that we could not admit them all. We therefore selected the clergy and the families of those gentlemen who so liberally had given donations toward the

building."¹⁰ And, somewhat later in the century, a number of Jews were numbered among the founders of the Queen City Club, known then and today for its high social status.

The Jewish population of Cincinnati grew slowly, so that, by the 1880's, it numbered no more than six thousand persons. The ethnic composition of this group had changed but very little from that of the original Jewish settlers; Cincinnati was still a "German" town. Its Jews were wealthy and secure. They had found a good life in this city and were determined to keep it that way.

Although Cincinnati Jewry was distinguished by its relatively prosperous situation, indigents and travellers were not uncommon. A historical survey presented by the United Jewish Social Agencies in 1928 began with these words:

Charitable work was begun by the Jews of Cincinnati in the dim, dark days which we are now striving to recall. The story of this early activity is to be found especially in the stories of the Jewish congregations and the Hebrew Relief Society. The latter began its efforts in the 1850's we are told. [This may refer to the Hebrew Benevolent Society, which was founded in 1842.¹¹] Between that time and 1896 several other Jewish charitable groups, differing in their basic functions but nevertheless overlapping somewhat, came into being.¹²

It may afford us some perspective on the advances made in charitable work by these early Cincinnati Jews if we recall that it was early in this period that the Jewish Hospital,

reputed to have been the first of its kind in the country, was founded.

Let us turn, temporarily, from the secular to the religious life of nineteenth-century Cincinnati Jewry. The first synagogue of Cincinnati (Kehillah Kedoshah B'nai Israel) was consecrated on September 9, 1836, although preparations and fund-raising efforts had been begun in 1829.¹³ In 1841, a second synagogue was founded (Kehillah Kedoshah B'nai Jeshurun). These two Orthodox congregations soon came to reflect the liberal religious attitudes of their members and may, in truth, be considered as prototypes of the later Reform Judaism.

It was into this situation that a young, liberal rabbi, Isaac Mayer Wise, came in 1854. His early arrival, coupled with the nascent religious liberalism of Cincinnati Jewry and with a future of forty years free from the pressures of massive immigration, assured the victory of Reform Judaism in Cincinnati. Under his leadership, Cincinnati became the national home of the Reform movement. Both in religious and charitable enterprises, the Jewish community was completely dominated by Reform Jews.

In the 1880's, Cincinnati received the first of what were to be, eventually, twenty thousand Eastern European,

Orthodox Jews. The effect of this influx on the older, acculturated families was traumatic. With their strange dress and customs, these newcomers presented a totally different image of the Jew, both to the Jews and to the non-Jews of Cincinnati.

The German, Reform Jews were horrified at the thought that the non-Jewish community might associate them with such undesirable aliens. As the history of the United Jewish Social Agencies reports, "The directors of that organization [Then called Hebrew General Relief] found themselves at quite a loss when Russians had to be handled instead of their familiar Germans. Even the extensive crops of hair covering the newcomers were barriers to better understanding."¹⁴ To improve relations, a group of men privately collected funds so that the community might welcome each new resident with a shave!

Perhaps more traumatic than the appearance and behavior of the Eastern Europeans was the drain their needs caused on the charitable funds of the Jewish community. More money, more effectively collected, was necessary immediately. It was under this pressure that the modern Jewish community structure was brought into being.

The United Jewish Charities was established on April 4,

1896, after many months of debate. At first, it was only a loose confederation of mutually-suspicious organizations. Within a few months, however, centralized fund-raising and disbursement were introduced. This led to a more effective and efficient charitable organization for the entire Jewish community. In addition to its relief work, the United Jewish Charities provided educational and vocational training so that the newly-arrived Jews would be able to blend more quickly into the American culture and civilization.

In 1920, the name of the organization was changed to United Jewish Social Agencies and, for the first time, funds from the Community Chest were used for relief work. In the late 1920's, the United Jewish Social Agencies was redesignated *Federation of Jewish Agencies and, subsequently,* the Associated Jewish Agencies. The Jewish Welfare Fund was established shortly after World War II. With this organizational change came the end of the period of innovation in the Jewish community. All the major institutions and agencies had been established; the great pioneering phase was over. The Cincinnati Jewish community is now in what one might term the "phase of improvement and consolidation." More advanced and specialized types of agency programs have been developed; communal services are now directed along

scientific, professional lines. But no new agencies have appeared, nor are they likely to. In the area of consolidation, significant changes are taking place.

The responsibilities of the two central organizations soon began to overlap considerably. ^{It was tacitly understood that} While the Associated Jewish Agencies was to continue its social planning, ^{whereas} the Jewish Welfare Fund was to take charge of fund-raising and allocations for the entire Jewish community. Because of its allocations procedure, however, the Jewish Welfare Fund soon became involved in social planning; it was necessary

to deal with programming if money was to be distributed

^{To avoid unnecessary duplication and waste of time and effort, many community} effectively. ~~To solve this problem, a Coordinating Committee~~ ^{Leaders felt that a single administrative agency would be desirable. Others, however, expressed grave} was established. This body is now two years old and is ^{doubts. Therefore, it was decided to establish a Coordinating Committee which would gradually} under careful scrutiny. It is presumed that it will be ^{take over the responsibilities of the two separate agencies. During the first phase of its} retained, strengthened, and that it will eventually become ^{existence, however, the Coordinating Committee's decisions were contingent upon ratification by the} a basis for a merged Jewish Community Federation, displacing ^{boards of the JWF and the AJA.} the two older agencies.

Thus, while there have been some changes, the general structure and composition of the Jewish community has been relatively static since the 1920's. As the merger of the Associated Jewish Agencies and the Jewish Welfare Fund comes closer to realization, we are aware that, increasingly, both the planning and the fund-raising will be concentrated

in the hands of a continually smaller group. Should the merger come to pass, we shall witness a ~~major~~ redistribution of the power in the Jewish community.

IV

THE MEN OF THE POWER STRUCTURE

THE LAYMEN

During the course of our research, we attempted to construct a composite picture of the leaders of the power structure of the Cincinnati Jewish community. While these characteristics do not indicate individual differences - and they are many - we believe that they are helpful in a general way.

The average age of the leaders of the power structure is approximately fifty-five. In no case did we find anyone younger than the middle forties who had substantial independent power; it was also our conclusion that individuals over seventy tend to decline in power, especially as they usually begin a withdrawal from community service. It is notable that no women appear in the survey. We consulted a number of knowledgeable Cincinnati Jews in the hope of finding women who would be included in the top levels of the power structure. This search led us to the conclusion that, while women often play crucial and influential roles through their husbands, by themselves they do not have power, at least in the same magnitude. In general, their activities are restricted to individual organizations

rather than the central policy-making bodies. They also tend to work more on the level of executing policy rather than formulating it.

The leadership of the power structure has no one characteristic area of residence in this city. However, there do appear to be several neighborhoods and suburbs which are acceptable and in which many of the men live. These are Hyde Park, North Avondale-Rose Hill, Paddock Hills, Clifton, and Wyoming. We are convinced that, having met a minimum standard of housing, a man in the power structure may live in any area of the city. It does seem, however, that the younger men frequent those areas in which many Jews live, obviously with the intention of developing useful contacts and association. We did not find that length of residence in Cincinnati was a key factor. The current chairman of the JWF Campaign, for example, has lived in the city only fourteen years. It is true, however, that many of the top men are from families which have lived in Cincinnati for several generations. As a general rule, we may say that a newcomer may rise in the power structure if he is ambitious, capable, and able to cultivate contacts with the older families who will, in turn, introduce him into the right circles and sponsor him during

his rise to power.

Finally, we noticed that there appear to be two types of occupations which are represented among the lay leaders of the power structure. The very highest level includes businessmen of considerable wealth. The other occupation which is preferred is law; of the men we interviewed, six of the eighteen laymen are attorneys.

One of the major purposes of this study is to determine the avenues of access to power. Consequently, when we examined the careers of the leaders of the power structure of the Cincinnati Jewish community, we asked, "How did these men achieve positions of power?"

It appears that there are two ways of entering the power structure: vertically or horizontally. The most common way is vertical mobility, so that a young man begins his career of community service in fund-raising, then assumes a committee or board assignment, progresses to the presidency of an individual agency, and finally achieves a top position in one of the central organizations (the AJA or the JWF). It is at this last stage that the individual either achieves permanent power or falls out of grace. As Jennings states, "In most organized endeavors, there is a series of steps that those at the apexes have traveled,

barring lateral introduction....In non-profit organizations, the process is popularly known as 'going through the chairs.'¹⁵

This is the "approved" and "normal" way of entering the power structure, even among those families who could usher their offspring into positions of power without first going through the lower stages. That this is so is indicated by the formation of the Leadership Training Council, an organization which recruits younger men for community service. The two-fold program of the LTC is open to any young Jew in Cincinnati. In the first phase of the program, the enrollee attends a series of lectures designed to familiarize him with the purpose, activities, and problems of the Jewish community and its organizations. Each trainee is then asked to indicate areas of community work in which he is most interested. The LTC attempts to place its graduates on functioning committees of these organizations. Thus involved, the young man may or may not achieve a leadership position. The second educational phase of the LTC program is designed to teach the younger men good habits of giving. Inasmuch as money is a perpetual problem in the Jewish community, the young leader must be taught to be generous as well as capable. As the need for trained

leadership expands, we believe that the influence of the LTC will become progressively more widespread. At present, one need not graduate from the LTC course to enter the power structure.

Horizontal mobility, on the other hand, means entering the power structure near the top without "going through the chairs." Because this is not the "normal" way of entering the power structure, it is usually reserved for several types of individuals. There are, of course, high-prestige persons who can be used for publicity. But, we must remark that these people do not achieve bona fide power, but remain ^{subservient to} ~~tools~~ *the interests and desires of the leaders* in the hands of the power structure. The second type of individual who achieves power by horizontal mobility is the large or potentially-large donor who feels that power and prestige are due him by virtue of his money. Finally, horizontal mobility may be used to induce an older man who has money, prestige, and capability to become active in community work. Such an individual cannot, obviously, be asked to start at the lowest levels; he must begin nearer the top.

Not every job in the Jewish community is open to the horizontally mobile individual. Generally, this type of appointment is limited to the top jobs of individual agencies.

or to second-level positions in the AJA or JWF, although very infrequently it may be used for the top positions in the central organization. Since such appointments are resented bitterly by those who have entered the power structure vertically, they are used sparingly and only when the results cannot be otherwise achieved. The leaders of the power structure are also somewhat wary about appointing someone to a top position without previously testing him on jobs of lesser responsibility. The horizontally-mobile individual is often an unknown quantity.

Regardless of which method of entry a person uses, he must have certain personal qualities which legitimize and secure for him his power. Analyzing what qualities or attributes are necessary to achieve lasting power in Cincinnati, we found two partially conflicting hypotheses. Although neither is correct in all respects, we tend to agree that the latter is more nearly representative of the way in which the men currently at the top of the power structure achieved their power.

The "democratic view" presumes that any young man can achieve a position of top power if he works hard and successfully, gives generously within his means, and is reasonable "presentable" and well-liked by the power structure.

Our research would tend to confirm this idealistic, egalitarian hypothesis to a certain extent. We are convinced that anyone can rise, for example to membership on the board of an individual agency or even to the board of the JWF or the AJA, provided he follows the pattern outlined above. One exception is the board of the Jewish Hospital, where membership appears to be contingent upon sizeable financial commitments. } *Questionable*

When we consider the top positions of organizational power and membership in the informal power structure which controls the policy-making of the Jewish community, other considerations rise which tend to deny the "democratic view." But, first we must determine which positions, if any, in the organizational structure are at the top level of the power structure.

It is our conclusion that the two top positions, chairman of the JWF Campaign and chairman of the JWF Board, are not necessarily top-level power structure positions, although inherent in these positions is a certain undeniable authority. Under the rules of the JWF before 1960, the campaign chairman automatically succeeded to the presidency and, a year later, to the chairmanship of the JWF Board. One could have, realistically, said that he would have entered

the power structure's top level. Now, however, the succession is not guaranteed; the chairman may be dropped from prominence after the campaign, although he still automatically joins the JWF Board. Consequently, we feel that his apparent power is derivative from the real power of the Board, indeed, of certain members of the Board.

The positions of president and chairman of the JWF Board have been merged into one job, the occupant of which is elected by the members of the Board. Although certain powers, such as attempting to bring about compromise, do inhere in the office, the real power may reside elsewhere. We must, therefore, conclude that the real power in the community is not of necessity associated with the top organizational positions. We also note that those who occupy these positions must have the consent and approval of those persons who do possess real power.

Where, then, does "real" power reside? Typically, the men who possess such power are members of the JWF Board, although that in itself is not a guarantee of such power. Some extremely powerful individuals are not members of the Board, but this is by their own choice. These men possess certain qualities which set them apart from non-powerful individuals. In the first place, they have given large sums

of money to the JWF and other communal fund-raising drives. Miller has stated that "A safe generalization is that although financial contributions are not automatic guarantees of organizational power, they are the surest way of achieving it."¹⁶

We are, of course, aware that the "democratic view" resists the idea that "money talks." Yet, we note that the realistic demands for finances place the large giver in a strategic power position. Appendix VI gives the distribution of gifts by dollar-value for the 1964-65 campaign of the JWF. We see that roughly 60.4% (\$662,787) of the total money was donated by only 3.7% (237 persons) of the donors. This fact alone indicates that the few large givers are much needed and that, as a consequence, they are able to assert their own opinions much more easily and effectively than other members of the Jewish community. The fact that large givers are extremely influential was further confirmed when we asked, "If a major project, such as a large capital expenditure, were proposed, who could get it accepted?" (Question 22) A typical answer was that this would "require at least one-third of the top givers in the JWF. (That group has 30-40 individuals.) Without that, there is no chance of success."¹⁷

In addition to being large givers, these men have been generous with their time and energies. With the exception of one man, they have all held top positions in the JWF which demanded many hours of work. The other person does the same in other areas of Jewish community work. Therefore, in a sense, we might say that they have earned their power by their contributions and efforts.

We also found that it is much easier to achieve a top position in the power structure if one is a Reform Jew. As we stated in Chapter Three, the Jewish community of Cincinnati has traditionally been controlled by Reform Jews. The contemporary situation is no different, although one member of the Orthodox community has achieved a certain level of power. We shall spend a good deal of time discussing this subject later in this study.

In addition to their religious affiliation, most of the men in the top levels of power are descendant from older families in Cincinnati which have had traditions of power. As such, they assume that they will continue the family tradition and power; and the simple assumption itself is often responsible for creating "real" power. But, belonging to an old-line, Reform Jewish family is not a sine qua non for gaining power. Children of Orthodox Jewish parents may achieve top-level power, provided they become

sufficiently acculturated to the upper-class, Reform Jewish mores. The proof of this contention is that a few of the top men in the power structure are first-generation Reform Jews; their appearance, however, in no wise distinguishes them from, for example, a fourth-generation Reform Jew.

During the course of our research, we have been struck repeatedly by the fact that the families which dominated the Jewish community of Cincinnati during the early years of the twentieth century have passed out of the picture. To be sure, some of their descendants have continued to be active, but typically their power and influence have been severely limited. There are, of course, even exceptions to that rule, and we may find one or two families which seem to have preserved their inherited status.

Nevertheless, we were led to ask, "Why, given all the necessary advantages, such as wealth, leisure, prestige, and a family tradition of service, have these families been disinclined and/or unable to continue at the top of the power structure?" A number of suggestions may be advanced. None of them will be sufficient to describe all the cases, nor will they all be operative in any one instance. Together, however, they form a general picture of the diffusion of the Reform Jewish leadership of the Cincinnati Jewish community.

In the first place, it is clear that public service is an exhausting and taxing avocation. As a consequence, we believe, there is the phenomenon that, after an extended period of communal service, a family may become tired. Its energies, creativity, and competitive drive expended, its responsibilities and activities may be undertaken by new and more ambitious families and individuals. With this, of course, goes the assumption of added power for the new group.

To this, of course, we must add the fact that some of these upper-class, assimilated Jews found it convenient to pass into Christianity, removing themselves from all contact with the Jewish community. Others moved out of the city.

A third consideration is that the older families were engulfed in a tidal wave of new residents. For a while, of course, they maintained themselves. But, after about three decades, the force of some twenty thousand immigrants striving vigorously to improve themselves was felt. More infertile than these newcomers, the older families could no longer provide adequate leadership personnel. As a result, a number of new families appeared in the power structure and, eventually, gained precedence over the older members.

There is another attractive explanation. When the immigrants first arrived in Cincinnati, it was the self-

appointed task of the assimilated Reform Jewish leadership to "Americanize" the newcomers. To this end, they devoted themselves with great fervor, teaching them English and trades, preparing them for citizenship, blunting the adverse effects of their unusual dress and manners, and providing them with charity as long as money, clothing, lodging, and recreation were needed. To these "Lady Bountiful's" it was a consummate shock when the flow of immigration ceased. The people they had once so vigorously and ably assisted had now moved into the middle-class, and some had even become wealthy. They no longer needed a dole, and no new immigrants arrived. What was now necessary, under these changed conditions, was a planned communal structure which would provide a richer Jewish life for all the Jews of Cincinnati. But, many of the older family members could not make the adjustment to the new task. When the settlement house became the luxurious community center, they were, so to speak, unemployed, and many of them disappeared from the scene, transferring their skills to activities within the general Cincinnati community where they could continue uninterrupted in their traditional charitable activities.

The leadership of the power structure is, typically, lax concerning Judaism and Jewishness. A historical note is

valuable here. Before World War I, Jews appeared to be very secure in Cincinnati. There was no need to assimilate, as they were well-accepted by the "Protestant Establishment." By the 1910's, however, mass immigration of Jews and Catholics had occurred in many areas of the country. Cincinnati had been a center of Catholic population for years. But the direct effect of local Jewish immigration and the indirect effect of the national Catholic influx resulted in a change in status for the Jews of Cincinnati. For this immigration was seen by the "Establishment" as a potential threat to its political and social power. As a consequence, there appeared a systematic program of exclusion and discrimination. In Cincinnati, for example, the Queen City Club, which had Jews among its founding members, began to exclude them from membership. In this situation, the upper-class Jews were faced with a choice. Either they could attempt to pass into Christian society, by open conversion or by merely avoiding anything Jewish, or they could retreat to the Jewish community where they could achieve the power and prestige denied them in the general community. With a few exceptions, the Jews chose the latter alternative.

Since this time, the position of the Jew in Cincinnati has improved, although he is still socially excluded from

certain circles. There is a renewed feeling of security among the leaders. They are more comfortable with their Judaism, as long as it is minimal. They are, typically, observant of only the few "required" practices, such as temple membership and holyday observance. While determined to prevent anti-Semitism, they are quite as much determined to do this without publicity, fanfare, or exposure of the

fact that they still feel marginal enough to be threatened by anti-Semitic attacks. Almost all of these men are also abysmally ignorant of anything but the most elementary information about Judaism, whether Jewish history, practice, Bible, Hebrew, or theology. This is not, however, seen as a detriment to their leadership or power. Their community service is based totally on a secular ethic.

Many of them honestly believe that more good can be accomplished by a quiet, behind-the-scenes effort than by an overt, public offensive.

Underlying their activity, we sense, is still the goal of achieving prominence in the general community. Consequently, they may be what Lewin calls "leaders from the periphery."

As he states,

In any group, those sections are apt to gain leadership which are more generally successful. 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 and are particularly

eager to have their "good connections" not endangered by too close a contact with those sections of the underprivileged group which are not acceptable to the majority. 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 minority, 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.

As a result, we find the rather paradoxical phenomenon of what one might call "the leader from the periphery." Instead of having a group led by people who are proud of the group, who wish to stay in it and to promote it, we see minority leaders who are lukewarm toward the group, who may, under a thin cover of loyalty, be fundamentally eager to leave the group, or who try to use their power outright for acts of negative chauvinism. Having achieved a relatively satisfactory status among non-Jews, these individuals are chiefly concerned with maintaining the status quo and so try to soft-pedal any action which might arouse the attention of the non-Jew.¹⁸

There can be no doubt that presenting a good public image to the non-Jewish community is crucially important to these men. Daily, they are in close contact with the business, professional, and governmental leaders of Cincinnati. No suspicion can be permitted that, in their own communal organization, these leaders are unable to maintain control. Consequently, the appearance of harmony and peaceful cooperation must be preserved, even at the expense of sacrificing or compromising principles. But, we would maintain, this is not the entire explanation. Even apart from the public

we are also convinced that the maintenance of good public relations is essential to the realization of their goals within the Jewish community.

relations problem, the top men in the power structure are committed to the idea that, at all costs, the organizational structure must function smoothly and with as few disruptions as possible. There is a pragmatic basis for this. A disgruntled group within the Jewish community might not contribute to the JWF Campaign. Funds being at a premium, it is extremely important that no group be alienated so completely that it withdraws or threatens to withdraw its donations. As a result, it is sh'lom bayis, communal peace, which has become the cardinal virtue in community operation, often at the cost of fundamental and necessary social planning.

While the marginality of the men at the top of the power structure is undoubtable, from the point of view of strong manifestations of Jewishness, we may seriously question the last part of Lewin's allegation, namely, that these leaders engage in "acts of negative chauvinism." We have found no occasion in which the top level of leadership has attempted to gain status in the general community by sacrificing the interests of the Jewish community. Men may, however, gain status by neglecting Jewish activities and restricting their communal service to organizations which are non-denominational or secular. Our findings lead us to the

conclusion that, quite to the contrary, the top leadership is zealous in its desire to make the Jewish community an exemplary community - if only to prove to the general community that Jews can do better than anyone else and that they can take care of their own problems!

Finally, we wondered whether it was necessary to have certain personal characteristics in order to enter the top levels of the power structure. Our research would show that these men are genteel, sophisticated, and worldly. It would also indicate that these qualities are not necessarily connected with power, although they are frequently associated with it. Younger men, who are attempting to gain power, however, must manifest the "proper" traits of character. These would normally include pleasant personality, good appearance, business or professional success, and moving in the proper social circles.

We attempted, during the course of our research to discover if there is one individual whose power is so extensive that he controls the entire Jewish community structure. Our unavoidable conclusion is that there is presently no such person. This conclusion must, however, be qualified in two respects. First, effective control over policy formation in the Jewish community can be and is

maintained by a loose coalition of members of the power structure. With a few salient exceptions, these men are on the Board of the JWF. The exceptions are men of great economic power who have chosen, for one reason or another, not to serve on the Board. Their opinions are, however, well-known, and they are consulted before any decisions of magnitude are reached. Only in the most extreme cases would the desires of these men be contradicted. On the other hand, it is not infrequent that a policy decision proposed at lower levels is reversed in view of the opinions of the few top men of the power structure. The second qualification is that, in limited spheres of interest, there are individuals who do exercise pre-eminent power. Thus, for example, the Jewish Hospital Board would appear to be dominated effectively by one man.

It would also be our observation that, although there appear to be many separate centers of power, all the most powerful men cooperate freely and frequently with each other. The practical result of this high degree of interrelatedness is that the power of each individual is enhanced within his specific sphere of interest and that, together, these men constitute a massive and powerful group.

In summary, we may say that a man may realistically

aspire to "real" power in the Cincinnati Jewish community if he is wealthy, willing and able to devote considerable amounts of his time and energy to communal work, and comes from an old Reform Jewish family (or has accepted completely the mores of this group). Whether he actually achieves "real" power depends partly on his personality and partly on a number of other factors, not the least of which may be chance.

We may now find it instructive to analyze a few instances of how a promising individual may lose power in the Cincinnati Jewish community. Among the men we interviewed were several who had risen to the level of JWF Campaign Chairman; then, ostensibly, they fell from power. Each of these men had earned the position of Campaign Chairman by prior generosity, devotion, and distinguished service. In no case was the campaign a failure; all lived up to the expectations of those who appointed them. Although they were appointed to permanent membership on the JWF Board following their campaigns, their lack of power is evidenced by the fact that they are rarely consulted on major issues and that their advice is not accepted. In each case, the result has been that the individual has refused to work for the JWF with the possible exception of some unavoidable

fund-raising. ~~even, but reflected personality conflicts.~~

We wanted to know why these men lost their power and, more important, why they did not continue their rise in the power structure. The reader will recall that, under the rules of the JWF before 1960, these men would have succeeded to two higher offices. Under the current rules, however, tenure and advancement are clearly at the discretion of other persons, and, consequently, power is derivative and considerably less than before the change in the by-laws. We would note that it has been suggested that the change in rules was adopted for the express purpose of denying advancement to one of these men who was not considered suitable for promotion. We are very hesitant about accepting this hypothesis, although it has some attractive elements to it, particularly as one of the rationalizations for the change was that some Campaign Chairmen might not make good presidents or chairmen of the JWF Board.

Our research indicates that these men were dropped from the upper levels of the power structure for personal reasons. In one way or another, they all had quarrels with those already at the top of the power structure. These disputes did not concern their capabilities or efficiency as

Campaign Chairmen, but reflected personality conflicts.

We are aware that none of these men is the scion of an old-line, Reform Jewish family of Cincinnati. In only one case, however, does this seem to have been a factor in his loss of power. In that instance, the individual concerned expected to be admitted to the "German-Reform-old-family" country club as a reward for his service. When he came to the point of applying, however, he was told that he would still be blackballed. Apparently, he was not yet "the right kind of people." It is interesting to note that, in this case, gossip among the wives of members of the power structure played as large a role in the final outcome as the overt decisions of the husbands. Thus, although we found no women at the top levels of the power structure, we can be sure that they are not as uninfluential as it might at first glance appear.

The other men who lost power did so, we believe, because the power structure considered them uncontrollable. As one interviewee said concerning one of these individuals, he "...was too rich for the blood of the JWF leadership which used him. He is too emotional, talks too much, is a fire-brand and a controversial rabble-rouser. He is also too Jewish. He lost leadership by bucking the crowd."¹⁹ In

general, these men have been characterized - and not without good reason, at times - as dissenters, troublemakers, and hot-heads. It is also true that the policies they advocate, while in direct conflict with those of the top men in the power structure, may appear more justified. They were, for example, leaders in the vain attempt to require the Jewish Hospital to pay for the Sheltering Oaks Hospital.²⁰

At this point, it is helpful to indicate that the policy-making level of the power structure is not completely closed to dissent. However, what discussion and controversy there is to be is also controlled by the top men. No issue will be raised for action until it has been agreed by the top level of the power structure that it should be raised. When the power structure is ready to discuss and attempt to solve an issue, their control and management does not cease; what is to happen must happen on their terms only. For, it is their basic desire to preserve their former policies insofar as possible. As Hunter states,

When new policy is laid down it must be consistent with the general scheme of old policy and should not radically change basic alignments of settled policy. This does not mean that structural alignments do not undergo drastic overhauling on occasion, but consistency is a prime virtue which must not be passed over lightly, so that the basic equilibrium in the social systems of the community may undergo as little disruption as possible.²¹

The example of the ill-fated Jewish Community Council may illustrate the strong desire of the power structure to maintain control over the processes and results of planning and decision-making. The Jewish Community Council was established as an attempt to democratize the Jewish community structure of Cincinnati. It was structured so that each Jewish organization in the city would be entitled to equal representation in the group. This structure, however, led to two difficulties. In the first place, too many people and organizations, often with conflicting objectives, were involved; the arrangement was unworkable and inefficient. A second problem was that the Jewish Community Council allowed dissident elements in the Jewish community a forum in which to stir up trouble. The power structure leadership felt that such open channels of communication could only frustrate their more efficient and benevolent functions. Consequently, although the Jewish Community Council has remained in existence on paper, it has not functioned in the past twenty years.

The desire to maintain control over the policy and functioning of the community is also demonstrated by the summary neglect by the power structure of social planning. When the Coordinating Committee of the AJA-JWF was first

organized two years ago, its structure reflected the power structure's lack of commitment to social planning. The fund-raising arm of the Coordinating Committee was established with a number of standing committees. The social planning phase, on the other hand, was left completely unstructured. Whatever social planning needed to be done, it was asserted, could be accomplished by the Coordinating Committee Board or by ad hoc committees. Substantial pressure was then directed at the Coordinating Committee, especially by some agency executives, with the result that a chairman for social planning was appointed. The effect of this change was minimized, however, when, shortly after his appointment, the chairman was moved up to be campaign chairman of the JWF. In the AJA proper, the social planning committee is moribund, and has been for some time - they were never assigned any

important work to do! This is vitiated by the fact that the social planning of the AJA has been taken over by the Coordinating Committee.

The report of the Long Range Planning Committee of the AJA-JWF is a beginning in the right direction. The section on financial needs, in particular, is of interest, as it discusses various alternative ways of meeting the increasing demands for money in the Jewish community. Whether any of the suggestions outlined in this report will be implemented depends on the degree to which they coincide with the policies

and objectives of the power structure and not on the merits of the proposals. Hunter has summarized the possibilities in the following statement.

Planning...becomes a ritualistic panorama engaged in by reasonably well-paid under-structure personnel whose plans more often than not fail to reach the point of action. Action results when a plan fits the relatively narrow interests of the policy-makers, but on many issues there is community paralysis and inaction....

If the professional in one of the social agencies is too zealous in searching out the basic causes of disorganization and social malfunctioning, he is liable to suspicion and censure. If he does engage in fundamental social research which turns up elements pointing to social reform or change in existing community alignments and structure, his materials may be presented to a limited group of persons who profess interest and who dutifully place his report with many like it in the files of the organization.²²

It is not at all difficult to explain the reluctance of the power structure to permit extensive planning. The primary objection is that plans, once made and publicized, demand a degree of commitment on the part of their formulators. Extensive, long range social planning would severely restrict the ability of the power structure to improvise solutions to current problems in keeping with the demands of their

overall value orientations. In contradistinction to this view, we must note the opinion, prevalent among leaders of the power structure, that they welcome long-range

In general, then, we look for a continued weakness in social planning, but are unable or not sufficiently knowledgeable to effectuate its projections. this area of community organization. This is unfortunate,

as successful planning could result in more efficient use of

both the human and financial resources available; it would solve many community problems, although not always along the lines which would be most acceptable to the power structure. Rather, we expect that the power structure will continue to operate on a crisis-to-crisis basis, with only a vague and haphazard idea of the goals and values which should be pursued. Planning will continue on an informal, conversational, and non-accountable basis, at least in the foreseeable future.

Nevertheless, we hasten to add a qualifying remark. Informal planning, for all its deleterious effects, does not represent the "smoke-filled room" image of conspiracy usually associated with power by the public. We would agree with the statement that,

The popular notion of men plotting behind the scenes is a fictional illusion except when one gets into the area of organized crime. The men of power usually operate openly with one another and on equal terms... If the little fellow comes out on the short end of affairs, or if he is "not in the know," as the popular expression goes, it is for reasons other than fraud.²³

Opposition to the power structure may also come from organized segments of the Jewish community. As such, it is more difficult to handle than ferment caused by one or two isolated individuals, who can usually be silenced by a policy of neglect or appeasement. Such a problem of

organized opposition to the power structure occurred some twenty-five or thirty years ago, during the formative years of the local chapter of the American Jewish Congress. The American Jewish Congress represented, generally, Eastern European, Orthodox, relatively new residents of Cincinnati. Its leaders had already become moderately wealthy, but had little prestige or social status. The Reform Jewish "managers" of the Cincinnati Jewish community wanted their financial contributions, but not their participation in community decision-making. As a consequence, these people had token representation on various agency boards, but no substantial power.

The situation changed radically when the Cincinnati chapter of the American Jewish Congress decided to follow a new policy of the New York branch of the organization. Their proposal was to hire a representative who would go to the big corporations located in Cincinnati and threaten them with economic and other reprisals unless they ended their discriminatory hiring policies. The Cincinnati chapter wanted the JWC to pay for this representative.

The "aristocrats" of the Jewish community, however, were on good working terms with their corporate counterparts. Furthermore, since they had become culturally and religiously

as assimilated as possible, the thought of such militant Jewishness was abhorrent to them. They could not, therefore, approve the request of the American Jewish Congress, as it ran counter to all their values. But, neither could they afford to antagonize such a wealthy segment of the Jewish community; the JWF needed their contributions.

A compromise solution was reached. The JWF would establish a program of educational and vocational training and guidance (The Jewish Vocational Service) with a trained college graduate at its head. This, the power structure believed, would enable Jews to get better jobs, yet avoid the unpleasant confrontation with the leaders of Cincinnati industry and business which would have resulted had the recommendations of the American Jewish Congress been followed.

Let us, then, note what appear to be the two salient results of this episode. First, the American Jewish Congress was defeated, although it was able to achieve some of its goals. The power structure managed to retain control of the outcome. Second, by keeping the program within the bounds of gentility and acceptability, the power structure preserved its good public image and relations among the non-Jewish influentials of Cincinnati. Indeed, they were soon anxious to point with pride to this program as a model which other

community groups would do well to emulate.

We can, therefore, generalize from this one example that an insurgent group, if well-organized and fighting for something which is morally justified, may have a decisive effect on community policy and programming, although, on the surface, it may be defeated. We shall discuss under a different heading the entire contemporary problem of community-supported Jewish education and the opposition of its proponents to the power structure.

We now want to turn our attention to three marginal leadership groups: the professional agency executives, the rabbis, and the laymen of the Orthodox Jewish community.

THE PROFESSIONAL AGENCY EXECUTIVES

Cincinnati has always been fortunate in regard its professional staff. Since the time of Boris D. Bogen in 1904, there has been a succession of distinguished professional social workers and agency executives serving the Cincinnati Jewish community. To a degree, this fact must account for the high standards and capabilities of Cincinnati's Jewish communal agencies, which have been copied throughout the United States. The current professional leaders of the Jewish community continue to manifest the

same elevated competency which marked their predecessors. While there may be individual deviations, the modern professional is technically well-trained and able to operate a program well above the level of similar programs outside the Jewish community.

We also note, however, that there has been a considerable and growing antagonism between the religious and philanthropic centers of Judaism. Each of these structures is attempting to gain pre-eminent power and prestige at the expense of the other. In this competitive situation, it appears that the professionals have elected a policy of militant secularism, making as few concessions to Jewishness as possible. There exists, it would seem, the feeling that, to become openly identified with overt Jewishness would be, in some way, both a defeat at the hands of the temples and synagogues and a dilution of their professional standards. It might be noted, in passing, that the tide of battle has been uniformly in the favor of the philanthropic structure, to the extent that religious institutions are now threatened with the very real possibility of becoming vestigial.

There is continuing pressure, however, on the part of laymen. They insist that community agencies must openly manifest their attachment to Jewish practices and ideals if

they are to continue receiving support from the Jewish community. The Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?" of the AJA-JWF reported to the Coordinating Committee that "There is a need for greater Jewish commitment among Jewish social work professionals....Jewish institutions need to clarify their roles in the perpetuation of Jewish group life."²⁴

It is our observation that the power of the Jewish community professional is growing considerably. There appear to be several reasons for this development. In the first place, the increasing complexity and specialization of modern communal service mean that the average layman cannot attain the same understanding of agency problems and needs as was formerly possible. As an inevitable consequence, he must place more reliance upon the testimony of the expert, in this case, the professional agency executive.

The importance of this trend must not be minimized. As the layman comes to rely more heavily on the advice of the professional, the power of the latter is extensively broadened. This particularly applies to policy formation and planning. As a general rule, we may assert that the effective limits on the professional's power are now determined only by his ability or inability to present information which would justify his recommendations and withhold that

data which would controvert his plans.

The power of the professional executive in the Jewish community is further increased by another factor which is not altogether unconnected with the first. This is the matter of board member selection and tenure. As the demands of specialization increase, the ability of the layman to contradict the professional decreases proportionately. The professional who wishes to establish a firm basis for his power must recognize this fact and the inevitable conclusions which are derivative of it. Thus, it is obvious that, in the selection of board members, the professional will be careful to hand-pick for nomination those individuals who are interested in the work of the agency but who are neither powerful nor too-well informed. These persons can be "educated" along the lines which the professional chooses. They must also, if possible, be connected with interests whose favor the professional wishes to cultivate. The professional, by so structuring his board, may preserve his expertise and, consequently, his power. Needless to say, this tactic is not always successful. Lay nominating committees have shown themselves determined to preserve at least a measure of independent judgment. Parenthetically, we note that laymen use different criteria for nominating

individuals for board membership. To them, social acceptability, friendship, wealth, and interest are more important.

Another fairly recent development has, paradoxically, helped to secure the power of the professional. In an effort to be more democratic, some boards have limited the terms, both of membership and office, to approximately four years. The supposed consequence of this was to be more representative membership and the advantage of a variety of different opinions. It was also held that, by demanding a turn-over in board membership, new people could be involved in agency work and good workers could be rewarded. Above all, the specter of the "self-perpetuating board" would be banished from communal life.

The effect of this policy has been somewhat unexpected. Before the democratic system was instituted, boards were frequently self-perpetuating; members had life tenure, even permanent occupancy of specific offices. Under this system, it was possible for the individual layman to develop sufficient knowledge and expertise that he could act as an effective check on the professional. Now that tenure on boards is limited, the layman is denied this possibility. As soon as he begins to develop a depth understanding of the

nature, functions, and problems of an organization, he is forced to leave his office and, on occasion, the board. In practice, this means that the checks on the professional are considerably diluted and that, as a consequence, his power is enhanced.

Having said this, it must still be noted that the professionals in the Cincinnati Jewish community have not taken advantage of the far-reaching potentials of power-seeking and empire-building. In general, they have worked closely with the laymen and have shown themselves dedicated to the highest professional standards. They have consistently placed institutional and program success above their personal advantage, although, as is obvious, the two may be tightly intertwined.

THE RABBIS

Turning from the professional agency executives, we now wish to discuss the nature of the rabbinate in Cincinnati and its relationship to the power structure.

During the nineteen-thirties, Cincinnati was the home of two powerful and prestigious Reform Jewish rabbis. Both David Philipson and James Heller had been president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and were nationally-

known and respected figures. Within the Jewish community, they had shown themselves to be dynamic and forceful leaders. Powerful in their own rights, they also had the sympathetic ear of many powerful Jewish laymen with the result that their influence was widely-felt in the Jewish community.

Philipson's death and Heller's abrupt departure from Cincinnati, occurring as they did within a few short years, left the Reform Jewish community without effective rabbinical leadership. The ensuing power vacuum was filled by men of lesser stature and power, for the laymen of the two temples had discovered that temple leadership was extremely attractive.

The history of the Reform Jewish rabbinate in Cincinnati for the past twenty years has been, in large measure, a continuing attempt to regain the influence of Philipson and Heller. In many other cities, rabbis have played key roles in Jewish philanthropic and communal affairs. This has not, recently, been true of Cincinnati. Indeed, we may truthfully say that, exclusive of the temples and one or two of the individual agencies, the Cincinnati Jewish community is run by thorough-going secularists who have scrupulously avoided allowing the rabbis a major role.

There is now, however, cause to believe that the Reform

Jewish rabbis are about to re-emerge as a factor in the power structure. We do not believe that they will ever exert decisive influence. Nevertheless, as the current generation of younger rabbis matures, we believe that they will play an increasing part in community policy-formulation, at least within the limits established by the leaders of the power structure. We have noticed that the Reform rabbis are consulted more frequently, and that they are more often invited to join boards of organizations. In the Jewish Community Relations Council, rabbis have even risen to policy-making positions.

The future of the Reform rabbinate is, at this writing, uncertain. That they will become more involved in extra-synagogal affairs is assured. Whether this involvement will carry with it increased power or whether they will remain tangential to the decision-making process, admitted only out of courtesy, remains to be seen. We suspect that the outcome, while mediate between these alternatives, will probably be closer to the latter.

There is a second class of Reform Jewish rabbis in Cincinnati who are also a factor in the power situation. These are the men who are members of the faculty of the Hebrew Union College. The College, itself, it will be noted,

is not a factor; it has neither sought nor been granted any role in Jewish community affairs. As individuals, however, some faculty members have become privately influential.

Because they are often considered as au-dessus des partis, these individuals have been able to secure influence as mediators and as covert members of the power structure. Their power is, almost entirely, based on social and personal contact; in general, they have not been extremely active in the actual functioning of the agencies. We also remind the reader that this situation is not true of the entire faculty. It is clearly a matter of individual predilection and talent.

The rabbinate in Cincinnati is, of course, not limited to Reform Judaism. There is one large Conservative synagogue, as well as a number of Orthodox schuls.

The Conservative synagogue, Adath Israel, was, for many years, led by Rabbi Louis Feinberg. It seems probable that the loss of this rabbi had somewhat the same effect on the Conservative laity as did the contemporary loss of Philipson and Heller among Reform Jews. In this case, however, the resultant loss of power for the rabbi was not nearly so accentuated. This is, in part, due to the semi-halakhic nature of Conservative Judaism, and in part due to the

personality of Rabbi Feinberg's successor. The Conservative rabbinate has remained a force in the Jewish community, although no longer a major or aggressive one.

We now turn to Orthodoxy in Cincinnati, for there we find the most concentrated and assertive rabbinical power. For the past several decades, the Orthodox Jewish community has been dominated by its so-called "Chief Rabbi." Nothing of consequence could be decided or done without his consent, or, at the very least, his toleration. As the adjudicator of halakic disputes, he has proved himself strict, although not unwilling to make allowances and compromises in cases involving non-essential matters. As an example of this flexibility, we cite the fact that the Jewish Community Center is permitted, under certain minimal restrictions, to remain open on the sabbath; similar institutions in other cities have been forced by an intransigent Orthodox rabbinate to close completely.

For all his willingness to compromise, however, there is no doubt that the "Chief Rabbi" runs the Orthodox community with a firm grip. Among the laymen, he has sufficient support that he can, virtually at will, command sizeable sums of money. During his frequent trips abroad, for example, he has wired home for tens of thousands of dollars to succor

refugees, and the funds have been raised within days.

The cost of the mikvah (ritual bath) which he built in the community exceeded the sum of money allocated by a great deal, yet the laymen were willing to make up the difference.

The practical result of this strong domination of the Orthodox community has been to discourage the growth of a strong lay leadership, especially in general Jewish communal affairs. There has been, to the best of our information, only one powerful Orthodox leader who has participated in the general Jewish community's planning and activities. Within the Orthodox community, the leadership has shown itself to be of the most narrowly-parochial and uninspired type. We cite as an example of this latter development the fact that the Orthodox Home for the Aged has never employed a professional social worker or executive and that it has continually refused free assistance from such agencies as the Jewish Family Service Bureau.

The "Chief Rabbi" is now eighty-five years old. As he ages, his power declines slowly, so that there is now the possibility that both lay leadership and a progressive and decentralized rabbinate may emerge. Whether this possibility will be realized or not, only time will tell. But the prospect is, for the first time, hopeful.

THE LAYMEN OF THE ORTHODOX COMMUNITY

One marginal leadership group remains to be discussed, namely, the laity of the Orthodox community. As we have already mentioned, there is only one Orthodox Jew who is at present active near the top level of the Jewish community structure. For the most part, Orthodox Jews have concentrated their efforts on the synagogues, schools, and the Orthodox Home for the Aged. At times they display a quasi-xenophobic response to those outside the Orthodox Jewish community. This was clearly the case with regard to the one refusal of a leader to see the interviewer; this man manifested great suspicion of anything which he considered "outside."

There are several factors which contribute to the explanation of this lack of participation. In the first place, as we have previously emphasized, Cincinnati's Jewish community was German and, from a very early date, dominated by Reform Jews. When the Eastern European, Orthodox Jews arrived, they found an established, powerful, and mildly hostile Jewish population. To dissipate the powerful control which the older, Reform Jewish families had over the communal structure was not a goal easily accomplished.

The well-intentioned, but naive and misguided attempts of the older Jewish residents of Cincinnati to "Americanize" the newcomers were a source of increasing the immediate tension. Plans, such as the one to shave the immigrants, were viewed by the Orthodox Jews as attempts to destroy all the finest characteristics of their Jewish culture, in other words, to make them goyyim. This, they resented bitterly, and the bad feelings engendered some seventy years ago have only recently begun to ease. The practical result of this antagonism was the withdrawal of the Orthodox Jews, feeling misunderstood and unwanted and desiring to protect themselves from the encroachments of the Reform Jewish "Americanizers."

In the long run, however, the acculturation of the Orthodox Jewish immigrant proved beneficial and productive. Now a wealthy segment of the Jewish community and, apart from religion, indistinguishable from the rest of it, Orthodoxy may be expected to provide more leadership in the total Jewish community structure. The period during which Orthodox Jews were struggling for their livelihoods has passed; now, surplus capital funds and leisure time are available for use in communal work. In addition, the Orthodox Jewish community has finally come to feel "at home"

in Cincinnati. This tendency will, we believe, be enhanced as the centralized rabbinical authority is lessened, as we previously noted. And, as a tradition of communal service develops, we may expect even greater participation from Orthodox Jews in the decision-making and functioning of the total Jewish community.

At the same time that the immigrants were drawing away from the Reform Jews, the latter were repelled by the newcomers. The immigrants were viewed as an alien force which was threatening to subvert the best efforts of the assimilated Jews to appear totally acculturated to their American environment. Consequently, successive generations of powerful Reform Jews have worked conscientiously to exclude the Orthodox; this policy has been shown successful. Now, however, that the Reform group is not producing enough leaders from its own ranks, there will certainly be more opportunity for young, ambitious Orthodox Jews to enter upper levels of leadership and power.

In addition to these reasons for the lack of participation on the part of Orthodox Jews, there are two other hypotheses which help to explain their under-representation at the top levels of the power structure. While we hold that the first three explanations are sufficient to account for this

phenomenon, nevertheless, these other factors must enter the total picture.

First, the leadership within the Orthodox community has long recognized that participation in a central fund-raising campaign reduces both the level of giving and the individual's involvement and awareness of the results; centralized allocation of funds involves a high degree of sophistication and anonymity for both the donor and the recipient, which, while efficient, is psychologically unrewarding. Consequently, they have encouraged decentralized fund-raising in the hope of receiving more money in the form of many, but smaller, contributions. At the same time, they are able to direct the donor to a plaque on the wall, to an orphan, or to a classroom, explaining that "Your money has accomplished these concrete results."

The second factor to be noticed is inherent in the nature of a ritualistic religion. There is a tendency among Orthodox Jews to feel that, having kept kosher, prayed daily, observed the sabbath laws, and put money in the pushkes (small collection boxes for individual charities) on the wall, they have fulfilled the mitzvah of being a "good Jew." Salvation, according to modern Orthodox practice, is more contingent upon ritual observance than social conscience.

As a result, Orthodox Jews have felt little compulsion to engage in extra-synagogal activities.

We are confident that, with the increasing liberalism and tolerance among the younger generations of both Reform and Orthodoxy, the time is not too distant in which Orthodox Jews will play a far more prominent role in the central community organizations. We must also note that, inasmuch as some of the current leaders of the power structure are first-generation Reform Jews, Orthodoxy has not been as unproductive as we might be led to think.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN THE
CINCINNATI JEWISH COMMUNITY

In our chapter on methodology, we discussed two different techniques for isolating and analyzing a power structure; the case-study method and the reputational survey. Although we selected the latter for the purposes of this thesis, the case-study method may be, with adequate staff and time, even more productive and reliable. Therefore, within certain limitations, we propose to use this chapter to describe some of the salient problems faced by the Cincinnati Jewish community and how the power structure intends to deal with them. This will, then, be a modified case-study approach.

At the outset, we may distinguish among three different categories of problems. There are, in the first place, those which can be solved by a greater expenditure of funds. Thus, for example, the program needs of an individual agency may be met by hiring new staff members and by spending more money for equipment, recreation, facilities, and the like. The second type of problem is that to which funds are irrelevant. These problems tend to deal with the qualitative factor in Jewish community life, that is to say,

with intangibles and with problems of ideology. Some current examples of this category of problem are: improving the quality of Jewish ^{adult} education and assuring that Jews want to and do take advantage of such opportunities; developing mutual respect between the two different segments of the Jewish community (Reform and Orthodox); increasing temple attendance; and deciding what the community's response should be to such contemporary issues as civil rights, the radical right, and labor unions. The third type of problem is mediate between these two alternatives, demanding both money and ideological commitment. In this category we would place the whole issue of the Jewish Community Center. Although sizeable sums are needed to retire the mortgage on the Center building, money alone will not decide the crucial question of why there is need for a Jewish Community Center in the first place. The analysis of the function of such an institution is a matter of ideology and must be dealt with on that level.

We propose to deal with three problems in this discussion: fund-raising and its attendant complications; the proposed merger of the AJA and the JWF; and community-supported Jewish education.

FUND-RAISING

It is axiomatic in community life that there is always less money available than those in charge of institutional programs want and need. The Jewish community is no exception to this peculiar phenomenon. Indeed, one of the prime areas of difficulty in contemporary community life is the matter of the allocation of JWF money to the individual agencies. To understand this problem, however, we must first deal briefly with the entire financial structure of the Jewish community.

The JWF receives funds from three sources: its annual campaign, special endowments, and the Community Chest (which pays its share through the AJA). According to the figures cited in Appendix VII, the receipts from the first two categories totalled \$1,135,482 in 1965-66. In addition, the Community Chest contributed \$276,420, although this sum was already designated for the following specific agency programs:

AJA Central Service	\$ 37,164
Jewish Family Service Bureau	141,840
The Bake Shop	13,476
Camp Livingston	8,292
Jewish Community Center	<u>75,648</u>
TOTAL	\$ 276,420
Jewish Hospital Out-Patient Department (given directly, not through AJA)	59,000 (approx.)

Altogether, a sum of approximately \$1,400,000 was available for distribution to all the categories of allocation. How the distribution is to be made is partially pre-determined by several top-level policy decisions of the power structure.

The first of these decisions is that, of the \$1,135,482 collected, certain amounts would be deducted before any allocations were made. These preliminary deductions were:

Operations of the JWF	\$ 112,420
Reserves ²⁵	<u>56,774</u>
Total	\$ 169,194

This is normal procedure in any organization and, therefore, reflects in no way any special influence of the power structure.

A second a priori decision concerns the sum allocated to the national United Jewish Appeal. In ^{some} many communities, however, the UJA operates a separate fund-raising campaign in competition with the local welfare fund. The power structure of the Cincinnati Jewish community wished to avoid this competitive and potentially destructive situation. To this end, a compromise was arranged. The UJA would not solicit funds in Cincinnati; a portion of the money collected by the JWF would, however, be forwarded to the UJA as Cincinnati's fair contribution. The percentage of the

available funds which is to be given to the UJA is subject to annual review and negotiation. As Appendix VII indicates, this percentage has been stabilized for the past six years between 42% and 45% of the total raised by the JWF. This sum is determined before the Allocations Committee of the JWF undertakes the distribution of the funds to overseas, national, and local agencies. It is a decision made by the top level of the power structure and reflects their commitment to two values: first, that the harmony of the local Jewish community must not be disrupted by competitive fund-raising drives, and second, that 45% of the total distribution of the JWF is not too great a price to pay for the absence of the UJA. We suggest that, as the need for funds on the local level increases, the power structure will re-evaluate the amount of money forwarded to the UJA, decreasing that sum considerably.

By these two decisions, the total amount of non-allocated money was reduced in the 1965-66 distribution by over \$650,000. Appendix VIII shows that, for this year, \$534,380 remained for distribution to all other agencies. This was not, however, the amount over which the Allocations Committee had charge. Appendix VIII indicates that \$40,000 was deducted from this total for interest on the mortgage

of the Jewish Community Center and for the Cincinnati Hebrew Day School (Hofetz Hayyim). We shall devote the last section of this chapter to the latter item. The assumption of payments for the interest on the mortgage of the Jewish Community Center was agreed to by the power structure before 1961 to obviate the possibility of financial insolvency for the Center. This problem had emerged as a result of expenditures on the new Center building far in excess of the proposed cost; instead of spending \$1,500,000 for the new facility, the Center committed itself to a structure costing \$2,400,000. This was, apparently, a larger debt than could be managed by the membership without outside help. ^

Therefore, as a result of these three decisions and the deductions which ensued, the amount finally available to the Allocations Committee for distribution was \$494,380. We examined Appendix VIII to determine the nature of the allocations process. Two conclusions are evident from the material presented.

The first conclusion is that there is very little change from year-to-year in the amounts allocated to the individual agencies. The Committee raised, for example, seven of the 1964-65 grants a total of \$12,311 in 1965-66; five reductions

totalling \$1,035 were made. The net change of \$11,276 is minute compared to the total amount of money involved. More important than this small degree of budgetary change, however, is the fact that, over the period of the last six years, only one agency was dropped (Delaware Valley College, which received \$50 per year) and only three were added (Jewish Occupational Council, Jewish Braille Institute of America, and Torah Umesorah). One other agency (American Academy for Jewish Research) did not receive its \$100 allocation in 1963-64. Nevertheless, the evidence clearly indicates that this is a static list.

There are two types of agencies on this list: those which receive a token payment and those which receive considerable support from the JWF. In 1965-66, the JWF made token payments of \$4,700 to sixteen organizations, both in Cincinnati and elsewhere. This sum is, more-or-less, irreducible, unless the organization is to be dropped entirely. This is highly unlikely. The consequence of this is that these appropriations are automatic.

The nearly \$490,000 which remains must be divided equitably among twenty-eight different agencies and organizations. There is only very slight leeway in this process, inasmuch as the amount of money available does not

allow for luxuries. Because the power structure has already established the guiding principle that no effective social planning is to be permitted and that, consequently, there can be no reasonable hope of measurably altering this list of organizations, the only options available to the Allocations Committee are minimal increases or decreases in specific allocations. Kept on the list, an agency must receive enough money to support, at the very least, its minimum program. Funds for more than that are not available. In this sense, and as the data in Appendix VIII clearly show, the Allocations Committee is little more than a rubber-stamp of the commitments made in previous years.

There is a second conclusion which is derived from the last two columns of Appendix VIII (C. C. Recomm. and 1965-66 Grant). This conclusion is even more important than the first one, in that it reflects the dynamic change occurring in the power structure of the Cincinnati Jewish community. The Coordinating Committee is empowered merely to recommend policies and decisions to the boards of its two constituent agencies, the AJA and the JWF. More than this, it is currently forbidden to do. Nevertheless, comparing the recommendations of the Coordinating Committee with the final decisions of the ^{Board} JWF ~~Allocations Committee~~, we are

struck by the fact that, in only one instance was there any alteration of these recommendations. United HIAS Service was granted \$800 more than the Coordinating Committee recommended. The difference in the allocations for the Cincinnati Hebrew Day School is only apparent; at the bottom of the list, there is full agreement on the \$20,000 appropriation. Furthermore, as note "h" of Appendix VIII indicates, this appropriation was made by the JWF Board of Directors and not by the Allocations Committee. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the recommendations of the Allocations Committee of the Coordinating Committee are prescriptive and that effective control over the distribution of funds has been taken from the hands of the JWF ^{Board.} ~~Allocations~~ Committee. This is a further indication of the tendency toward centralized power which we have discussed previously and which we shall summarize in the next section of this chapter.

Many of the phenomena we have discussed in this section are the results of the problems of fund-raising in the Cincinnati Jewish community. Therefore, it is important to understand some of these difficulties. We have already noted that the amount of money available for distribution is barely sufficient to meet the minimal needs of the

agencies on the allocations roster. This, we asserted, severely restricted the freedom of the Allocations Committee. This situation will become increasingly difficult in future years, for the financial demands on the Jewish community which can be reasonably projected are sizeable. Using 1965-66 as a base figure, we attempted to project the needs of the JWF for the next ten years. Agency needs, as reflected in Appendix VII (National and Overseas; Local Agencies), indicate that one may assume a demand for funds rising at approximately five percent per annum, merely to maintain the same program. This generally-accepted figure represents the increase needed to meet rising costs of staff, materials, building, and programs. Therefore, we expect that, for agency needs, the Cincinnati Jewish community will be called upon to provide a total of approximately \$6,500,000 over the next ten years. This also assumes that the size of the Community Chest contribution will remain stable. However, in view of the Community Chest's growing commitments under new Federal programs, this assumption is not at all certain. A sizeable reduction in Community Chest participation would demand an equally large increase in the JWF budget.

In addition to this sum of \$6,500,000, we must include

a projection of the demands for capital improvement funds, as these will have a direct bearing on the amount of money available in the Jewish community for contributions to the JWF. At present, there are building campaigns in the Jewish community for approximately the following amounts:

Jewish Hospital	\$ 3,500,000
Adath Israel Congregation	2,000,000
Rockdale Avenue Temple	2,000,000
Jewish Community Center	500,000
Temple Sholom	<u>400,000</u>
TOTAL	\$ 8,400,000

We may also reasonably expect that other organizations will undertake new building projects. It is, therefore, not inconceivable that in the next ten years Jews will be asked to donate as much as \$15,000,000 to local capital improvement programs. The total demands on the Jewish community will, in all probability, be well in excess of \$20,000,000 in the foreseeable future, without including the annual contribution to the UJA. One must also remember that Jewish citizens of Cincinnati are also called upon for generous support of many non-Jewish causes and that this constitutes a further drain on the financial resources of the Jewish community.

On the other hand, the column entitled "Total Campaign" in Appendix VII indicates that, rather than increasing to meet the increasing needs, the amount of money available has been static or falling since 1952-53. The dilemma posed by these figures is obvious: financial needs are increasing yearly, but there are no new funds available to meet them.

One solution is already evident from the figures in Appendix VII under the UJA column. It would appear clear that, as the sense of international crisis wanes, those members of the power structure responsible for the setting of the percentage given to the UJA will respond to the pressures of growing agency needs by reducing the UJA allotment. This gambit has, however, only limited usefulness; should the UJA allocation drop too low, that organization would surely start a separate campaign in Cincinnati. This, we expect, would have a disastrous effect on the already-weakened fund-raising structure.

The Long Range Planning Committee of the AJA has summarized the situation in the following manner:

....the amounts raised in community campaigns in the past ten years have fluctuated within a narrow range indicating a stability in community fund raising. In the next five or ten years, barring a local, national or overseas emergency..., this pattern is likely to remain.

Contributing to the validity of this presumption is the

Benjamin Engel report which cites the lack of economic and population growth in Cincinnati. If this pattern continues there will be little or no new money available to the community, beyond normal increases in operating expenses, from central fund raising.

...the needs of local agencies are increasing so rapidly that even at the expense of national and overseas agencies, local communities will not raise sufficient funds to meet them.²⁶

This same report suggests four alternatives for meeting increased local needs.²⁷

1. Cut Back Present Programs.
2. Priorities.
3. Possibility of Government Funds.
4. Endowment Funds.

The Long Range Planning Committee pessimistically indicated that none of these alternatives is feasible and that only the third has any potential for substantially alleviating the problem.

Our research indicates that the Jewish community has undertaken two long-range programs intended to help this situation. The first is a concentrated effort to increase the amount of money contributed to the JWF campaign. The most effective instrument of this approach has been the Leadership Training Council which has raised considerably the level of giving among the younger members of the community. As the influence of the LTC is further extended, some relief

in the financial crisis may be forthcoming.

The second program is, in our opinion and despite the contrary statements of the Long Range Planning Committee, the eventual elimination of some non-essential agencies and programs from the list of beneficiaries of the JWF. The first step in this process, the provision of criteria by which agencies may be judged, has already been taken. The report of the Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?" states: "...the Committee interpreted its charge to be the establishment of a rationale for the existence of Jewish communal services by which it hoped to provide some positive guides for community planning for the Coordinating Committee."²⁸ Furthermore, the summary of this report states that its intention was to provide "...the Coordinating Committee with a basis for long-range planning and for the establishment of priorities to determine the most effective use of community funds."²⁹

Whether the criteria established by this committee are accepted or another set is formulated, we believe that the power structure has begun to consider seriously the possibility of reducing the list of JWF beneficiaries. This will, obviously, be a long and tedious process, involving profound changes in personal attitudes and community structure and

overcoming considerable inertia. When the Coordinating Committee undertakes more of the functions of the two separate central organizations, becoming a de jure central power, its ability to implement this policy commitment will be measurably enhanced.

Finally, we must note that, as the press of financial demands grows greater, the power of the person who gives large amounts will be unavoidably strengthened. The success of the fund-raising campaign will depend increasingly on the generosity of such individuals, and, as a consequence, their preferences in matters of policy will be accorded even greater respect than at the present.

We are not nearly as pessimistic about the future financial stability of the Jewish community as the published reports. We believe a restrained optimism is possible for the following reasons. First, the Engel report, which is the source of much of the pessimism, refers only to the general Cincinnati community; it has not yet been demonstrated that it is also applicable to the Jewish community, although the power structure has made this assumption. Second, as we indicated, there now appears to be the realistic possibility of eliminating some superfluous beneficiaries of the JWF. Finally, we are confident, perhaps naively so,

that a Jewish community which could raise over \$1,800,000 during the 1948 crisis can raise such sums again if properly motivated and educated.

THE PROPOSED MERGER OF THE AJA AND THE JWF

In several other places in this thesis, we have already alluded to some of the ramifications of this proposal. It is our purpose, at this juncture, to summarize the attitudes and problems concerning the merger.

We shall first recapitulate the historical trends which preceded and which, in fact, occasioned the proposal that the AJA and the JWF merge into a combined Jewish Community Federation. At the outset, the functions of these two central organizations were differentiated. The AJA was charged with the supervision of the operation and programs of the individual ^{health and welfare} agencies, as well as with whatever long-range planning it chose to undertake. The JWF ^{assumed} ~~was~~ responsible ^{let} solely for the collection and allocation of funds. Had ample sums been available, this division of responsibilities might have remained viable. This is, as we have indicated, not the case; barely enough money is received to provide for the minimal needs of each beneficiary agency. As the shortage of funds grew more acute, the Allocations

Committee of the JWF was forced to establish a system of unwritten priorities based on programmatic rather than financial criteria. This led to an unavoidable involvement in the field of social planning, which had previously been the province of the AJA.

This overlapping and duplication of functions seemed to many of the leaders of the power structure inefficient and wasteful, both in terms of money and human energies. Some of the same individuals served on both boards, discussing the same problems twice and arriving at similar solutions. In this situation, there was no doubt that the Jewish community would be more efficiently operated under a merged central organization. *This decision was made notwithstanding considerable doubt and skepticism from some individuals.*

The first step in this direction was taken in 1964 when a Coordinating Committee of the JWF and the AJA was established. Its functions were, admittedly, duplications of the functions of the two separate organizations, and its power was restricted to making recommendations to its constituent groups. Under this structure, the AJA and the JWF were to remain temporarily independent and sovereign within their own areas of competency. If the Coordinating Committee proved effective, a merger would occur; if not, the structure would continue as before, and the Coordinating Committee

would be abolished. As we indicated in our discussions of fund-raising, this sovereignty has not been maintained.

~~The Allocations Committee of the JWF~~ is clearly under the sway of the Allocations Committee of the Coordinating Committee; only in one instance was a recommendation altered slightly.

Consequently, it appears certain that, in the proximate future, the two organizations will be merged into one central, administrative body. The power structure is already committed to this course of action, although a specific time schedule has not yet been established.

While the general policy of merger has been accepted, there still exist some hesitations among the leaders of the power structure. In the first place, the mechanisms for change in a voluntaristic community such as the Cincinnati Jewish community are extremely slow and cumbersome. Long-established attitudes and organizational allegiances must be changed through a ponderous process of education and propaganda. Historically, the AJA and the JWF boards are somewhat suspicious of each other, and this feeling has intensified as the JWF has undertaken some functions of the AJA. We feel that it was for these reasons that the Coordinating Committee was established only as a temporary body without

any strong power; when it proved itself a workable, useful system, then would be the time to make a permanent change. Had the power structure wished to afford the Coordinating Committee a bona fide chance to prove its worth, it would have delegated to it a limited amount of real power. The fact that the Coordinating Committee is only empowered to recommend means that no real test of its effectiveness can be made. In short, we suggest that the present status of the Coordinating Committee is a temporary device, designed to accustom the Jewish community to its existence gently and to accumulate covertly elements of real power. In the meantime, people are becoming accustomed to the idea, so that the ultimate change will be accomplished smoothly and quietly whenever the power structure chooses.

A second stumbling-block is the feeling that each of these central organizations acts as a check on the other and that each represents a specific point of view. It is true that the JWF has tended to be more liberal and more internationally-oriented than the AJA which sees its interests in terms of specific local programs; but we remain unconvinced by this argument. The overlapping of both functions and personnel appears to have destroyed what, originally, was a loose checks-and-balances system in the

Jewish community. Nevertheless, the fear is often expressed that, in a merger, the distinctive viewpoint of one agency would be subordinated to the orientation of the other and, ultimately, destroyed. And the fear, whether justified or not, has tended to hold back any moves in the direction of a merger.

At the present time, the Coordinating Committee is under review by a committee representing both the AJA and the JWF. This review was provided for when the Coordinating Committee was established. We cannot, of course, be certain of the outcome, but we suggest that, for the next few years, the status quo will be preserved. Ultimately, the currently de facto merged central organization will become de jure. For the present, the three interacting and overlapping groups will continue, as the community sacrifices efficiency for deliberation and tradition.

THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNITY-SUPPORTED JEWISH EDUCATION

The problem of community support for Jewish schools is the most complex and, potentially, the most destructive currently facing the Cincinnati Jewish community. The basic issue is: Should Jewish schools receive financial support from the JWF and, if so, to what degree? So stated, the

problem is deceptive, for it involves far more. We shall attempt to summarize here the various aspects of the problem.

There are two Jewish educational institutions in Cincinnati which receive support. One is the Cincinnati Community Hebrew Schools (CCHS), which is composed of Yavneh Day School and five separate afternoon schools, two of which are Conservative and three of which are Orthodox. The other school is the Cincinnati Hebrew Day School (CHDS - Hofetz Hayyim). Each of these represents a distinctive and, we believe, irreconcilable ideology, although both offer the same minimal English program required by state law. Yavneh Day School may be described as a secular, Hebrew language, Israel-centered school. What stress is placed on religious observance is of the nature of a familiarization; children learn the traditions of Judaism, but are never compelled to accept them. Underlying the entire school is the subtle influence of the Labor-Zionist orientation of the school's founders. CHDS, on the other hand, is an Orthodox Jewish school in the tradition of the Heder and the Talmud Torah; strict adherence to traditional practices is demanded, and stress is placed on the traditional Hebrew textual studies.

The JWF supports these schools in the following amounts:

CCHS		
	Yavneh Day School	\$ 27,000
	Afternoon Programs	39,000
CHDS		<u>25,000</u>
	TOTAL	\$ 91,000

In addition, the director of the Bureau of Jewish Education, which received \$20,200 in 1965-66 to serve as the coordinating agency for all Jewish education in Cincinnati, spends a part of each day assisting the Yavneh Day School. Therefore, an undetermined part of his salary must be counted as an additional subsidy for that school. We may, therefore, reasonably estimate that \$100,000 or about 20% of the money allocated by the JWF is allotted to Jewish education.

The roots of the crisis go back many years in the history of the Cincinnati Jewish community, and both parties to the controversy have been guilty of gross misstatements. By long tradition suspicious of Orthodoxy, the old-line Reform Jews in the power structure have patently misunderstood the nature of the differences between the two schools. Logically, of course, it would be rational for the schools to combine the English aspects of their programs; a

considerable saving of money might result, especially by a consolidation of certain administrative functions. But this proposal, which has been regularly advanced by the power structure, as well as by the financially-troubled CHDS, fails to recognize the profound distrusts and suspicions which exist between the two schools. There can be no doubt that, were it possible to merge the secular aspect of the schools, the students at the Yavneh Day School would be required to observe the stringent Orthodox practices of the CHDS; compromise in the other direction could not be expected.

The most extreme element of the power structure does not even recognize any difference between the two schools. To these persons, all Jewish day-school education is Orthodox, and the general Jewish community has no business supporting it. There are also some members of the power structure who, aware of all the ramifications and subtleties of the situation, still question the legitimacy of JWF support for the schools. An additional problem is raised by the proponents and supporters of congregation-centered Jewish education. We may note that neither the Reform Jewish religious schools nor the school of the Adath Israel congregation receive JWF funds. Yet, it is correctly pointed

out that, of the five afternoon schools which are associated as the CCHS, four are operated by congregations. The CCHS Board and administrators are very reticent about interfering in the operation of these schools. Consequently, it is quite logical that some members of the power structure have said: "Either support all congregational schools, including the Reform Jewish ones, or none at all!" The fact of the matter is that the congregational affiliation of these four schools is conveniently ignored by most of the members of the power structure; community funds are allocated to the CCHS as an entity without regard for its two-fold composition. We may, then, state that the normative position of the members of the power structure is that the Jewish community has a legitimate purpose in subsidizing Jewish education; the problem arises in the determination of the amount of that support.

We note that the power structure understands this support as an investment of sorts involving mutual responsibilities. Many of the leaders of the power structure with whom we talked asserted that what they called "the Orthodox community" does not contribute its fair proportion either of money or of communal service. The power structure, of course, understands the goal of these two institutions to

be the education of future generations of community leaders and looks for concrete evidences of this, such as graduates of the schools assuming responsibilities in the community (or, in the meanwhile, parents of graduates). We believe that rarely in the history of the Cincinnati Jewish community has there been such a difference of opinion as to the purpose of any institutions. We agree that the amount of money contributed by the families which use the two schools is probably not equal to the sum received. However, in terms of communal service, we note that the supporters of the Yavneh Day School have a far more distinguished record than those of the CHDS; many of them participate extensively in a wide variety of Jewish communal activities. Of the CHDS, only one man is active in the general community structure; he is the only Orthodox Jew currently at a high position in the power structure. But, the fundamental assumption by the power structure that an allocation must be paid back by equal contributions or services must be questioned. It is our understanding that the disbursing of general community funds is directed to assist those agencies and groups which cannot otherwise maintain themselves; such funds, we believe, should not be allocated on the assumption that they must be repaid, that assumption being a

radical distortion of the concept of charity.

If, on the one hand, the power structure has been lacking in insight, on the other hand, the people in charge of the CHDS have been militant and uncompromising in their demands. Their position and requirements tend to be non-negotiable, which leads to an impasse of ill-will and bad feeling. They, of course, feel unjustly treated by the Allocations Committee. They point to the fact that the CCHS receive \$66,000 plus the services of the director of the Bureau of Jewish Education, while the amount granted their own institution is only \$25,000. In actuality, however, the imbalance is not as great as would be, at first glance, apparent. Of the \$66,000 granted the CCHS, \$39,000 is budgeted for the after-school programs, an independent group of schools which are not paralleled in the CHDS structure. Therefore, the actual difference for the all-day programs is reduced to \$2,000. This notwithstanding, the proponents of the CHDS have urged the adoption of a parity system in which funds are allocated according to the number of pupils enrolled. Considering the total sum of \$91,000 as a unit, they feel that they would gain considerably by this measure. In fact, however, only \$52,000 is devoted to the all-day programs, and the

division of this sum is, if anything, slightly weighted in the favor of the CHDS. Its day-time enrolment is approximately seventy students, while the Yavneh Day School has ninety pupils during the day. Nearly three hundred youngsters attend its various after-school classes. An exactly proportionate division of the \$52,000 which is allocated for the one hundred and sixty day-time students would give exactly \$23,125 to the CHDS and \$28,875 to the Yavneh Day School. On the basis of these figures, we can see that the present arrangement benefits the CHDS by \$1,875 more than would any change in the direction of parity based on the number of students.

The total enrolment of the day-time and after-school classes is less than five hundred students. Yet, we have already noted that almost 20% of the available JWF funds are allocated to this small number of individuals. The power structure has already agreed, in principle, to subsidize the two schools; but many of the leaders cavil openly at the disproportionate amount allotted to these agencies. We cannot foresee, however, any possibility of reducing the sum allocated to Jewish education in the near future, barring a revolutionary change in the attitudes and policies of the power structure.

An analysis of Appendix VIII will show that the \$20,000 grant to CHDS was changed in ¹⁹⁶⁰~~1964-65~~ from a regular allocation to an "off-the-top" deduction authorized by the JWF Board of Directors. The motivation for this change was a threat by the one Orthodox member of the power structure. He made it apparent to the power structure that, if he did not get more money for the CHDS, he would withdraw his contribution from the JWF campaign and urge his friends to do the same. This would have meant a loss of more than the \$20,000 to the JWF, so a compromise was reached. The CHDS would receive \$20,000 off-the-top, as indicated in Appendix VIII and a small, supplementary allocation. The over-all effect of this was to reduce the UJA allotment by almost \$10,000, since the off-the-top deductions are excluded from the formula for the UJA share of the JWF funds. On the other hand, the CHDS would, for the first time, submit a budget of how the funds were to be used. We may, parenthetically, note that the budgets of both day-schools appear to be somewhat contrived and unreliable; the suspicion may be justified that they do not truthfully reflect the actual distribution of the allocated funds.

Pressure for more money on the part of the CHDS has been mounting in the last year, so that, shortly, there will

be another crisis in this area of community life. We suggest, however, that, in the interests of community harmony and fruitful fund-raising, the power structure will again arrange a compromise solution. Nevertheless, this is one area of community activity in which tension will continue to mount and for which no viable solution is immediately available.

CONCLUSION

We have, throughout this thesis, attempted to describe the composition and the activities of the power structure of the Cincinnati Jewish community. We suggested that this power structure does exist, although not as a monolithic structure. It is, primarily, composed of Reform Jews who by reason of their wealth, effort, and social position have gained power in the Jewish community.

This group, while it controls both the policy and finances of the Jewish community, is not unopposed. Various individuals and groups have challenged its power, sometimes with an unexpected degree of success. In general, however, the power structure can assert effective control in cases which it considers important.

We believe that the efforts of the power structure have been honestly directed toward the best interests of the entire Cincinnati Jewish community. They have shown themselves willing to compromise and have held fairly consistently to a theory of "catholic Israel" in which all segments of the Jewish population have legitimate and unalienable rights. Perhaps the best demonstration of the beneficial aspects of the power structure is the high

quality of communal service rendered by the individual agencies. This beneficial work will continue, especially if the power structure admits the value of long-range social planning and commits itself to accept the results of such studies.

We suggest, finally, that the power structure will become more flexible and diffuse in the future as the religious, social, economic, and ethnic divisions within the Jewish community weaken. On the other hand, the growing homogeneity of the Jewish community may not be sufficient to offset the increased power of the few large contributors to the JWF campaign, especially in view of the increasing shortage of funds. Within the next generation, we shall know the answers to these questions. And, upon these answers depends the future of the Jewish community of Cincinnati.

APPENDIX I

TENTATIVE HYPOTHESES AND IMPLICATIONS

HYPOTHESES

IMPLICATIONS

AREA OF STUDY: Personal characteristics of power structure personnel; Recruitment, advancement, and replacement of power structure personnel.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>I. Top personnel are, within limits, similar in social and economic class position and in value orientation and goals.</p> | <p>a. There are characteristic occupations, ages, and areas of residence.</p> <p>b. The primary policy objectives of the top personnel are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Continuity of personnel.2. Continuity of policy.3. Sufficient compromise and accomodation to keep intra-community peace and cooperation.4. Maintenance of good public relations, especially with non-Jews.5. Strong, non-militant and non-activist policy of defense against anti-Semitism.6. Avoidance of ostentatious patterns of consumption without sacrificing luxuries or comforts.7. Strong desire to exclude from power persons whose responses would not be predictable or controllable. <p>c. Ranking of values on areas of social concern would show a significant degree of agreement.</p> |
| <p>II. Recruitment of current top personnel was done by the prior generation of top personnel.</p> | <p>a. Family connections were important in the achievement of power positions.</p> <p>b. Other criteria of importance were: length of residence, <u>alleged</u> ethnic origin, agreement with specified values.</p> <p>c. Sponsorship to high levels</p> |

of power was necessary.

III. Recruitment of the next generation of top personnel is made to assure as much continuity of policy, values and objectives as possible.

- a. New leaders are deliberately selected on the basis of the estimate of their ability to continue the policies and goals of the older men.
- b. New leaders are tested by being given tasks at successively higher levels of power and responsibility.
- c. Successful performance on a job is a sine qua non, but not a guarantee of promotion. Other factors are, perhaps, even more important.
- d. The old ruling elite is not replacing itself; a personnel shortage in Cincinnati is causing the inclusion of new and disparate elements of the Jewish population.
- e. There is no pretense of democracy in the operation of the Jewish community, on the highest levels of decision making.

AREA OF STUDY: The unity or disunity of the power structure.

IV. There are power cliques or crowds in Jewish communal affairs based largely on family and/or business connections.

- a. A few men are at the very top level of power.
- b. There are clustered around these men several men of lesser power and importance who follow the lead of the "patriarch."

V. The crowds are not generally competitive with each other; each has a separate and generally recognized expertise or "pet" area of activity.

- a. While certain positions in the communal structure are held by all the top men, either at the same time or successively, each has one area of activity which is recognized as his major interest or project.

- b. On matters of general communal interest the top men cooperate extensively.
- c. On matters of interest to the special area of concern of any one of the top men, other leaders may be called on for assistance. This is given on a quid pro quo basis.
- d. While no one crowd or interest group has total control over the community as far as initiating and enacting of proposals, there is extensive use of a veto power to negate undesirable actions and to secure compromises and concessions in proposed actions.
- e. There are fairly consistent patterns of interaction and advice-giving among the top men. There are also characteristic patterns of avoidance.

VI. Synagogues and temples are not consulted in the policy-formulation phase; they are important in the implementation phase.

- a. Rabbis are relatively powerless in Cincinnati.
- b. They do have a limited veto power based on moral and/or halakic considerations.
- c. Jewish education is relatively unimportant to the power structure personnel.
 - 1. This may not be true of basically traditional Jews.
 - 2. It is not seen as a necessary qualification for leadership.
 - 3. It is not considered a pressing community problem, except re; day schools.

VII. Some crowds possess power in Jewish circles only because of their ability to represent Jewish interests in the general community.

- a. They are not highly regarded by leaders who are actively working themselves in the Jewish community.

AREA OF STUDY: Personal attitudes of power structure personnel.

VIII. The top men in the power structure have a characteristic self-image.

- a. They are consciously aware of their power, but see themselves as benefactors.
- b. They are relatively weakly associated with Jewishness.
 - 1. The rank of their identities is:
 - a. Businessman or professional.
 - b. Communal leader.
 - c. Jew.
 - 2. This may be inoperative in the case of Orthodox Jews.
 - 3. There is a strong pattern of cultural assimilation.
 - a. Residence.
 - b. Club memberships.
 - c. Business associates and friends.
 - d. Degree of Jewish observance.
- c. There is little pretense of representative leadership.

IX. The men at the top are typically motivated by similar forces.

- a. There is a general lack of open recognition of their own motivations.
- b. Motivations expressed are most frequently rationalizations.
- c. Personal motivations may be:
 - 1. Achievement of leadership which is inaccessible in the non-Jewish community.
 - 2. Concern with control over the Jewish community so it does not develop characteristics inimical to the philosophy of the leadership.
 - 3. A humanitarian concern.
 - 4. A desire for creative expression.

5. A sense of duty, of "noblesse oblige."
6. A desire to prove to the non-Jewish community that the Jewish community is self-sufficient and can take care of its own needs.
7. A "will-to-power" (desire to dominate others).
8. Social or other external pressures.
9. A desire to prove oneself capable of handling leadership roles (thereby alleviating self-doubt).

QUESTIONNAIRE

(The notation "Shown on a card" indicates that the statement was typed on a 5 x 8 inch card and shown to the interviewee. He was asked to respond to this statement.)

NAME OF RESPONDENT:

ADDRESS:

AGE:

OCCUPATION:

1. One of the men I have talked to about this thesis said that he thought the organization and operation of the Jewish community, and the Welfare Fund in particular, was very poor and ought to be revamped. How do you feel about this?

2. If this could cause some agencies to withdraw from the Welfare Fund, who would you nominate as members of a committee to bring them back?

3. What kinds of jobs have you held in the Jewish community?

4. In which jobs were you most interested?

5. Did you lose interest in any?

6. Where does the important work in the Jewish community get done?

7. "It is important to satisfy all elements of the Jewish community." (Shown on a card).

8. "Except for religion there is actually little difference between the way a Jew and other Americans feel. It is wrong to harp on the idea that Jews are really distinct." (Shown on a card).

9. (Card with article depicting a synagogue desecration was shown.) How do you think the community should handle an incident of the sort reported in this article, if it were to happen here? Who would be some of the men whom you would ask to handle the situation?

10. "Young leaders should be carefully groomed to carry on the present policies of the Jewish community leadership." (Shown on a card).

11. What the Jewish community needs is:_____.

12. As a Jewish community leader, what do you see as some of the most important purposes of the Jewish community?

13. What was the first leadership position you accepted in the Jewish community? Who nominated you? Did you have any hesitation about accepting, and, if so, why?

14. Had you had any previous experience in this sort of work?

15. Did some of your family or friends try to get you involved in community work?

16. (Shown on a card) Please rank the following 1 through 5. "The most important issues facing the Jewish community today are...."

- _____ Church-state relations
- _____ Israel
- _____ Anti-Semitism
- _____ Fund-raising
- _____ Provision of community services, such as health care, family service, vocational guidance, etc.
- _____ Day schools (community-supported)
- _____ Finding good professional and lay leaders
- _____ Other (specify)

17. Why do some men make good leaders and other men poor ones?

18. Some people move up to top positions of leadership. Why are they chosen over others?

19. Are the people active in the Jewish community today doing a better or worse job than those a generation ago?

20. Who would you say are some of the outstanding younger leaders in the Jewish community today?

21. "Leaders must act for the entire Jewish community; I am confident that the Jewish community is satisfied with the leadership we have." (Shown on a card).

22. If a major project, such as a large capital expenditure, were proposed, who could get it accepted?

23. With whom would you want to talk over such a project?

24. Would your ideas be generally acceptable to the Jewish community? Might there be objections? Why?

25. To what activity in the Jewish community do you give the most time?

26. Whose views usually seem close to yours? Whose seem to be different?

27. Is there any individual who can veto an important proposal or obtain significant compromises before it is accepted?

28. Who are some of the Jewish leaders you see informally, such as at home or at the club?

29. Do you sometimes have non-Jews over to your home?

30. Do you go over to their homes?

31. What Jewish periodicals do you read regularly?

32. Do the rabbis in the community have anything to offer in terms of Jewish community leadership?

33. Have you ever noticed the rabbis taking part in policy decisions, such as the distribution of the Welfare Fund money? If not, why?

34. Should the temples and synagogues take a more active role?

35. "My children attended (attend) the following type of religious school...."

☐ Orthodox
☐ Conservative
☐ Reform
☐ Day School
☐ None

They attended (attend) ____ days-a-week.
 (Shown on a card).

36. "To be an effective leader in the Jewish community, a man should be able to read some Hebrew and know something about the Bible and Jewish history." (Shown on a card).

37. Who are the Jews who are most influential in the non-Jewish world in Cincinnati?

38. "When it comes to important matters, a lot of people usually go along with my way of thinking."
 (Shown on a card).

APPENDIX III

INITIAL LETTER TO INTERVIEWEES

Hebrew Union College Letterhead

(Date)

(Address)

Dear _____:

I am a senior at the Hebrew Union College and am presently writing my rabbinic thesis under the direction of Dr. Jacob R. Marcus and Dr. Robert Katz. The topic of this study is the leadership of the Jewish community. We are hopeful that my research will increase our understanding of the leadership needs of the Jewish community and, consequently, direct us toward more effective use of our resources. For myself, as a future rabbi, the insights I shall gain will be invaluable.

To secure the basic information necessary, I am interviewing a cross-section of the Jewish leaders of Cincinnati. Many people have suggested that you might be willing to assist me by sharing with me your experiences in our Jewish community and your appraisal of it.

In a few days, I shall call you with the hope that we shall be able to arrange a personal interview at your earliest convenience. Thank you in advance for your consideration and assistance.

Very sincerely yours,

Kenneth D. Roseman

APPENDIX IV

TRANSCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEWS

This appendix is to be filed in the American Jewish Archives, on the campus of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio, for "RESTRICTED USE ONLY," pursuant to the guarantee of anonymity offered to the interviewees. Permission for its use may be obtained from the Director of the American Jewish Archives or from the author of this thesis.

APPENDIX V

LETTER OF APPRECIATION

Hebrew Union College Letterhead

(Date)

(Address)

Dear _____:

I want you to know how much I appreciate the fact that you took time out from your busy schedule to help me with my research. Your insights and observations will, I am sure, be extremely valuable in the preparation of my thesis.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Very sincerely yours,

Kenneth D. Roseman

APPENDIX VI

CAMPAIGN REPORT - ANALYSIS OF GIFTS

Campaign Year 1964-65

SOURCE: Records of the AJA-JWF

Gift Category	Total Campaign (Regular & Special)		Special Fund	
	Number of Contribu- tors	Amount Contributed	Number of Contribu- tors	Amount Contri- buted
Under \$10	2,233	7,436	41	233
10 to 49.99	2,290	42,427	134	2,703
50 to 99.99	553	31,845	80	4,740
Sub-total to \$99.99	5,076	81,708	255	7,666
100 to 249	783	107,810	62	8,269
250 to 499	326	104,099	19	5,050
500 to 999	237	141,449	6	3,150
Sub-total \$100 to \$999	1,346	353,358	87	16,469
1,000 to 2,499	165	225,077	8	13,174
2,500 to 4,999	32	105,160	1	2,500
5,000 to 9,999	30	186,050		
10,000 to 24,999	10	124,500	1	15,000
25,000 & over				
Sub-total \$1,000 and over	237	662,787	10	30,674
GRAND TOTAL	6,659	1,097,853	352	54,809

A - Analysis by Gift Category

APPENDIX VII

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS BY THE JEWISH WELFARE FUND

6/30/49, 6/30/53 - 6/30/66

Year Ending 6/30	Total Campaign	Regular	Special	Total Dist. Based on Reg. Campaign	UJA	% of Dist.
1948-49	1,812,196	1,812,196		1,854,304	1,322,000	71.2
1952-53	1,385,267	1,385,267		1,385,662	732,000	52.8
1953-54	1,265,385	1,265,385		1,352,878	627,000	46.4
1954-55	1,199,137	1,199,137		1,296,945	576,840	44.5
1955-56	1,069,630	1,069,630		1,122,728	450,500	40.0
1956-57	1,275,433	1,125,790	149,640	1,141,217	440,500	38.1
1957-58	1,298,989	1,068,304	230,404	1,114,150	440,000	39.5
1958-59	1,125,950	995,204	130,746	1,005,758	400,000	39.8
1959-60	1,226,477	1,078,001	148,476	1,076,200	431,500	40.1
1960-61	1,125,497	1,030,736	94,761	1,041,618	408,389	39.2
1961-62	1,074,560	1,015,675	58,885	1,029,694	400,647	38.9
1962-63	1,123,006	1,053,469	69,537	1,031,825	419,235	40.6
1963-64	1,128,502	1,076,829 ^a	51,673	1,051,167	426,884	42.7
1964-65	1,152,712	1,097,885 ^a	54,827	1,073,365	438,205	41.0
1965-66	1,135,482	1,073,120 ^b	62,362	1,068,510	422,710	39.6

Year Ending 6/30	Special Fund	Total UJA	% of Total Raised	National and Overseas	% of Dist.	Local Agencies	% of Dist.
1948-49		1,322,000	73.0	126,900	6.8	252,550	13.6
1952-53		732,000	52.8	112,964	8.2	360,746	26.0
1953-54		627,000	49.6	114,694	8.5	359,016	26.5
1954-55		576,840	48.1	111,684	8.6	363,902	28.1
1955-56		450,500	42.1	95,968	8.6	328,532	29.3
1956-57	149,640	590,140	46.3	106,215	9.3	333,285	29.2
1957-58	230,404	670,404	51.6	106,788	9.6	332,991	30.0
1958-59	130,746	530,746	47.1	100,675	10.0	309,671	30.4
1959-60	148,476	579,976	47.3	106,320	9.9	351,302	32.6
1960-61	94,761	503,150	44.7	104,075 ^d	10.0	348,311	33.4
1961-62	58,885	459,532	42.8	103,425 ^d	10.0	346,777 ^e	33.7
1962-63	69,537	488,772	43.5	108,225 ^d	10.5	367,527	35.6
1963-64	51,674	478,558	42.4	111,385	10.6	380,100	36.2
1964-65	54,827	493,032	42.8	113,115	10.6	389,990	36.2
1965-66	62,362	485,072	42.7	112,230	10.5	401,150	37.4

Year Ending 6/30	Capital	% of Dist.	Operation	% of Dist.	Reserve ^c	% of Total Raised
1948-49			72,472	3.9	57,000	3.1
1952-53	128,250	9.3	77,500	5.6	55,000	4.0
1953-54	125,000	9.2	72,753	5.4	55,000	4.3
1954-55	100,000	7.7	92,176	7.1	50,000	4.2
1955-56	100,000	8.9	89,507	8.0	65,000	6.1
1956-57	90,000	7.9	106,217	9.3	65,000	5.1
1957-58	75,000	6.7	99,782	9.0	60,000	4.6
1958-59	28,021	2.8	98,101	9.8	65,000	5.8
1959-60	20,000	1.9	101,954	9.5	65,000	5.3
1960-61	20,000	1.9	108,466	10.4	59,611	5.3
1961-62	20,000	2.0	111,345	10.8	46,859	4.4
1962-63	20,000	1.9	119,181 ^f	11.5	50,293	4.5
1963-64	20,000	1.9	112,798	10.7	53,793	4.8
1964-65	20,000	1.8	112,055	10.4	57,636	5.0
1965-66	20,000	1.9	112,420	10.5	56,774	5.0

NOTES TO APPENDIX VII

- a - Includes Endowment and Special Purpose Fund.
- b - Includes Endowment and Special Purpose Fund and anonymous one-time deficit gifts.
- c - Prior to 1960-61 reserves were established by the finance committee based on auditor's calculations. From 1960-61 to 1962-63, the auditor's recommendations were used. In 1964-65 the Board of Trustees directed that reserves be established at 5% of total campaign pledges.
- d - Does not include \$1000 grants to National Foundation for Jewish Culture from Fund for Emergencies.
- e - Does not include \$1670 additional grants from Fund for Emergencies.
- f - Includes \$5000 for Sheltering Oaks Study.

APPENDIX VIII

SUMMARY OF ALLOCATIONS

Budget Committee I Individual Service & Counselling	1961-62 Grant	1962-63 Grant	1963-64 Grant	1964-65 Grant	C.C. Recomm.	1965-66 Grant
Cincinnati Committee for Refugees	11,500	11,500	11,500	14,500	20,500	20,500
Emergency Grants	2,500 ^a	3,273 ^b	2,067 ^c	2,939	-	-
Jewish Occupational Council ^d	-	-	-	500	500	500
Jewish Braille Inst. of America ^e	-	-	-	-	50	50
Jewish Voc.. Service	39,500	46,500	50,000	51,000	53,050	53,050
Orth. Rabbis' Fund	350	300	300	300	300	300
Rabbis' Fund	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,300	1,300
United HIAS Service	5,500	6,200	7,000	6,200	6,200	7,000
TOTAL	58,250	65,900	70,200	76,839	81,900	82,700
Budget Committee II Group Work & Recreation						
B'nai B'rith National Youth Serv. Appeal	2,500	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850
Hillel Foundation	2,877	2,877	2,877	3,100	3,100	3,100
J. C. C.	70,500	74,000	76,000	78,000	79,250	79,250
Int. on Bldg. Loan ^f	20,000	20,000	20,000	-	-	-
National J.W.B.	12,175	12,585	12,585	12,585	12,000	12,000
Price Hill Center	750	750	750	750	750	750
TOTAL	88,802	93,062	95,062	97,285	97,950	97,950

Budget Committee III Medical, Aged, and Chronic Ill	1961-62 Grant	1962-63 Grant	1963-64 Grant	1964-65 Grant	C.C. Recomm.	1965-66 Grant
Hadassah	8,800	9,290	9,750	9,750	9,750	9,750
Home Medical Service	1,380	1,700	1,800	1,800	1,700	1,700
Jewish Hospital	41,500	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
Leo N. Levi Hosp.	300	300	150	150	50	50
Sheltering Oaks Hosp. &	42,000	44,000	46,473	46,000	46,000	46,000
TOTAL	93,980	97,290	100,173	99,700	99,500	99,500

Budget Committee IV Educational & Cultural	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	C.C.	1965-66
	Grant	Grant	Grant	Grant	Recomm.	Grant
Amer. Academy for Jewish Research	100	100	-	100	100	100
Amer. Assoc. For Jewish Education	800	905	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Amer.-Israel Cultural Foundation	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,000	3,000	3,000
Amer. Jewish Archives	-	280	400	400	400	400
Amer. Jewish Hist. Soc.	245	285	200	200	200	200
Bitzaron	150	150	150	150	150	150
Bur. of Jewish Educ.	19,500	19,500	20,200	20,200	20,200	20,200
Cincinnati Community Hebrew Schools	60,000	64,000	66,000	66,000	66,000	66,000
Cincinnati Hebrew Day School ^h	20,000	20,000	20,000	-	5,000	5,000
Off Top	-	-	-	(20,000)	-	(20,000)
Delaware Valley Coll. ¹	50	50	-	-	-	-
Dropsie College	750	800	800	800	800	800
Hebrew Univ.-Technion	13,150	14,095	14,200	15,000	15,000	15,000
Histadruth Ivrit ^h	715	720	600	500	500	500
Israeli Institutions	3,450	3,450	3,450	3,450	3,450	3,450
Jewish Publication Soc.	330	345	350	500	500	500
Jewish Teachers' Sem.	150	150	150	100	100	100
Jewish Telegraphic Agen. ^j	500	500	1,200	1,500	1,500	1,500
National Found. for Jewish Culture ^k	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Synagogue Coun. of Am.	300	330	330	300	300	300
Torah Unesorahe	-	-	-	-	100	100
YIVO-Institute for Jewish Research	450	485	450	450	300	300
TOTAL	103,940	109,445	112,980	114,850	119,800	119,800

Budget Committee V Defense & Community Relations	1961-62 Grant	1962-63 Grant	1963-64 Grant	1964-65 Grant	C.C. Recomm.	1965-66 Grant
J. C. R. C.	37,020	39,000	40,800	42,000	42,000	42,000
Amer. Jewish Committee	18,250	18,600	19,000	19,600	19,600	19,600
Amer. Jewish Congress	10,250	10,425	10,425	10,425	10,425	10,425
Anti-Defamation League	18,250	18,600	18,600	18,800	18,800	18,800
Jewish Labor Comm.	1,000	1,140	1,140	1,000	1,000	1,000
Jewish War Veterans	350	350	350	350	350	350
NCRAC	<u>1,800</u>	<u>1,940</u>	<u>2,255</u>	<u>2,255</u>	<u>2,255</u>	<u>2,255</u>
TOTAL	86,920	90,055	92,570	94,430	94,430	94,430
TOTAL FOR AGENCIES EXCLUDING CHDS	431,892	455,752	470,985	483,104	493,580	494,390
Interest on JCC Bldg. Loan and CHDS	-	-	-	40,000	40,000	40,000
GRAND TOTAL	431,892	455,752	470,985	523,104	533,580	534,380

NOTES TO APPENDIX VIII

- a - Maximum made available from Fund for Emergencies for emergency immigration by JWF Board on February 9, 1962. Not included in total.
- b - Estimated as cost of resettlement of three families added to normal quota of two by JWF Board on February 9, 1962. Families did not come in -- funds were not used. Not included in total.
- c - Committee recommended that regular allocation (\$11,500) come from funds available for allocations and that if additional funds were necessary they come from UJA Rescue Fund or JWF Fund for Emergencies. \$2,067 not included in total.
- d - Admitted as a beneficiary agency as of July 1, 1964.
- e - Admitted as a beneficiary agency as of July 1, 1965.
- f - Not included in total.
- g - Sheltering Oaks was leased to Jewish Hospital on January 1, 1964 for a period of five years with the option of renewing the lease for an additional five years. The Welfare Fund agreed to continue the subsidy at the rate of \$46,000 per year for an 18 month period through the end of June 1965 pending review by the Coordinating Committee.
- h - Allocation established by JWF Board of Directors. Not included in total.
- i - Discontinued as a beneficiary agency by Board action, March 25, 1963.
- j - JTA was admitted as a beneficiary by Board action effective July 1, 1963. From 1952-62 the agency received payment for services through the Administrative Budget. In 1963-64, it received \$700 from funds available for allocations and \$500 was transferred from the Administrative Budget. \$500 for 1961, 1962, and 1963 not included in total.

- k - National Foundation for Jewish Culture was granted \$1,000 from the fund for Emergencies by Board action in 1961, 1962, and 1963 (not included in total). It was admitted as a beneficiary agency effective July 1, 1964.

FOOTNOTES

- 1
Appendix IV, 34.
- 2
Associated Jewish Agencies of Cincinnati, Report to the Coordinating Committee from the Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?" (January 29, 1965), 3-4.
- 3
Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953), 2-3.
- 4
Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status," American Journal of Sociology, XLV (September, 1939), 171-172.
- 5
Irving L. Horowitz (ed.), Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), 605-606.
- 6
Robert Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power," American Sociological Review, XL (December, 1950), 730-731.
- 7
Hunter, Community Power Structure, 9.
- 8
Aaron Wildavsky, Leadership in a Small Town (Totowa, N.J.: The Bedminster Press, 1964), 278.
- 9
Floyd Hunter, Ruth C. Schaeffer, and Cecil G. Sheps, Community Organization: Action and Inaction (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1956), 44.
- 10
Jacob R. Marcus, Memoirs of American Jews (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955), I:211.

- 11 Marcus, Memoirs of American Jews, I:214.
- 12 United Jewish Social Agencies of Cincinnati, United Jewish Social Agencies (1928), 1.
- 13 Marcus, Memoirs of American Jews, I:211.
- 14 United Jewish Social Agencies of Cincinnati, United Jewish Social Agencies, 1.
- 15 M. Kent Jennings, Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta (Glencoe: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), 181.
- 16 Norman Miller, "The Jewish Leadership of Lakeport," Studies in Leadership, ed. Alvin W. Gouldner (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), 224.
- 17 Appendix IV, 4.
- 18 Kurt Lewin, "The Problem of Minority Leadership," Studies in Leadership, ed. Gouldner, 193.
- 19 Appendix IV, 40.
- 20 Supra, 4-5.
- 21 Hunter, Community Power Structure, 209.
- 22 Hunter, Community Power Structure, 240-241.
- 23 Hunter, Community Power Structure, 180.

24

Associated Jewish Agencies of Cincinnati, Report to the Coordinating Committee from the Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?" 2.

25

Since the 1964-65 campaign, this figure has been set at 5% of the total funds collected.

26

Associated Jewish Agencies of Cincinnati (Long Range Planning Committee), Committee of Ten: Issue and Commentary (October 27, 1965), 1.

27

Associated Jewish Agencies of Cincinnati, Committee of Ten: Issue and Commentary, 2-4.

28

Associated Jewish Agencies of Cincinnati, Report to the Coordinating Committee from the Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?" 1.

29

Associated Jewish Agencies of Cincinnati, Report to the Coordinating Committee from the Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?" 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Baltzell, Edward D. The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Brady, R. A. Business as a System of Power. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Cartwright, Dorwin, ed. Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor: Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1959.
- Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion in their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life. Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.
- Dewey, John. The Problems of Men. New York: Philosophical Library, 1946.
- Friedrich, Carl J. Authority. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Gouldner, Alvin W., ed. Studies in Leadership. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Haroutunian, Joseph. Lust for Power. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1949.
- Horowitz, Irving L., ed. Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1956.
- _____, Ruth C. Schaeffer, and Cecil G. Sheps. Community Organization: Action and Inaction. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1956.
- Jennings, Eugene E. An Anatomy of Leadership. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Jennings, M. Kent. Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta. Glencoe: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Kahn, Robert L. and Elise Boulding. Power and Conflict in Organizations. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Keller, Suzanne. Beyond the Ruling Classes: Strategic Elites in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1963.

Landis, Paul H. Social Policies in the Making: A Dynamic View of Social Problems. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1947.

_____. Social Control: Social Organization and Disorganization in Process. Chicago and Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, Co., 1939.

Lasswell, Harold D. Politics: Who Gets What, When, How. New York and London: Whittlesey House, 1936.

_____. Power and Personality. New York: W. W. Norton, 1948.

_____ and Abraham Kaplan. Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Leviton, Richard. Religious Motivations in Recent and Contemporary Jewish Communal Leadership. Unpublished Rabbinical Thesis, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1956.

McConaughty, John. Who Rules America? New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1934.

Marcus, Jacob R. Memoirs of American Jews. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955.

Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Monsen, R. Joseph, Jr. and Mark W. Cannon. The Makers of Public Policy: American Power Groups and their Ideologies. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1965.

Mosca, Gaetano. The Ruling Classes. New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1939.

Mueller-Deham, Albert. Human Relations and Power: Socio-Political Analysis and Synthesis. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957.

Polsby, Nelson W. Community Power and Political Theory. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Presthus, R. V. Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Rogow, Arnold A. and Harold D. Lasswell. Power, Corruption, and Rectitude. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Russell, Bertrand. Power: A New Social Analysis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1938.

Sereno, Renzo. The Rulers. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962.

Simon, Yves. A General Theory of Authority. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962.

_____. The Nature and Functions of Authority. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1940.

Strausz-Hupe, Robert. Power and Community. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1956.

Thometz, Carol E. The Decision-Makers: The Power Structure of Dallas. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1963.

Westin, Alan F., ed. The Uses of Power: Seven Cases in American Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962.

Wildavsky, Aaron. Leadership in a Small Town. Totowa, N.J.: The Bedminster Press, 1964.

Ziegler, Edward. The Vested Interests: Their Origins, Development, and Behavior. New York: MacMillan, 1964.

PERIODICALS

- Bendix, Reinhard. "Bureaucracy and the Problem of Power," Public Administration Review, V (1945), 194-209.
- Bierstedt, Robert. "An Analysis of Social Power," American Sociological Review, XV (December, 1950), 730-738.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr. and Robert L. Hamblin. "The Effect of the Wife's Employment on the Family Power Situation," Social Forces, XXXV (May, 1958), 347-352.
- Brooks, Maxwell R. "American Class and Caste: An Appraisal," Social Forces, XXV (December, 1946), 207-211.
- Field, Oliver P. "Property and Authority," The Journal of Politics, III (August, 1941), 253-275.
- Freund, Ludwig. "Power and The Democratic Process: A Definition of Politics," Social Research, XV (September, 1948), 327-344.
- Goldhamer, Herbert and Edward A. Shils. "Types of Power and Status," American Journal of Sociology, XLV (September, 1939), 171-182.
- Kelso, Robert W. "Banker Control of Community Chests," Survey Graphic, (May, 1932), 117-119.
- Mace, C. A. "Hierarchical Organization," The Sociological Review, XXV (October, 1934), 373-392.
- Moore, B. "The Relation Between Social Stratification and Social Control," Sociometry, V (August, 1942), 230-251.
- Murphy, Albert J. "A Study of the Leadership Process," American Sociological Review, VI (October, 1941), 674-687.
- Neeley, Twila E. "The Sources of Political Power: A Contribution to the Sociology of Leadership," American Journal of Sociology, XXXIII (March, 1928), 769-783.
- Nickle, Clarence E. "Community Control," Social Forces, IV (December, 1925), 345-355.

Pape, Leslie M. "The Sources and Limits of Political Power," Social Forces, XVIII (March, 1940), 424-428.

Riezler, Kurt. "The Will to Power," Social Science, (February, 1942), 123-140.

Roucek, Joseph S. "Political Behavior as a Struggle for Power," The Journal of Social Philosophy, VI (July, 1941), 341-351.

Scholz, Karl. "Transitions in the Exercise of Power," Social Science, (July, 1943), 135-140.

Tannenbaum, Frank. "The Balance of Power in Society," Political Science Quarterly, LXI (December, 1946), 481-504.

von Beckerath, Herbert. "Economics and Politics," Social Forces, XIV (October, 1935), 42-53.

REPORTS

Associated Jewish Agencies of Cincinnati (Long Range Planning Committee). Committee of Ten: Issue and Commentary. October 27, 1965.

. Indices of Economic Growth in the Cincinnati Area (Based on report by Benjamin Engel), June, 1965.

. Report to the Coordinating Committee from the Committee on "Why Jewish Agencies?", January 29, 1965.

Cohn, Martin M. Problems of Jewish Identity Facing Us Today. Associated Jewish Agencies and Jewish Welfare Fund, Cincinnati, Ohio. (Paper presented at the Intermediate and Small Cities Executives Institute, August 22, 1965).

. The Role of Research in Federation and Agency Planning: A Critical Analysis. Associated Jewish Agencies and Jewish Welfare Fund, Cincinnati, Ohio. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Philadelphia, Pa., May 31, 1965).

Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. Youth Looks at the Jewish Community. New York: November, 1965.

United Jewish Social Agencies of Cincinnati. United Jewish Social Agencies, 1928.

POWER IN A
MID-WEST JEWISH COMMUNITY

APPENDIX IV

TRANSCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEWS

This appendix is to be filed in the American Jewish Archives, on the campus of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio, for "RESTRICTED USE ONLY," pursuant to the guarantee of anonymity offered to the interviewees. Permission for its use may be obtained from the Director of the American Jewish Archives or from the author of this thesis.

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters and Ordination

by

Kenneth D. Roseman

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
February, 1966

Referees

Dr. Jacob R. Marcus

Dr. Robert Katz

INTERVIEWEE: Murray Blackman

OCCUPATION: Reform Jewish Rabbi

Discussing the rabbinic situation in Cincinnati, he commented that we are now at the tail end of a period of "escalating reaction." The Cincinnati Jewish community used to be led by strong rabbis, such as Philipson and Heller. When they stepped down, the vacuum was filled by laymen. These lay leaders reacted strongly against the strong rabbinic leadership of the previous years, and there were no new rabbis who were strong enough in their own rights to assert themselves. Now, we are beginning to get rabbinic involvement in the Jewish community by rabbis on a substantive level. The cause is twofold: new personalities and the recognition that rabbis are needed and useful.

Cincinnati, he asserted, is a highly undemocratic Jewish community. Leadership is in the hands of the moneyed oligarchy, although they may not hold offices. This would seem to be the case in other communities. We have "leadership by smoke-filled room." The old-line families are continually trying to squeeze out upstart Eastern European Jews. The new leaders may represent the views of the old families, but not strong Jewishness; there are exceptions. There is an increasingly anti-democratic trend. The Leadership Training Council catapults young men prematurely into leadership and exerts control on who is eligible for leadership.

He characterized Henry Hersch, new Chairman of the Jewish Welfare Fund Campaign, as the "darling of the power elite." He has little commitment and avoids controversy.

One of the problems in the Jewish community is the ultimate clash of agency executives who are allied with persons committed to Jewish values with those nominal leaders who are marginal Jews.

The attempt to merge the AJA and JWF through the Co-ordinating Committee is an attempt to get the purse strings and social planning in the hands of the same people, who would inevitably be the old-line families. Formerly, the two agencies had productive opposition. Maybe this is an inevitable change.

On the problem of day schools, there will be some compromise, of necessity. The leadership is committed to the principle of supporting parochial Jewish education. But, the question is: What kind and how much support? There will, consequently, be some support, but also some tension. This may not be a bad situation.

INTERVIEWEE: Murray Blackman (cont'd)

The Reform Jewish community has accepted the notion of "Catholic Israel." The broadness of their support of Jewish causes has been impressive. Now they feel that they also have some rights, and they want to assert them.

INTERVIEWEE: Herbert Bloch, Jr.

OCCUPATION: Department Store Executive

A cooperative fund-raising agency has some things people don't like. But, those who pop off are immature, and their ideas are less important than the amount of noise they create. Combining fund-raising and social planning is a necessary compromise. Messer and Goldstein (Wolf) don't get their way. Current decisions are based on background, not on merit. If an agency is to be cut out, it is done slowly, if at all. There is a necessary, built-in inefficiency. The JWF is a fairly routine operation, plodding along. New projects tap new, undeveloped talents. One needs the power structure, but the power structure doesn't initiate the enthusiasm.

He has lost interest in some activities because of the demands on his time and the slow forward movement, which has caused a drop in his enthusiasm. Therefore, we continually need new people to avoid hum-drum. Young men don't stand up to the power structure, so need older men with maturity. This will lead to dynamic progress, as illustrated in the cases of Messer and Luckman. Some men who would fit in this category give substantially, but do not work. Examples would be Louis Lerner, Marvin Warner, Kanter. The infusion of new blood is necessary every seven to ten years or we get uninspired leadership in the central agencies. The individual agencies seem to get adequate leadership all along.

The important work of the Jewish community is done in two places, depending on function: money is controlled by the power structure, but budget and program are derived from the individual agencies.

The recognized need to satisfy all segments of the Jewish Community causes some of the ponderous slowness of movement and progress. This is especially true in the area of finances.

With regard to Jewish education, there are still a few stalwarts who are totally opposed, such as Sidney Weil. Many object to the continuation of two schools and to the amount of money expended (Yavneh gets \$60,000; Chofetz Chaim receives \$20,000; Bureau of Jewish Education gets about \$25,000). The people in charge of fund-raising don't want to provoke anyone; in this matter, the fund chairman can override the power structure because of financial considerations. Other considerations are that the Orthodox give less than they receive. In regard to contracts for two old homes, it was intransigence on the part of some Reform leaders that prevented a possible merger, when the merger was very close.

About 75% of all Jews feel that there is really no difference between Jews and non-Jews. But, this is not true of the leadership. They have a greater sense of obligation to other Jews and to the Jewish community.

INTERVIEWEE: Herbert Bloch, Jr. (cont'd)

Anti-Semitic incidents should be handled by laymen in conjunction with the proper civic authorities. The first step should be a call to the police. Headlines are unimportant, so one should not crank an incident up into a big public relations problem. The police can provide better, more authoritative public relations than the Community Relations Committee, especially to the press and media in situations regarding Jews, Negroes, any minority. Public relations and wide coverages pushes the offenders and the abused into corners with their backs to the wall. These matters should be taken care of through normal business channels. Example: The editor of the Catholic Telegram in pre-WW II Cincinnati wrote some anti-Jewish articles. He was ousted by informal pressures through influential laymen. Laymen can say: "God damn it, you can't do this and still move among decent citizens in Cincinnati. I'm going to fix your wagon."

He evinced satisfaction with the present policies and stressed the value of the Leadership Training Council.

One of the major needs of the Jewish community is to find mature leadership. Current leaders are "wearing out," due to routine which is not exciting. This is especially true in the general, central agencies. Smaller units have an easier time. There are vast personnel resources untapped, such as the spenders in Amberley who don't work.

The purpose of the Jewish community is the same as in any other group. Father's influence started him in communal work.

Ranking of issues stresses fund-raising, Jewish education, and finding good lay leaders, in that order.

Regarding what makes a good leader, he stressed motivation, although he stated that it was usually unknown. Few work just to do good; many want personal satisfaction, reputation, etc. Also need a common standard or sense of values, sufficient time and money.

The communal services today are more sophisticated than those of the last generation, but there is need for the inspired "reach." This is vital, but the present trend will be toward expanding and improving present facilities rather than initiating new services.

Some of the young leaders of importance are: Henry Hersch, Charles Stix, Dick Weiland, Nachum Eden, Bernard Rosenberg. If he wanted to get something across that involved money, he would require at least one-third of the top givers in the JWF (That group has 30-40 individuals.). Without that, no chance of success.

INTERVIEWEE: Herbert Bloch, Jr. (cont'd)

Some of the men with whom he usually confers are: Alfred Friedlander, Fritz Rauh, Mark Levy, and Herb Oettinger. He uses the professionals as "enablers." On the other side of many questions, he usually finds Eddie Jacobs and Al Butohkes. Generally, however, he is in the majority. Henry Hersch, Carl Rauh, Dick Weiland are others with whom he has consistent agreement. Two men (Phil Steiner and Philip Meyers Sr.) were termed great, but unprincipled, compromisers. Harold Goldstein (and his "side-kick" Joe Wolf) was termed the "worst element in the Jewish Community." He called him negative, destructive, too controversial, the worst possible public relations, someone who got in by default. None of these men, however, have sufficient power to topple an issue if it is properly raised; the best they can do is secure a good measure of compromise or delay.

He has little contact socially with non-Jews because he does not make the effort.

Regarding the rabbis of the community, he termed Goldfeder of Adath Israel a good rabbi and respected Murray Blackman of Rockdale Avenue Temple - thoughtful, well-accepted, expressed what he thinks clearly and well. Wohl of Wise Temple he considered a good influence, but one who continually overplays. Goldman of Wise Temple he called a "half-wit," a pusher, a bad rabbi. The synagogues and temples play a role in every business except "the business of religion." They should try to step out of communal affairs.

Jewish education is helpful because it is important to feel comfortable as a Jew. It is also important to let everyone know that you are a Jew and that you are strongly against anti-Semitism.

Some of the prestigious Jews in the general community are: Fred, Ralph, and Jeffrey Lazarus, Robert Westheimer, Herb Oettinger, Philip Meyers Sr., Alfred Friedlander, Willis Gradison Jr., Murray Seansonood, Robert Goldman, and himself. There is a current of resentment in the Jewish community when a moneyed Jew makes a big contribution to the general community. This, in his words, "may not be wrong."

INTERVIEWEE: Philip T. Cohen

OCCUPATION: Building Contractor

The AJA (UJSA) still consists mainly of German Jews and their descendants. The JWF started in the 1930's with an influx of immigrants who had sizeable needs (jobs, homes....) and other national and international needs. Thus, help was needed and new agencies outside the AJA (and the Community Chest) emerged. These agencies drew strength from a cross-section of the Jewish community, but there grew up a tension because of the suspicion of and competition with the AJA. The Co-ordinating Committee would be a good thing in alleviating some of these tensions. The AJA fears giving money to the day schools and other Orthodox forms of Judaism. On the totally other side of the coin, Conservative and Orthodox Jews fear loss of money resources if they merge with the AJA. A merger of the AJA and the JWF is probable, but not in the near future.

Regarding specific problems: In Jewish education, one of the prime conflicts is between the two schools, where there is a strong rationale for a merger into one facility. The Jewish Community Center is good, but not well-accepted socially by the big donors. He is optimistic regarding the younger leaders who show considerably more flexibility. Cincinnati Jews have had a good social conscience and, consequently, developed excellent individual agencies. This feeling of social responsibility has been lost by the descendants of the original settlers. There is a hard core of sophisticated, old-Cincinnati Jews who take Judaism lightly and their social responsibility lightly. This is a thorn in the side of community ventures, inasmuch as they could help the Jewish community flourish. Yet some did get enthused on a specific project, Glen Manor. There is a great deal of money in Cincinnati. Negotiations about the merger of the two old homes broke down when Rabbi Eliezer Silver insisted that there could be only Orthodox services and one chapel. However, there were intransigents on both sides.

The Problem of Religious Apathy: This should be dealt with as a laymen's problem. Must motivate others by learning what motivates those who are active. It also exists in a lesser degree in relation to the social structure, especially regarding people who give lip-service to their Judaism. There is a failure to recognize that the agencies come from a Jewish commitment; they support the Jewish communal agencies only because it is "the thing to do," or because they fear that they would lose prestige if they did not. Temples and synagogues must bring about a rededication on this level. Therefore, they should try to bring proven leaders into the religious agencies to get others to follow. He will bring in a circle of friends who respect him. If we are to have Jewish agencies, we must have a better idea of Jewish commitment. We need Jewish content and understanding. What else is distinct?

INTERVIEWEE: Philip T. Cohen (cont'd)

He pointed to meaningful distinctions between the Jewish and non-Jewish ways of life. We have led in health and welfare projects. We have shown a deeper concern for our fellowman and have done the most effective job.

If there were an anti-Semitic incident, it could best be handled through the JCRC, the rabbis, and the police. There would be no advantage other than educational in publicity if the incident could be otherwise handled. The public should, however, know that a moral sin was committed.

The major need of the Jewish community is a grooming in the knowledge of Jewish commitment. Otherwise Jewish agencies will falter. Too many don't know why we are different or why we should be. The purpose of the Jewish community is to fulfill the teaching of Judaism, especially in the area of social action. We must lead the way in action, based on a theory of mitzvot. We have a responsibility to show the way for others.

Leadership is frequently given on grounds other than merit. Ability, knowledge, commitment, etc., may be subordinated to social contact, friendship, or business connections.

Ranking current problems, he states: Apathy of Jews toward Judaism, Israel, communication with the total community regarding needs and problems, fund-raising, and finding good leadership, in that order. A successful fund-raising campaign can help other causes by establishing a favorable climate. It is easier to get capital funds than operating funds, the appeal for which is repetitive with no sense of personal contact or responsiveness. The receipts of the JWF are hugely inadequate, but this is a problem of mass communication.

Good leaders are those who are willing to give of themselves, in terms of time, money, and effort. They are convinced of needs and rise to meet them. Publicity-seekers fade out quickly. Some get personal gratification without dedication; they, too, don't stay in very long. He must be able to endure frustrations, have to sacrifice family life. He must have intelligence and understanding. Examples of leaders who dropped out because their personal gratification demands were not met are Messer (Losantiville Membership) and Robert Stern. A good leader must be able to gain the confidence and respect of his co-workers so that he can influence them.

The facilities in the Jewish community are better now than a generation ago, but we have leadership weaknesses. The young men are doing a good job and will do better; there is sufficient cause for optimism.

INTERVIEWEE: Philip T. Cohen (cont'd)

Some of the good younger leaders are: Henry Hersoh, Val Friedman, Billy Friedlander, Charles Tobias, Stan Rose, Bernard Dave, Baron Gold, Barry Stuhlbarg, Dick Weiland (although he is somewhat of a loner), Alan Rosenberg. One who has the potential, but has yet to prove himself, is Phil Meyers Jr.

We should try to satisfy all elements of the Jewish community, but not uncritically. With apathy, there is a tendency to compromise without principles.

On a project which requires large capital investment, the board of one's own institution must give a substantial sum first. Then, you try to involve key individuals who have large personal wealth; this would be about 1% of the Jewish community and would include such men as Meyers, Steiner, the Lazarus family, Salinger, Bloch, etc. The nature of the Board may help or hinder the project. If it is an ingrown Board, it may not recognize new needs, even if the individuals are highly dedicated. There is a continuing need for progressive, outstanding, new people who are about to achieve and sustain an interplay of agencies and total community support. He mentioned that two of the men he would consult on a major project would be Philip Meyers Sr. and Carl Rauh.

There are only a handful of people with real wealth in Cincinnati. A combine of these people could easily block almost any project that they wanted to defeat by withdrawing the funds which potentially they could contribute.

He said that he has virtually no social contact with non-Jews.

The rabbis of the community could play a large role in terms of Jewish commitment and education, but, with the exception of Murray Blackman, they have not done well in this regard. The temples and synagogues need to take a more active role in total community affairs. Some Jewish education is necessary if a man is to be an effective Jewish leader.

Some of the Jews who are influential in the non-Jewish community are: Murray Seasongood, Herbert Oettinger, Charles Messer, the Lazarus family, Philip Meyers Sr., Herbert Bloch, and Philip Steiner.

INTERVIEWEE: Martin Cohn

OCCUPATION: Executive Director of the Associated Jewish Agencies, Social Worker

There is a power structure in Cincinnati, but it is becoming more flexible and open. The old, German, Reform Jews under Wise established a hegemony with rather absolute control. Now, others are able to get in. But, generally, they have already accepted the mores, norms, and goals of the ruling group. One also needs money to get in, although not as much as would be thought. The time of settlement in Cincinnati and accumulation of excess capital are important, although to a lesser degree.

There has been no effective Orthodox lay leadership because Rabbi Silver was able to centralize power under his own auspices. Now that he is losing control, it is a serious problem, in that there exists a power vacuum. Reform leaders did keep out those who were not acceptable, but it was a two-way street. He sees more Orthodox involvement in the next generation.

Jewish education receives 25% of the money kept in Cincinnati (\$100,000 of \$400,000) which is about 5% above the national average. The conclusion one reaches is that the day school people have bargaining power from weakness, especially since they do not give much to the JWF. The demands on the community cannot be estimated for the future accurately, because government and community chest programs will vary greatly. While he expects no reduction in the size of the JWF drive, there could be a sizeable increase needed if the community chest contribution (now about \$400,000) were reduced, which might occur if they diverted their attention to new programs for the poor and aging. He was optimistic, however, stating that Cincinnati can meet the operating and improvement demands which will be placed upon it.

Cincinnati is more stratified than cities of a comparable nature. It is similar to San Francisco and Baltimore in its degree of breaking-down barriers. The German, Reform Jewish establishment has been beneficial to the city, even though there has been no democracy. Money does talk, inasmuch as there are large demands, and big gifts are needed to meet them. A giver of large sums is always welcomed, although he cannot buy his way into the power structure easily. The middle group of givers has been lagging, and there is a critical need to educate younger men to increase the size of their gifts. The idea of power structure as a group of men sitting in a smoke-filled room and working out evil plots is invalid. The power structure is informal and varies from area to area, from issue to issue.

INTERVIEWEE: Martin Cohn (cont'd)

Fund-raising is always a problem, but Cincinnati does better than comparable communities. The big problem will come if there is a serious change in the amount of support received from the community chest, etc. Another problem is the care of the aged. There will be continual pressure in the area of geriatrics. The problem of Jewish education must also be resolved. We give a large sum to day schools, and there are disputes. The resolution will come after a while, when a consensus of opinion has been reached. However, he would not predict what this consensus might be.

Some people will, naturally, be excluded from leadership. There are strong social pressures at play. If a person is disliked, he cannot get in. If enough people like him, he will get in temporarily. Then, he will be tested to see if he is predictable or not, whether he is the right sort, if he can do a good job. If he is harmless or gives only moderately, but up to his means, they will keep him. Otherwise, out!

INTERVIEWEE: Nachum Eden

OCCUPATION: Insurance Agent

In general, he wanted the JWF fundamentally strengthened. He thought that it leaves voids and is less strong than some might think, with the exception of the monetary monopoly it possesses. It is timid, taking no stands, and this he viewed as a key deficiency. There is too much compromise, with the view to making everyone happy; but this is a sign of weakness and that the men in control have no strong values for which they will fight. He suggested that survival with the concomitant values of difference and intelligent understanding of Judaism was the key value. But, many of the leaders feel that there is no difference between Jews and non-Jews other than their religion; he strongly disagrees.

Anti-Semitism should be handled through the JCRC and men like the rabbis, Phil Steiner, Eugene Weston, Carl Rauh, and Henry Hersch. There is no point being scared, since the issue cannot be avoided.

The key need in the Jewish community is education as to the goals, philosophy, and direction of Judaism. This is critical if there is to be Jewish survival. Survival is the key value for subjective reasons, self-protection, etc.

He was drafted into community service on the claim that "there was nobody else who could do the job." That they would pick someone with relatively small experience indicates that there is a dire need for manpower.

Ranking community issues, he cited in the following order: provision of community services, religious education, fund-raising, Israel, and a re-evaluation of Church-State relations.

Good leaders have intelligence, education, stick by their convictions, grow in their positions. If a man has these qualities and lacks great wealth, he will still rise in the leadership structure. There are few such men, and this is a critical need. Money is not a sine qua non, but desire is. The younger leaders are better educated in secular fields and are more efficient, but they have not yet developed a feeling of commitment. Once they are aroused, they do a good job. The growing use of professionals leads to lay non-involvement. We must train these professionals to do a better job of educating the laymen.

It is impossible to operate a voluntaristic community on a democratic basis. There are costs involved, but inevitably.

INTERVIEWEE: Nachum Eden (cont'd)

The men necessary to the fulfillment of a major project include Messer, Lichter, Philip Meyers Sr., Bloch, and Steiner. He felt closest to Steiner and would ask his advice. He usually finds that the following people agree with him most frequently: Ezra Spiechandler, Naftali Frankel, Ruth Zeligs, Sally Brown, Rabbi Albert Goldman. On the other side of most questions, he finds Herbert Oettinger (He identifies Jewish education with Orthodoxy, and he is totally foreign to this world.), Robert Westheimer, and Carl Rauh. The Executive Committee of the JWF can veto or delay important proposals unless there is an unusual amount of public pressure.

The rabbis don't lead on a community basis. They have a sanctity which would be destroyed if they took part in the day-to-day workings of the secular Jewish community. They also have feelings of inwardness and are jealous of their prerogatives, and this is costly to the total community. They do not appear to understand the community from a total point of view and inject antagonisms in policy matters when they do get involved. It is, consequently, better not to involve them. They have not proved forthright or daring, but always try to represent the leaders of their congregations. The congregations should be more integrated into the total community picture, and education should be on a community-wide basis, rather than its present segmented form.

A good Jewish education is essential to good leadership. It is criminal that the current leaders have a kindergarten Jewish education. Their involvement in agency work is equivalent to their total Jewish involvement and is the substance of their Jewishness.

The Jews who are most involved and influential in the non-Jewish community are Benjamin Schwartz (Juvenile Court Judge), Walton Bachrach (Mayor), Abraham Citron and Harold Goldstein (JCRC), and the rabbis.

INTERVIEWEE: Alfred Friedlander

OCCUPATION: Stock Broker

There is a power structure. Example: In the giving of Sheltering Oaks Hospital to the Jewish Hospital, a group of ten men got together and decided that it was the only thing to do. Therefore, despite some opposition, it was done. The same thing is true regarding the origin of Sheltering Oaks. These men are old-line, German, Reform Jews and have a tradition of benevolent service in the community dating back a hundred years. They also do a lot outside the specifically Jewish community.

Too few men are concentrated in too many board positions. There is a great need for many new men. The Leadership Training Council is a good start, but there are still problems. One needs time, consequently, one must have enough money to be able to take time off from daily occupations. This limits the number of younger men who can be involved, although it is very desirable that they be on committees, boards, etc. The result is that the older, moneyed people or people who have money behind them get the big jobs - a purely pragmatic problem. There is a broadening of the base of power, although it is slight, among the younger men, as well as increasing flexibility. Problems that caused difficulties a generation ago are no longer acute. The question arose: Why are not the Orthodox Jews contributing their share of leadership and workers? We discussed the possibility that there might be a lag after the time of settlement before a group was sufficiently acculturated so that it could turn from the daily problems of making a living and accumulating excess capital to community service. He saw further rapprochement in the next generation.

As he sees it, the main problem now is the giving of 20-25% of the money kept by the JWF in Cincinnati to a limited aspect of Jewish education. There is no general agreement that such money should be given at all. There is a bigger disagreement as to what percentage of the JWF funds should go to Jewish day schools. No agreement can be reached on whether to merge the two schools. While this will not tear the community apart, it will continue as a source of tension and dissension. Maybe the next generation will resolve it. Meanwhile, despite the dissatisfaction, the status quo will continue relatively unchanged.

In reference to the proposed reorganization of the AJA and the JWF, the Co-ordinating Committee has been fairly successful and should be retained with an eventual merger. This will not come until the power structure sits down and

INTERVIEWEE: Alfred Friedlander (cont'd)

decides that it will happen. This will probably occur fairly soon. The former rift between the AJA and the Jewish Hospital and that between the Zionists and the anti-Zionists are over; they are now replaced by the controversy over Jewish education, where a few zealots are working to the disadvantage of the total community.

A lot of money has been wasted because the Orthodox do not want to compromise. This is especially true in the case of the Old Home and, more recently, in the problems of Jewish education. The demand for money is less of a problem than finding good young leaders. We also need better total community social planning.

He has a close social relationship with many non-Jews. He stressed the involvement of Jews in general Cincinnati affairs, that it is above and beyond the level of other groups. There is a non-parochial interest, although also a degree of activity in Jewish communal affairs. Little overt Jewishness is manifested by men such as himself. He claimed that there is little anti-Semitism in Cincinnati; that which remains is marginal, even in executive levels. Socially, it is still apparent, but less than formerly. He noted that we also practice discrimination by excluding non-Jews from Rosantiville Country Club!

INTERVIEWEE: Baron Gold

OCCUPATION: Attorney

He seemed satisfied with the current organization of the JWF, but noted that it is stagnant in terms of fund-raising. We need to increase about 5% per year to take care of the rise of operating expenses, even with the same program we now have. That this money is not forthcoming will cause budgetary fights, because some activity is going to be cut down.

He would call on certain men in the causes with which they have been most associated. Thus, if it were a matter of defense, he would call Steiner, Goldstein, Israel, and himself. For Jewish communal services, it would be Bloch and Westheimer or Weston. In Jewish education, Nachum Eden. Phil Meyers Sr. he characterized as totally opposed to Jewish education as a category of JWF expenditure - "We're giving that money to Orthodoxy!" Eddie Jacobs he called "Silver's boy, but willing to deal a little."

He agreed that it was desirable to satisfy all elements of the Jewish community, although he wanted to use the words "be acceptable to."

He stressed the fact that there is a difference between Jews and non-Jews, especially on the level of social responsibility. Jews have higher moral standards. Now that they are socially accepted, the problem is how to stay different? Anti-Semitic incidents should be handled through the courts, attempting to play down the professional bigots. The majority of Jews would keep quiet regarding discrimination, but would contribute liberally in terms of funds. Drama is necessary only for the JWF, where you cannot raise money or call on efforts without some cause. In defense problems, there is no organized community in terms of action. Harold Goldstein and Allen Brown would be the two persons called on to handle such problems.

Among the community needs he cited were, first, the raising of adequate sums of money, and second, the securing of a broader base of representation on boards, especially the more influential ones. He said that the purpose of the Jewish community was to bring order out of chaos, to represent the views of individuals and groups, and to gain Jewish goals.

People get involved in the community work accidentally. He visited Israel during the war, wrote home about his impressions. Wohl gave a sermon on the letter, and he was marked for communal service. Most people either saw a need or were asked to work for worthy causes. People don't work for causes or give to unspecific causes; they like to work for people and for causes which they can understand.

INTERVIEWEE: Baron Gold (cont'd)

Ranking the issues facing the Jewish community, he listed the following in order: fund-raising, provision of community services, finding good professional leadership, and maintaining a Jewish identity in a free society. With regard to professional leadership, he said that a good degree of upgrading was necessary, both educationally and financially.

To be a good leader, a person needs to be able to express himself, intelligence, to be able to get along with people, and an ability to bring others to compromise. A person with ability and interest can get involved, provided that he has the right contacts. He gave the example of Henry Hersch. Some people seem to rise in leadership faster than others because of ability, family background and connections, ethnic origin, and financial reasons. The younger men are doing just as good a job as the leaders in previous generations; in fact, it may be a more enlightened job. He mentioned Harris Weston, Bernard Rosenberg, and Henry Hersch as excellent younger leaders. Among the older leaders, he said that he would want Charles Messer ("acceptable everywhere") and Phil Steiner on his side. He gave an extensive list of all the leaders of the Jewish community whom he would consult before making up his mind on an important matter - he would vote only after a great deal of research.

He mentioned that Bernard Rosenberg, Henry Hersch, Dick Weiland, Al Bilik, and Charles Tobias are usually on the same side that he is, and that he frequently disagrees with the ardent advocates of Jewish parochial education, especially Nachum Eden. He thought that the President of the JWF Board in coalition with a few other men could veto almost any project that might be proposed, and that other men could force significant compromises. In this regard, he mentioned Phil Steiner most prominently.

The rabbis have taken strong moral stands on such issues as civil rights, but they have avoided being involved in the daily working of the secular Jewish community. They will work on an ad hoc basis for good causes, but they are afraid of politics, taking sides on non-religious issues, etc. The temples and synagogues are not sufficiently unified to act effectively. Consequently, they are little involved in community action.

He disagreed that Jewish education was an essential part of the preparation for a Jewish communal leader. He thought that one can be effective without it in most areas.

Mentioning some of the Jews who are most influential in the general community, he named Carl Rubin, Mike Israel, Bob Westheimer, Henry Hersch, and Marvin Warner. A group of Jews who would be seen as Jews who made good, but who have a little influence, are Willis Gradison Jr., Walton Bachrach, and Benjamin Schwartz.

INTERVIEWEE: Baron Gold (cont'd)

He seemed to feel that he was generally with the majority in any major matter. This would go along with the fact that he voted only after consulting most of them.

He had some contact with non-Jews socially. But, he said that he does not go out of his way to invite them over, nor do they. If invitations were extended, they would be accepted.

INTERVIEWEE: Robert Goldman

OCCUPATION: Attorney

This was a rather unproductive interview although I did gain insight into the history of the Jewish community of Cincinnati and into the feelings of a segment of that community which feels well-accepted and secure among the non-Jews of the city. He pointed out the typical method of economic advancement several generations back, from stock clerk to peddler to owner. Both his family and his wife's are third-generation residents of the area. They feel completely at home in the city and are totally acculturated to upper-middle class American life.

He said that most people get involved in service to the community because of family tradition and expectations, plus accidents. With reference to his own career of Jewish community service, he happened to be at the right place at the right time. An early Zionist meeting had invited Brandeis to address them, but Rabbi Philipson disinvited him because he did not want a speech on Zionism. Many in the community resented this affront and decided to form a committee to reinvoke Brandeis and to propagandize for Israel. Since Goldman was young, vigorous, and of the right sort of family, he was asked to be secretary of the group. When he succeeded in this one job, he was immediately asked for other positions. After one success, people seek you out for other jobs.

The old families are weakening, but not altogether. Some are deeply involved (such as his own son), but some have completely disappeared. He did not offer any explanation of this phenomenon.

INTERVIEWEE: Harold Goldstein

OCCUPATION: Attorney

He remarked that "the power structure is impotent when the non-power structure wants to make an issue of it." The power structure exists because of the law of inertia. The community gives lip-service to democracy, but things are run in committee. When matters reach the Board, the momentum is not easily challenged; it is easier to ratify the decision reached in the committee.

Some organizations have strong characters as chairmen and weak under-structures. The nucleus of power can be as small as six persons; they can run the organization.

One current fight in the power structure is regarding the tenure of Martin Cohn. Goldstein claims he is sadistic, that he attacks his subordinates, that thirty-six have quit or been fired in seven years, out of a permanent staff of eleven. Does this indicate paranoia? Goldstein fought with him several years ago, then quit dealing with him. All the executives of the individual agencies hate him. He is a failure in personal relations. The JWF is way down in terms of morale and finances. It is now run by default and has ceased being a real community organization.

Characterizing different community leaders, he said that Henry Hersch was bright, but a "gutless wonder" who wants to be liked by the power structure.

Charles Messer is still considered East European.

Richard Weiland is the "Frank Sinatra of his clan."

Marvin Warner is "a real crumb."

Mark Levy is a "tool."

Philip Meyers Sr. is extremely reactionary. He considered himself as one who would undermine the power of the JWF committee. He said that he must proceed very carefully. I wondered if he felt tangential. The power structure, he said, wants to maintain the status quo; it wants to keep quarrels private, to be good in the eyes of the non-Jewish community. There is a clear choice to be made: "Kiss ass or run a real healthy community."

The power structure is maintained by having a strong power nucleus plus operating on the committee structure and having a weak board. They use the wrong criteria for selecting board members: not intelligence, courage, sense for democratic structure, articulateness, but wealth, fiction of representing different groups, etc. He cited Eddie Jacobs as one who is alleged to represent the Orthodox community, but who lacks all the vital criteria for being a good board member. The professional executive provides ego-satisfactions for the laymen, placing them on prestige committees. Otherwise,

INTERVIEWEE: Harold Goldstein (cont'd)

some of these people never receive any rewards or ego-satisfactions at all.

He commented on the "Lazarus crowd." It is not representative of anything to worry about in Jewish affairs. They are deferred to because of their money, but their contributions are niggardly in respect to their total wealth. They give only about \$15,000-\$20,000 per family or a clan total of less than \$75,000. The effect of their giving is to set a low standard for giving throughout the total Jewish community. This is a deleterious effect of the power structure. A healthy community would not solicit funds from them, but would "tell them to go to hell."

He gave several examples of the exercise of power.

(1) According to the rules of the game, the chairman of the JWF drive was to be appointed the chairman of the JWF board and later president. This way, he could be used in power for at least three years. Then, they adopted new rules. The chairman of the campaign now succeeds to nothing, and the other two offices are elective by the rest of the board. He fought their rationale that a good fund chairman would not necessarily be a good chairman or president of the board. This affected Joseph Wolf most specifically, since he was in office as fund chairman when the change in rules was passed. They did not want him in, so they changed the rules in the middle of the game, not after his tenure. They removed the reward for the job. Now, persons can be elected (appointed) without first being the working chairman of a campaign; this is a horizontal appointment, not vertical advancement.

(2) Power is frequently exercised during the Summer when others are off-guard or away on vacation. Herbert Bloch Sr. wanted a campaign for raising \$250,000 to create a home for chronically ill in July. This eventually became Sheltering Oaks. Goldstein objected since only fourteen members were present and since all the budget had been approved without preference to any one beneficiary. But, "an argument for equity and justice makes no difference to these men." The campaign for \$250,000 was approved, but they ran a campaign for \$400,000 and built a facility for nearly \$900,000. Thus, they created something which ran a deficit of \$60,000 per year. Goldstein suggested that it be sold, and that the funds be given proportionately to all the beneficiaries. The action was that Sheltering Oaks was given to the Jewish Hospital free and clear. Note: Jewish Hospital is in the power of the old, Germanic group. Why, he asks, should the Jewish community finance only Jewish doctors?

(3) The Jewish Community Center started out authorized to build for \$1,000,000, but ended up with \$2,500,000, a huge mortgage, and tzores.

INTERVIEWEE: Harold Goldstein (con't)

(4) Regarding the proposal to merge the AJA with the JWF, he said that this would tend to concentrate power. He objected to consolidation and said that the orientation of the AJA was to individual agencies, whereas the JWF was over the total community. There already exists five or six points of interlocking. The compromise was the Co-ordinating Committee, but each agency remained autonomous and can accept or reject the recommendations.

(5) The Jewish Community Council was emasculated in 1947. It represented all the organizations of the Jewish community and was representative democracy. It spawned the JCRC and the JWF, since both derived their authority from it. It was killed by anti-democrats such as Philip Meyers Sr. and Jeffrey Lazarus, but was never legally put out of existence.

(6) With reference to Jewish parochial education, he said that this was the only time that he had prevailed against "them" (the assimilationists and the temples) and managed to keep the community Hebrew schools as members of the JWF. They are still in the JWF, although it is a tough fight. Goldstein made many enemies, even clients, on this matter, but he kept the schools from being destroyed as a source for a different type of Jewish education. Eddie Jacobs wants all the day schools merged, which would lead to only one kind of Jewish education. Goldstein gave up this fight because the school "crowd" is just as immoral as the JWF power structure; neither wants community discipline, but for different reasons. One's goals are not the same as the people who achieve or who want to achieve them, nor is the excellence of a goal an indication or guarantee of the excellence of the aspirants. He cited as an example the Communist ideology versus the fact of Stalinism.

Power is preserved through nominating committees. As an example, he said that James Magrish appointed Gil Bettman as chairman of the nominating committee. The result was that Magrish was nominated for another term as JWF Board chairman. He noted that Bettman and Magrish are in the same law firm.

In 1948, Sol Luckman came from New York. The Rose-Moskowitz group had not been accepted, but had money. They could have broken the back of the Germanic power structure, and they did share power temporarily. But they didn't want a fight. Their need for acceptance and being liked is too great. "Conformity was the price of acceptance." They did not want to stir anything up regarding the Jewish community or the goyyim.

INTERVIEWEE: Henry Hersch

OCCUPATION: Attorney

There is a lack of creativity and enthusiasm. We need more involvement among people his age (40) in the JWF and the total community structure, so that they will develop a broader and better perspective and a view of the community's needs. The young men have a responsibility to the total community. He disputes the theory that there is a closed power structure, based on his own experience. He is young and relatively new to Cincinnati (moved here 14 years ago). The criticism reflects dissatisfaction with something other than the organizational structure. He favors the Co-ordinating Committee of the AJA-JWF and would like a merged federation. This is not done yet because of vested interests. This is indicative of the conflict between the AJA (UJSA) group which contains the old German Jewish families versus the more recent Cincinnati residents who are tied to Jewish education, Israel, UJA. It is a threat and the problem is: Whose image will the merged federation reflect?

Other current problems include the need for better rapport between professionals. This might ease a lot of other community problems. There is a current threat by the Orthodox Jewish group in the field of Jewish education; if they don't get their way, they claim they will withdraw their contributions to the JWF. The short-range compromise will be in terms of finances only. The longer-range solution must be in terms of social planning done through the Co-ordinating Committee. It cannot be done issue-by-issue.

It is important, wherever possible, to satisfy all elements in the Jewish community. However, whatever planning is done is bound to offend someone - "it is the nature of the beast." Inasmuch as financial resources are limited, some vested interests will be hurt. Jewish education receives a disproportionate and unreasonable percentage of the amount of money available, especially since there are two schools with different ideologies. In the past, people have held to the status quo to avoid hurting others; this was a lesser evil than good planning.

Judaism has a set of values and a sense of identification and commitment that persist despite a lack of practicing religious Judaism. There is a feeling of obligation and compassion which transcend religious practice in the narrow sense. It is alright to get close to the goyim - not unsafe.

Anti-Semitism should be considered a despicable act on the part of a few bigots. One should not infer from it popular distress or dislike for all Jews. Any action should be taken by the general community. It would not be helpful for the rabbis to decry an incident from their pulpits. Anti-

INTERVIEWEE: Henry Hersch (cont'd)

Semitism would be an inappropriate act in 1965 Cincinnati and the non-Jewish population would speak out more forcefully than the Jewish group.

The younger men have a good involvement in the community, but they need a broad exposure to the community structure. Thus, they should receive information from the Leadership Training Council, participate on lower levels, then move into policy positions.

The purpose of the Jewish community is to preserve Jewish values and agencies and to develop a sense of Jewish identity. We also must strive to maintain the high professional standards for the agencies.

Leadership almost automatically accrues to one who gives time and energy, plus adequately of his finances. He went up the "normal" range of campaign positions in the JWF, then was "tagged" as a possible leader. This became a snowball so that now the offers for jobs far exceed the involvement he has time to make.

Ranking issues facing the Jewish community, he mentioned in this order: fund-raising, finding good leadership, provision of community services, religious education, and Israel.

Some men make better leaders because they have a sense of commitment - actual working is important. There are some who have an almost instinctive feel for how to do jobs, an ability to lead based on temperament and personality. If such a person devotes his time and energy as well as some money to the task, he will become a leader.

The current leadership is doing a more flexible job than previous generations. There are broader interests represented which leads to efficiency and compromise.

He mentioned some young men he thought highly of. These included: Bill Friedlander, Dick Weiland, Val Friedman, Nachum Eden, Alan Rosenberg, and Robert Westheimer. Of the older men, he felt that the following were important for support in any major project: Herbert Bloch Jr., Eddie Jacobs, Alfred Friedlander, Carl Rauh, the Lazarus family, Phil Steiner, and the president of the top agencies. A fund-raising drive is not approved by the JWF; its only function is to schedule the drive most effectively.

INTERVIEWEE: Henry Hersch (cont'd)

He mentioned Harold Goldstein as one factor in the community which is disruptive. He is a negative force who has assumed the role of community revolutionizer. He alienates everyone. Joseph Wolf is in his orbit.

He stated that he had little contact with non-Jews, indeed, "less than he would like." He belongs to a weekly luncheon group which includes many, but otherwise, neither group makes a significant effort.

Of the rabbis, Blackman is the most active. Goldman has a limited scope. The others are identified with their own institutions. He thought it would be advisable for the rabbi to take an interest in community affairs, in limited areas. Jewish education, he said, was not essential for community life. It is helpful personally, but not in the operation of the JWF. One could be a complete secularist and succeed in a community agency.

Jews who are influential in the general community include the Lazarus family, Phil Meyers Sr., Fred Roth, Charles Messer, Albert Sabin, Gil Bettman, the Gradison family, the Westheimer family, Herbert Bloch Jr.

INTERVIEWEE: Rabbi David Indich

OCCUPATION: Orthodox Jewish Rabbi

I asked only one question concerning the relationship of the Orthodox Jewish community to general Jewish community organizations. Why is there less Orthodox Jewish participation than Reform Jews?

His answer was in many parts:

(1) The Reform Jews have, in the past, systematically kept the Orthodox Jews out.

(2) Orthodox Jews are suspicious of Reform Jews and have, consequently, avoided too close association with them. (These first two factors will break down as acculturation and interaction between the two groups increase.)

(3) Reform Judaism feels threatened by Orthodox Judaism, which is large and growing. Therefore, it is seen as a threat which might take over the community structure if it were too much involved.

(4) Orthodox Judaism has not accepted theoretically the idea of central fund-raising. It prefers individualized efforts where the results can be seen and in which more money can be raised.

He felt that there was a rapprochement between the younger generations. They feel that there is no need to fight about the non-essential elements of religion. There is more in common than there is that separates Jews.

INTERVIEWEE: C. E. "Mike" Israel

OCCUPATION: Executive for Women's Dress Manufacturing Co.

The combination of German and East European Jews means that the professionals need more skills. The complex society requires the revamping of the education of laymen, which, in turn, means that we must find men of ability and develop them, both as professionals and as laymen. We must use many systems of reward, kedved, etc.

He mentioned Harold Goldstein briefly, saying that this was a personality problem.

"A man should be acknowledged by what he gives, not what he makes." One of the problems of the community is that, while dollar-needs are growing, the size of gifts is decreasing or staying the same. The Jews are complacent and accepted, so they feel no urgency. Impersonalized, organized philanthropy leads to a feeling of the lack of closeness to any individual charity. It takes considerable sophistication to maintain this concept. The JWF is alright, and its problems are not insurmountable. One of the key problems is that so few people give the majority of the money; must broaden the base of contributions. The services have been maintained and improved. The problem is a matter of technique and strategy. Maybe a shock would arouse the populace. Jews maintain their identity through their pride in their contribution to American life. He would not want to see any split in the JWF, but if one occurred it would not wreck the organization.

He said that the JCRC is the most dynamic element in Jewish life today. It has a religious goal of giving the people a physical heaven-in-life. It is a place where Jews make a full contribution to democracy.

A unified charity has a responsibility to satisfy all elements of the Jewish community. But, people want to see the results of charity, not a depersonalized organization. They want physical results. Also, no one will agree with all the programs run by a joint charitable organization.

The Jews are distinct. They should keep up that feeling. There is vitality in the Jewish community, and the Jews are respected for their ability to organize, raise money, and for their brains. The non-Jews appraise them higher than they do themselves.

An anti-Semitic incident would be handled immediately by the JCRC in conjunction with similar non-Jewish groups. A statement would be issued. There would be full consultation with the police, inasmuch as there is a warm relationship

INTERVIEWEE: C. E. "Mike" Israel (cont'd)

with Chief Shrotel. There would be a great civic outcry, followed by a deep study of what caused the incident. There would be discussions of the dangers of this in the whole society, even among Negro leadership. One must prepare for this sort of coverage years in advance.

The most important need of the Jewish community is money.

The purposes of the Jewish community are to give the individual identification and association with a group which recognizes and accepts him and with which he has a background. There is a heritage to be preserved (because it is good) through organizations. This purpose leads to all kinds of activities.

He got into leadership activities when he moved into town. He had been active in Indianapolis in the JCRC, but did not want to work here. Then, he felt that his life was aimless and selfish, so he got started working for the local JCRC.

Ranking different issues, he listed in order: fund-raising, Jewish education (which is tied in closely with federal aid to parochial schools), finding good leadership, provision of community services, and Israel.

A good leader is one who can effectively take responsibility. There is a desperate need for such people. If someone does, he is sucked into the vacuum and jobs just come to him. There are more offers than he can handle. The sharp lines of the past which were based on money and ethnic origin are pretty well gone. The newer leaders are an improvement, but they need a cause or an overt problem before their talents can be fully manifested. Some of the better younger men are Henry Hersch, Baron Gold, Bernard Rosenberg, Charles Tobias, and Abe Brown. The Jews want a somewhat different type of leadership: they want the leader to be a judge with all the members having an equal say.

He said that any group can propose and effectuate a major project. He has never noticed that the power structure had a key say except on the Jewish Hospital board which is composed of rich men. Elsewhere, boards are based on interest, representation, and prior service.

His social associations are not with the rich Jews, but with men who have ideas and gumption. Frequently, these are non-Jews.

The rabbis of the community have made a magnificent

INTERVIEWEE: C. E. "Mike" Israel (cont'd)

contribution through their work with the JCRC. They have not, however, been involved in the work of the community in such areas as the JWF. The temples are beginning to take on more of a role in community action, something in which they were very derelict previously.

Some Jewish education helps a leader considerably, especially since we start building potential leaders in the religious school.

The Jews who seem to be influential in the non-Jewish community include: Philip Meyers Sr. the Lazarus family, Charles Messer, Willis Gradison Sr. and Jr., Fred Roth, and the executives of the various agencies on particular problems.

A strong leadership keeps others away. This peculiar phenomenon is wrong. Leadership should continually change. There should be multilateral, democratic leadership. But, not too many Jews will get down and do menial jobs.

INTERVIEWEE: James Magrish

OCCUPATION: Attorney

One of the tasks of leadership is to be intentionally "Pollyannish." A leader should try to minimize conflicts and achieve compromise as much as possible, at least until it is no longer feasible. Example: Eddie Jacobs wants to force more money for his day school. Magrish would compromise to preserve the Jewish community. But, the demands of the Orthodox Jews tend to be non-negotiable.

"Jewish education" is a misnomer, since the day schools represent a maximum of 400 children out of a total Jewish school-age population of over 5,000. The day schools, therefore, receive a vastly disproportionate amount of support.

The older families are not as out and have not disappeared as much as one would tend to think. Their descendants are active, although not always in the top leadership. Inter-marriage and the desire to lose their Jewishness has taken a crucial toll on these families. Magrish used to think that religion was a separating factor - this was the common opinion; Charles Taft pointed out that any religion leads to common interests and unifies even members of different religions.

Money talks, but not too much. One of the tasks of leadership is to prevent it from talking too much. Good sense, experience (Note that the top givers are usually also the top workers), etc., always can overcome money's pressures.

Top leaders do not see jobs as prize sinecures, but as forced responsibilities. They want out, but will not quit on their jobs.

The Jewish community is a community based on the agreement that Jews must survive and that they must be provided with certain social services.

INTERVIEWEE: Charles Messer (cont'd)

OCCUPATION: Building Contractor

The JWF is the community's Supreme Court. It should evaluate other organizations and distribute appropriations on the basis of how well each organization is doing its job. No members of the JWF board should, ideally, have a vested interest in any other organization which is under its jurisdiction - it will have to be impartial.

In the current structure, there is little intelligence or moral honesty. There is too much politicking. There also is no depth support for the leaders. This leads to a lack of dignity and discourages leaders. People are too emotional and not objective enough. The JWF should not interlock with other agencies, but should judge the job of others. To make jobs more attractive, the leaders should strive to satisfy the personal needs of other leaders. (The story is that Messer wanted to buy his way into Lesantiville Country Club by working hard in the community. When he finished a successful campaign, he was told that he would still be black-balled, since he was still not acceptable, not "the right kind of person." This soured him on leadership and occasioned the type of comment found above.) He feels that you cannot trust the people currently in leadership positions. He has lost interest in leading, he says, because of the inability of leaders to do a good job.

He stressed fund-raising, since it is only with money that one can operate the programs run by the social agencies. It may be considered "dirty" work, but it is necessary and should be more highly regarded.

There is too much politicking, compromise, horse-trading. The organizations are never evaluated objectively. This leads to inefficiency and lethargy.

He felt that Jews have a superiority over non-Jews in community work.

In the event of an anti-Semitic incident, he felt that the Jews should conduct themselves with exemplary dignity. There should be dignified aggressive action and consultation with the national defense agencies. All elements of the Jewish community should be engaged in activity and should demand protection. We should also go to other religious groups and get quick action. We should not apologize for being Jews.

The two key needs of the Jewish community are money and a fundamental reorganization.

INTERVIEWEE: Charles Messer (cont'd)

The fundamental purpose of the Jewish community is to propound a way of fully dignified life that Jews ought to have. It should be exemplary in its treatment of all segments of the community. It should measure up to the responsibilities as seen by the non-Jewish community, but should not favor Jews at the sacrifice of non-Jews. We have two obligations which must both be met: religion and citizenship.

He began to lead in the community in 1948 after he had been ill for a long period. His illness gave him time to think and he felt that he had not made any worthwhile contributions. Regretting this, he decided to work in the communal structure, to take on obligations, and to repay a long overdue debt to the Jewish community. Thus, he was ripe for working when the leadership asked him to head the JWP. He wanted to justify his own existence. It is better, he said, to do more than too little.

Ranking issues, he named in order: finding good leaders, fund-raising, provision of community services, anti-Semitism, and Israel.

He felt that good leaders have an early background of working for the Jewish community and in its organizations. They must be capable of accepting responsibility early in life. They must be willing to make a "College Try," to make an honest, hard-hitting effort. He felt that he had spoken openly in his leadership career and, consequently, that people considered him a rebel. He had had to cross influential people, to get into thick arguments, and to gain the reputation of one willing to dissent.

Today's leadership shows a degeneration and retrogression from the older leadership. This may be inevitable as the community grows older. The Jewish community is not satisfied with the leadership in the sense that it is harder to get leaders. This shows that people are unwilling to work because there are no rewards or satisfactions. The inevitable result is that we have poorer leaders.

Having no sympathy with the in-group of the power structure, he would not consult with any of them before voting on a major issue. His ideas might not be generally acceptable, but he would not be leathe to express unpleasant or unpopular sentiments. He has no fear of economic retributions, since most of his business is transacted outside the Jewish community.

INTERVIEWEE: Charles Messer (cont'd)

It is not often that any leader can veto a major proposal. Yet, it is bad to have even the measure of concentration of power that we now have. It cannot be controlled, especially if there is an individual who wants to misuse his power.

He said he doesn't belong to any social club because it is too divisive for a leader. A person should not have apparent allegiances if he wants to call on the whole community. (See p. 30).

He entertains non-Jews only outside of his home. They are not ready to have extensive social relations with Jews, have not made any advances in that direction, so why should we push in where we are not wanted.

The rabbis have contributed moral leadership, but not in regard to the JWF. It would be bad if they were involved in the controversies that rage there. The temples and synagogues are sufficiently busy within their own structures and activities. Some Jewish education would be alright, but it is not a prerequisite for leadership.

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Meyers Sr. (Jew 10)

OCCUPATION: Businessman (Jew 10)

In this interview, one noticed especially the use of the pronoun "I," even in contrast to the other interviews.

When asked about the possibility of a rift in the JWF, he immediately asked if I meant the Orthodox led by Eddie Jacobs, Silver, and the Meskowitz family. He claimed that he saw nothing wrong with Jewish education, but only with the men who are currently involved with it. One might be able to get Chofetz Chayim out of the JWF, but the JWF has a responsibility to be considerate, trying to keep the Jewish community together. The Orthodox are hard to deal with, since they don't supply workers. They deal with the Reform Jews as with another faith. The separatists strongly support the Orthodox institutions, but no one else feels too strongly about it. There are few Orthodox in the American Jewish Committee. It is composed of a few rich, German Jews, who are considered geyyim by the Orthodox - this is the popular view.

One of the activities of which he is most proud is his chairmanship of the dinner on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of the Jews in America. He invited many non-Jews; it was good public relations to let them know that the Jews are not recent immigrants.

According to his view, the JWF runs the community, because money means power.

The community tries to satisfy all elements of its composition, including the Orthodox, even though they do not give in proportion to their receipts.

He thought that Jews are like any other Americans and that the major difference is religious. They are distinct, but it may be wrong to harp on it. Jews are generous, kindly, community-minded, charitable. "Christianity stinks. It has produced warfare. The best in Christianity is Jewish."

If an anti-Semitic incident happened here - and he doubted that it would - the better element of the general community would be aroused, the police and the newspapers would condemn it, and there would be vocal and active condemnation from the Jewish community. He noted that he had been among the few who had blocked the adoption of the University of Munich as a sister-university to the University of Cincinnati, on the grounds that Munich was the seat of Nazism. He does not like Germans.

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Meyers Sr. (cont'd)

He believes that the Leadership Training Council is important in that it teaches young men the structure of the community and the workings of its institutions. However, after they gain a clear concept of what the institutions are, they should be encouraged to think for themselves.

Beside the need for additional money, the Jewish community needs to interest younger men in the needs of various institutions. The rich young men do not give commensurate with their means and they are neglecting their responsibilities. Giving is only a matter of education. We need money to run any project.

One doesn't think up purposes for the Jewish community. Rather, purposes are determined by needs. One of the problems that needs to be confronted is why are not Jews at the top of big corporations. There is unspoken discrimination which must be defeated. Jewish youth should have a parallel opportunity with non-Jewish youth based solely on ability.

He mentioned some of the other problems confronting the community in the following order: fund-raising, provision of community services on the same high level as previously achieved (Noted that the Jewish community is well-run and organized, which reflects the German demands for efficiency and proficiency. The Jewish Hospital is the oldest such hospital in the country.), anti-Semitism (the executive-suite phase), finding good leadership, and religious education. On the latter, he noted that many Reform Jews are antagonistic and believe that they should not teach Hebrew. They feel that it is not a community obligation now that public schools are available. We need better religious education, but not Hebrew education. It depends on the home to develop a Jewish heart. But, he is not opposed to Hebrew schools. (!)

He characterized the American Council for Judaism as "a bunch of misguided punks!"

A person is thrust into leadership positions if he is a talker. If he then shows ability, others want him, and the demand increases automatically. Money is not the key criterion for moving up the leadership ladder. He felt that the younger generation is doing "just as good" a job as the previous generation of leaders. Among the good younger men, he mentioned Val Friedman, Henry Hersch, James Salinger, Robert Stern, Dick Weiland, John Frank, Phil Meyers Jr.

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Meyers Sr. (cont'd)

Among the men with whom he frequently agrees, he mentioned: Carl Rauh, Alfred Friedlander, Ed Kuhn, Sidney Weil, Willis Gradison Sr., Murray Seasongood, and Robert Goldman. The only man he mentioned with whom he has frequent disagreements was Harold Goldstein. However, none of these men has the power to veto a major proposal.

He felt that the rabbi should serve on some committees of the Jewish community, such as the JCRC. He could be included in some areas, but felt that the workings of the JWF would be below rabbinical dignity. He also felt that it would be helpful to have some Jewish background, although that was not strictly necessary.

Among the Jews who are most influential in the non-Jewish world he named: himself, Murray Seasongood, the Lazarus family.

INTERVIEWEE: Sidney Meyers

OCCUPATION: Businessman

The leadership the community has had has been beneficial, good. Even though influential men have a special role, they have acted in the best interests of the total community. He stressed the fact that the vast majority of the leaders have come from the Reform Jewish community, although not necessarily from German backgrounds. He suggested that Reform Judaism teaches an intelligible way of looking at the world and creates an awareness of action in the world. Few Orthodox Jewish leaders have emerged, so Reform Judaism has had leadership both by default and by seizure. He questioned the value of intensive Jewish education in relationship to leadership, inasmuch as few leaders have managed to emerge from intensive Jewish schools. That the total community gives so much money to day schools ought to be re-evaluated in this light. If it is the responsibility of the community to support the schools, the people who run the schools and who emerge from them have a reciprocal responsibility toward the community in terms of giving and service. They do not seem ready to take on this responsibility.

A leader is appointed if he has ability, time, interest, and a moderate degree of economic security. Money has great influence, inasmuch as there is need for it. Yet, the rich men don't seek publicity or influence or jobs - they try to stay in the background. This leads to problems in obtaining leaders who are effective for the JWF campaign - you can't solicit large sums unless it is known that you are also a large giver. It involves using younger men who are less influential and who have difficulties devoting as much time or money to the campaign as could older, more established men. The campaign chairman must make a considerable sacrifice of his time, consequently of his business. There has had to be considerable pressure on younger men to accept this job, and they even had a 16-man composite chairmanship one year, when they could not get a satisfactory man. There is little reward, except prestige, publicity, and personal growth. The notable men who have accepted the top job have been thoroughly devoted to the idea of community service.

The influence of the Hebrew Union College is through the students as ambassadors and through Dr. Glueck as a figure - He is the most well-known Reform Jew in America, maybe the world. There is a special security and awareness of Judaism in Cincinnati as a result of the College (and formerly of the UAHC). There is less felt anti-Semitism and little feeling of difference.

INTERVIEWEE: Sidney Meyers (cont'd)

With reference to the older families of Cincinnati Jewry, the story is one of three generations: rags to riches to rags. Maybe the new generation is soft, too coddled by the older members of the family who had to fight for their fortune. After a while, a family loses its competitive nature and is satisfied with the status quo.

INTERVIEWEE: George Newberger

OCCUPATION: Social Worker (Head of Jewish Vocational Service)

There is a definite cleavage between Reform, German Jewry and Orthodox, Eastern European Jewry in Cincinnati. To become a leader, one must have money, family position, and the interest. This leads to power. Another factor which must be taken into account is the assumption of having power which, itself, often leads to real power.

Professionals, by virtue of their special knowledge and information, are relied upon to give answers to community problems. The action taken is usually based on his facts and opinions. Consequently, if he has a bias, he can slant the board's decision by manipulating the statistics. He has power by respect and by his access to facts and information. This is all done covertly and adroitly by influencing laymen. The rotation of the board, which is considered a progressive and democratic method, as opposed to a self-perpetuating board, leads to greater respect for the knowledge of the professional and a growth of his power and influence, both in actions and in the nominating committee.

Influential people are not necessarily on boards, but their point of view is always sought out or known in advance. Since the community operates with money (especially the JWF), the opinions of the big givers are considered - no one wants to be responsible for the loss of revenue. Therefore, they reach influence through their giving. The UJA has received top priority in the bias of the big givers, and local agencies have had to suffer. There will be no change in this arrangement until a few big givers change their minds. They don't get together as a cabal, deciding how things are to go in advance. But, they don't need to. The younger leaders know that contradicting the will of the power structure is an automatic end to their own leadership.

An example of the influence of a specific group is the case of the American Jewish Congress in its formative years in Cincinnati. They represented persons of little status or wealth, mainly Eastern European Jews. However, their money was wanted in the JWF by old-line German Jewish aristocrats. Therefore, they were taken on boards in token fashion. The national American Jewish Congress had a program to fight discrimination in industry at that time. The Cincinnati group became fired up to fight the big corporations here. They wanted the JWF to appropriate some money to hire a representative to go to the big corporations to make them start hiring Jews. But, the old aristocrats were on good, cooperative terms with the corporate executives. They had almost passed, so the idea was terrifying to them.

INTERVIEWEE: George Newberger (cont'd)

They would accept only a genteel representative, not a firebrand or force (as had been successfully used in New York City). The American Jewish Congress was defeated, but a compromise was reached on an acceptable program of vocational and educational guidance for Jewish youth. They got a graduate with a degree in vocational guidance and a measured, controlled agency. Thus, they kept old-line control of the board without alienating the American Jewish Congress people from the JWF, which would have entailed a loss of their contributions. Conclusion: The community power structure was somewhat moved by the American Jewish Congress, but the movement was controlled, kept in the bounds of gentility. They were afraid of a bad image in the eyes of non-Jews; they did not want to gain the image of bad citizens. They wanted to keep a measure of predictability in the actions of the community.

The old group sees itself now as Jews adjusting to a Gentile environment. It believes that it has the "right" general interests for the entire Jewish community. Socially acceptable and successful among non-Jews, this group has little overt Jewishness left from its ghetto origins.

Originally, this group contained the old philanthropists, the "Lady Bountifuls." They provided for the immigrant-influx, giving them a chance to start agencies which would Americanize the newcomers. They did a good job in changing them over without becoming identified with a wierd group of immigrants. The settlement houses which they founded became the Jewish Community Center, and they don't understand why we need a special Jewish Community Center, why there should be a middle-class country club, when the need for Americanizing has gone.

This group has also learned that one can never pass completely. Examples are Justin Rollman and Fleischman. Some even return to Judaism after the first blush is over. Examples of these might be: Philip Meyers Jr., Gil Bettman, Willis Gradison, Jr. Now people are more comfortable with their Jewishness than when the German-American Bund was virulent.

The younger leaders are a sizeable bunch and are highly identified with the Jewish community. They even want to take over from the elder leaders on the Boards, to do it right, bring in modern methods, government money, etc. They may stress the non-sectarian nature of the agency and its service to the total community, although the board is still sectarian. He is impressed by their vitality. They are young, have a good education and a great interest in the Jewish community. Their parents are tired and jaded; they have no motivation and give mechanically.

INTERVIEWEE: George Newberger (cont'd)

The JWF has lost ground, as the big givers wonder why they should give at all. Some think of it as defense insurance against anti-Semitism. There is no desire to build a really rich Jewish community life. The older men had no pep. Consequently, there is a big role for the rabbi and the professional social worker, although they have not yet accepted it. They appear to have no mission other than operating their individual agency, when they could be stimulating the development of Jewish identity or a more satisfying Jewish life. The rabbis have little influence in this secular community. The stress among laymen is on fund-raising and board membership. There is only a token identification with religion. The rabbis don't influence the secular activities in which the values of the business civilization are stressed. Social workers are suspected of empire building, being sentimental in regard to people, etc. There is greater stress on institutional development than on service to people.

Harold Goldstein was too rich for the blood of the JWF leadership which used him. He is too emotional, talks too much, is a firebrand and controversial rabble-rouser. He is also too Jewish. He lost leadership by bucking the crowd.

Phil Steiner decided to give Sheltering Oaks to Jewish Hospital with the deficit paid by the JWF.

There is a conscious effort to bring in new people, both for their money and to get them moving up in the organizational structure. But, they are never allowed to get the top job. The head of the JWF campaign is subordinate to the Chairman of the JWF or the President of the AJA.

Joseph Wolf was used and dropped and now is not even consulted.

With 27,000 Jews, the Cincinnati JWF raised 1/8 of the total raised by the general community's Community Chest. (Figures are \$8,000,000 versus \$1,100,000). The community is affluent and per capita giving is at a high level.

The tripartite formula for dividing up JWF funds is that the UJA, national and international agencies, and local agencies are all represented. The go-ahead is never given to the allocations committee until the exact terms of the formula are decided. This limits the allocations committee to minor decisions. Another command decision is that the JWF will give the Jewish Community Center \$20,000 to pay the interest on their mortgage. This decision was made before the allocations procedure began.

Agencies are now improving their services and are getting away from the concept of merely giving charity. The stress

INTERVIEWEE: George Newberger (cont'd)

is now on individual betterment and richer life. This is the rationale for a secular program.

As Jews lose their ties to Israel and Europe, the leaders will question the percentage of the funds which should be diverted to the UJA. This may lag somewhat, but the trend is downward. The allocations committee has little prestige, but is a good training ground. The decisions it is allowed to make are on small matters, basically whether to increase or decrease by very small amounts on agency budgets.

The big people have a simplified, but overly-sure-of-self view of their roles in the Jewish community.

There is a broadening of the base and increasing flexibility in the power structure. Henry Hersch, he characterized as intelligent, aggressive, prudent agent of the power structure. He is cautious and follows such a person as William Friedlander who is independent, along with all the other qualities.

Regarding the Jewish Vocational Service campaign to build a structure for \$250,000: He used James Magrish who has more influence than power. They had the top twenty men of the Jewish community to a meeting. All of them knew the reason, and Phil Steiner said: "Well, everybody's here." The smile on his face indicated that he meant that everyone who was important for a decision was there. They sold them on the need for the JVS building without a solicitation and got their blessing. Then, it was only a formality to have it approved by the boards of the JWF and AJA.

The things which were important to the prior generations are no longer important to the new generation. They don't and won't give the same amounts of money. There is no expectation on these people. They act on the basis of whims and may easily branch out to non-sectarian affairs.

Regarding the Report to the Committee of Ten of the AJA, there is evident pessimism regarding the lack of potential for increasing revenues. If one asks the question, "Why Jewish Agencies?" the potential criteria are set-up for eliminating agencies, when the revenue drops. These feelings are based on an Engel Report about Cincinnati which said that the total community was static; the Jewish community structure did not question whether these findings could be legitimately applied to the Jewish sub-community of the total Cincinnati community.

INTERVIEWEE: George Newberger (cont'd)

The Jewish Community Council became defunct because it was democratic and uncontrollable. The Co-ordinating Committee of the AJA-JWF is also undemocratic. They have stressed fund-raising and allocations over social planning. The Social Planning sub-committee is not needed is the feeling of the power structure. We can merely appoint ad hoc committees as they are found necessary. Thus, social planning would be done by the executive and administrative personnel. When the power structure was forced to appoint a standing social planning committee, they showed their lack of commitment to social planning by lifting the chairman to use him as JWF campaign chairman. The AJA social planning committee died because of lack of work.

The central power structure improvises without regular channels of communication. It can make decisions in informal conversations, thus avoiding accountability.

INTERVIEWEE: Carl Rauh

OCCUPATION: Investor and Businessman

The Jewish community is badly organized in that it has three decision-making bodies. It is a very slow process. It would be more efficient to have a single central body.

Pessimism is the key spirit. The problem is the lack of money, since the JWF campaign has not risen in past years. Therefore, either cut services or drop an agency. Reports on "Why Jewish Agencies?" may be preparation for establishing criteria for dropping agencies. This shows how cumbersome the decision-making process is that eventual decisions need long preparation before they are made, even when everyone agrees on the eventual outcome.

There is need for a great extension of young leadership. The older generation has done a very poor job of recruiting. He sees too many of the same people at all the meetings. Now, there is difficulty getting good young men. Also, young men do not give at the same level, especially since there are no crises. Some groups of young men are very conservative, fearful, hard to involve in general Jewish community enterprises.

The Orthodox have not been in Cincinnati long enough to be active in top leadership. They might provide better leadership in the next generation, but this must be seen. He also said that there might be other possible explanations.

The old families are tired, but they have also disappeared through assimilation, etc.

He noted that the top gift sets the level of giving for the entire campaign and that the top gift in Cincinnati is too low.

INTERVIEWEE: Bernard Rosenberg

OCCUPATION: Attorney

He is strongly in favor of the merger of the AJA and JWF to provide an important control over community planning and fund-raising. He wants a strong central agency with community discipline.

Many lay leaders abdicate their responsibility to the professionals, especially regarding decisions and the supervision of their implementation. The board must not be a rubber stamp. The professionals in every agency do too much in the field of policy, especially if the laymen are too busy or on the board too long. Therefore, we should have only limited terms of tenure. The jobs ought to rotate more frequently, involving new people and new thoughts. Otherwise, we estrange people. This must be a conscious, public effort, and, psychologically, will engender more community support.

We should try to satisfy all elements of the Jewish community, but, at the very least, we should talk about matters openly and honestly, reaching the most generally acceptable solution. We need free and total discussion. Regarding the merger of the two old homes, he said that not enough pressure was used to attain a merger. Regarding day schools, there is too much pressure being used to push the merger. Too frequently, determinations are made by self-appointed group representatives. This is not democratic. People are sometimes involved for not very complimentary reasons. The heads of groups are often very strong persons.

The division between the Orthodox and Reform Jews is becoming stronger, and the effect on the JWF's fund-raising and planning is disastrous. How can we build Christian-Jewish relations without a knowledge of Judaism and agreement within the community? He felt that more united than divided Jews from all other Americans. "If you believe in God, what difference is it which religion you follow?"

We must keep up communications and relationships with influential persons in the general community so that an anti-Semitic incident can be handled by capable individuals. We have a good relationship with the current chief of police. In the light of Pope John XXIII's proposals, he thinks that there is not any one "right belief." There is no reason to continue to set up boundaries between groups, and this is true if only for enlightened self-interest.

INTERVIEWEE: Bernard Rosenberg (cont'd)

He stated that he was not concerned with maintaining Judaism or the Jewish way of life. We have a community through mores, tradition, inertia, for all the same reasons that one has any sort of community.

He got into leadership by his own decision, although he did not expect to be asked to take certain jobs and was flattered when he was. If a man cannot enjoy his leadership position, then there is something wrong.

He felt the most important issue facing the Jewish community is human relations in all aspects. Jews need understanding and compassion along these lines. Anti-Semitism will disappear if Jews take the affirmative position socially and break down their self-segregation in after 5 o'clock relationships.

Good leaders have personal discipline and integrity. Sensitivity is more important than intelligence, for it leads to the ability to make a discerning judgment. They must be able to get along with people, have a sense of humor, and possess a positive orientation. Personality is the most important consideration for moving up the leadership ladder, especially tact and respect for others.

He expressed great admiration for the pioneers of the Jewish community a generation ago. We now do not contribute new things, but enhance or refine what they originated. The older people may be more prejudiced or biased, but they also have other abilities. They did not settle for security, but put their convictions on the line. There are many younger leaders who do excellent jobs, but "why not?" It is hard to isolate a few, since many avoid recognition and responsibility. A well-rounded individual should make a worthwhile contribution.

We find it very difficult to satisfy the entire community, as there is too much division. The ethnic lines are breaking down more than the religious barriers. There is also a growing Jewish-Christian rapprochement in both schools and homes.

He felt that there are enough wealthy and prestigious people in any area of Jewish community endeavor that they can band together to get any sort of project accomplished. He wished it were otherwise and thought that a strong central authority would help.

One of the reasons Jews have so few social contacts with non-Jews is their morbid fear of intermarriage, especially among women. He said that this is imposing one's own

INTERVIEWEE: Bernard Rosenberg (cont'd)

principles on the children at their own expense. It teaches them self-segregation.

He stated that the rabbis have been "great" in community service. People object too much to the rabbis and want them to be all things to all people. Nevertheless, they are criticized for excelling. He likes them better as a group than any other in the Jewish community. He rejects the idea of easy conversions in cases of intermarriage in favor of instruction and counseling. He would let the latter go in the press of other activities so as not to allow one's time to be dissipated through administration. The rabbis need better public relations. He characterized certain rabbis: Blackman has benefited the community through the JCRC; Goldfeder and, to a lesser degree, Goldman are "terrific;" Wohl is a fine pastor. The synagogues and temples should take on a larger role, which they are beginning to do now. One should know as much about Judaism as we do about many other preoccupations. We should try to understand the world, since the religious phase of life is central in the ecumenical era.

Among the Jews who are influential in the general community, he named Benjamin Schwartz, Walton Bachrach, Gil Bettman, and Willis Gradison Sr. But, he noted, those who are involved in the general community are usually the least involved in the Jewish community.

INTERVIEWEE: Fred Roth

OCCUPATION: Retired Businessman

Regarding the antagonism between the Orthodox Jews and the Reform Jews, he thought that the early twentieth-century programs of Americanization caused a great deal of this. Naive Reform Jews appropriated money to make them look more acceptable. He recalled a meeting attended by his grandfather at which the subject of the "barbarians" was the main topic of discussion. The question was, "How shall we deal with them so that they look a little more civilized?" As a result, the committee raised \$2,000 to provide each of the new immigrants with a free shave! Naturally, this caused distrust among the newcomers, who saw in these well-meaning attempts the goyvish sentiments of German, Reform Jews. This antagonism is slowly disappearing, although they still keep to themselves.

Regarding the disappearance of the old leading families, he said that in the early twentieth century the Jewish leaders were widely accepted everywhere by "The Protestant Establishment." Jews founded the Queen City Club, etc. When tens of thousands of Jewish immigrants became apparent on the American scene, the "Protestant Establishment" throughout the country was threatened, and Cincinnati was not immune. They felt that their political power was in jeopardy. Therefore, they began a conscientious program of exclusion of Jews and anti-Semitism. Jews took either of two courses: enter the Jewish community structure and work strongly there or try to become Christian. The Cincinnati Jewish community grew from about 6,000 to its present size of 27,000, and the bulk of the migrants were Eastern European, Orthodox Jews. Old families became tired and lost their competitive desire. They also wanted to go on to bigger things. "Why continue picky fights about Jewish minutiae?"

INTERVIEWEE: Rabbi Eliezer Silver

OCCUPATION: Orthodox Jewish "Chief" Rabbi

Apart from the statement that he wants to go back to the old ways, the verbal part of this interview was singularly uninformative. Perhaps part of the cause was that, for my benefit (!), he spoke a large amount of Yiddish.

However, one could glean from his entire demeanor that he considered the entire Orthodox community under his iron hand and that he could get almost anything he wanted from them at the drop of a hint. He mentioned several instances in which he had spent unauthorized sums of money and had demanded that his "hasidim" back him up. In building the communal mikveh, for example, he overspent his allotment by nearly double; but the laymen kicked in and made up the deficit.

Thus, it is clear that his title of "Chief" Rabbi is more than a verbal consideration. He can and does run the Orthodox community with a strong hold.

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Steiner

OCCUPATION: Toy Manufacturing Company Owner

One community problem is the loss of function attending the JWF board as the Co-ordinating Committee takes over more responsibilities, especially in planning and allocation. The AJA board of twenty-five people is hurt to a lesser degree, as it has fewer functions. Thus, it sees the Co-ordinating Committee as less of a threat. The Co-ordinating Committee is doing a good job and should move forward. The JWF may become a figurehead unless it is activated and made to do things. The merger is alright if the Co-ordinating Committee functions well, but there is a danger in the loss of numbers of people. The JWF board has served as a status symbol and as a reward for younger men.

The JWF has no real constitution. Until 1960, the chairman of the campaign automatically became president and then chairman of the board. This way, they kept the retiring man in office and service for at least two more years. The JWF board decided that succession in jobs was no longer a good idea. Steiner fought the change. They had claimed that a chairman of a campaign would not necessarily make a good president or chairman of the board. Steiner held that, if a man was good enough to be campaign chairman, he is good enough for the other jobs. There was a feeling that the board should select its own president and have more permanent direction. In actuality, all presidents have been past campaign chairmen. This does mean the loss of service of the most interested and informed persons. This move did help clear the lines of authority, but it did not draw the retiring person back into action and, consequently, there was a loss of effort and zeal.

The AJA board is composed of community leaders. It does not represent specific agencies, but each member has attachments to different agencies. It helps and advises its constituent agencies. It is reasonably democratic and not self-perpetuating. Members are appointed by the agencies and there are also at-large members. The members are all Reform Jews because there is a major interest in Reform Jewish agencies plus general Jewish community agencies. There is some slant and bias toward the interests of member agencies which may not agree that the board helps them at all. Example: Glen Manor does not think that the AJA board is helpful. Why? The board members of Glen Manor are not thinking of the total Jewish community, but only of Glen Manor. These are people who did very little before they got involved in this one area of community service at the time of the fund-raising campaign. The AJA tried hard to get a merger of the two old homes, but there was antagonism from both groups and its ideas were not accepted. Glen Manor is a hundred per cent wrong in this case. Unless the AJA leaders are behind a project, it hasn't got a Chinaman's chance.

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Steiner (cont'd)

The JWF has the power of the purse. Therefore, it is more important than the AJA (UJSA). It also contains most of the agencies and does a lot of the social planning (although it was never so intended). The planning function grew in order to allocate funds properly. The approximate scheme for dividing the available funds is: From the total amount, deduct off the top the current JWF operating and campaign costs, the interest on the Jewish Community Center mortgage, and the money paid to the Jewish educational agencies; this totals about \$250,000. The remainder is divided fifty-fifty between the UJA and all other national and local agencies. The UJA is not satisfied and wants a larger share of the Cincinnati money. They don't get a real fifty per cent because other funds such as endowments are not included in the scheme. The JWF believes that the UJA gets a fair shake and that we should now stress local agencies. The board feels that the present division is equitable, despite pressures. This is especially true now that the Israeli situation is stabilizing and that there is less emotional appeal. The needs still exist, but they are on a broader scope.

Locally, we have an established pattern and the amounts received by the agencies are roughly the same from year-to-year.

Jewish education gets 20-25% of the money remaining in Cincinnati. Is this percentage justified? All agencies need more and all are deserving. Some think that Jewish education should have more because they claim that it leads to Jewish survival. (He noted that he is a bad product of poor Reform Jewish education with little ritual.) There has been little leadership from men oriented toward Jewish education, and he didn't know what it would do for the Jewish community as a whole. The survival of the Jewish community does not rest on intensified Jewish education, but he would be glad to reverse this opinion if he found other evidence. We should give to this cause, but a lower percentage.

Some say that two central agencies waste talents and that we should combine into one board with an arm for fund-raising and one for planning. Many oppose it because of tradition. It might be less taxing on individuals, but we may get a better Jewish community with two agencies. A compromise was the Co-ordinating Committee which would act as a temporary, advisory Jewish Community Federation. It is now up for review. Some seem to think that this attempt at merger is a good idea and that we ought to continue in this line. A smaller group thinks that we should keep the present set-up of two separate agencies as checks for the Co-ordinating Committee. Steiner dislikes the idea of merging completely at this point. We would lose the intensity of community

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Steiner (cont'd)

thinking and the activity of those who are interested in only one area of endeavor. Worse, we would lose any check on the Jewish community agencies. Diversity gets a better compromise than through homogeneity.

The AJA is a close-knit group. The JWF is close, but has a slightly wider representation.

We should sacrifice speed and efficiency for diversity of opinion. He thought that speed may itself be inefficient. We want more of the community involved which will lead to a thriving community.

The Orthodox group are not honest except from their own point of view. They should be represented, because we need all the facts to reach the best possible compromise. The community is not run by democracy, but by people getting together, compromising, and getting things done. This is a practical philosophy.

If one wants a great deal of money for anything from the JWF, it is impossible. If one wants a small appropriation for something beneficial, anyone can get it. People are in leadership because they have been active in Jewish affairs. Their contributions have been recognized and their judgment is respected. They are influential because of their past experience.

An independent agency cannot raise operating expenses outside the JWF structure. On capital fund drives, the JWF has only the power to schedule the drive, but it cannot withhold permission. In general, it should offer any help it can.

The Young Leadership Training Council was organized about 1955 by the then-leaders who wanted to get young men into leadership. It gives background orientation regarding the Jewish community and the agencies. Then they are involved in individual agencies and move up to the boards. Thus, we hope to get a community-minded and able group into agency leadership. Then they are brought into the central JWF structure. The YLTC was originally to help the JWF raise funds; now it has its own fund-raising mechanisms to teach the value of giving. If a young man does a good job, he rises in stature, is recognized, and appointed to a higher leadership position.

Actions speak louder than words, especially in regard to personal service. Good service brings about a rise in the level of leadership and the one who does a good job is pushed by those above him. If one can give money, he becomes even better known (or if he gives liberally of his means).

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Steiner (cont'd)

The JWF chairman must be popular, respected, a hard worker in the past (service and giving up to his means). Let the man make the office and not the reverse.

We have Jewish agencies because Jews want to be among their own - "an aura of being at home." The agencies came from original needs, then grew into larger groups. Why are there some agencies with duplicating purposes, especially in the field of defense? The NCRAC vainly proposed a merger. Steiner says that there should be no one voice speaking for all Jews, even though it could save money. But, what would be the results? Each agency has an individual approach to the problems, and differing views may lead to productive and new results. We need dissent, although we should always strive to save money. The task of leadership is "balancing money with results." A good leader paints with a broad brush rather than with a thin line.

There are several different types of problems:

(1) Those that can be solved with money: The needs for capital funds are huge. He estimated that, in the next ten years, the community will be called upon for \$15,000,000 in improvement funds. This is in addition to current operating funds of over a million each year, not counting a rough 5% increase from year-to-year for added expenses and rising costs.

(2) Those that cannot be solved with money alone (problems of ideology); These would include such things as increasing attendance at temples, deciding on what the Jewish community is to do, to stand for, and why, increasing the quality of Jewish education and getting people to take advantage of the offerings (if they do, indeed, want any intensification), helping improve relations with the general community and deciding the role of the Jewish community in respect to current social issues, and achieving mutual respect between groups within the Jewish community. On this latter point, he said that we need more than mutual tolerance. We would like to see harmony among laymen.

Clashes on ideology have been rare in Cincinnati. The refusal of the two old homes was based in part on differing ideologies, but also partly on other considerations. The only real clash came about 1955 when there was a question of whether community dinners would be kosher or not. The issue was decided in favor of kosher, although there was one year in which the dinner was not kosher. The Orthodox boycotted the affair, although they separated between that issue and the JWF which had sponsored the dinner; they continued their contributions.

INTERVIEWEE: Philip Steiner (cont'd)

Some of the better younger leaders he mentioned were: Henry Hersch, Bernard Rosenberg, Harris Weston, Robert Stern, Dick Weiland, Buzzy Brown and Jerry Teller. He showed dislike for Harold Goldstein.

There are no basic disagreements in the Jewish community because there are no issues over which one can fight. On allocations, the vested interests and pet organizations are in play. Allocations procedures are also part of the educations of leaders, in that they study agencies, decide about money. But, the decisions are predictable because, as people are all fair-minded, they reach similar decisions.

You never find a maverick chairman of the JWF. You may not get the best chairman, but never the wrong one. "One either swells or grows - and no one swells." Six months of community decisions with personal responsibility makes a man decide either good or better.

Regarding Sheltering Oaks Hospital, it was pushed by a forward-thinking group about fifteen years ago. This group was led by Steiner and Herbert Bloch Sr. A long-term rehabilitative facility was needed, so it was developed at a cost of \$750,000. It was not for the convalescent or for terminal care, but for the chronically ill who could be rehabilitated. It was, however, built too large for the need and, therefore, cost more money to pay off the deficits. To get more revenue, Sheltering Oaks took in convalescents. It still cost the Jewish community too much, without doing an expert job. Therefore, it was made available to the Jewish Hospital which set aside over thirty beds for rehabilitative purposes. The deficit would be paid to the Jewish Hospital by the JWF. The problem is that it was built ahead of its time and too large. Now, the Orthodox Jewish Home has a medical facility for the same purposes, and the Jewish Hospital takes over the rest of the need. This is an example of a community helping itself.

The Jewish Hospital and Sheltering Oaks are both in the Jewish community, so why sell it? Would one sell something to oneself? "Tommyrot!" The Jewish Hospital is not only a corporation, but a part of the total Jewish community. Sheltering Oaks is now being used for the purpose for which it was built and more efficiently. It has also paid by a JWF loan and an over-allocation of money.

The community is composed of institutions. The boards represent the Jewish community only in given phases of endeavor.

INTERVIEWEE: Joseph Wolf

OCCUPATION: Roofing Contractor

Someone who wanted to destroy the JWF would be "a leaf in the wind" and totally ineffectual. The JWF is, however, in danger from those who want to make it into a federation. He disagrees. The Co-ordinating Committee is a sneaky way of leading towards the federation of merged boards. The federation would do all the fund-raising, social planning, and allocations. Many want this on the cry of efficiency. This is wrong. The JWF was hard-working, nationally and internationally minded, generous group; the AJA is parochial, local, separatist, anti-Israel. The AJA would, however, dominate the JWF in a federation. There is the additional fear that the UJA might come in and run a separate campaign. The Co-ordinating Committee is now under study; Wolf thinks it is a duplication of effort.

The JWF must have a lot to do. It must have a raison d'être beyond the actual campaign. If it could act with power, it would draw the best leaders and would be able to interest good young men. People must be involved in something which has a clear purpose.

On the issue of Jewish education, he claimed that the social planners (Cohn, et. al.) have been shortsighted. The cries for intensified Jewish education are pushed by the Moskowitz clan, Eddie Jacobs, Ezra Spicehandler and others. They say that if they don't get adequate funds, they will go out on their own, which is a destructive tack, leaving no room for compromise. They could merge the English classes, but the Yavneh group fears Orthodox indoctrination, while the Orthodox group fears secularism. Rabbi Goldfeder and Sidney Weil also want a subsidy for their schools. Chofetz Chayim was out of the JWF for a while, but it came back with a budget; the final effect was to bring Jacobs and the Moskowitz's back into the fold. Now they want more in the budget, yet they are wasteful and difficult. Wigser and Ritter are very difficult people. Anyone who tries to settle the Jewish education problems in the JWF will come home with his tail between his legs and bloodied, as in the past. The Reform and Orthodox Jews cannot compromise. People like Sidney Weil, the Rauh's, and Alfred Friedlander are very upset about the amount of money spent on this one area.

He asserted that Jews are not different from other Americans, but are well-integrated, even in some bad respects. They still excel regarding college attendance, but this may be because of insecurity and a desire to be the best. Anti-Semitism keeps us Jewish, but we are losing our Jewishness.

INTERVIEWEE: Joseph Wolf (cont'd)

If there were an anti-Semitic incident, he would call on the police and avoid the JCRC. The burden of enforcement is on the Christians, the government, and the general community. We haven't done anything wrong to them. There should be no organized community action or meetings.

The Jewish community has no current major needs. One of the problems he mentioned is that some agencies provide services which have nothing to do with Jewishness. Why should the community provide services which are the duty of the general community to provide? The city should take over the Bake Shop and the Community Center. The Jewish community should be concerned with only those things which are specifically Jewish.

There are no specific purposes to the Jewish community. It never speaks. People tell it what they want and need. Leadership sets the goals based on these expressions. Persons alone create the needs. Example: A few individuals such as Sidney Rose and Herbert Bloch Sr. developed the goal of Sheltering Oaks and pushed it through. The purpose of the community is to raise enough money to satisfy the demands of the professionals and their rubber-stamp boards.

Listing issues in order, he mentioned: religious education, fund-raising (if we don't raise enough money, the UJA will want a larger percentage or come in with their own campaign) and correct and wise allocation of funds.

He characterized a number of leaders:

(1) Sol Luckman: Sincere, honest, honorable. He gave unstintingly of himself and his money. Feared no man.

(2) Fritz and Carl Rauh and Alfred Friedlander: Third-generation Jews who were shamed into giving generously by Luckman. They are socially-accepted, smart, capable, and interested.

(3) Henry Hersch: Interested, dedicated, wants to be in the in-group, not a rebel. He thinks fast, is a good speaker, is intelligent and presentable.

(4) Willis Gradison Jr.: A negative person, expresses himself rarely. His wife is very acceptable. They are strong Republicans and have the right background.

(5) Harold Goldstein: Exceptional mind and dedication to the community, uncompromising and courageous.

One needs money to be able to act in the community. One does not need the right ethnic origin. This is a difference which is in the eyes of the beholder.

INTERVIEWEE: Joseph Wolf (cont'd)

The strong leadership has gone, since the reason for it has gone. It was represented by men such as Ralph and Jeff Lazarus, the Rauh's, Sol Luckman, and Philip Meyers Sr. Now we have reason to be divided. Israel as a cause is defunct. A million dollars in Cincinnati is poor fund-raising, but there is no focal point of emotional appeal. When people were dying and fighting, there was an automatic increase of effort and funds. Now, all there are are petty, internequine squabbles.

Among the better younger leaders, he named Bernard Dave, Dave Steel, Henry Hersch, Charles Stix, Dick Weiland, and Bernard Rosenberg.

We have adequate Jewish leadership and use our resources adequately. The power structure cannot be bucked effectively. Leadership must try to satisfy all elements of the Jewish community, but only on the basis of need and correctness. There should be no unprincipled compromises.

The Jewish Community Center is a monstrosity foisted on the Jewish community by Marvin Warner and Kerten Mailender. They were authorized to build for \$1,500,000, but they spent \$2,400,000 and asked the JWF to pay for it. This was manifestly unfair.

Sheltering Oaks was a project of Steiner, Weston, Magrish, et. al., who forced through a full gift of it to the Jewish Hospital. Wolf tried to get a study made of the institution. They were afraid to let him talk. Now the JWF gives Jewish Hospital \$37,000 per year to let it take over with a guarantee of only fifteen beds for communal use. The screaming on the part of the power structure was to give the idea that they were doing the community a favor.

Community discipline is very strong. He recalled an incident with Philip Meyers Sr. who had a luncheon to raise a few dollars for the JCRC when he was president of it and thought that it needed extra operating funds. The JWF forced him to abandon the extra, informal drive.

If a major project were proposed, he would want the following on his side for policy discussion: Steiner, Fritz Rauh, Alfred Friedlander, and Herbert Bloch Jr. He would avoid Harold Goldstein, call on Eddie Jacobs if he thought he could be managed, and include Lou Lerner and Maury Levin. He might also include Nachum Eden. If it were a question of money, he would include the Lazarus', the Meyers', and Joseph Stern.

He sees himself as an independent, but usually agrees with Harold Goldstein ("We're both held in disrepute."), Harris Weston, and James Magrish ("fair, but weak.").

INTERVIEWEE: Joseph Wolf (cont'd)

He usually disagrees with women, especially Ruth Zeligs and Mrs. Benet. He is unable to influence them at all.

Messer is angry with the Jewish community leadership because he wanted to be invited to join Lesantiville Country Club and wasn't. It hit his wife harder than himself. He is accused of making money off his Jewish contacts, but, in reality, he has done free work and given generously. Yet, they have not been accepted, and this rankles. A lot of gossiping women aggravated the situation. He has much to give, especially advice. The Jewish community gives no rewards.

We used to have some forceful rabbis, such as James Heller. Now we have none who have authority over more than their own congregations. They are consulted only out of courtesy or that they could offer some help from a religious standpoint. The temples have no function for a larger role. Jewish education is definitely a non-essential when it comes to community service.

Naming the most influential Jews in the general community, he listed the Lazarus's, the Raub's, Alfred Friedlander, Messer, Bloch, the Meyers', Murray Seassongoed, Max Hersch, Gil Bettman, Walton Bachrach, and Willis Gradison Jr. The last two are non-participating Jews.

The following questionnaire was used as the basis of the following interviews: Herbert Bloch, Jr., Philip T. Cohen, Nachum Eden, Baron Gold, Henry Hersch, C. E. Israel, Charles Messer, Philip Meyers, Sr., Bernard Rosenberg, and Joseph Wolf. The questions were not all asked of any one interviewee, nor were they found to be uniformly valuable.

It is appended here for the convenience of the reader, although it is to be found elsewhere in the interpretive section of the thesis as a special appendix.

THESIS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

NAME OF RESPONDENT:

ADDRESS:

AGE:

OCCUPATION:

1. One of the men I have talked to about this thesis said that he thought the organization and operation of the Jewish community, and the Welfare Fund in particular, was very poor and ought to be revamped. How do you feel about this?

2. If this man could cause some agencies to withdraw from the Welfare Fund, who would you nominate as members of a committee to bring them back?

3. What kinds of jobs have you held in the Jewish community?

4. In which jobs were you most interested?

5. Did you lose interest in any?

6. Where does the important work in the Jewish community get done?

7. "It is important to satisfy all elements of the Jewish community." (Shown on a card).

8. "Except for religion there is actually little difference between the way a Jew and other Americans feel. It is wrong to harp on the idea that Jews are really distinct." (Shown on a card).

9. (Card with article depicting a synagogue desecration was shown). How do you think the community should handle an incident of the sort reported in this article, if it were to happen here? Who would be some of the men whom you would ask to handle the situation?

10. "Young leaders should be carefully groomed to carry on the present policies of the Jewish community leadership." (shown on a card).

11. What the Jewish community needs is: _____.
12. As a Jewish community leader, what do you see as some of the most important purposes of the Jewish community?
13. What was the first leadership position you accepted in the Jewish community? Who nominated you? Did you have any hesitation about accepting, and, if so, why?
14. Had you had any previous experience in this sort of work?
15. Did some of your family or friends try to get you involved in community work?
16. (Shown on a card) Please rank the following 1 through 5. "The most important issues facing the Jewish community today are....."
 _____ Church-state relations
 _____ Israel
 _____ Anti-Semitism
 _____ Fund-raising
 _____ Provision of community services, such as health care, family service, vocational guidance, etc.
 _____ Day schools
 _____ Finding good professional and lay leaders
 _____ Other (specify) _____
17. Why do some men make good leaders and other men poor ones?
18. Some people move up to top positions of leadership. Why are they chosen over others?
19. Are the people active in the Jewish community today doing a better or worse job than those a generation ago?
20. Who would you say are some of the outstanding younger leaders in the Jewish community today?
21. "Leaders must act for the entire Jewish community; I am confident that the Jewish community is satisfied with the leadership we have." (Shown on a card).
22. If a major project, such as a large capital expenditure, were proposed, who could get it accepted?
23. With whom would you want to talk over such a project?
24. Would your ideas be generally acceptable to the Jewish community? Might there be objections? Why?
25. To what activity in the Jewish community do you give the most time?

26. Whose views usually seem close to yours? Whose seem to be different?

27. Is there any individual who can veto an important proposal or obtain significant compromises before it is accepted?

28. Who are some of the Jewish leaders you see informally, such as at home or at the club?

29. Do you sometimes have non-Jews over to your home?

30. Do you go over to their homes?

31. What Jewish periodicals do you read regularly?

32. Do the rabbis in the community have anything to offer in terms of Jewish community leadership?

33. Have you ever noticed the rabbis taking part in policy decisions, such as the distribution of the Welfare Fund money? If not, why?

34. Should the temples and synagogues take a more active role?

35. "My children attended (attend) the following type of religious school...."

____ Orthodox
 ____ Conservative
 ____ Reform
 ____ Day School
 ____ None

They attended (attend) ____ days-a-week"
 (Shown on a card).

36. "To be an effective leader in the Jewish community, a man should be able to read some Hebrew and know something about the Bible and Jewish history." (Shown on a card).

37. Who are the Jews who are most influential in the non-Jewish world in Cincinnati?

38. "When it comes to important matters, a lot of people usually go along with my way of thinking." (Shown on a card.).

N.B. The notation "Shown on a card" indicates that the statement was typed on a 5 x 8 inch card and shown to the interviewee. He was asked to respond to the statement.